

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

DONELAN, CLEARY, WOOD & MASER, P.C.

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW
SUITE 750
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3934

OFFICE: (202) 371-9500

TELECOPIER: (202) 371-0900

December 11, 1995

Alan Thomas
Network Services Division
CCB/FCC, c/o Room 6008
2025 M Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
DEC 11 1995
COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Re: Ex parte submission per Section 1.1206, CC Docket 94-102

Dear Alan:

The attached memo from Joe Blaschka, Jr., responds -- on behalf of NENA, APCO and NASNA -- to the question you posed by phone last week, on costs to PSAPs and other public safety communications facilities of proposals for E9-1-1 compatibility in the PBX/MLTS portion of the referenced rulemaking.

As I read Joe's response, particularly the second paragraph, it appears that specific information about the types and costs of the upgrades is more likely in the possession of PBX/MLTS vendors or of the Local Exchange Carriers (LECs).

Feel free to call Joe directly if you feel that would be helpful.

Regards,


Jim Hobson

cc: Joe Blaschka, Jr.; Bob Gurs; Bill Stanton

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

041

Adcomm Engineering Company

Communications Consulting Engineers

14631 128th Avenue NE
Woodinville, WA 98072-4651
Voice: 206-821-8827 FAX: 206-488-3952
E-Mail: adcomm@halcyon.com

December 9, 1995

To: Jim Hobson

cc: Bob Gurss

From: Joe Blaschka Jr. P.E.

Subject: PSAP costs related to MLTS compatibility.

The cost of implementing MLTS compatibility to public safety agencies would be dependent on the method chosen to provide MLTS compatibility. If we assume the MLTS equipment is providing a more or less standard CAMA type interface and data in a compatible format, then there would not be any affects on the PSAP's themselves. However, there have been some alternatives using "extra" equipment to provide ANI/ALI information to the PSAP's. In these cases, the extra equipment would have some cost but the costs are not well defined at this point.

There are network costs associated with implementing MLTS connectivity because of the additional trunks required. While these may be a telco cost, they will eventually be felt by the governmental agency that is purchasing the service. In general, most government agencies have attempted to make this an MLTS interconnection cost. The cost in general is a little hard to pin down because of the different ways LECs define their tariffs. In some cases, the cost of the tandem interface and the selective routing equipment is apportioned out over all the users and is handled by one large aggregate cost. In other cases, the LEC has a specific charge for each trunk that is added so the costs are clear.

There is hope the costs will be reduced in the future by trunk concentration at the central office or by "tandeming" through the CO so the PBX's use the same 9-1-1 trunks as everyone else. There are things being worked on now to accomplish this, but nothing readily available.

I hope this helps. As with much of 9-1-1, there are some things that can be dealt with generically but there are always exceptions to the rule. (It seems the exceptions are becoming the rule!)