

Attachment 1: Closure list of issues for 2011 AIT Contract Review

Issue No.	CP(s)*	Issue Name	para No.	Summary of Issue	Closure statement
1	Three and also C&W BT	Administrative burden of faxes for submitting AIT claims	Para 28 main body Annex E, paras 2.5(a), 4.1, 5.3 and 6.3	Fax is inefficient and an unnecessary administrative burden. Certainty of delivery is now possible to ensure by email rather than fax. We propose that email ought to be adopted for the submission of AIT claims, as an alternative or substitute to the current fax process. Despite the fact that this issue is already being investigated via the 2010 SIA General Contract Review, we suggest that, for completeness it is included in this review too, given the impact it has on current AIT process.	Now closed as a Contract Review issue following the establishment of the industry trial. An invitation to participate in an e-mail trial was sent to each CP on 2 August 2011, following an industry briefing on 27 July. The trial is now being pursued separately.
2	Three	Debit Notes	Clause 6.6 (a) iv of the Annex E of the AIT Supplemental Agreement	Three proposes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CPs agree a form of debit note which will be accepted by all parties for the purposes of Annex E; and 2. There shall be no obligation on the ONO to contact TNO before issuing a debit note over and above confirming to the TO that it had not received a Rejection Notice by the 34th AIT calendar day. Should the TO not be satisfied, it shall confirm from its own records whether a Rejection Notice was sent to it by TNO in copy. 	Guidance for the use of Debit Notes was developed and added to the issued AIT Operations Guide
3	C&W	Third-party scenario	Annex E para 5.2	Amend paragraph 5.2 of Annex to provide for extended timescales where the retention results from 3 rd party notification.	It was agreed that it was not practicable for TNOs and their service providers to cope with further grounds for extending the serving date.

4	C&W	Overseas scenarios	Appendix E5, point 15	We would like to explore the opportunity to expand the scope of AIT to overseas scenarios - other than just calls to UK PRS which have originated overseas.	It was agreed that it was not practicable to extend the domestic AIT scheme to take in outgoing IDD.
5	Jersey	Scope of AIT	Annex E	Extend scope of AIT to include Calls rerouted overseas e.g. PBX hacked calls to a UK PRS number rerouted to international premium rate services	It was agreed that PBX hacking and switch security is essentially a matter for the originating network. It would not be reasonable to add PBX hacking to the list of AIT indicators so that of itself it was sufficient case for "reasonable suspicion" and therefore for retention. Although PBX hacking would alert the AIT specialist, as with the generality of traffic, it would only become appropriate for AIT retention if its fits the AIT criteria.
6	BT	Scope of AIT	Annex E para 1.2	"For the avoidance of doubt" reference to National Telephone Numbering Plan	Agreed to add confirming text to paragraph 1.2
7	BT	Rejection Notices	Annex E	Consider how to deal with procedural issues e.g. wrongly quoted prices, wrong number ranges, failure to deliver AIT Call Data	BT's recommendations have been added to the AIT Operations Guide; the attention of all CPs is drawn to paragraph 5.2.3. It would seem 'best practice' for TNOs to wait for receipt of the relevant CDR information from the ONO before issuing an A2 Rejection Notice, unless it is clear the A1 Retention Notice information is so factually incorrect as to make it impracticable to investigate the alleged incidence (e.g. wrong number ranges). Upon receipt of CDR data (which is a key

					requirement) any Rejection Notice issued by TNO should be clear as to why they believe the submitted CDR does not support AIT and as appropriate provide additional evidence (i.e. own data, supporting documentary information as to services on offer) to refute a claim of AIT. At all times BT should be copied in.
8	BT	PPP CoP 12	Annex E	Review any possible impact of PhonepayPlus Code of Practice edition 12	Reviewed and agreed that no direct impact for interconnect – matter for terminating operator and downstream service providers.