

From: Melissa Hughes <melissa_hughes@county.com.au>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/24/96 7:36pm
Subject: Voice communcations over the internet

RECEIVED

APR 25 '96

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

Please don't restrict this wonderful facility. Let market economics have their natural effects

Regards

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Melissa Hughes

All opinions expressed here are my own and no represent those of my employer.

1
SEARCHED
SERIALIZED
INDEXED
FILED

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

From: Jim Keefe <jimkeefe@ilhawaii.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/25/96 12:09pm
Subject: Internet Phones

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

As a regular traveler on the internet, I am opposed to the long distance phone companies' effort to close off an innovative and inexpensive alternative to some of their services. It seems that it was only a few short weeks ago that the same companies who've come crying to mommma (the FCC) about that big bully, competition, were themselves keen for a freer competitive marketplace. To a company they testified in favor of opening the telecommunications market, and fought every effort to carve out exceptions. Now that they're free to compete, they want the government to step in and stop a competitor for them, the cowards.

I hope that you'll stand firm in opposing their shameless attempt to protect themselves from the rigors of the marketplace, while they enjoy its many blessings.

Jim Keefe

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ASCOE _____

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

From: Mark Parker <ctis@ix15.ix.netcom.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/25/96 12:29pm
Subject: telephones on the Internet

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The Telecommunications industry is monopolized by AT&T, Sprint, MCI, ETC. I hardly believe that the Internet Phone will hurt the Long Distance market which has been a monopoly for so long. The quality of voice and service that the internet provides can not compare to that of the NON-Internet phone calls.

IS COMPETITION STILL LEGAL IN THE UNITED STATES?

If this law passes to keep Internet enabled phone calls illegal the Long Distance companies will have even more power and thus monopolize the industry still!

I STRONGLY VOTE TO KEEP INTERNET ENABLED PHONES AND SOFTWARE LEGAL!

Thanks,
Mark E. Parker
Peoria, Illinois
Telecommunications Consultant

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

1

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: ILYA SANDLER <isandler@utkux.utcc.utk.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/25/96 12:38pm
Subject: comments on ACTA Internet Phone Petition from concerned consumer

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I am an active Internet and long distance service user. I am not using and have never used Internet to avoid usual long distance charges, I am not in any way affiliated with companies developing and selling "Internet phone" and similar software.

quoted text is from the public text of ACTA petition unquoted text is my comments.

1. "... ACTA submits that the providers of this software are tele- communications carriers, and, as such, should be subject to FCC regulation like all telecommunications carriers.."

providers of software ARE NOT telecommunication carriers, much like phone and wire manufacturers are not telecommunication carriers, or envelope and postcard manufacturer is not a post service, therefore providers of software CAN NOT be regulated as telecommunication carriers.

2. "ACTA submits that it is not in the public interest to permit long distance service to be given away, depriving those who must maintain the telecommunications infrastructure of the revenue to do so.."

Internet users are paying to Internet Service Providers (ISP) or to online services, these companies in turn either lease or own their own telecommunication infrastructure, thus paying for infrastructure maintainance...And many long distance companies (for example AT&T and MCI) actively provide Internet-related services for their customers for an additional charge, thus INCREASING these companies' revenues.

This is a free market, and new technologies replace old ones and I expect that ACTA members have to either compete successfully with new technologies, or to adopt them (for example by leasing phone lines, starting to provide Internet services, etc) or to disappear

3. "The misuse of the Internet as a way to bypass the traditional means of obtaining long distance service could result in a significant reduction of the Internet's ability to handle the customary types of Internet traffic.."

Internet is a computer network, serving for transmitting data between computers, any type of data (text, video, audio) (as long as they may be converted into digital form) may be sent over the Internet. The nature of data is unimportant and Internet traffic already consists of different types of data (including text, graphics (most home pages now use graphics), audio(weather forecasts as example),etc). Thus "Internet phone" and similar software do not introduce any new type of traffic. and ACTA petition does NOT provide any evidence that internet phone may overload the Internet.

In fact "internet phone" has a potential to make Internet more popular thus making Internet and telecommunications in general more attractive for investors and accelerating the progress in telecommunications.

4. "ACTA asks the Commission, as special relief. to order the Respondents to immediately stop their unauthorized provisioning of telecommunications services.."

As I person having had a large computer programming experience, I believe that while development of "Internet phone" and similar software is not simple, it can be done by an individual professional computer programmer, thus making senseless any attempt to prohibit sale of such software. Also enforcement of such an order would require to control the type of data sent over the Internet, but any attempt of such a control would inevitably increase many times the cost of Internet use for

ALL network users and WILL result in a significant reduction of Internet's ability to handle the customary traffic. This fact alone makes impractical prohibiting sale of "Internet phone" and similar software. Also such an order would pose a serious financial burden on the companies which develop new technologies (like "Internet phone"), thus slowing the progress in telecommunications.

In conclusion, suggested by ACTA measure (prohibiting sale of "Internet Phone") is

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

- 1) uncompetetive (instead of trying to compete with or to use new technologies, ACTA members are trying to restrict developpent and use of new technologies)
- 2) unmotivated (ACTA petition doesn't provide any evidence that this measure would serve to public benefit)
- 3) impractical (i.e. can't be accomplished effectively)
- 4) most likely to slow the progress in telecommunications

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Bob Delaubenfels <bobdel@MICROSOFT.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 12:41pm
Subject: Oppose ban on Internet voice communication

This is to register my opposition to the proposed ban, filed in a petition by the America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA),

>on voice data communication over the Internet. This ban would stop
>companies from selling software and hardware products that let people
>use the Internet to make long-distance phone calls. While ACTA claims
>to be acting in the best interests of the public, what the ACTA
>petition reduces to is one generation of technology clashing with another. Do not allow those with a vested interest
in the current technology to handcuff the productive development of new communication technologies.

Thank you.

Bob deL.

The views expressed are my own and not those of the Microsoft corporation

No. of Copies rec'd _____ /
List ABCDE _____

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Erica Gies <egies@compcurr.com>
To: fcc gov <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 1:33pm
Subject: query

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

To whom it may concern:

I am a copy editor trying to verify the accuracy of your e-mail address. I believe we incorrectly listed it as hm8775@fcc.gov. I assume the correct address is rm8775@fcc.gov. Could you please e-mail me back to verify this for me ASAP? Thanks. My e-mail is egies@compcurr.com.

Erica Gies

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

From: Clayton Johnson <a-clayj@microsoft.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 1:34pm
Subject: Voice bits over the Internet

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Please don't not accede to the telephone companies demands of outlawing voice bits over the Internet. For many year Bell held a monopoly over voice communications in this country. As a result of changes against Anti-trust laws that monopoly was broken.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Having voice telecommunications across the Internet is a must if we are going to follow to spirit and intent of anti-trust laws.

It is a superior technology which the telephone companies are afraid they can't compete. So are we to outlaw it? That most certainly is not

American. Capitalism works and has made this country strong because it encourages better more efficient ways of doing things. This would be like horse breeders petitioning the government to outlaw the fledgling automobile industry! Where would we be now if that had occurred?

Clayton S. Johnson
6710 123rd PL SE
Bellevue, WA 98006
(206)603-9347 (Home, Evening)
(206)882-8080 ext. 12418

My views do not necessarily represent those of my employer.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Janet Sheperdigian (Exchange) <janetsh@Exchange.Microsoft.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 2:05pm
Subject: Telephones on the net

I understand that there is a move to ban technology that allows people to carry on a phone conversation over the Internet, thereby reducing long distance fees.

It's a little surprising that this could ever be considered in the best interests of anyone except those who are charging money for the old technology. I understand that Hoover quit making harnesses for horses and switched to vacuum cleaners when the world moved on to automobiles.

These companies need to do the same. Consumers should not be penalized because some people/companies won't change.

Thanks,
Janet Sheperdigian
3615 155th Ave NE #112
Bellevue, WA 98004
(206) 298-2639

The opinions expressed in this message are solely those of the author and should not be assumed to represent those of Microsoft Corporation, its employees, or its stockholders.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL RECEIVED
APR 25 1996

From: Dean Dretske (CDI - West) <a-deandr@microsoft.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 2:21pm
Subject: Petition by ACTA to stop use of Internet for voice communications

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Sirs:

I am opposed to adding any regulation/legislation which would prevent voice conversations over the Internet.

>

This is a new technology and the providers of older technology will always fight for the status quo. I encourage you to let the market determine the value of this new technology and the spread of its use. This will not be an overnight replacement of the current long distance phone systems. Its use is extremely limited, since the use of this software does not allow its user to call people with normal telephones - they can only call others with similar software.

I urge you to NOT make a Declaratory Ruling, NOT give Special Relief, and NOT Institute Rulemaking Proceedings as requested by the ACTA.

Thank you,
Dean Dretske
1911 1st Ave N
Seattle, WA 98109

>I speak only for myself.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
FILE # _____

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

APR 25 1996

From: Howard Thayer <hthayer@bendnet.com>
To: A4.A4(ssegal)
Date: 4/25/96 2:37am
Subject: [Fwd: [Fwd: Internet phones]]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Message-ID: <317F1AEE.2133@mail.bendnet.com>
Date: Wed, 24 Apr 1996 23:25:51 -0700
From: Howard Thayer <hthayer@mail.bendnet.com>
Reply-To: hthayer@mail.bendnet.com
Organization: The Computer House
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0B2 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: dstplet@fcc.gov
Subject: [Fwd: Internet phones]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Message-ID: <317F1288.5BD6@mail.bendnet.com>
Date: Wed, 24 Apr 1996 22:50:00 -0700
From: Howard Thayer <hthayer@mail.bendnet.com>
Reply-To: hthayer@mail.bendnet.com
Organization: The Computer House
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0B2 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: rm8775@fcc.gov
Subject: Internet phones
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Regarding DA 96-414,report # cc 96-10

If we are to regulate or forbid the use of Internet phones the maybe we should also forbid the use of E-mail because it cuts out the use of the post office and decreases there revenue. Also while we are at it we should do away with phone patches and the like for the Ham operators along with the video capabilities they have because that will cut into the deep pockets of the telephone companys also since they have video conferencing also. I'm sure if we really think about it they is a wide range of services that telephone companys have that other companys have also. Maybe while we are at it maybe we should do away with fax machines. Granted it does create quite a revenue for telephone companys but it does cut out the post office, UPS, FedEx and the like. How long are we going to continue to protect the telephone companys and give in to there every wim. Lets face it they are so use to having it there way that they think that everything they ask for they should get. After all how many times have they been completely turned down for rate inceases or been denied to bring out new technology that they come up with. I think they are more upset that they didn't think of it first. Good thing to because they probably would have stuck it to the internet users to and don't think for one moment that if they had come up with it first that they wouldn't charged less for the use of a internet phone the they charge for a regular telephone. Thank you for taking the time to read this and remember what is fair for one is fair for all. Now is the time to make a stand AGAINST the monopoly the telephone companys have and show them just because they cry they can't have any part of what they want.

Howard Thayer
20569 Ambrosia Lane
Bend Oregon, 97702
541-388-9905

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABOVE

1

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: EKR <tobam@bulldog.afsc.k12.ar.us>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/25/96 2:03am
Subject: Long distance phone calls on the net

Let the people prevail in the freedom to utilize the internet as a long distance voice medium in the manner available to them through advances in home computer hardware and software. Stop the power grabbing, money hungry, monopolizing, present day Phone Companies from this blatant attempt at the stifling of what they see as a potential rival and an alternative for the people

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RECEIVED

From: Chambers, Larry <lhc4@CCDOD1.EM.CDC.GOV>
To: FCC <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 8:54am
Subject: Please reject the ACTA petition to limit Internet long-distance

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

calling and let free enterprise have a chance.

L. Chambers
Atlanta, GA

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

*****Posting from e-mail list*****

America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA), a trade group representing 130 small regional long distance carriers, who has filed a petition with the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) to stop companies from selling software and hardware products that let people use the Internet to make long-distance phone calls. While ACTA claims to be acting in the best interests of the public (and there is an argument about the fact that cheap Internet rates are somewhat derivative from bulk sales of extra long distance bandwidth which might be undermined by massive adoption of Internet telephones, though any statement about Internet macroeconomics is mostly speculation), what the ACTA petition reduces to is one generation of technology clashing with another.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

1

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

From: ken_thomas <ken_thomas@bbs.bragg.army.mil>
To: A20.A20(kwerbach)
Date: 4/25/94 6:24am
Subject: Internet Telephone Debate

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Sir -

Do you really feel that people talking to people they have never met or seen on the Internet is going to threaten the big-business Telecommunication infrastructure? I think not...and the Internet can in no way be regulated...I think we have learned that through the passage of the Indecency Act...the only thing that did was make it easier to find porn and made it public to others that this is a good and easy way to obtain such material..The same thing will happen if this is also made true to Internet phone channels. Instead of going on a channel...people will make private channels or just talk to each other via a known IP Address. Please stop the trend of over regulation and allow technologie and the people behind it continue to improve our communications around the world...

Sincerely, Ken Thomas
ARS KB6NNC

Number of Copies rec'd _____
18 ABCDE

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

APR 25 1996

From: Don Raichle <draichle@cris.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/24/96 9:27pm
Subject: Internet Phone Tax

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I am writing to express my strong OPPOSITION TO ANY INTERNET PHONE TAX.

This is the wrong time to burden a fledgling industry, just when it is struggling for acceptance.

Don Raichle
46 Rich Street
Irvington, NJ 07111
201.375.2978

Copies rec'd 1
FICL ABCDE

RECEIVED

From: Willis B. Boyce <wboyce@greenleaf.gfr.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/24/96 10:24pm
Subject: Internet telephony.

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Sir:

The attempt by the "American Carriers Telecommunication Association" (ACTA) to bar the sale of software which permits users to send voice data over the Internet is no more than an effort to use government coercion to eliminate competition and is entirely without merit. The group apparently feels that the existence of this software will disturb the price structure of the Internet and of standard telephone service, but such is the nature of the free market.

Aside from the fact that the government has no place telling people how to transmit data, any ban on telephony software would be impossible to enforce, since independent programmers, perhaps in other countries, would write the software anyway, and it would be extremely difficult to scan the Internet for voice communication. Even if a program could be devised to recognize digitized human voices, it would not be able to determine if the conversation was "live" or if it was pre-recorded, and in any case the data could be encrypted, rendering any such program useless.

--
Willis B. Boyce
finger wboyce@greenleaf.gfr.com for PGP public key
<http://www.gfr.com/~wboyce>
vote Libertarian! <http://www.lp.org/lp/>

Number of Copies rec'd _____
LBT ABCDE

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Stig <stig@hackvan.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/24/96 11:57pm
Subject: I disagree with the ACTA petition.

ACTA's petition to bar companies from marketing internet telephony products is a pile of protectionist rubbish.

If current regulations, through some bizarre orwellian twist, make it illegal to do voice communications over the internet, then those regulations should be changed to permit what is a perfectly sensible evolution of technology.

To reiterate:

Voice On the Net -----> YES
Telco Protectionism -----> NO

Thank you,
Jonathan B Stigelman

Copies rec'd _____
CODE _____

From: Sandie Miller <sandiem@microsoft.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 2:49pm
Subject: Do NOT ban voice bits over the Internet!!

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Peter Henriksen <peterhe@microsoft.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 2:59pm
Subject: ACTA petition re. telephones on the Internet

To whom it may concern:

I have recently become aware of a petition by the America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA) to stop the sales of soft- and hardware products making it possible to use the Internet and a multimedia PC for long distance telephone calls. The ACTA is claiming to be acting in the best interests of the public with this petition.

I fail to see how it can be in my best interest to be kept from using my Internet provider - and incur the relatively low monthly cost of maintaing that relationship - to make long distance phone calls and instead be forced to rely on a traditional carrier at a much higher cost to me. It seems to me that the petition is entirely self serving and has nothing to do with the interest of the public. I am aware that the ACTA claims that there's an economic relationship between the low cost of Internet access and bulk sales of long distance bandwidth. but that remains speculation on their part.

In short, I would like to see this petition denied. I believe that it is in the best interest of the public to be able to make an informed choice between services of this kind.

Thank you for considering my input

- Peter Henriksen, peterhe@microsoft.com
25832 SE 41st Place
Issaquah, WA 98029

No. of Copies rec'd _____ /
List ABCDE _____

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Bill Brisky <billbris@microsoft.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 4:08pm
Subject: Voice on the Internet comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Sirs:

I recently heard the disturbing news that a group is attempting to stop the ability of individuals to communicate over the Internet. Although I am glad that individuals in this country have the ability to bring up possible problems for public comment (and possible action), this particular issue "rubs" me the wrong way, and I think I've narrowed down my uneasiness to two major points:

1. Progress

My first point is this: I'm sending my comment to you via Electronic Mail over the Internet. I am not typing this on a typewriter, folding the letter, putting the letter in an envelope and using the U.S. Postal Service. The irony is that not only can I do this, but it is now acceptable.

It seems that at any given point in history there are those who have a vested interest in providing goods and services during a time when those goods and services are either disappearing or changing. Yes, it is unsettling for those who have to make the change, and yes, we are probably better off because of the changes.

Imagine the Pony Express mail system arguing against Mr. Morse's "new" technology, or the European monasteries fighting against Mr. Guttenberg's new printing press.

Things change because people see problems, and in this country, they are allowed to solve those problems and even try to make a business out of their solution.

2. Technology

When it comes right down to it everything that is shipped around the Internet are just electronic signals. Whether the signals come out as my electronic mail to you, or as my digitized voice coming through your computer's speakers, it still just data. Why should some types of data be prohibited and others not? Yes, this brings up the entire "Pornography on the Net" question, but that is not a valid comparison. The questionable content still exists on the net, it's a matter of Adult v. Minors, not Content v. No Content. Also, no one is arguing that this is a type of data, in itself, is harmful or disturbing.

It comes down to this, there are some smart, energetic people who have found a new way of communicating information using an existing medium (the Net). It just so happens that other people (a lot of them) also think that this is a good solution to a problem. At the same time this new solution happens to step on another group of people's "turf". I would not be surprised that at some point in the not-so-distant future someone else will come up with a new means of communicating that will force existing "Voice-on-the-Net" companies to change their business as well.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Bill Brisky

"If you pick up a starving dog and make him prosperous, he will not bite you. This is the principle difference between a dog and a man."

-- Mark Twain (1835-1910)

CC: Bill Brisky <billbris@microsoft.com>

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Lana Mitchell (Vlt Comp) <a-lanami@MICROSOFT.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/25/96 4:52pm
Subject: Internet Voice Bits

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

>Don't let the America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA)
>stop companies from selling software and hardware products that let
>people use the Internet to make long-distance phone calls. While ACTA
>claims to be acting in the best interests of the public, what their
>petition is doing is pitting one generation of technology against another.

Lana Mitchell
Redmond, WA

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____