

FCC MAIL SECTION

APR 29 11 48 AM '93

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C.

DOCKET FOR COPY  
ORIGINAL AW

DISPATCHED BY

In the Matter of )  
the Bell Operating Companies' Tariff )  
for the 800 Service Management System, )  
Tariff F.C.C. No. 1 )  
and )  
800 Data Base Access Tariffs )

DA 93-491

Transmittal No. 1

CC Docket No. 93-129 ✓

ORDER

Adopted: April 27, 1993;

Released: April 28, 1993

By the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The Commission recently required that all local exchange companies (LECs) file access tariffs implementing a new rate structure for 800 access service. The change in rate structure resulted from the LECs' conversion to a new technology for delivering 800 services, namely, 800 data base service. The Commission, in CC Docket No. 86-10, conducted a rule making regarding 800 data base services in which it prescribed a rate structure and filing dates for data base 800 access service tariffs, and required the tariffing of the Service Management System (SMS/800) to support providing 800 services.<sup>1</sup> The SMS/800 is a centralized data base through which the customer records and routing instructions for each 800 telephone number are entered and updated and 800 numbers are reserved. The carriers listed in Appendices A, B and C filed tariffs to comply with the requirements that the Commission established in CC Docket No. 86-10.

2. By this Order, we are advancing the effective date for

<sup>1</sup> Provision of Access for 800 Service, CC Docket No. 86-10, Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 102 FCC 2d 1387 (1986); Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 3 FCC Rcd 721 (1988); Report and Order, 4 FCC Rcd 2824 (1989); Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration and Second Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 6 FCC Rcd 5421 (1991); Order, 7 FCC Rcd 8616 (1992); Second Report and Order, 8 FCC Rcd 907 (1993) (Rate Structure Order); Memorandum Opinion and Order on Further Reconsideration, 8 FCC Rcd 1038 (1993); Order, 8 FCC Rcd 1423 (1993); Order, DA 93-294 (March 11, 1993).

the SMS/800 tariff and the LEC data base query tariffs, as listed in Appendices A, B and C, suspending them for one day, imposing an accounting order and initiating an investigation with issues to be designated in a subsequent order. Also, we are ordering some of the price cap LECs to recalculate their PCIs to reflect the revisions in their exogenous costs which are discussed in this Order.

## II. BACKGROUND

3. The 800 data base system, as the LECs have chosen to deploy it, uses the LECs' signalling system 7 network which carries signalling for a variety of communications services, including 800 traffic. That signalling network interacts with several regional databases, called Service Control Points (SCPs), which will contain customer records and routing instructions for each 800 number. When an 800 call is placed, it is held at the Service Switching Point (SSP)<sup>2</sup> until a query can be sent to, and routing instructions received from, the SCP.<sup>3</sup> The routing instructions tell the SSP which IXC to send the call to and the IXC can then, in turn, route the call to the 800 service subscriber.<sup>4</sup> This carrier identification is the basic level of service in 800 data base. LECs also offer "vertical services" which enable customers to vary the routing and destination of 800 calls.

4. The other major component of the 800 data base system is the Service Management System for 800 services (SMS/800). It is a central data base in which all of the customer records for 800 numbers are maintained. The SMS/800 is interconnected to the SCPs and periodically updates the data in the SCPs by downloading current customer records to each of the regional SCPs. Only specified entities, called Responsible Organizations (RESPORGs), are allowed to access the SMS/800 to make such changes. For each 800 number, there is only one RESPORG.

---

<sup>2</sup> An SSP is located at either an end office or a tandem switch. It holds an 800 call, initiates a query and routes the call when instructions are received from the SCP.

<sup>3</sup> The SCPs are also currently used to provide another database service, Line Information Data Base (LIDB) and may be used to provide other services in the future.

<sup>4</sup> The 800 data base system is far more flexible than the NXX system it is replacing. Under NXX, all of the 800 numbers for a particular NXX were assigned to the same IXC and if an 800 subscriber wanted to change carriers, it had to change 800 numbers. Under the 800 data base system, 800 number numbers within the same NXX can be assigned to different carriers, and traffic to an 800 number can be switched from one carrier to another or divided among several carriers by time of day or other allocation factors.

5. Local exchange carriers (LECs) filed three types of tariffs relating to the provision of 800 data base management services. First, the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) jointly filed a single tariff to provide the SMS services used by RESPORGs. Specifically, Ameritech Operating Companies (Ameritech), The Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies (Bell Atlantic), BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth), Nevada Bell (Nevada Bell), The NYNEX Telephone Companies (NYNEX), Pacific Bell (Pacific), Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (Southwestern) and US West Communications, Inc. (US West), jointly filed a tariff as the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) on March 5, 1993, to provide functions and support services through the SMS/800. See Bell Operating Companies' Tariff for the 800 Service Management System, Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 1 (SMS/800 tariff). This tariff is filed pursuant to Commission order and establishes the charges that the RESPORGs must pay for access to, and use of, the Service Management System. The petitioners listed in Appendix D filed petitions for rejection, suspension or investigation of this tariff, to which the BOCs filed a joint reply denying that the tariff was unlawful.

6. The second type of tariff establishes the rate structure for 800 data base query service. Individual tariffs were filed on March 1, 1993 by LECs, listed in Appendix B, which own their own SCPs.

7. Eleven parties filed petitions against these tariffs to which nine LECs filed replies which denied that the tariffs were unlawful. See Appendix E.

8. The third type of tariff was filed on March 5, 1993 by LECs which do not own their own SCPs and must purchase query service from another entity. These LECs are listed in Appendix C. The parties listed in Appendix F filed petitions against these filings to which ten carriers filed replies which denied that the tariffs were unlawful.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> On March 22, 1993, AT&T filed a letter petition objecting to the per query rate in Vitelco's proposed tariff, alleging that the rate was based on a mathematical error. By letter of April 2, 1993, Vitelco acknowledged the computation error and stated that it would be withdrawing its tariff and providing 800 data base query service through another carrier. Vitelco filed tariff revisions cancelling its data base 800 query filing on April 26, 1993.

### III. SMS/800 TARIFF

#### A. Pleadings

9. Four parties filed petitions against the BOCs' SMS/800 tariff. In its petition, Allnet Communications Services, Inc. (Allnet) argues that the transmittal does not comply with the Commission's affiliate transactions rules. Allnet also argued that the terms and conditions in the tariff fail to prevent the SMS/800 system from being administered in a way that discriminates in favor of the BOCs which own the SMS/800 and expresses concern about tariff provisions governing how quickly RESPORG changes must be made and the definition of "subscriber." Allnet also objects to the requirement that SMS/800 customers obtain liability insurance, including blanket contractual insurance specifically insuring for the terms of the SMS/800 tariff and to patent liability provisions which put the responsibility on RESPORGs for any patent infringement claims arising from the use of the SMS/800 system in conjunction with facilities or equipment furnished by the RESPORG.

10. Cubic Computer Company (Cubic) filed comments on the SMS/800 tariff seeking rejection of the proposed tariff. Cubic argues, among other things, that the SMS/800 tariff is probably illegal under current antitrust legislation and that the SMS/800 system should be operated by "private industry" and made accessible to all users, not just RESPORGs.

11. On March 22, 1993, MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI) filed a petition for rejection and suspension of the above-referenced transmittal. Among other issues, MCI argues that the BOCs have failed to provide information about the proper allocation of SMS/800 costs to the intrastate jurisdiction and have failed to follow the Commission's affiliate transactions rules. MCI also challenges the method used to allocate software support costs and questions whether the BOCs overrecover their SMS/800 costs when the total revenue from charges to RESPORGs and charges to SCP owners is considered. Finally, MCI states that the BOCs should be required to fully document their demand assumptions.

12. On March 22, 1993, Sprint Communications Company LP (Sprint) filed a petition asking the Commission to investigate the proposed SMS/800 tariff. Sprint argues that the BOCs provided insufficient information, particularly regarding the allocation of costs. Second, Sprint argues that the rates appear to be excessive because of understated demand forecasts. Third, Sprint argues that eligibility for RESPORGs, procedures for even-handed enforcement of the terms and conditions of the SMS/800 tariff, and mechanisms to handle future requests for enhancements to the SMS/800 system should be clarified.

## B. Discussion

13. The SMS tariff raises significant questions of lawfulness regarding cost allocations, resulting rate levels, and terms and conditions of service that warrant suspension for one day, imposition of an accounting order, and investigation. We will designate specific issues and establish a pleading cycle for this hearing in a subsequent order.

## IV. 800 DATA BASE QUERY TARIFFS

### A. Pleadings

14. The Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Committee (Ad Hoc), Aeronautical Radio, Inc. (ARINC), Allnet, American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T), The California Bankers Clearing House Association et. al. (Cal. Bankers), CompuServe Incorporated (CompuServe), First Financial Management Corporation (First Financial), International Communications Association (ICA), MCI, National Data Corporation (National Data) and Sprint filed petitions against the 800 data base query tariffs filed by the LECs who own the SCPs. The petitioners allege that some or all of the LECs fail to provide adequate cost support to properly justify their proposed 800 data base query rates and vertical feature rates, claim exogenous cost treatment for costs which the Commission did not define as exogenous in this proceeding,<sup>6</sup> include overhead in calculating their exogenous costs,<sup>7</sup> and propose terms and conditions that are either unlawful or unreasonably vague.<sup>8</sup> Petitioners further argue that the reasonableness of the SMS costs claimed by the LECs has

---

<sup>6</sup> See Provision of Access for 800 Service, Second Report and Order, 8 FCC Rcd 907 (1993); Allnet Petition at 5; MCI Petition at 6-8 and Appendix C (says Pacific claimed \$7.6 million in tandem upgrade investment and expense and \$1.5 million in SSP expenses, says Southwestern, Ameritech and U S West have also included SSP or access tandem expenses or investment); AT&T Reply at 3 (cites Pacific's access tandem costs as example of impermissible costs).

<sup>7</sup> AT&T Petition at 3 (claims that the LECs inclusion of overhead loadings in calculating exogenous costs is inconsistent with Commission's 800 Access Order); MCI Petition at 9 (claims that the LECs included the following overhead costs in their calculation of exogenous costs; Ameritech estimated at \$4,000,000; Bell Atlantic \$3,924,815; Pacific Bell \$1,649,325; NYNEX \$1,568,195; United \$697,882; SNET \$343,338).

<sup>8</sup> AT&T Petition at 5 (Ameritech, BellSouth and Southwestern appear to bundle POTs translation with basic 800 query service and set vertical services rates at zero); MCI Petition at 26, 33 (some LEC's definitions of Area of Service Routing are inconsistent with the Commission's order, several LECs have bundled vertical features with basic 800 query service).

not been demonstrated<sup>9</sup> and the LECs' treatment of vertical features is not clear and may be inconsistent with the Commission's orders.

15. In addition, on March 22, 1993, MCI filed a petition to reject and suspend and investigate many of the 800 data base tariffs filed on March 5, 1993 by LECs which do not own SCPs. MCI argues that some of these LECs fail to provide the requisite cost support for the charges in their tariffs.<sup>10</sup> MCI also argues that there are other deficiencies with some of these tariffs, including inappropriate demand assumptions, suspect estimates of unbillable data base queries, definitions of area of service routing which are either unreasonably vague or inconsistent with the Commission's order, impermissible bundling of basic query service and vertical features and unreasonably vague definitions of "query."<sup>11</sup>

### B. Discussion

16. The data base 800 query tariffs of both those LECs owning the SCPs and those that do not own SCPs raise significant questions of lawfulness regarding cost allocations, resulting rate levels, and terms and conditions of service that warrant suspension for one day, imposition of an accounting order, and investigation. We will designate specific issues and establish a pleading cycle in a subsequent order.

17. Ameritech, Bell Atlantic, Nevada Bell, NYNEX, Pacific, SNET and United are all price cap carriers that included overhead costs in their calculation of exogenous costs.<sup>12</sup> Some of those carriers inappropriately rely on Commission decisions which authorize carriers to use overhead costs in the calculation of prices, but none of them have cited any authority for the use of

---

<sup>9</sup> MCI Petition at 13. (Claims that billings by Bellcore to the NASC/800 SMS should be, at least as to the BOCs, regulated as affiliate transactions).

<sup>10</sup> MCI Petition against ALLTELL Telephone System, Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, et al., Transmittal No. 6, et al., at 5, 9 and n.18. MCI also filed a separate petition against Rochester Telephone Company F.C.C. Tariff No. 1, Transmittal No. 185, alleging that Rochester's tariff for Enterprise Telephone Company in Pennsylvania is deficient because it proposes to pass through the rates it is charged by the Independent Telecommunications Network (ITN) without providing any cost support for ITN's rates.

<sup>11</sup> See generally MCI Petition.

<sup>12</sup> Bell Atlantic's Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 566, filed on April 26, 1993, removed the overhead costs from its request for exogenous treatment and reduced the PCI to reflect this change. Therefore, we did not need to specify a level for Bell Atlantic's PCI.

overhead costs in calculating their exogenous costs.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, overhead costs are not properly included as exogenous costs of implementing 800 data base service. Exogenous treatment is generally afforded to costs that are triggered by administrative, legislative or judicial action beyond the control of the carriers.<sup>14</sup> In the present proceeding, the Commission allowed the carriers to treat as exogenous "the reasonable costs they incurred specifically for the implementation and operation of the basic 800 data base system...." (emphasis added).<sup>15</sup> None of the carriers have made a showing that they have experienced increases in overhead costs that are specifically attributable to the provision of data base 800. Under price caps, the carriers are already recovering their pre-existing overhead costs in their normal rates and allowing them to also recover overhead costs through their exogenous costs may provide them with an excessive recovery of those costs unless they had experienced an actual increase in overhead costs specifically attributable to the implementation or operation of the basic data base 800 service.

18. Therefore, Ameritech, Nevada Bell, NYNEX, Pacific, SNET and United filed invalid Price Cap Indices (PCIs) because they improperly included overheads in their calculation of the exogenous costs by which they adjusted their PCIs. Therefore, these carriers' PCIs should be recalculated at the levels displayed in Appendix G. Because the rate levels in these transmittals establish APIs that are below the PCIs in Appendix G, none of the filings violates the requirements of Sections 61.45(g) and 61.49(e) of our rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 61.45(g) and 61.49(e), that a carrier's API not exceed its PCI. Thus, although we will investigate the exogenous cost claims of price cap carriers, no action on their rates is warranted at this time, except for the action we describe in the following paragraph.

19. We also performed a statistical analysis of the data base query rates proposed by the LECs which own their own SCPs. For this analysis, we reviewed the basic query rates in the transmittals to identify any that were anomalously high because

---

<sup>13</sup> See Ameritech Reply at 4, n.9, citing Amendment of Part 69 of the Commission's Rules Relating to the Creation of Access Charge Subelements for Open Network Architecture, CC Docket Nos. 89-79 and 87-313; Report and Order on Further Reconsideration and Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 6 FCC Rcd 4524, ¶ 44 (1991) (Part 69/ONA Order); NYNEX Reply at 4, n.11, citing Part 69/ONA Order at ¶¶ 42-44 and Memorandum Opinion and Order on Second Further Reconsideration, 7 FCC Rcd 5510, ¶ 11 (1992).

<sup>14</sup> Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Dominant Carriers, Second Report and Order, 5 FCC Rcd 6786, 6807 (1990).

<sup>15</sup> Provision of Access for 800 Service, Second Report and Order, 8 FCC Rcd 907 at ¶ 27 (January 29, 1993).

they exceeded the industry mean rate plus one standard deviation. Such analysis, even though not exactly precise, is generally reasonable in this context since all LECs are deploying similar data base systems. In the present case, the industry mean rate was .0044 cents per query and the standard deviation was .0023 cents per query, resulting in a threshold rate of .0067 cents per query. This threshold level was exceeded by GTOC (excluding GTOC - Alaska), GTSC and United. Therefore, we are partially suspending these rates under Section 204(a) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 204(a), to the extent that they exceed .0067 cents per query pending investigation of the reasonableness of the amounts in excess thereof. We believe this partial suspension is reasonable and in the public interest to protect ratepayers, while allowing carriers to charge reasonable rates for an interim period.

#### V. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

20. An original and four copies of all pleadings shall be filed with the Secretary of the Commission. In addition, one copy shall be delivered to the Commission's commercial copying firm, International Transcription Service, 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037. Members of the general public who wish to express their views in an informal manner regarding the issues in this investigation may do so by submitting one copy of their comments to the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222, Washington, D.C. 20554. Such comments should specify the docket number of this investigation.

21. All relevant and timely pleadings will be considered by the Commission. In reaching a decision, the Commission may take into account information and ideas not contained in pleadings, provided that such information is placed in the public file, and provided that the fact of reliance on such information is noted in the Order.

22. Ex Parte contacts (i.e., written or oral communications which address the procedural or substantive merits of the proceeding which are directed to any member, officer, or employee of the Commission who may reasonably be expected to be involved in the decisional process in this proceeding) are permitted in this proceeding until a final Order is released and after the final Order itself is issued. Written ex parte contacts must be filed on the day submitted with the Secretary and Commission employees receiving each presentation. For other requirements, see generally Section 1.1200 et. seq. of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.200 et. seq.

23. The investigation established in this Order has been analyzed with respect to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 and found to contain no new or modified form, information collection, or recordkeeping, labeling, disclosure or other record retention

requirements as contemplated under the statute.

## VI. ORDERING CLAUSES

24. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, the LECs listed in Appendices A, B and C SHALL FILE tariff revisions on April 29, 1993, to be effective on not less than one day's notice, in order to advance the effective dates of the above-referenced transmittals and any subsequent revisions.

25. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. § 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the tariffs listed in Appendices A, B and C, ARE SUSPENDED for one day.

26. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i), 204(a), 205(a) and 403 of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 204(a), 205(a) and 403, an investigation IS INSTITUTED into the lawfulness of the tariffs listed in Appendices A, B and C.

27. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 204(a) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C., 47 U.S.C. § 154(i) and 204(a) and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the LECs listed in Appendices A, B and C, SHALL KEEP ACCURATE ACCOUNT of all earnings, costs, and returns associated with the rates that are the subject of this investigation.

28. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. § 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the Bell Operating Companies, for the tariff listed in Appendix A, and each of the LECs listed in Appendices B and C, SHALL FILE tariff revisions reflecting this suspension on April 29, 1993.

29. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, the LECs referenced in Appendix G SHALL RECALCULATE their PCIs to the levels shown therein.

30. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i), 204(a), 205(a) and 403 of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 204(a), 205(a) and 403, an investigation IS INSTITUTED into the lawfulness of the exogenous costs claimed by the price cap LECs listed in Appendices B and C.

31. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 204(a) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. 204(a), the amount of the basic 800 data base query rate that exceeds .0067 cents per query for United Telephone Company, GSTC and GTOC (excluding GTOC - Alaska) is HEREBY SUSPENDED for five months from the presently

scheduled effective date, to October 1, 1993.

32. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. § 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, that the United Telephone Company, GSTC and GTOC (excluding GTOC - Alaska) SHALL FILE tariff revisions reflecting the partial suspension of their basic 800 data base query rates on April 29, 1993.

33. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, the LECs listed in Appendix C, SHALL FILE tariff revisions reflecting the flow-through of any reductions in the basic 800 data base query rates of the LECs listed in Appendix B. These revisions SHALL BE FILED no later than May 6, 1993, to be effective on not less than one day's notice.

34. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, for the above purposes, we waive Sections 61.56, 61.58 and 61.59 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 61.56, 61.58 and 61.59, and assign Special Permission No. 93-349.

35. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petitions for rejection or suspension and investigation of the Bell Operating Companies' Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 1, listed in Appendix A, filed by Allnet Communications Services, Inc., Cubic Computer Company, MCI Telecommunications Corporation and Sprint Communications Company LP, ARE GRANTED to the extent indicated, and otherwise ARE DENIED.

36. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petitions for rejection or suspension and investigation, of the tariff transmittals listed in Appendix B, filed by the Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Committee, Aeronautical Radio, Inc., Allnet Communications Services, Inc., American Telephone and Telegraph Company, the California Bankers Clearing House Association, et al., CompuServe Incorporated, First Financial Management Corporation, International Communications Association, MCI Telecommunications Corporation, National Data Corporation and Sprint Communications Company LP, ARE GRANTED to the extent indicated, and otherwise ARE DENIED.

37. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petitions for rejection or suspension and investigation, of the 800 data base query tariffs listed in Appendix C, filed by American Telephone and Telegraph Company, MCI Telecommunications Corporation, Compuserve Incorporated and First Financial Management Corporation ARE GRANTED to the extent indicated, and otherwise ARE DENIED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cheryl A. Tritt". The signature is stylized and somewhat cursive.

Cheryl A. Tritt  
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau

**APPENDIX A**

**SMS/800 TARIFF**

Bell Operating Companies	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 1
--------------------------	---

**APPENDIX B**

**800 DATA BASE ACCESS TARIFFS - SCP OWNERS**

Ameritech Operating Companies	Tariff F.C.C. No. 2, Transmittal Nos. 698 & 701
Bell Atlantic	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 560 & 566
BellSouth	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal Nos. 94 & 99
GTE Telephone Service Company (GSTC)	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 36
GTE Telephone Operating Companies (GTOC)	Tariff F.C.C. No.1, Transmittal No. 775
NYNEX	Tariff F.C.C.No. 1, Transmittal No. 168
Pacific Bell	Tariff F.C.C. No. 128, Transmittal No. 1615, 1621 & 1622
SNET	Tariff F.C.C. No. 39, Transmittal No. 556
Southwestern Bell	Tariff F.C.C. No. 73, Transmittal No. 2264 & 2269
United Telephone Company	Tariff F.C.C. No. 5, Transmittal No. 316
U.S. West	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 335

**APPENDIX C**

**800 DATA BASE ACCESS TARIFFS - NON-SCP OWNERS**

ALLTELL Telephone System	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 6
Centel Telephone Companies	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 219
Century Telephone of Ohio, Inc.,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 6
Chillicothe Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 39
Cincinnati Bell Telephone,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 35, Transmittal No. 622
Citizens Utilities Companies	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 5
Coastal Utilities, Inc.,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 7
Dunkirk and Fredonia Telephone Company	Tariff F.C.C. No. 2, Transmittal No. 16
Elkhart Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 40
Farmers Telephone Cooperative, Inc.,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 4
Fidelity and Bourbouse Telephone Company, (Not petitioned against - filed March 15, 1993)	Tariff F.C.C. No. 35 Transmittal No. 35
Great Plains Communications, Inc.,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 3, Transmittal No. 54
GTOC - Alaska	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 776
GVNW Inc./Management,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 72
Hargray Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 9

Illinois Consolidated Telephone Co.,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 2, Transmittal No. 66
LaFourche Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 10
Lufkin-Conroe Telephone Exchange,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 2, Transmittal No. 10
Lincoln Telephone and Telegraph Co.	Tariff F.C.C. No. 3, Transmittal No. 65 & 67
Millington Telephone Company, Inc.,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 5
Mount Horeb Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 6
National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.	Tariff F.C.C. No. 5, Transmittal No. 540 & 548
Nevada Bell	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal Nos. 154 & 159
Northwestern Indiana Telephone Company	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 3
Pineland Telephone Cooperative,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 2, Transmittal No. 16
Rochester Telephone Corporation	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 185
Roseville Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal Nos. 24, 25 & 27
Southeast Telephone Company of Wisconsin, Inc.,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 2 Transmittal No. 8
Sugar Land Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 2, Transmittal No. 13
Taconic Telephone Corporation,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 15
Telephone Utilities Exchange Carrier Association (TUECA),	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 116
Union Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 32

Vista Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 14
Vista-United Telecommunications	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 8
Virgin Islands Telephone Corporation,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal Nos. 14 & 16
Warwick Valley Telephone Company,	Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, Transmittal No. 17

**APPENDIX D**  
**List of Petitions Against SMS/800 Tariff**

<u>Petitioner</u>	<u>Tariffs Petitioned Against</u>
Allnet	BOCs, Trans. No. 1
Cubic Computer	BOCs, Trans. No. 1
MCI	BOCs, Trans. No. 1
Sprint	BOCs, Trans. No. 1

**APPENDIX E**  
**List of Petitions Filed Against Data Base Query Tariffs  
of SCP Owners**

<u>Petitioner</u>	<u>Tariffs Petitioned Against</u>
Aeronautical Radio, Inc.	Ameritech, Transmittal No. 698 Bell Atlantic, Trans. No. 560 BellSouth Trans. No. 94 NYNEX, Trans. No. 168 Pacific, Trans. No. 1615 Southwestern, Trans. No. 2264 US West, Trans. No. 335
Ad Hoc	Ameritech, Transmittal No. 698 Bell Atlantic, Trans. No. 560 BellSouth Trans. No. 94 GTSC, Trans. No. 36 NYNEX, Trans. No. 168 Pacific, Trans. No. 1615 SNET, Trans. No. 556 Southwestern, Trans. No. 2264 US West, Trans. No. 335 NECA, Trans. No. 540
Allnet	Ameritech, Trans. Nos. 698&701 Bell Atlantic, Trans. No. 560 BellSouth Trans. No. 94 NYNEX, Trans. No. 168 Pacific, Trans. No. 1615 Southwestern, Trans. No. 2264 US West, Trans. No. 335
AT&T	Ameritech, Transmittal No. 698 Bell Atlantic, Trans. No. 560 BellSouth Trans. No. 94

Nevada Bell, Trans. No.	154
NYNEX, Trans. No.	168
Pacific, Trans. No.	1615
SNET, Trans. No.	556
Southwestern, Trans. No.	2264
United, Trans. No.	316
US West, Trans. No.	335

Cal. Bankers

Not Specified

CompuServe and First Financial

Ameritech, Transmittal No.	698
Bell Atlantic, Trans. No.	560
BellSouth Trans. No.	94
GTOC, Trans. No.	775
GSTC, Trans. No.	36
Illinois Consolidated, Trans. No.	66
NECA, Trans. No.	540
NYNEX, Trans. No.	168
Pacific, Trans. No.	1615
Rochester, Trans. No.	185
SNET, Trans. No.	556
Southwestern, Trans. No.	2264
United, Trans. No.	316
US West, Trans. No.	335

ICA

Ameritech, Transmittal No.	698
Bell Atlantic, Trans. No.	560
BellSouth Trans. No.	94
GTOC, Trans. No.	775
NYNEX, Trans. No.	168
Pacific, Trans. No.	1615
SNET, Trans. No.	39
Southwestern, Trans. No.	2264
US West, Trans. No.	335

MCI

Ameritech, Transmittal No.	698
Bell Atlantic, Trans. No.	560
BellSouth Trans. No.	94
GTSC, Trans. No.	36
GTOC, Trans. No.	775
NYNEX, Trans. No.	168
Pacific, Trans. No.	1615
SNET, Trans. No.	556
Southwestern, Trans. No.	2264
United, Trans. No.	316
US West, Trans. No.	335

National Data

Ameritech, Transmittal No.	698
Bell Atlantic, Trans. No.	560
BellSouth Trans. No.	94
GTSC, Trans. No.	36

Sprint

GTOC, Trans. No.	775
NECA, Trans. No.	540
NYNEX, Trans. No.	168
Pacific, Trans. No.	1615
SNET, Trans. No.	556
Southwestern, Trans. No.	2264
United, Trans. No.	316
US West, Trans. No.	335
Ameritech, Transmittal No.	698
Bell Atlantic, Trans. No.	560
BellSouth Trans. No.	94
GTSC, Trans. No.	36
GTOC, Trans. No.	775
Telesector Resources Group, Trans. No.	168
Pacific, Trans. No.	1615
SNET, Trans. No.	556
Southwestern, Trans. No.	2264
US West, Trans. No.	335

**APPENDIX F**  
**Petitions Against 800 Query Tariffs**  
**Filed by Non-SCP Owners**

**Petitioner**

**Carrier Petitioned Against**

AT&T

Nevada Bell, Trans. No. 154  
Vitelco, Trans. No. 14

CompuServe and First Financial

Illinois Con., Trans. No. 66  
NECA, Trans. No. 540  
Rochester, Trans. No. 185

General Communications, Inc.

NECA, Trans. No. 548

MCI

ALLTELL, Trans. No. 6  
Century of Ohio, Trans. No. 6  
Chillicothe, Trans. No. 39  
Cincinnati Bell, Trans. No. 622  
Citizens Util., Trans. No. 5  
Coastal Util., Trans. No. 7  
Dunkirk, Trans. No. 16  
Elkhart, Trans. No. 40  
Farmers, Trans. No. 4  
Great Plains, Trans. No. 54  
GVNW, Trans. No. 72  
Hargray, Trans. No. 9  
Illinois Con., Trans. No. 66  
LaFourche, Trans. No. 10  
Lufkin-Conroe, Trans. No. 10

Lincoln, Trans. No.	65
Millington, Trans. No.	5
Mount Horeb, Trans. No.	6
NECA, Trans. No.	540 & 548
Nevada Bell, Trans.	154
N.W. Indiana, Trans. No.	3
Pineland, Trans. No.	16
Rochester, Trans. No.	185
Roseville, Trans. Nos. 24 & 25	
S.E. Wisconsin, Trans. No.	8
Sugar Land, Trans. No.	13
Taconic, Trans. No.	15
TUECA, Trans. No.	116
Union, Trans. No.	32
Vista, Trans. No.	14
Vista-United, Trans. No.	8
Vitelco, Trans. No.	14
Warwick Valley, Trans. No.	17

MCI (Second Petition)

Rochester, Trans. No.	185
-----------------------	-----

APPENDIX G

ADJUSTED PCI RESULTING FROM EXCLUSION OF OVERHEADS

	EXISTING PCI A	EXOGENOUS COSTS B	OVERHEADS C	ADJUSTED PCI D
AMERITECH	94.4100	\$9,706,638	\$3,444,771	95.1067
NEVADA BELL	95.0920	\$291,461	\$62,088	95.5605
NYNEX	99.1409	\$5,880,385	\$1,568,195	99.4281
PACIFIC BELL	91.7400	\$15,666,349	\$1,649,325	94.3347
SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND TEL	101.3677	\$1,089,562	\$343,348	101.8582
UNITED - FLORIDA	84.5648	\$2,283,777	\$232,725	87.2247
UNITED - INDIANA	92.3216	\$203,696	\$22,886	93.8998
UNITED - NORTH CAROLINA	95.3376	\$1,505,771	\$170,174	98.5819
UNITED - OHIO	96.1302	\$712,426	\$74,226	98.4966
UNITED - EASTERN	93.8890	\$629,768	\$70,640	96.4000
UNITED - MIDWEST	94.7937	\$648,076	\$59,652	96.2425
UNITED - NORTHWEST	81.3108	\$260,852	\$24,092	83.2210
UNITED - SOUTHEAST	94.6191	\$414,026	\$43,020	97.5061

Note:

Bell Atlantic adjusted its PCI for both Transmittal No. 560 and Transmittal No. 566.  
LECS will recalculate their PCIs to reflect the adjusted PCIs in column D.