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1. Background

1.1 Legal background

Under its founding law, Order 65, the Communications and Media Commission (CMC) is solely responsible for licensing and regulating telecommunications, broadcasting, information Services and other media in the Republic of Iraq, and among its functions is the drafting and implementing of standards and rules for competitive provision of telecommunications and access to Numbering resources.

1.2 Regulatory background

Number Portability (NP) is all about Numbers and about nothing else than Numbers. One of the corner-stones during the drafting of the Policy and the Regulation was to ensure that the regulatory instrument for and the implementation of NP in the Republic of Iraq will be future-proof and cost-effective. The same centralised infrastructure, Customer processes and IT-processes will therefore be used for all kinds of NP, independently of technology, operation or ownership of networks or the features of services. Hence also virtual network Operators (MVNOs) will have to offer NP to its Customers.

1.3 Project background

CMC commissioned consultants WRAP International AB to advice on the introduction of Number Portability. CMC requested advice on good practice internationally in the implementation of NumberPortability and the Porting process, a preferred choice between different approaches in the light of international experience conditions in the Republic of Iraq, and a roadmap for the implementation. The project started in January 2015.

1.4 Consultation background

The published NumberPortabilityConsultation document(NP Consultation) discusses the considerations made and the justifications behind the proposed roadmap for the implementation of NumberPortability in the Republic of Iraq. It also put forward drafts of the policy on NumberPortability and of the regulation on mobile NumberPortability. These had been discussed with CMC, but before making any decisions CMC wished to consult stakeholders.

The “Number Portability Policy” document is intended to be self-contained and to apply when Customers change the Providers of services that do not necessarily depend on Numbers. The final version of this document can now be ordered from CMC, or can be downloaded from the web: www.cmc.iq
The “Mobile Number Portability Regulation” document refers back to the “Number Portability Policy”, as it is intended to provide more details than the “Number Portability Policy” for the specific case of Mobile Number Portability (MNP). The final version of this document can now be ordered from CMC, or can be downloaded from the web: www.cmc.iq

1.5 The Number Portability Consultation

CMC published the NP Consultation on its website on 17th September 2015, with a closing date on 17th October 2015. Some answers were slightly delayed, so the closing date was postponed one week, till 24th October 2015.

Submissions were received from three mobile Operators in the Republic of Iraq;

- Asiacell
- Korek
- Zain

(No other entity commented on the NP Consultation.)

The mobile Operators sent both general comments, as well as responses to the specific NP Consultation questions in the document.

CMC wish to take this opportunity to thank the mobile Operators for their time spent and their efforts made, to be able to send this valuable feedback!

CMC has sent detailed answers on all comments and responses received from each mobile Operator individually.

1.6 Reading instructions

The source from which CMC received the responses/comments to the NP Consultation issues of general interest, has been removed from this NP Consultation report.

Chapter 2 “Consultation questions, responses and answers” is a compilation of the specific questions raised by CMC in the NP Consultation, responses received from the mobile Operators and CMC’s answers on those responses. The answer on some other more general remarks from the mobile Operators have also been included in this chapter.

Chapter 2 follows the same structure (i.e. with the same headings) as the NP Policy, the MNP Regulation and chapters 4 and 5 in the NP Consultation document.

The details related to updates made to finalise the NP Policy and the MNP Regulation documents, based on the outcome from the NP Consultation, can be found in chapter 3 “Updates in the NP Policy and the MNP Regulation”.
Additional clarifications on some of the regulations in the NP Policy document are included in “ANNEX A: Additional clarifications on the Number Portability Policy”.

In the same way, additional clarifications on some of the regulations in the MNP Regulation document are included in “ANNEX B: Additional clarifications on the Mobile Number Portability Regulation”.

Kindly note that the additional comments doesnot affect the NP Policy and/or the MNP Regulation document. They are included in this NP Consultation report to clarify responses/questions received during the NP Consultation process.

1.7 Conclusions

The NP Policy and the MNP Regulation documents are now officially approved. No further changes will be made at this point in time. The final version of the documents, both in an Arabic and in an English version, can now be ordered from CMC and can also be downloaded directly from the web: www.cmc.iq

The NP Consultation process is finalised by publishing this Number Portability Consultation Report.

Further details, comments and questions on the implementation of NP in the Republic of Iraq, will be managed in the NP Forum that will be established during Q1 2016.
2. Consultation questions, responses and answers

Below is a compilation on the specific questions raised by CMC in the NP Consultation, responses received from the mobile Operators and CMC’s answers on those responses. Some other remarks of general nature from the mobile Operators have also been answered by CMC.

2.1 Scope

No specific questions.

Response:

Point 1 in the “Number Portability Policy” and in the “Mobile Number Portability Regulation” strengthens our view on what should be the role of CMC in the Number Portability implementation in Iraq. CMC should not interfere in the development of the NP specifications, which instead should be worked out by the NP Industry forum.

Answer:

Experience from other countries shows that one of the key factors for a successful implementation of NP is a well-functioning and active NP forum, with all Operators as permanent members and headed by the telecommunication regulatory authority. CMC is determined and happy to take this leading role, both during the specification phase, the phase in which the CRDB Provider will be selected, during the implementation phase as well as after the MNP launch.

Response:

We would also like CMC to ensure that the cost recovery process would be equitable among concerned Operators/Providers and CMC to share with the stakeholders the expected cost to be incurred, in order for them to assess and prepare the required budget.

Answer:

- A Central Reference Database Provider (CRDB Provider) will be selected thru an open tender process, with pre-defined evaluation criteria, headed by the CMC. The plan is that this tender process will take place during H1, 2016.

- The establishment, maintenance and operation of the CRDB will be paid as yearly fees by the Participating Operators, to the CRDB Provider in proportion to allocated PortableNumbers. This yearly fee will guarantee that the CRDB Provider will manage a pre-defined maximum Number of yearly Portings, at no per-Porting cost for the Operators. No up-front costs to the CRDB Provider will be allowed.
CMC will establish a NP industry forum (NP Forum) during Q1 2016, headed by CMC, in which all mobile Operators will be permanent members. NP Forum will be involved in reviewing and publishing the CRDB tender and selecting the best CRDB Provider for the implementation of NP in the Republic of Iraq. In this process the yearly cost (to pay for the CRDB) per Operator will be determined.

2.2 Interpretation

No specific questions.

Response:

In reference to “Range Holder”, we suggests that “Block Operator” or “Range Holder” should be added to the “Interpretation” chapter in the Policy and in the Regulation.

**Block Operator** or **Range holder** means a licensed Operator that has been allocated a Number block that contains a Number that is being or has been ported.

Answer:

The NP Policy has been updated.

2.3 Motivation

No specific questions.

Response:

Developing a system to cater for any kind of Portability needs detailed assessment.

Answer:

Processes and other administrative issues will be described in the NP administrative standard document. Routing will be specified in the NP network standard document. IT issues related to the communication between the Operator’s NP systems and the CRDB will be detailed by the CRDB Provider during the implementation phase of the project.

Response:

How will the integration with CRDB be managed?

Answer:

The details for the IT-interfaces between the CRDB and the mobile Operator’s NP systems will be defined during the early phases in the MNP implementation project, after the CRDB Provider has been contracted, and will be handled within NP Forum.
2.4 Plans

Q1: CMC intends to implement NP using a step-by-step approach, beginning with MNP. What is your view about this approach and the timing for the implementation of NP for the different technologies?

Response:

We have no objections to CMC using a step-by-step approach to implement NP by starting with Mobile Number Portability.

But as the same centralised infrastructure, Customer processes and IT-processes will be used for all kinds of NP, independently of technology, we are in a view that CMC should make sure that NP is provided by all licensed Operators/Providers who are entitled to Numbering-Assignment (fixed wireline and wireless), thereby eliminating any anticompetitive practices in a timeline not more than 2 years after the commercial launch of MNP.

Answer:

CMC has currently no plans to launch Fixed NP, while any active MVNO Operator on the Iraqi telecom market, at the launch of MNP, will be obliged to also offer MNP to the telecom Customers in the Republic of Iraq at the same time as the mobile Operators. Please refer to regulation 12 in the NP policy document regarding CMCs plans in relation to NP for WLL Operators “Services that depend on Wireless Local Loop (WLL) Numbers, as identified in the National Numbering Plan, are also available in Iraq. CMC might introduce Service Provider Number Portability for WLL Numbers later. In doing so it would take into account the need for the market to develop robustly and the demand for Service Provider Number Portability from Service Providers or Customers.”

Response:

Yes, NP implementation should be implemented step-by-step. First only MNP and then fixed line NP. As far as time-line is concerned, below are the key phases during the implementation of MNP:

- Regulations
- Formation of MNP CRDB
- Formulation of Business Processes & Policies in the light of regulation
- CRM enhancements
- Network & charging system enhancements
- MNP operations team formation
- Customer Care
- Sales / Commission structure
- Marketing communication plan

The above may take between 18 months and 2 years.

Answer:
Thank you for your comment.

Response:

Announcing MNP launch date 3 months in advance is not helpful. CMC in cooperation with Mobile Operators should have a clear timetable for the implementation and launch of the MNP in the draft regulation or in a separate resolution. Giving us three months to launch the MNP is not enough. The timeline required to implement MNP should not be less than 18 months from the decision date. The Porting terms and conditions which include processes, procedures, financial terms and specifications should be agreed among mobile Operators.

Answer:

All mobile Operators will be permanent members in the NP Forum that will be active during the selection of the CRDB Provider and during the implementation of the CRDB. The three (3) months mentioned in the MNP Regulation, regulation 13, refers to the notice time CMC will give the Operators to know the exact MNP go-live date, not the timeframe from a signed contract with the CRDB Provider till the MNP launch date. MNP is expected to be launched during 2017.

2.5 User rights

Q2: CMC is in favour of allowing the Customer to request to port multiple Numbers in the same Porting order. If this will be the case; do you think that the whole order should be rejected if one of the Numbers in the order is rejected by the losing Operator/Provider for legitimate reasons, or should the approved Numbers be ported and only the rejected Number not be ported?

Response:

• We believe that the whole order should be rejected. If not it would encourage bad behaviour of subscribers and increase Operators stock of bad debts.

• There should also be a limit to the quantity of Numbers that a specific Customer can port at one time. Above that quantity, the Porting of Numbers should require special treatment that could be outlined by the NP Industry forum.

Answer:

We will take your valuable comments into consideration during the detailed specification phase of the MNP project.

Response:

To avoid complications, it is recommended to have one NPR against one MSISDN so every case is dealt with separately. It is recommended to have smooth operations and Porting. Based on our experience from other markets, the NP request should be per MSISDN.
Answer:

The reason for allowing more than one Number in the same Porting request is for the convenience of business/corporate Customers. In addition – more than one Number in the same Porting request is allowed in several countries.

2.6 Porting process

Q3: Any comments on the parameters listed in chapter 4.6 are welcome.

Response:

We believe that the whole Porting process should be discussed within the NP Industry forum and cross-checked with the CRDB supplier.

Answer:

The Porting processes will be an important part of the NP administrative standard document that will be drafted during Q4 2015. The NP administrative standard document (among other important documents) will be presented at the launch of the NP Forum.

Response:

- The targeted Porting time of one hour when Customer is in a sales outlet of the gaining Operator is not realistic and any targeted Porting time by CMC should be agreed upon by all concerned parties. One day is the standard.

- The whole end to end time for transferring a Number from one Operator to another, which is mentioned in the document to be 1 hour only, this time is not realistic and should be revised for sure.

- One hour is really short time to entertain a port-out request. There will be validation applicable, ownership, subscriber data validation, related post-paid accounts in case of post-paid payable bill. So TAT should be minimum 72Hr, elsewhere it’s 4 days.

Answer:

- The Porting of one single mobile Number shall be fully automated at both the losing and the gaining Operator and very smooth for the Porting Customer. It shall be as easy as giving the Customer a new SIM with a Number in the gaining Operator’s own Number range, if the Customer is in the gaining Operator’s outlet. In some countries Numbers are ported within just a few minutes during these specific circumstances, but one (1) hour will be allowed in the Republic of Iraq since the break-before-make principle will be implemented.

- The specific requirements on how this will be implemented will be detailed later. There should not be any technical problems to manage this also in the Republic of Iraq, since Porting can happen instantly in other countries.
CMC recognises that e.g. Porting of several corporate Numbers may require more time and manual steps. CMC might decide to specify other timelines for this timer later.

Response:

The period of time required to port the same Number more than once should be extended to three months.

Answer:

CMC has decided to change this from 30 to 90 days, to be the same as the Cool-Down Period, during which the losing Operator is not allowed to initiate any contact with the ported-out Customer.

Response:

We recommend that the losing Operator should be allowed to retain the Customer within 7 days from the Porting request. Can the losing Operator contact those Customers for win-back after 3 months? What medium of communication can be used? We need a chance to reach Customers to resolve issue & retain within 7 days from the Porting request is generated in the system. We need clarity if win-back is allowed after 3 months from successful port-out.

Answer:

- Win-back by the losing Operator will by no means be allowed until after three (3) months after a successful port-out.

- After three months the losing Operator is allowed to initiate a communication with the ported-out subscriber by e.g. SMS, call, mail etc.

- CMC might decide to allow a short grace period for the Porting Customer to be allowed to port-back to his old Operator after a successful port-out, if he changes his mind within a few days from the Porting. But this port-back (which is to be seen as a normal port-in and must follow the normal Porting process) should only happen on the initiative by the Porting Customer.

- The gaining Operator is always responsible to solve any technical issues after port-in. Sometimes the gaining Operator will have to contact the losing Operator to solve the issue.

2.7 Support systems

Q4: CMC aim to have a contract with an external independent CRDB supplier to establish, maintain and operate the CRDB. What is your view regarding which entity/entities should be appointed as the CRDB supplier?
Q5: To ensure that each Operator/Provider can provide NP on an equal and neutral basis to the telecom Customers in Iraq, CMC proposes that the CRDB supplier will have identical, fair and non-discriminatory SLAs with all of the Participating Providers, What is your view of the legal arrangements around the CRDB?

Response:

We believe that the NP Industry forum should be responsible for identifying the best supplier of the CRDB. It should also be left to the NP Industry forum to decide which third party (who can be the CRDB supplier as suggested by CMC) should establish, maintain and operate such platform, as the SLAs and GoS need to be shared and agreed between all parties involved (Operators and CRDB supplier).

Answer:

• Please refer to the second Response in chapter “2.1 Scope” above.

Additionally:

• All security, legal, technical, administrative, reporting, financial and operational requirements etc. on the CRDB Provider, together with a draft contract for the CRDB Provider will be included in the RFP. The contract will be drafted by a knowledgeable local Iraqi law firm.

• CMC will sign the contract to establish, maintain and operate the Central Reference Database (CRDB) with the CRDB Provider. Each Operator will also sign a Service Level Agreement (SLA), with exactly the same wording, with the CRDB Provider to ensure equal and fair treatment.

Response:

This also requires an agreement among Operators and between Operators and the third part supplier in which this why we strongly recommend that the contract to be between the Operators and data base contractor as well not only with CDB and CMC.

Answer:

The contract to establish, maintain and operate the CRDB will be signed by CMC, since CMC is the owner of the MNP service and all telecom Numbering resources in the Republic of Iraq.

Response:

Yes, we have to engage a MNP technology partner to manage NPR for all Operators.

Answer:

Thank you for this remark.

Response:
Need to be clarified as the CRDB is involved in call query during call setup.

Answer:

CRDB will not be involved during routing of calls.

2.8 Network implementation

Q6: CMC suggests that Operators/Providers that are required to offer NP to its Customers shall have the possibility to use either QOR or ACQ for routing of calls and messages to ported Numbers. Do you foresee any technical problems with this proposal?

Response:

We believe that the ACQ method should be allowed to avoid any future technical problem due to the move towards all services being delivered using IP based routing (LTE, Volte with implementation of IMS, …) and to avoid the dependency on the Donor for call completion that might lead to longer holding time. Though there are many types of call routing implementation across the globe (ACQ, QOR, CD, OR…), the most efficient and scalable one is ACQ method of call routing when using a central database (CDB) of ported Numbers which would be the case in Iraq. Moreover the international best practice is the use of this ACQ method when a CDB is implemented.

The QOR has many drawbacks:

- More search complexity for routing Number
- Less efficiency in terms of network resources used
- Use of dedicated signalled circuit between originating network and donor network
- High call routing cost

But this issue of the routing calls method should be discussed within the NP Industry forum.

Answer:

Nothing in the current version of the NP Policy and the MNP Regulation prevents the mobile Operators to implement and use the ACQ methodology for routing of calls and non-call related signalling to portedNumbers. CMC would however welcome a decision from all mobile Operators to use ACQ.

Response:

ACQ method is feasible for our network.

Even this method will add overhead time to Call Setup time and impact Customer experience and also increase signalling transactions to establish a call.

Answer:
Experience from other countries shows that the call set-up time is not significantly higher when ACQ is introduced, but the signalling capacity has to be increased.

2.9 Number management

Q7: Kindly elaborate on possible commercial arrangements for sharing the Number administration costs of the Range Holder for Numbers that have been ported from him to other Operators/Providers.

Response:

As the Range Holder will still be responsible for the administrative management of the ported Numbers; we believe a commercial arrangement should be made between the Range Holder and the gaining Operator/Provider. In this commercial arrangement, the gaining Operator/Provider could bear the related Number administration cost. The amount could be determined based on LRIC or LRIC+ methodology.

Answer:

This valuable input will be discussed further in the NP Forum.

2.10 Cost recovery

Q8: The gaining Operator/Provider is allowed to charge the Porting Customer a reasonable administrative fee for Porting, but the gaining Operator/Provider can also decide to waive this fee. What is your view about how much this fee would be?

Response:

We agree with the proposal to allow the gaining Operator/Provider to charge the Porting Customer a reasonable fee for Porting. This fee would be determined based on LRIC+ methodology in order to cover only the incremental administrative costs of Porting the Number of the Customer.

But we believe that following the principle of cost causation, the donor party should charge also the Porting Customer the incremental administrative costs of Porting the Number of the Customer. This will give a clear price signal to Customers considering MNP to prevent uneconomic behaviour.

In order to be consistent with the principles of effective competition and cost minimisation and at the expense of relaxing the ‘right price signal’, it would be preferable for the donor party to charge the gaining party rather than the Customer, leaving it to the gaining party to charge the Customer.

The charge to the Customer should be a one-off charge and should be determined by the NP Industry forum. Its level should not deter Customers from using MNP.

We suggest a fee of USD 10.

Answer:
• Thank you for your valuable and detailed comment.

• The only differences for the losing Operator when a Customer is terminating his contract due to NP, rather than for any other reason, is to ensure that calls and non-call related signalling to this ported Number will be routed to the gaining Operator, and to ensure that the Number is marked as ported-out and not recycled to be used for any other Customer at the losing Operator.

• The Porting cost to the Porting Customer will be discussed further within NP Forum.

Response:

Needs further investigation, which requires some time. We see that compensation may be paid by the gaining Operator to the loosing Operator, the compensation amount requires further investigation

Answer:

This question refers only to the administrative charges for Porting to be paid by the Porting subscriber.

Response:

On CRBD platform investment reading the first paragraph we understand the Operator with lower market share has higher opportunity to gain more port in from market, so Operator with lower market share will bear higher cost. Is our understanding correct?

Answer:

The Operator with the highest amount of allocated Portable Numbers from CMC will bear the highest cost.

2.11 Governance

Q9: What is your view about when the NP industry forum should be established?

Response:

We believe that the NP industry forum should be established just after the adoption by CMC of the legal framework of Number Portability as the NP industry forum should be in charge of the implementation process of Number Portability through negotiation and agreement on:

• Technical solution
• Porting processes
• Business processes
• Cost recovery
• Cost apportionment
• Billing and charging
• Legal arrangements
• Commercial arrangements
• Implementation milestones.

Answer:

Thank you for the response. Please refer to the answer under chapter “2.7 Support systems” above.

Response:

NP industry forum should be formed as soon as MNP project is kick off, so that readiness on all Operator side is aligned to have a successful launch.

Answer:

Thank you for the response. NP forum will be established during Q1 2016.

2.12 Dispute resolution

No specific questions.

Response:

We agree.

Response:

• MNP central body CRDB is the platform to resolve any disputes
• What will be the process to resolve, objection process, time line, etc? This need to be provided in details.

Answer:

Processes to solve problems during and after the Porting process will be detailed during the CRDB implementation phase. Normally problems that arise after the Porting process will be business as usual, in accordance with the interconnection agreement. While problems during the Porting process will be canalised via the CRDB Provider for resolution. All unresolved matters can be escalated to CMC for final resolution.

2.13 Customer awareness

Q10: There are other technical tariff transparency solutions, than an audible tone to alert the caller at the beginning of a call to an off-net destination. Do you think that e.g. a voice message would be more suitable?

Response:

We agree that a voice message would be more suitable than an audible tone alert.

Answer:
• A study made of various solutions to solve the Customer tariff transparency problem in EU, showed that Customers after a while find a voice message to be quite annoying and causing unnecessary waiting for the call to be connected. That is why we have suggested the audible tone solution.

• It must also be possible for the Customer to turn on and off this alert, if he so wishes, to also cover e.g. the situation when the difference in on-net and off-net charges is low or zero.

• However, the technical details will be discussed further within NP Forum.

Response:

Another solution is the establishment of a free phone Number that will provide the ported status of any Number.

Answer:

Please refer to regulation 63 in the MNP Regulation document “Every Participating Provider shall provide user interfaces offering responses to web queries and to Short message Service (SMS) messages that request information on whether a Number is Ported. The user interfaces shall be the same for all of the Participating Providers.”
3. **Updates in the NP Policy and the MNP Regulation**

CMC wants to once again thank the mobile Operators for their valuable input on the NP Consultation.

As a result of the NP Consultation, CMC has decided to make the below updates in the NP Policy and in the MNP Regulation documents. No further changes will be made at this point in time.

**Update 1:**

The interpretation, in the NP Policy:

*"Range Holder means, in relation to a Number, the Service Provider to which CMC has assigned the Number."*

Has been updated to:

*"Range Holder or Block Operator means a Service Provider that has been allocated a Number block, which contains Portable Numbers."*

**Update 2:**

Bullet point 4, in regulation 25, in the NP Policy:

*"The Losing Provider has been providing any of the Services to the Customer for less than thirty (30) days."*

Has been updated to:

*"The Losing Provider has been providing any of the Services to the Customer for less than ninety (90) days."*

**Update 3:**

Regulation 16, in the MNP Regulation:

*"There is no limit to how often a Customer may Port a Number, except that a Customer may only Port the Number once within any period of thirty (30) days."*

Has been updated to:

*"There is no limit to how often a Customer may Port a Number, except that a Customer may only Port the Number once within any period of ninety (90) days."*
ANNEX A: Additional clarifications on the Number Portability Policy

**NP Policy, regulation 13:**

CMC has no current intentions of introducing Service Provider Number Portability except for mobile Numbers and WLL Numbers. In particular, CMC has no current intentions of introducing Service Provider Number Portability for the Fixed Landline Numbers identified in the National Numbering Plan.

*Additional clarification:*

If any MVNO Operators have launched their services in the Republic of Iraq at the time for the MNP launch – they will also be obliged to offer MNP to the mobile telecom Customers in the Republic of Iraq, at the same time and under the same conditions as the mobile Operators.

**NP Policy, regulation 16:**

The right to Port Numbers belongs to the Customers to whom the Numbers are assigned, not to the Service Providers who assign the Numbers. It should not be restricted by any contractual conditions.

*Additional clarification:*

The Customer will be able to port-out his Number even though he is under an existing contract, if the Number has passed the normal check of all legitimate reasons for rejection, as defined in regulation 25 in the NP Policy.

**NP Policy, regulation 25, 3rd bullet point:**

The Losing Provider should authorise a change of Service Provider without unnecessary delay, unless at least one of the following conditions holds:

- ...
- The Customer has not disputed but has not yet paid a bill for the Services issued by the Losing Provider more than thirty (30) days previously.

*Additional clarification:*

The right for the losing Operator to refuse to port-out a Number because of an outstanding bill, is only related to the specific Number the Customer wants to port-out. I.e. the losing Operator shall not reject a port-out request on a Number (if all other reasons for rejection has passed) even though the Customer might have other Numbers for which he has not paid all issued bills.
ANNEX B: Additional clarifications on the Mobile Number Portability Regulation

MNP Regulation, regulation 14:

A Customer may Port Active Mobile Numbers, including vanity, fax and data Numbers, to any chosen Service Providers, regardless of whether the Service Providers operate their own networks and offer the same Services. In particular, each Customer may Port Active Mobile Numbers between Network Operators and other Service Providers, between Prepaid and Postpaid plans, and between residential and business offerings.

Additional clarification 1:

The losing Operator is not allowed to refuse to port-out e.g. a vanity Number, if the Number has passed the normal check of all legitimate reasons for rejection, just because it is a vanity Number. Please refer to regulation 25 in the NP Policy.

Additional clarification 2:

Only active E.164 Numbers that are known by the Porting subscriber can be ported. Technical Numbers and Numbers that the Operators are using only for internal testing cannot be ported.

MNP Regulation, regulation 15:

A single request by a Customer for Porting shall suffice to initiate the Porting Process for multiple Numbers.

Additional clarification:

A common Porting request form shall be developed and agreed upon between the mobile Operators (under NP Forum) to the satisfaction of CMC.

MNP Regulation, regulation 17:

Every Service Provider shall let Customers take the same Services, regardless of whether the Service Provider is the Range Holder for the Numbers of the Customers.

Additional clarification:

Any new Customer to the gaining Operator (independently of if he will take a Number in the gaining Operator’s own Number range, or if he will port his Number from another Operator) will be able to subscribe to the same pre-paid or post-paid services at the gaining Operator.
MNP Regulation, regulation 22:

The request for Porting sent from the Gaining Provider to the Losing Provider, and the master data for Ported Numbers, shall include information on both the Network Operator and the Service Provider, at both the gaining side and the losing side.

Additional clarification:

This is to ensure that MNP will work properly also when e.g. MVNO Operators have been launched.

MNP Regulation, regulation 27:

Any credit or balance remaining in the account of a Porting Customer, whether Prepaid or Postpaid, with a Losing Provider, shall be treated according to the contract of the Customer with the Losing Provider.

Additional clarification:

If e.g. a Customer loses his credit on a pre-paid account if he terminates his contract for any other reason than port-out, he will lose the credit also when he is Porting his Number to another Operator. If the Customer is obliged to get e.g. any unused deposit for international roaming back if he terminates his contract for any other reason than port-out, he will get this unused deposit back also when he is Porting his Number to another Operator.

MNP Regulation, regulation 28:

Porting stops the provision of Services by the Losing Provider to a Customer. However the contractual obligations of the Customer to the Losing Provider will remain until they are fulfilled or annulled.

Additional clarification 1:

The contract for telecom services signed by a Customer should have the information about what will happen if he decides to terminate the contract before it expires, even without NP.

Additional clarification 2:

The Customer will be able to port-out his Number even though he is under an existing contract, if the Number has passed the normal check of all legitimate reasons for rejection, please refer to regulation 25 in the NP Policy. But he has to pay the “final bill” (which should include any outstanding debts, including early termination charges) that the losing Operator might send to him after the port-out.

Additional clarification 3:
The losing Operator is allowed to send a “final bill” to the ported-out post-paid Customer after the successful port-out. The ported-out Customer has to pay this “final bill”. In many countries this “final bill” is sent up to 45 days after the Porting, to ensure that also all international roaming charges will be invoiced. The “final bill” is not regarded as Win-Back.

**MNP Regulation, regulation 29:**

If a Customer requests Porting of a single Mobile Number and is in a sales outlet of the Gaining Provider, the Porting shall occur within one (1) hour of the Customer consenting to Porting.

*Additional clarification:*

The Porting of one single mobile Number shall be fully automated at both the losing and the gaining Operator. It shall be as easy as giving the Customer a new SIM with a Number in the gaining Operator’s own Number range, if the Customer is in the gaining Operator’s outlet. In some countries Numbers are ported within just a few minutes during these specific circumstances, but one (1) hour will be allowed in the Republic of Iraq, since the break-before-make principle will be implemented.

**MNP Regulation, regulation 31:**

The Porting Process shall include a check that the person requesting Porting is eligible to do so. If the request is for Porting a single Mobile Number the check shall be automated.

*Additional clarification:*

There should not be any technical problems to manage this also in the Republic of Iraq, since Porting can happen instantly in other countries.

**MNP Regulation, regulation 43:**

Every Participating Provider shall route calls and messages to Ported Numbers by Query On Release (QOR) or All Call Query (ACQ), and every other Service Provider shall do so by Onward Routing (OR), QOR or ACQ as defined in the Number Portability Policy.

*Additional clarification:*

Nothing in the current version of the NP Policy and the MNP Regulation prevents the mobile Operators to implement and use the ACQ methodology for routing of calls and non-call related signalling to ported Numbers. CMC would however welcome a decision from all mobile Operators to use ACQ.
MNP Regulation, regulation 51:

Every Service Provider shall bear its own administrative costs due to MNP, except that a Gaining Provider may recover such costs through charges on Porting Customers. CMC may limit these charges, if CMC considers them to be significant disincentives to Porting.

Additional clarification:

The gaining Operator is allowed to charge the Porting Customer a reasonable administrative fee for Porting, but the gaining Operator can also decide to waive this fee, which is the case in many countries. CMC may limit any Porting fee to the Customer, if CMC considers it to be a significant disincentive to Porting.

MNP Regulation, regulation 60:

Every Participating Provider shall promote awareness among its current and prospective Customers of the availability and benefits of MNP, to the satisfaction of CMC.

Additional clarification:

The point stresses “to the satisfaction of CMC”, hence also all other applicable regulations on market communication have to be followed.