

TELECOMMUNICATION MOBILE NUMBER PORTABILITY REGULATIONS, 2009.

TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE GAZETTE OF INDIA, EXTRAORDINARY, PART 111, SECTION 4
TELECOM REGULATORY AUTHORITY OF INDIA NOTIFICATION New Delhi, the 19th September,
2012 TELECOMMUNICATION MOBILE NUMBER PORTABILITY (FOURTH AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS, 2012 (19 of 2012) In exercise of the powers conferred by sub- No. 116-15/2012-MN----
----- section (1) of section 36, read with sub-clauses (i), (iii) and (v) of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of
section 11 of the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India Act, 1997 (24 of 1997), the Telecom Regulatory
Authority of India hereby makes the following regulations to further amend the Telecommunication
Mobile Number Portability Regulations, 2009 (8 of 2009), namely:- 1. (1) These regulations may be called
the Telecommunication Mobile Number Portability (Fourth Amendment) Regulations, 2012. (2) They
shall come into force sixty days from the date of publication in the Official Gazette. 2. In regulation 11 of
the Telecommunication Mobile Number Portability Regulations, 2009 (8 of 2009) (herein after referred to
as the principal regulations), in sub-regulation (4) and sub-regulation (6), for the words "one hour"
wherever occurring, the words "two hours" shall be substituted. 1

3. After chapter III of the principal regulations, the following chapter shall be inserted, namely;-

"CHAPTER 111 A FINANCIAL DISINCENTIVES FOR CONTRAVENTION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE REGULATIONS 17 A —Consequence for contravention of the provisions of

regulation 8 or (1) If any service provider regulation 10 or regulation 11 or regulation 12 . contravenes the
provisions of sub-regulation (6) of regulation 8 or regulation 10 or sub-regulation (4) of regulation 11 or
sub-regulation(6) of regulation 11, it shall, without prejudice to the terms and conditions of its licence or
the provisions of the Act or rules or regulations or orders made, or, directions issued, thereunder, be liable
to pay an amount, by way of financial disincentive, not exceeding five thousand rupees for each
contravention, as the Authority may, by order direct. (2) If any service provider contravenes the provisions
of regulation 12, it shall, without prejudice to the terms and conditions of its licence or the provisions of
the Act or rules or regulations or orders made, or, direction issued, thereunder, be liable to pay an amount,
by way of financial disincentive not exceeding ten thousand rupees for each wrongful rejection of the
request for porting, as the Authority may, by order direct. (3) No order for payment of an amount by way
of financial disincentive under sub- regulation (1) and sub-regulation (2) shall be made by the Authority
unless the service provider has been given a reasonable opportunity of representing against the
contravention of the regulation observed by the Authority. 17B — Deposit of amount payable by way of
financial disincentive under these The amount payable by way of financial disincentive under these
regulations. regulations shall be remitted to such head of account as may be specified by order by the
Authority." ajeev rawa SECRETARY AGRAWAL Telecom Regulatory Authority of India R+10002/New
Delhi 110602 Note 1: The principal regulations were published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, part
III, section 4 vide notification No. 116-4/2009-MN (Vol.II) dated 23rd Sept. 2009 and amended vide: a)
Notification no. 116-1/2010 dated 28th January, 2010 (I of 2010) b) Notification no. 116-1/2010 dated
24th November, 2010 (5 of 2010) c) Notification no. 116-5/2012 dated 8th June, 2012 (16 of 2012) Note
2: The Explanatory Memorandum explains the objects and reasons of these regulations. •leiecoßl 3
Explanatory Memorandum The Telecom Regulatory Authority of India issued the Telecommunication
Mobile Number Portability Regulations, 2009 (8 of 2009) dated 23rd September, 2009 laying down the
basic business process framework for implementation of mobile number portability in the country. The
regulation and 13 of the regulations came into effect in all telecom service areas in the country from 20th
January 2011 through the Authority's direction dated 18th January, 2011

2. In the aforesaid regulations, provisions have been made for a Service Provider, acting as a Donor
Operator, to reject a porting request under the grounds mentioned in regulation 12 of the regulations

3. After implementation of the MNP Regulations, the Authority had received a number of complaints wherein the subscribers have reported that their porting requests have been rejected by the donor operators on frivolous grounds.In order to ascertain whether the porting requests being rejected are as per the provisions of regulation 12 of the regulations, the Authority sought supporting documents from the concerned Service Providers who have rejected porting requests under categories such as 'UPC mis-match', 'contractual obligation', 'less than 90 days from the date of activation of new

connection' and 'outstanding payment due'. In a number of cases, the Authority noted that the Donor Operator, could not furnish satisfactory evidence to establish that the rejection of the porting requests of the subscribers done by them were in accordance with the regulation 12

4. Further, in the regulations, the Authority specified timelines for various activities for the porting process. While reviewing the progress of MNP, the Authority noted that deviations are also taking place in the timelines specified by the Authority in the regulation

5. In order to discourage the operators for wrongly rejecting the porting requests and to encourage them to meet the time lines specified in the MNP regulations, the Authority decided to seek comments from the stakeholders on introduction of 4 provisions for levying of financial disincentives in the MNP regulations for non- compliance of regulations. Accordingly, TRAI placed the draft amendment in the regulations on the subject on its website on 3rd August 2012 for consultation with the stakeholders. The comments of the stake holders on the draft regulations were solicited by 13th August 2012. Further, on request of stakeholders the Authority had extended the last date for submission of comments by stake holders up to 3rd September 2012. In their response, the stakeholders had commented broadly on the Power of Authority for introducing financial disincentives in the regulations, financial disincentives on deviation from timelines & wrongful rejections in the regulations. The Authority has analysed these comments, which are given below:

6. Power of the Authority for introducing financial disincentives in the regulations: The service providers and the Associations have in their comments, inter-alia, stated that the Authority lacks statutory mandate to impose financial disincentive on the service providers for non-compliance of the provisions of the regulations. The Authority has considered the points raised by the service providers and their associations and have been advised that it has power to impose financial disincentives on the service providers in order to regulate the telecom sector and to protect the interest of the consumers of the telecom sector. The TRAI Act confers power on the Authority not only to regulate but also the power to ensure the compliance of the provisions of the regulations. The word "ensure" has mandatory connotation, it means "make certain". Furthermore, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in its judgment dated the 17, Aug, 2007, in Civil Appeal No. 2104/2006 (Central Power Distribution Co. & Ors Vs. CERC & Anr), inter-alia, held that "it is well settled that a power to regulate includes within it power to enforce". The main purposes for enactment of the TRAI Act, 1997, as discernable from the preamble thereof, and as applicable to TRAI are (a) to regulate telecommunication services : (b) to protect the interest of the service providers and consumers of telecommunication services; and (c) to ensure orderly growth of 5 telecom sector. From the reading of the various provisions of TRAI Act, it is clear that protection of the interest of the consumers has been given paramount importance by the legislature. It will not be out of place to mention that there are a catena of judgments by the Supreme Court wherein the Hon'ble Court has repeatedly re-stated the proposition that legislation should be read and interpreted so as to further the purpose of its enactment and not in a manner that derogates from its main objectives. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment in the case of State of Karnataka Vs. Vishwabharthi House Building Co-operative Societies and Ors. [(2004) 5 SCC 430], quoted with approval the judgment of Hon'ble Guwahati High Court in the case of Arbind Das Vs. State of Assam & Ors. [AIR 1981 Gau 18 (FB)] wherein it was inter-alia, held that where a statute gives a power, such power implies that legitimate steps may be taken to exercise that power even though these steps may not be clearly spelled out in the statute. The Hon'ble Court further held that in determining whether a power claimed by a statutory authority can be held to be incidental or ancillary to the powers specially conferred by the statute, the court must not only see whether the power may be derived by reasonable implication from the provisions of the statute, but also whether such powers are necessary for carrying out the purposes of the provision of the statute which confers power on the Authority in exercise of such powers. The relevant part of said judgment reads as under:- We are of firm opinion that where a statute gives a power, such power implies that all legitimate steps may be taken to exercise that power even though these steps may not be clearly spelt in the statute. Where the rule-making authority gives power to certain authority to do anything of public character, such authority should get the power to take intermediate steps in order to give effect to the exercise of the power in its final step, otherwise the ultimate power would become illusory, ridiculous and inoperative which could not be the intention of the rule-making authority. 6 In determining whether a power claimed by the statutory authority can be held to be incidental or ancillary to the powers expressly conferred by the statute, the court must not only see whether the power may be derived by reasonable

implication from the provisions of the statute, but also whether such powers are necessary for carrying out the purpose of the provisions of the statute which confers power on the authority in its exercise of such power. Apart from casting duty on the Authority to protect the interest of the consumer, TRAI Act under section 11 (1)(d) confers power on TRAI to perform such other functions including such administrative and financial functions as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act. It is also worthwhile to mention over here the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in U.P. Cooperative Cane Unions Federations vs. West U.P. sugar Mills Association & Ors. (AIR 2004 SC 3697) wherein the Hon'ble court, inter alia, held that the word to regulate is a phrase of broad impact having a wide meaning comprehending all facets not only specifically enumerated in the Act, but also embraces within its fold the powers incidental to the regulation envisaged in good faith and its meaning has to be ascertained in the context in which it is being used and the purpose of the statute. The Hon'ble court held that even when the power to fix tariff was not expressly given in the Act, the power to regulate the price of Sugar Cane would include in itself the power to fix tariff. In other words, even a power not explicitly vested with the authority would be held so vested, if it was intrinsic to the exercise of larger, general power to regulate. The relevant part of the aforesaid judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is as under :- "20 "Regulate " means to control or to adjust by rule or to subject to governing principles. It is a word of broad impact having wide meaning comprehending all facets not only specifically enumerated in the Act, but also embraces within its fold the powers incidental to the regulation envisaged in good faith and its meaning has to be ascertained in the context in which it has been used and the purpose of the statute. 7 26... The provisions of the Act referred to above also show that the legislature has made very elaborate provisions regarding supply of sugarcane by cane-growers, its purchase by the sugar factories and payment of price thereof In fact, very detailed and exhaustive provisions have been made in the Rules and the 1954 Orders to ensure that at the time of delivery of sugarcane by the cane-growers, its weight and price is correctly recorded and the price is paid to them within 14 days, failing which the sugar factory is liable to pay interest. In such circumstances, the irresistible conclusion which can be drawn is that the regulatory power possessed by the State Government shall also include the power to fix the price of the sugarcane. If it is held that the State under its power of regulation cannot fix the price, then the statutory provision contained in the 1953 Act, the Rules and 1954 Order will become completely one sided, operating entirely for the benefit of sugar factories giving them many advantages with no corresponding obligations and leaving the cane grower in a lurch with a host of restrictions upon him. This can never be the intention of the Legislature. It will not be fair to read the Act and the Rules in such a restrictive manner, whereby the provisions made for the benefit of the cane growers become wholly illusory.... The Authority is, therefore, of the view that in order to effectively discharge its functions under TRAI Act and to protect the interest of the consumer of the telecom sector, it has power to impose financial disincentives on the service provider for non-compliance of the provisions of the regulations.

7. Financial disincentives for deviating from time lines prescribed in the MNP process: a) Recipient operator to submit customer details to MNP service provider within 24 hours of receipt of porting request:- Regarding the timelines for forwarding the porting requests by the recipient operator, few service providers stated that there is no provision for time stamp for the requests of porting made by the subscriber. Some of the stake holders suggested that TRAI should specify threshold for number of cases for not meeting the time lines. Stringent subscriber verification guidelines, was also mentioned as one of the constraints in meeting the timelines. The Authority is of the opinion that the service provider can comply with the regulations with date as a reference. Further, service provider is activating the subscriber in his network only at the end of porting period. Therefore, it has sufficient time to verify the subscriber. b) Donor Operator to provide the clearance to the porting request only on the 4th working day:- Stake holders expressed that there is no effect on the timelines of the MNP processes even if the Donor Operator takes more than four days. One of the stake holder suggested that threshold in such cases should be 98%. It has been observed by the th Authority that the service providers have been clearing the porting request before 4 working day, which is against the instructions issued by the licensor. The Authority is of the view that clearance of the porting request should be done only on the 4th working day as it is the security requirement. Therefore, the Authority finds no reason for acceding to the request of the stakeholders and hence no relaxation is allowed. c) Time lines for Deactivation and Activation:- Some of the stake holders suggested for modification of time lines from 2 hours to 4 hours excluding network down

time/latency related issues for deactivation and activation. One of the stakeholders suggested the threshold of 95% of the porting 9 requests within 2 hours averaged over one month. Having considered the comments of the stakeholders the Authority is of the view that the network downtime cannot be a reason for non compliance with the time lines. The operators should schedule their systems/processes so as the activations and deactivations are not disrupted. Considering the present status of the service providers in meeting these time lines, the Authority felt that they will be able to meet these timelines within 2 hours duration each for deactivation and activation of a mobile number. Therefore timelines for activation/deactivation, in sub-regulation (4) and (6) of Regulation 11 of principal regulations, has been modified from 1 hour to 2 hours. As this activity takes place during the night time, this increase in the timelines will not be inconvenient to the customers. d) Financial disincentive in case of wrongful rejections and deviation in timelines in the MNP process Some of the stakeholders suggested that wrongful rejections should have a QoS norm. Some of the stakeholders suggested benchmarks for invalid rejections also. However, the Authority is of the opinion that it will not be practical to prescribe wrongful rejection as QoS parameter, as wrongful rejections are known only after verification is carried out. Therefore, Authority is of the view that wrongful rejections need to be discouraged by levying financial disincentives on the concerned Donor Operator after verifying the correctness of rejection of porting requests on sample basis. In view of the foregoing, the Authority has decided to amend the principal 8. regulations by incorporating provisions for levying financial disincentives

9. For the purpose of verification of correctness of rejection of porting requests by the Donor Operator or compliance to the timelines, the Authority may call for data from Access Providers or Mobile Number Portability Service providers or both from time to time. Based on the analysis of the data and supporting information provided by the 10 MNP service providers and Access Providers, the Authority shall levy financial disincentives on the concerned access provider as following: (a) In the cases where deviation is noticed by the Authority in the timelines specified in regulation 8 (6), 10, 11(4) or 11(6), a financial disincentive of Rs.5,000/- will be levied for each contravention. (b) In the cases where contravention is established in rejection of porting request for an Access Provider acting as Donor Operator, a financial disincentive of an amount of Rs. 10,000/- will be levied for each rejection. IO. Before reaching to a conclusion about contravention and imposing the financial disincentives, the Authority shall give a reasonable opportunity to the concerned Service Provider to represent before the Authority. 11 TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE GAZETTE OF INDIA , EXTRAORDINARY, PART 111, SECTION 4 TELECOM REGULATORY AUTHORITY OF INDIA NOTIFICATION New Delhi , the 22nd July 2013 TELECOMMUNICATION MOBILE NUMBER PORTABILITY (FIFTH AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 2013 (9 of 2013) In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section No. 116-4/2013-NSL-II-- (iii) and (v) of clause (b) of sub- (1) of section 36 , read with sub-clauses (i), section (1) of section 11, of the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India Act, 1997 (24 of 1997), the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India hereby makes the following regulations to further amend the Telecommunication Mobile Number Portability Regulations, 2009 (8 of 2009), namely:- 1. (1) These regulations may be called the Telecommunication Mobile Number Portability (Fifth Amendment) Regulations, 2013. (2) They shall come into force after ninety days from the date of their publication in the Official Gazette

2. In regulation 2 of the Telecommunication Mobile Number Portability Regulations, 2009 (8 of 2009), (hereinafter referred as the principal regulations),- (a) after clause (b), the following clause shall be inserted, namely:- "(ba) "authorised signatory" means the person authorised by a body corporate, firm or any organisation or body to make request in writing for the porting of corporate mobile phone number allotted to such body corporate , firm or organisation or body; (b) after clause (c), the following clause shall be inserted, namely:- "(ca) "corporate mobile number" means the mobile phone number allotted in the name of a body corporate, firm or any organisation or 3.body." In regulation 5 of the principal regulations, after clause (c), the following provisos shall be inserted, namely:- " Provided that the Access Provider shall - identify and allot a distinct identification code to all the corporate (a) mobile numbers available in its subscriber data base; and (b) in case of a request for simultaneous porting of more than one corporate mobile numbers, allocate separate unique porting code for each corporate mobile number." In regulation 6 of the principal regulations, after clause (e) of the first 4. proviso and before the second proviso, the following clauses shall be inserted, namely:- (f) no corporate mobile number shall be ported unless the porting request in respect of such number is accompanied by an

authorisation letter from the authorised signatory of the subscriber in the format annexed to these regulations ; (g) the porting request, in case of corporate mobile number, does not seek simultaneous porting of more than fifty mobile numbers; (h) the porting request, if made for more than one corporate mobile number, such numbers belong to the same Donor Operator." 5. (a) In regulation 7 of the principal regulations,----- in sub-regulation (3), (i) in clause (a), the word " and" appearing at the end shall be deleted; (ii) in clause (b), at the end, the word "and" shall be inserted; (iii) after clause (b), the following clause shall be inserted, namely:- " (c) in case of corporate mobile number, an authorisation letter from the authorised signatory of the subscriber permitting such portinÉ'; (b) for sub —regulation (4) the following sub-regulation shall be substituted, namely:- " (4) The subscriber shall , with his request for porting , pay the porting charge, if any, for each mobile number sought to be ported". 6. (a) In regulation 8 of the principal regulations,----- in sub- regulation (6) , for the proviso , the following provisos shall be substituted, namely:- Provided that in case of corporate mobile number, the Recipient Operator shall also forward to the Mobile Number Portability Service provider, a scanned copy of the authorisation letter issued by the authorised signatory permitting the porting of the such mobile number: Provided further that for the corporate mobile number, the time period for forwarding the mobile number etc, to the Mobile Number Portability Service provider shall be forty eight hours from the receipt of porting request: Provided also that in calculating the period of twenty four hours specified in sub-regulation (6) and forty eight hours specified in second proviso, the intervening Sundays and Public Holidays declared under the Negotiable Instrument Act, 1881 (26 of 1881) shall be excluded: Provided also that forwarding of one copy of authorisation letter permitting porting of more than one mobile number, in case of corporate mobile number, shall be sufficient for the purposes of sub- regulation (6)." , (b) for sub-regulation (7) the following sub- regulation shall be substituted, namely:- (7) The Recipient Operator shall be liable to pay Per Port Transaction charge in respect of each mobile number forwarded by it to the mobile number portability service provider"

7. In regulation 9 of the principal regulations, in sub-regulation (4) for the words " the details of such request to the Donor Operator for seeking his clearance for such porting the words " the details of such request alongwith scanned copy of the authorisation letter in case of corporate mobile number, to the Donor Operator for porting" shall be substituted.80 (a) In regulation 12 of principal regulations----- after clause (h) and before the proviso, the following clauses shall be inserted, namely:- (i) in case of a corporate mobile number, the porting request is not accompanied by authorisation letter from the authorised signatory of the subscriber; the validity period of the Unique Porting Code has expired before its 0) receipt by the Donor Operator. for the existing proviso, the following provisos shall be substituted, (b) namely:- Provided that while rejecting a request for porting, on any ground specified in clause (a) to (j) , each corporate mobile number shall be treated separately : Provided further that if the Donor Operator rejects a porting request on the grounds specified in clauses (h) and (i), he shall indicate the full details of the grounds on which the porting request has been rejected and retain a copy of such records for a minimum period of six months." In regulation 16 of the principal regulations, after sub-regulation (7) 9. the following sub- regulation shall be inserted , namely:- " (8) In case of rejection of porting request of a corporate mobile number on the grounds specified in clause (i) of regulation 12, the Mobile Number Portability Service provider shall retain the scanned copy of the authorisation letter for a minimum period of six months". Format of Authorization Letter for porting of corporate Mobile Numbers 4, (see regulation 6 (f)) To be submitted on company letter head To, (The Recipient Operator) Subject: Port out of corporate mobile number. the authorized signatory of M/ s. 1. (name of the body corporate etc.), hereby authorize the porting out of the following mobile phone numbers, allotted to Operator) to M/ area):- S.No .(name of body corporate etc.), from M/ s....(name of the Recipient Operator) in---- ..(name of the Donor (name of service Corporate Number Mobile Unique Porting code Undertaking It is certified that I am the authorized signatory for the above mentioned mobile numbers and this information has been updated with the Donor Operator. Name of Company: Authorized Signatory Name: Authorized Signatory Contact No: Signature of Authorized Signatory: Authorized Signatory email ID: Stamp of the Company/ corporate/ organization: Date: Note: If this letter has more than one page, each page shall be signed by the Authorised signatory -End of Format-- 77) I (Raj ev Agra al SECRETARY Note 1: The principal regulations were published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, part III, section 4 vide notification No. 1164/2009-MN (Vol.II) dated the 23rd Sept. 2009 and amended vide: a) Notification no.

116-1/2010 dated 28th January, 2010 (1 of 2010) b) Notification no. 116-1/2010 dated 24th November, 2010 (5 of 2010) c) Notification no. 116-5/2012 dated 8th June, 2012 (16 of 2012) d) Notification no. 116-15/2012 dated 19th September, 2012 (19 of 2012) Note 2: The Explanatory Memorandum explains these regulations. the objects and reasons of 1. 2. 3. 4

5. Explanatory Memorandum The Telecom Regulatory Authority of India issued the Telecommunication Mobile Number Portability Regulations, 2009 (8 of 2009) dated 23rd September, 2009 laying down the basic business process framework for implementation of mobile number portability in the country. The Regulations 10, 11, 12 and 13 of these regulations came into effect in all telecom service areas in the country from 20th January 2011 through the Authority's direction dated 18th January, 2011. Complaints were received from subscribers of Corporate mobile numbers that their porting requests have been rejected by the donor operators under the category "Contractual Obligation" for want of permission/ authorization from the company/ corporate for porting such numbers. In order to address issues relating to processing of porting requests, from the corporate mobile numbers, TRAI had placed draft Telecommunications Mobile Number Portability (Fifth Amendment) Regulations 2013 on 19th March 2013 on TRAI's website www.trai.gov.in seeking comments of stakeholders by 2nd April 2013. In the draft amendment, separate procedure for porting of corporate mobile number has been specified, as it requires authorization from the concerned authorized signatory of the corporate or organization. On the request of some stakeholders, the date for receiving comments was extended upto 09th April 2013. The Authority examined the comments received from the stakeholders; the key issues and its analysis are given below: Time period for implementation Most of the stakeholders sought time for implementing the new process for porting of corporate mobile numbers, ranging from 30 days to 3 months. Considering the time required for setting up the processes such as identification of corporate mobile numbers, establishing UPC generation mechanism specified in these regulations for corporate mobile numbers, changes required in the existing gateways for corporate MNP RAJEEV At nary 6. 7. 8. process and its testing, it has been felt that sufficient time should be given to service providers and MNP service providers to carryout required changes in their system. Accordingly, the amendments are made effective after 90 days from the date of its publication in official gazette. Need for Authorized signatory's letter Presently, for porting of individual numbers, authentication of subscriber is carried out through Unique Porting Code mechanism. One of the stakeholders has suggested that corporate subscribers should seek No objection Certificate (NOC) from the Donor Operator. In this regard, it may be noted that the existing porting process is Recipient Operator led porting, as such the customer approaches to the Recipient Operator for porting of a mobile number. No Objection Certificate from the Donor Operator will go against the principles of existing framework, therefore, is not acceptable. However to ensure genuineness of porting, a copy of the letter from authorized signatory's will be sent by the Recipient Operator to Donor Operator alongwith other required details. Limit on the number of mobile numbers in a corporate porting request On the issue whether there should be a limit on number of corporate mobile numbers which can be included in one porting request, one of the suggestion has been to put a limit on the number of corporate mobile numbers in a porting request by the authorised signatory. The issue has been examined and limit of 50 mobile numbers with a corporate porting request has been prescribed so that probability of errors in feeding of large mobile numbers with UPCs by the Recipient Operator is reduced and at the same time sufficient numbers can be processed simultaneously with authorized signatory's request. Need for separate UPC for corporate mobile numbers sought to be ported On the issue of whether each corporate mobile number should have separate UPC or whether one UPC will be sufficient for all corporate mobile numbers, some of the stakeholders have suggested that there OFJQI€/RAJEEV A' tpp 9. 10. should be a single UPC for all requested corporate mobile numbers generated by the Authorised signatory, while some of them have suggested that each corporate mobile number should generate separate UPC for porting of their mobile number. In the present arrangement the request for generation of UPC for a mobile number, sought to be ported, should be generated from the same mobile number. If mobile number of the Authorised signatory is permitted to generate UPC, the entire framework is required to be changed without serving any useful purpose. Moreover Donor operators need to maintain a separate list of such Authorised Signatories for authentication. In view of the complexities in such arrangement, it is felt necessary that UPCs be generated by the user of each corporate mobile number to avoid conflict / dispute regarding the porting of corporate mobile number to avoid that the number is ported out without the user knowledge.

Provision is made wherein Authorised signatory will send such numbers under his signature and in a defined format. Requirement of enclosing a scanned copy of authorisation letter In the Regulations, provision has been made for sending scanned copy of the letter from the authorized signatory of the company/ organization by the Recipient Operator to Donor Operator. Some of the Telecom Service Providers have informed that sending of scanned copies would need additional hardware infrastructure in their customer Relationship Management (CRM) system. They have also indicated that the existing connectivity with the MNPSs needs to be enhanced to meet the bandwidth required for sending the scanned copy of the Authorization letter. This may also require additional investment. In this regard, it may be noted that corporate mobile numbers may not be large in numbers. Further only one scanned document shall be required for multiple corporate porting numbers up to 50 mobile numbers and corporate porting request can be processed in company owned customer centers where such facilities are normally available. In case such facilities are not available, corporate customers requesting for porting may be asked to provide the scanned copy of required Authorisation letter. The scanned document being in the format of PDF will not require large bandwidth between Telecom Service Providers and MNP Service Providers. As such, significant investment may not be needed to put in place the proposed mechanism 11. 12. 13. 14, Stakeholders also pointed out that this being a manual activity which involves scanning of documents and sending as an attachment? Recipient Operator may require more time for processing. Considering this, it has been decided to increase the time for Recipient Operator to forward the corporate porting request to Mobile Number Portability Service providers from existing 24 hours to 48 hours. In this regard, it is pertinent to mention that the Donor Operator is expected to clear the porting request on the fourth working day upon receipt of porting request from MNP service provider. Rejection of Porting request by Donor Operator Telecom Operators also suggested for providing a separate rejection category for rejection of corporate porting request due to authorization letter being invalid so that the exact reason for rejection is known to the concerned authorized signatory. Accordingly, separate category for rejection of corporate porting request has been incorporated. In addition to above, one more category of reason of rejections has been added i.e "the validity period of the Unique Porting Code has expired before its receipt by the Donor Operator". The reason for the same is that on analyzing the reasons of rejections, it was noticed that many porting requests are being rejected due to "UPC mismatch". On further analysis, it was found that majority of rejections due to UPC mismatch were actually due to expiry of validity period of UPC. In order to have clear distinction between actual "UPC mismatch" and "UPC expiry", a new reason of rejection has been added. Additional time for Donor Operator to clear or reject a corporate porting request Some of the stakeholders sought more validation time for the donor operator from existing 4 working days to 7 working days to clear or reject a porting request of a corporate mobile numbers In this regard it is felt that the time of 4 working days specified in the existing regulation is sufficient to clear or reject corporate porting request by the Donor Operator, as manual checks are mostly relating to authorized signatory which is common to all ported corporate mobile numbers upto 50 mobile numbers. Therefore, existing timelines of four working days have been retained. tA7)D