

Original

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ADVISORY AND COMPLIANCE DIVISION  
Telecommunications Branch

RESOLUTION NO. T-12068  
February 24, 1988

R E S O L U T I O N

GTE CALIFORNIA. ORDER AUTHORIZING THE OFFERING OF  
PERSONALIZED TELEPHONE NUMBER SERVICE.

SUMMARY

This resolution authorizes G.T.R. California (GTEC) to establish a new tariffed offering, Personalized Telephone Number Service (PTNS). This discretionary service, which allows a customer to select the last four digits of their telephone number is currently provided free. The Commission has already authorized Pacific Bell and Continental Telephone Companies to provide PTNS service. GTEC's Advice Letter No. 5118 is consistent with our policy to charge the cost causer for the expenses they generate.

BACKGROUND

PTNS enables residence and business customers to select the last four digits of their telephone number in lieu of the telephone number offered by the service representative. This discretionary service is currently provided by the utility at no charge to customers. Consequently, the added cost incurred by the utility in providing this service is borne by the general ratepayers. Consistent with our policy of having the cost causer bear the expense, GTEC, by Advice Letter No. 5118 filed January 26, 1988 requests authority under Section 454 of the Public Utilities Code, to establish PTNS on a tariffed basis. The following are the proposed charges for PTNS.

Personalized Telephone Number Service	<u>RESIDENCE</u>	<u>BUSINESS</u>
NON-RECURRING CHARGE.....	\$35.00	\$60.75
MONTHLY RECURRING CHARGE.....	\$1.50	\$3.50

General will offer PTNS only upon customer request.

General's proposed non-recurring charge is identical to a service connection charge for a new telephone number.

Pacific's non-recurring charge for residence and business is \$10.00 and \$38.00, respectively.

Continental's non-recurring charge for residence and business is \$10.00 and \$38.00, respectively

General's proposed monthly recurring charge is identical to the monthly recurring charge of Pacific Bell and Continental Telephone.

Those customers who have a specific number prior to the establishment of this service will not be charged for PTN service.

It is estimated that this filing will have an increased annual revenue effect of \$396,704.

### Discussion

Advice Letter No. 5118 was protested by API Alarm Company (API) by letter dated February 3, 1988, arguing that:

- 1) API believes that a PTN service should not apply for something so inconsequential as a prefix request (i.e. the first three numbers in a 7 digit telephone number).
- 2) GTEC is proposing nonrecurring charges (NRC) for PTN which are greater than those NRCs in Pacific Bell's PTN offering. For residence customers, GTEC has proposed an NRC of \$35.00, while Pacific's is only \$10.00. For business customers, GTEC has proposed an NRC of \$60.75, while Pacific's is only \$38.00. API believes that the Commission's approval of GTEC'S higher rates for this service would unfairly penalize customers located in GTEC'S service area.
- 3) GTEC'S advice letter does not include reasons for offering PTN service. General Order No. 96-A, Section III. C. states in part, "The (advice) letter should give essential information as to the reasons for the filing...". API believes that PTN service should not be approved until GTEC fulfills its requirements under General Order No. 96-A.

GTEC responded to API's protest by letter dated February 12, 1988, arguing that:

- 1) Customers placing service orders requiring telephone number assignment will be offered a choice of five available numbers. The data base that is used to assign telephone numbers randomly retrieves the telephone numbers requested. In all likelihood, the different prefixes available from each central office would be represented in this random retrieval. Thus, the customer could choose from these five available telephone numbers the prefix desired. If the customer identified to the customer representative the need of a special prefix before the representative inquired into the database, the representative could query the database by the requested prefix. If there was an available telephone number with the requested prefix, the

system would identify it. The customer would be assigned the telephone number retrieved. Any further searching to satisfy this type of request, would be discriminatory to other customers who may want a telephone number different than the original five offered.

- 2) GTEC's proposed NRC for PTN Service is equivalent to the existing service connection charge (GTEC's Schedule Cal. P.U.C. No. A-41) applicable to customers requesting telephone number changes. API's implication that generally equivalent rates should be charged by all local exchange carriers does not take into consideration that all carriers do not have equivalent operating costs.
- 3) General Order 96-A Section III.C. specifically states that only "essential information" be included, according utilities some latitude as to how General Order No. 96-A filing requirements should be addressed by each tariff filing. GTEC's reason for the filing was to establish a new service offering.

#### FINDINGS

We find that the rates, charges and conditions authorized in this resolution are just and reasonable.

API's protest is denied. It is the Commission's belief that a PTN Service charge applies whenever a customer selects a telephone number or available prefix other than what was initially offered to the customer. GTEC is proposing to offer prefixes without a PTN charge if the customer requests an available prefix before the service representative searches the computer system. Any searches beyond this point would constitute a PTN and all applicable charges would apply. To allow a customer to select any part of the telephone number without being charged a PTN Service charge would be discriminatory to PTN customers.

GTEC's NRC mirrors their charge for a number change service charge. API's belief that GTEC's NRC should be more in line with Pacific Bell's when providing similar services. This does not take into account the differing operating costs of these two different utilities.

GTEC's advice letter filing fulfills General Order 96-A, Section III.C., which states in part "that the advice letter should include essential information as to the reasons for the filing...". The advice letter states that the purpose is to provide a new service. We do not require the utility to go into detail for the reasoning for providing services. We require that the service be non-discriminating to GTEC's subscribers, that the rates be justified and that the service provide a contribution. GTEC provides tariff language and financial information that fulfills these requirements.

IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1) API's protest is denied.
- 2) General is authorized to offer Personalized Telephone Number Service only upon customer request and at the rates and conditions discussed above, effective March 7, 1987.
- 3) All tariff sheets filed under Advice Letter No.5118 shall be marked to show that such sheets were authorized by Resolution of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California Number T-12068.
- 4) The effective date of this Resolution is today.

I certify that this Resolution was adopted by the Public Utilities Commission at its regular meeting on February 24, 1987. The following Commissioners approved it:

STANLEY W. HULETT  
President  
DONALD VIAL  
JOHN B. O'HANIAN  
Commissioners



---

Executive Director