

30 January 2019

ICASA

Attention: Mr Lordwill Zwane

Per email: lzwane@icasa.org.za

SUBMISSIONS: DRAFT ORDERING SYSTEM SPECIFICATION FOR NUMBER PORTABILITY

1. ISPA refers to the Draft Ordering System Specification for Number Portability published in GG 42109 on 13 December 2018 and sets out its submissions below.
2. As a general comment ISPA advocates an approach of minimum interference with the existing regime other than where:
 - 2.1. It is necessary to provide for non-geographic number portability; and
 - 2.2. There is an opportunity to clarify areas which have caused practical challenges.
3. Section 8:
 - 3.1. This section appears to have been copied for a commercial agreement and should be redrafted to be more appropriate for a document of this nature.
 - 3.2. Sub-section 8(1) is incomplete.
 - 3.3. ISPA requests that provision be made for exchange of formal notifications by email and not just fax.
 - 3.4. ISPA is concerned that this section is overly-prescriptive in setting out, for example, where an arbitration is to be held. We suggest that allowance to be made for parties to a dispute to vary the provisions of this section by agreement.
 - 3.5. The Authority will be aware that arbitration is an expensive and time-consuming exercise which in many instances will not be justified by the commercial interests at stake. This acts to the prejudice of smaller operators.
4. Section 9:
 - 4.1. This section has, in part, been copied from a commercial agreement and as a whole makes no sense.
 - 4.2. There is a shared understanding of what a force majeure event is, and it seems unnecessary for the Authority to be overly-prescriptive in this regard.

5. Sections 7, 8(A), 11 and 23:

5.1. ISPA requests that time periods be expressed as a discrete number of calendar days rather than using references to "1 month".

5.2. In ISPA member's experience calculation of the former is straightforward but the latter creates confusion in practice.

6. Sub-section 10(5):

6.1. ISPA submits that the approach adopted is unduly complex.

6.2. The requirement to draw up and get sign-off of per-port project plans is - in the majority of cases - unnecessary and not observed in practice.

6.3. ISPA suggests that this requirement should only apply where requested by a party on a per-port basis.

7. Sub-sections 10(9) & (10) and section 32:

7.1. ISPA submits that the process for a "Change of Address" should be removed given that verification is based on the NDC boundary only and can be undertaken by a licensee in accordance with the Numbering Plan Regulations.

8. Section 10:

8.1. ISPA notes the introduction of an obligation to utilise the SOAP interface, notwithstanding that the majority of ISPA members continue to rely on the WebGUI interface.

8.2. ISPA does not support the replacement of "Port Request SPID" and "Port Response SPID" with "Port Request OID" and "Port Response OID" respectively for GNP/NGNP on the basis that the CRDB already knows which operators serve a number. ISPA submits that the current positions under the MNP Regulations and existing OSS should be retained.

8.3. ISPA requests further that the service provider model be retained as a workable model which may well see greater take-up in the fixed market as it grows and matures.

9. Sub-section 13(1):

9.1. ISPA submits that a simple amendment to this section could clarify an issue which has created confusion for years:

"13. Messages

The following business rules will apply to ensure operational efficiency:

- (1) A range is a single entity, and once porting activities have commenced must remain an entity until the porting process has been completed."

10. Miscellaneous:

10.1. Page 50: section 12 promises to set out valid reason codes but fails to do so.

10.2. Pages 94 and 103 - "ANNEXURE XX" requires numbering.

11. We trust that this above is of assistance to the Authority in its further deliberations.

Regards

ISPA REGULATORY ADVISORS