

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FBI 10

JULY - 7 1996

**From:** Mary Clare Wohlford <mcgoats@naxs.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(RM8775)  
**Date:** 5/6/96 5:51pm  
**Subject:** RuleMaking 8775-ACTA Petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

This is an informal comment submitted to express my view that the ACTA proposal is both untimely and premature and should not be considered at this time. The potentials of the internet include voice, video, sound, as well as telephony, if use for telephone communication is curtailed, restricted, or otherwise interfered with can other restrictions and curtailments be far behind? It is in the interest of public freedom that experimentation with new technical means be encouraged, not immediately squelched by companies, such as ACTA, who fear competition.

For the government to act precipitously at this time would signal the citizenry that the FCC is ready to stifle any innovative methods when a small segment of industry cries that they 'anticipate' competition from another. Why not wait and see what develops? To date those who petitioned the FCC can cite to no concrete numbers of internet telephone users or show how they will be adversely affected, if they will indeed be affected at all.

The petition of ACTA is without merit and should be dismissed. The FCC, for a period of at least five (5) years, should study internet communications and see if any valid unfair competition occurs and include users and suppliers of internet communications in all discussions and decisions made at that time.

Sincerely,

Mary Clare Wohlford  
Wytheville, Virginia 24382

Number of copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** Gerard T. McIntyre, SMSgt, USAF <mcatag@minot.com>  
**To:** A20.A20(kwerbach)  
**Date:** 5/6/96 10:17am  
**Subject:** (no subject)

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECORDED  
INDEXED  
MAY 10 1996  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION  
U.S. AIR FORCE

-- BMX\$

Dear Sir,

I read the article in the Internet World magazine about the petition that ACTA is doing, and would like to have my comments heard.

I believe that the smaller companies are getting greedy and upset over nothing. First off, I am all for full development of the iPhone type technology. The large phone companies aren't losing any sleep over it, and this free long distance thing is far from ever being close to being really competitive with the regular phone companies.

Most people are not going to go out of their way to make bigger bills to save money. ie: everyone is not going out to buy a computer for a couple of thousand dollars, then pay a server, add another phone line, buy the iPhone software all to save on their long distance bill???

The next thing is there are not enough truly dedicated servers to call people in all the areas you wish to call, let alone have friends and relatives who have a computer so that you may use the iPhone to speak to them. I know this first hand.

When I first read about the free long distance possibilities I jumped into the band wagon. We happen to have 3 computers in our home, one for myself, my husband and the kids. I was the first to get on the net and just about two weeks ago my husband finally got on the net.

I bought the iPhone, I downloaded FWD's software, I spoke to my relatives and friends, most don't have a computer, and the one's that do are complaining about any more cost towards the computer.

I am all set up and have no friends or family to call. I do not wish to call strangers. I also heard that if you are lucky enough to find a server most of them have only one line to use for calls and getting on is a real heart ache. When I found a server in an area to call to a regular phone with FWD, the server was not interested in letting me use their line to try to talk to someone I knew in the area, they are too busy trying to use it for their own calls.

ACTA should stop over reacting. It is much easier to use the regular phone to call anyone you want than it is to find a server or to get a friend or relative to buy the iPhone.

Maybe, if ever when the phone companies get smart and convert over to such a system to help all their customers save money can this ever be very successful. At least with the regular phone one can call anyone, anyplace, anywhere, at anytime, and in today's society isn't time and convenience more important to us, that we are a society ready to pay for it....within reason that is, few people are going to do what I did and go through the expense to set and then find out how disappointed one can be.

Tell, ACTA to take a chill pill and relax, it will be many years before this iPhone really catches on fire, and maybe by then the big Phone Company giants will spring something new that will really pose a threat to the little companies.

Thanks  
Maria T. McIntyre star@minot.com

Mr. [unclear] room'd  
LID 1-001E

RECEIVED

MAY 11 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

**From:** TONY SATTERTHWAITE <TSATTERT@usagroup.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 10:45am  
**Subject:** ACTA petition--NO

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

The America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA), a trade group representing 130 small regional long distance carriers, 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, what the ACTA petition reduces to is one generation of technology clashing with another. Besides that, it is common knowledge that whenever government interferes with private industry, the consumer suffers.

ACTA is attempting to use the coercion of your agency to halt healthy competition. If you accept their petition, you will be in effect supporting a monopoly. Please turn down the ACTA petition, in the interest of free-market economics (which made this country the world power it is today). Allowing the consumer to decide what products and services he or she wants is the only common sense approach

Thank you,

Tony Satterthwaite

**CC:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("arsenal@iquest.net")

1  
SEARCHED INDEXED SERIALIZED FILED  
MAY 11 1996  
FBI - MEMPHIS

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Jimmy D. Burrell <jburrell@inst.com>  
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>  
Date: 5/7/96 11:05am

Informal Comments on RM 8775 to be filed with the 'FCC'

Dear Sirs,

My name is Jimmy D. Burrell, a concerned consumer and Internet user. I am writing in reference to RM 8775 in which, on March 4, 1996, America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA) filed a Petition for Declaratory Ruling, Special Relief, and Institution of a Rulemaking relating to the provision of interstate and international interexchange telecommunications service via the "Internet" by non-tariffed, uncertified entities.

My position is that ACTA has no basis for filing the aforementioned petition nor should there be any Declaratory Ruling, Special Relief, nor a Rulemaking relating to the provision of interstate and international interexchange telecommunications service via the "internet" by non-tariffed, uncertified entities. The reasoning and logic which supports my position is quite clear and very simple. The fact is, any Internet communication or exchange of data is by nature "from one node to the next" and these intermediary connections are individually regulated and paid for already. Many of these "node to node" or intermediary connections are provided by ACTA and they thereby receive payment for the very service they seek Special Relief on. Further, these intermediary connections are already under the regulatory oversight of the FCC, thereby negating any need for a Declaratory Ruling or an Institution of a Rulemaking relating to this issue.

As this issue relates to "making a long distance call", it is possible, using "Internet Phone" or similar software to "string together" several intermediary connections and deliver "voice" to a destination that would be considered "long distance" if you were to make the same connection using your telephone. However, as stated earlier, every connection made during this process has been previously agreed to, contracted for, and paid by the entities representing each end point of the intermediary connection.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Jim Burrell

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** David McCarthy <davemac@earthlink.net>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 11:38am  
**Subject:** RM No. 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

I am opposed to this petition.

While the carriers may feel threatened by the voice capability of the Internet, where would they have the technology stop?

Since video transmission on the Internet is possible, will the broadcast networks or cable operators want to ban it? For that matter, since the data transmission capacity of the Internet is in "competition" with value-added networks such as AOL and CompuServe, why don't those companies protest? Why are so many radio stations currently participating in the RealAudio network, which allows their "signal" to go out over the Internet?

I don't believe it is wise to try to artificially limit the technology. Perhaps a better solution is for the petitioners to join in the competition, by adding value to the service (Internet "phone" service is certainly not today a threat to anyone's profitability. But they could create value by allowing Internet -> landline service, for example, and charge a fee for it.)

Thank you

David McCarthy  
9 Wedgewood Drive  
Hopkinton, MA 01748

FILED  
MAY 10 1996  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

**From:** Frank T Lofaro <ftlofaro@billy-boy.CS.UNLV.EDU>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/6/96 8:04pm  
**Subject:** ACTA petition (RM 8775)

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I am opposed to the Federal Communications Commission instituting rules restricting the provision and use of hardware and software to provide electronic conferencing services over the Internet. The following factors are reasons to not implement such a ruling. First, the FCC is limited by the First Amendment, and can only take action where there is a compelling need, such as preventing interference or ensuring fair access to monopoly owned communications resources; even in such cases, they must use the least restrictive means necessary. Software, including Internet phone software, is a form of expression, and as such is protected by the First Amendment. Secondly, the FCC's Common Carrier Bureau, which is the Bureau handling the ACTA petition, has jurisdiction only over common carriers. As Internet service providers are not afforded common carrier status or protection (a fact reaffirmed in the recent Communications Decency Act legislation), they should not be subject to such restrictions that such status incurs. Internet service is not a monopoly and does not use an intrinsically limited resource (e.g. spectrum or public wires). In addition, providers, distributors and users of Internet phone hardware and software are not in any way common carriers or telecommunications entities. Telephone companies providing inter-exchange services using the Internet could be subject to FCC rulings on this issue, as usual, but private use of the new Internet conferencing technologies does not fall into that realm. Finally, the FCC, as a federal commission, only regulates interstate activities, and banning the provisioning of Internet phone hardware and software would restrict use of such technologies even within states or even private networks. Also, the social and political implications of the FCC fining or otherwise sanctioning individuals and companies for using the Internet, a non-publically owned entity, in an otherwise lawful manner is politically and socially undesirable. It would undermine freedom of expression and communication, and reduce the value of the Internet as a communications medium, a situation the FCC would hopefully want to avoid. In any event, in order for such actions to be taken, legislation would have to be passed allowing the FCC such jurisdiction over Internet activities

1  
List ABOVE

**From:** Al Schober <aschober@audioal.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/6/96 8:42pm  
**Subject:** RM No. 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

I feel that by limiting software and hardware expansion allowing the usage and testing of programs and capabilities such as Internet-phone, CU-see me and the like would hamper the products that exist to help maintain networks. I work for an educational facility that constantly looks for ways to provide support to users in differing ways and also to get students to utilize the new technologies as they exist. The internet is a constant tool in helping to provide a testing base and ease of contact among users with similar goals.

Al Schober

SEARCHED \_\_\_\_\_  
SERIALIZED \_\_\_\_\_

9-11-96

111-1111

**From:** Mitch Taranow <mtaranow@lr.net>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/6/96 9:38pm  
**Subject:** Against ACTA

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Please rule against the America's Carriers Telecommunication Association's requests. The Internet seems to be functioning just fine without additional regulations.

For: [unclear] /  
List: ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

100-100000000

100-100000000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

**From:** Elliot Lee <sopwith@cuc.edu>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/6/96 10:40pm  
**Subject:** RuleMaking 8775 - ACTA Petition (Informal Comment)

I would like to express my distaste for the ACTA's petition to regulate Internet telephone traffic. Why?

- It lacks merit technically. Internet telecommunications services may, and indeed already have had an impact on traditional telecommunications services. Should we therefore stifle the exploration of new and exciting scientific discoveries, because they have the potential to antiquate the existing methods of operation?

- It lacks merit competitively. America, which is based upon the principles of free speech, should not attempt to strangle any methods of communication which may foster that free speech. Telephony over the Internet is a means by which citizens may express their opinions, and conduct their personal affairs, in a cost effective manner. Because the ACTA members have their livelihood at stake is no reason to squelch others who have a similar, and as strong, right.

Regards,  
Elliot Lee

\*=UNIX\*=\*=Programming=\*\_INTERESTS\_\*=\*=Internet\*=\*=Graphics\*=\*=WWW=\*  
Elliot Lee | Computer Science Student | 7600 Flower Ave. sopwith@cuc.edu | Columbia Union College |  
Takoma Park, MD 20912 USA http://www.cs.cuc.edu/~sopwith/ | (301) 891-4260

----- PGP public key now available, 'finger -l sopwith@cs.cuc.edu' -----

Number of Copies rec'd  
List ANODE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** Dr. Philip B. Terry <doc@smarty.smart.net>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/6/96 11:14pm  
**Subject:** Comments re Telephony technology via internet

7/11/96 11:14 AM  
111 - 111  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20541

I find it disturbing the nature and amount of regulation our government is/has/plans on instituting on the internet. I believe it imperative that the U.S. government our own Constitutional First Amendment Rights and be at the forefront of developed nations in regards to supporting free speech and communications technology, such as the potential unleashed with the internet and related technology

In particular, the recent communications law and the current consideration of limiting telephony technology, I find appalling. It would not be in the best interest of technology and consequently the ability of our citizens to master and ultimately enhance such technology, if we restrict the applications at every turn.

We should, at every opportunity encourage new technology and healthy competition as the telephony technology will provide!

I thank you for your consideration of my views.

**CC:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("President@whitehouse.gov")

1  
No. of Copies rec'd  
By ASCE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** Nancy Godfrey-Kozoriz <godzoriz@wizard.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 5:05am  
**Subject:** Re: RM No. 8775

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Hello,

In response to your "request for comments", I would like to say that while creators of hardware and software for telecommunications via the Internet \*may\* have a responsibility similar to the nature of makers of telephones, they should in no way be considered "common carriers" or treated as such.

If the members of ACTA had pursued the advancing of technology as thoroughly as the creators of this Internet-only hardware and software, then more people around the world would now have access to these more advanced communication techniques. Use of this technology would now be widespread, and undoubtedly well-priced.

Because the makers of this technology have one-upped the ACTA's members, they are responding by attempting to have the government (in the form of the FCC) step in and solve their problem for them.

Effectively, this technology is no different than the current "chatroom" or IRC set-ups which have been being used for \*many\* years with no complaint from ACTA. People have been able to communicate via these methods without regard to country of origin or local carrier, and the ACTA has been silent.

Now, because this communication includes the voice and video, they feel it infringes too greatly on their sphere of influence, and thus must be regulated. No matter that virtually the same conversations are taking place, via the same media that the ACTA was a significant player in creating. Because now you can HEAR the other person, this communication is now somehow different.

This is preposterous. The ACTA is out of line here, and the FCC should make that clear to them and rule against this petition.

Thank you for your time,

Nancy Godfrey-Kozoriz  
1215 Chapman Ave.  
Las Vegas, NV 89104  
(702) 385-0663

APPROVED FOR FILING  
MAY 10 1996

RECEIVED

MAY 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Nancy Godfrey-Kozoriz <godzoriz@wizard.com>  
To: A16.A16(rm8775)  
Date: 5/7/96 5:05am  
Subject: Re: RM No. 8775

Hello,

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

In response to your "request for comments", I would like to say that while creators of hardware and software for telecommunications via the Internet \*may\* have a responsibility similar to the nature of makers of telephones, they should in no way be considered "common carriers" or treated as such.

If the members of ACTA had pursued the advancing of technology as thoroughly as the creators of this Internet-only hardware and software, then more people around the world would now have access to these more advanced communication techniques. Use of this technology would now be widespread, and undoubtedly well-priced.

Because the makers of this technology have one-upped the ACTA's members, they are responding by attempting to have the government (in the form of the FCC) step in and solve their problem for them.

Effectively, this technology is no different than the current "chatroom" or IRC set-ups which have been being used for \*many\* years with no complaint from ACTA. People have been able to communicate via these methods without regard to country of origin or local carrier, and the ACTA has been silent.

Now, because this communication includes the voice and video, they feel it infringes too greatly on their sphere of influence, and thus must be regulated. No matter that virtually the same conversations are taking place, via the same media that the ACTA was a significant player in creating. Because now you can HEAR the other person, this communication is now somehow different.

This is preposterous. The ACTA is out of line here, and the FCC should make that clear to them and rule against this petition.

Thank you for your time,

Nancy Godfrey-Kozoriz  
1215 Chapman Ave.  
Las Vegas, NV 89104  
(702) 385-0663

SEARCHED INDEXED  
SERIALIZED FILED

RECEIVED

MAY - 7 1996

**From:** Glen Johnson <gjohnson@jofoto.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 6:42am  
**Subject:** ACTA petition

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I would like to express my opinion on the ACTA petition for relief from voice communications over the Internet.

In my opinion, the Internet and any other technological advances should be allowed to proceed without hinderence. If society should benefit from these advances then I feel it is a good thing. The fact that it takes profits away from the Communications companies is of secondary and little importance to me. I do not feel sorry for these companies who wish to take money from the public when we can get alternative services free of charge. They should use more of their gigantic profits for research and development and less for exec. perks.

While it is true that Internet users must pay access fees, we should not be penalized for the fact that use of the Internet is free. It is about time that society is allowed to make use of a technological advancement without some corporation jumping in to profit from it.

Lastly I would like to express my oposition to cencorship of any form, including Internet content.

-- Glen Johnson 2810 Finfeather, Bryan, TX 77801  
409-823-2729 fax 409-822-0951 gjohnson@jofoto.com

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_ /  
LIST CODE \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** TONY SATTERTHWAITE <TSATTERT@usagroup.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 10:45am  
**Subject:** ACTA petition--NO

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAY - 7 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA), a trade group representing 130 long distance carriers, 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, what the ACTA petition reduces to is one generation of technology clashing with another. Besides that, it is common knowledge that whenever government interferes with private industry, the consumer suffers.

ACTA is attempting to use the coercion of your agency to halt healthy competition. If you accept their petition, you will be in effect supporting a monopoly. Please turn down the ACTA petition, in the interest of free-market economics (which made this country the world power it is today). Allowing the consumer to decide what products and services he or she wants is the only common sense approach

Thank you,

Tony Satterthwaite

**CC:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("arsenal@iquest.net")

Pls. do not add to rec'd  
List ANDOT

RECEIVED

MAY 27 1996

From: Jimmy D. Burrell <jburrell@inst.com>  
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>  
Date: 5/7/96 11:05am

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Informal Comments on RM 8775 to be filed with the 'FCC'

Dear Sirs,

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

My name is Jimmy D. Burrell, a concerned consumer and Internet user. I am writing in reference to RM 8775 in which, on March 4, 1996, America's

Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA) filed a Petition for =  
Declaratory Ruling, Special Relief, and Institution of a Rulemaking = relating to the provision of interstate and international interexchange = telecommunications service via the "Internet" by non-tariffed, = uncertified entities

My position is that ACTA has no basis for filing the aforementioned = petition nor should there be any Declaratory Ruling, Special Relief, nor = a Rulemaking relating to the provision of interstate and international = interexchange telecommunications service via the "internet" by = non-tariffed, uncertified entities. The reasoning and logic which = supports my position is quite clear and very simple. The fact is, any =

Internet communication or exchange of data is by nature "from one node = to the next" and these intermediary connections are individually = regulated and paid for already. Many of these "node to node" or = intermediary connections are provided by ACTA and they thereby receive = payment for the very service they seek Special Relief on. Further, = these intermediary connections are already under the regulatory = oversight of the FCC, thereby negating any need for a Declaratory Ruling = or an Institution of a Rulemaking relating to this issue.

As this issue relates to "making a long distance call", it is possible, = using "Internet Phone" or similar software to "string together" several = intermediary connections and deliver "voice" to a destination that would = be considered "long distance" if you were to make the same connection = using your telephone. However, as stated earlier, every connection made = during this process has been previously agreed to, contracted for, and = paid by the entities representing each end point of the intermediary = connection.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Jim Burrell

1  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

**From:** David McCarthy <davemac@earthlink.net>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 11:38am  
**Subject:** RM No. 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am opposed to this petition.

While the carriers may feel threatened by the voice capability of the Internet, where would they have the technology stop?

Since video transmission on the Internet is possible, will the broadcast networks or cable operators want to ban it? For that matter, since the data transmission capacity of the Internet is in "competition" with value-added networks such as AOL and CompuServe, why don't those companies protest? Why are so many radio stations currently participating in the RealAudio network, which allows their "signal" to go out over the Internet?

I don't believe it is wise to try to artificially limit the technology. Perhaps a better solution is for the petitioners to join in the competition, by adding value to the service (Internet "phone" service is certainly not today a threat to anyone's profitability. But they could create value by allowing Internet -> landline service, for example, and charge a fee for it.)

Thank you

David McCarthy  
9 Wedgewood Drive  
Hopkinton, MA 01748

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1996

**From:** Eric Litman <Eric\_Litman@viaduct.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 12:19pm  
**Subject:** ACTA Petition opposition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am strongly opposed to the regulation of the Internet under Common Carrier law. The technology base of the Internet is one such that the development of new and innovative applications is fostered. That voice carriage over the Internet is feasible is consequential and irrelevant. Regulation of this technology "testbed" will merely stifle the birth and proliferation of new technologies, and will be vastly more harmful to the public interest than any potential lost revenue telecommunications carriers believe they may now incur.

Regards.

---

Eric A. Litman, CEO, Viaduct, Inc. <http://www.viaduct.com/>  
Internet security and commerce consulting. PCS: (301) 254-0200

*[Handwritten signature]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

MAY - 7 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

**From:** Todd McMillin <toddmcm@cris.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 12:45pm  
**Subject:** RM No. 8775

To whom it may concern:

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I believe that the Internet should not be regulated in any way. Communication over the Internet in any form be it graphic, audio, video, or any other means is my choice and should not be regulated or interfered with in any way, by government or any corporation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

MAY 27 1996

**From:** Brad Davis <bdavis@mhz.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 2:11pm  
**Subject:** ACTA petition

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I feel that the FCC needs to be very careful in this arena. Currently, the amount of traffic is minuscule and no carrier is really being hurt.

However, if Internet voice is cut off (and especially if the wording of the ruling is broad), the ruling will stop the current experimentation in important new ways of communication, including Internet based voice mail (besides two way communication), video conferencing, and the new virtual 3D world based communication methods.

Most consumers won't take advantage of Internet Phones, they don't yet take advantage of the Internet. Please don't destroy the experimentation that might lead us to the future of communications just to satisfy a group of common carriers who still base their world model on a 60 year old law.

Brad Davis  
(I only represent myself on these matters.)

**CC:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("bdavis@crossbow.mhz.com")

SEARCHED  
SERIALIZED

RECEIVED

MAY - 7 1996

**From:** Peter Daniel Pflanz <pflanz@Oswego.Oswego.EDU>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 2:19pm  
**Subject:** Why stop developing our country.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Why does our government feel that is necessary to always protect large corporation interests. If there is a why do something we already know how to do, why stop it. I think the internet telephone devices sound like a really clever idea. As soon as some new technology comes around everybody gets so bent out of shape. Deal with. Don't stop research and development reward it. I thought this was a free company, what gives you the right to regulate what software is used on the the world wide internet. The US should also realize that they should not and can not regulate the world's computer network. It is for the entire planet, not just for the US. Think it about, people don't want control over what they explore. It should be left up to the people to choose....

Reply to me at petepflanz@worldnet.att.net. :-)!!!!!!!

.....  
.....

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1996

From: John Chevalier <johnchev@mint.net>  
To: A20.A20(kwerbach)  
Date: 5/7/96 4:41pm  
Subject: Internet Voice Communications

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I'm writing to you concerning the attempt of ACTA to shut down Internet "phone" type programs that allow a person to speak over the internet, all over the world for free.

First, I would like to point out that the Internet is not a domain owned and operated by the United States-it is the "internet"-international. How would the FCC or ACTA propose to control other countries uses of the internet? Even if you shut down Internet "phone" type programs here in the US why couldn't I log into one provided in Germany or Canada?

Second, how would ACTA propose you monitor what a person is using the internet for. As far as you know I could be browsing the Net or I could be talking on it. The only way you could find out is to monitor me without my knowlege, right (or you could make it a law that I must agree to be monitored to use the Internet in the US-Big Brother??)?

Third, what would be the next thing that someone propose the government control on the internet? I know, it would be E-mail! Think of the revenue lost everyday to mail sent over the internet and not via the postal service. Then you would have to put controls on all the chat groups! That is a form of completely free communications too. Then you'd have to put controls on all the MUD games, and "Virtual Worlds" because they are "real time" communications also, which provide free communications. Oh, lets not forget about Video conferencing, that is definately free and very interesting communications.

I recognize that phone companies are concerned about thier future as more and more people get the internet and discover its vast number of uses but that is not my problem. And please don't let them try to tell me that many people will lose their jobs. If they grew and evolved with the internet in mind they could create MORE jobs. Why is ACTA, and possibly our government, in the business of suppressing technology? Shouldn't we be trying to take advantage of this technology, helping it to develop, making it even better and more useful, encouraging the little guys who have thought this stuff up and are trying to make it grow? Or are we more concerned with the big companies that are already established and have alot of financial clout?

I think that is the problem, money talks in our government. Some politician will get paid mighty well for trying to get controls on internet communications. Common sense tells anyone that Internet communications is a wonderful, educational thing that tears down the borders and walls between people and countries. Communication leads to understanding, which leads to peace. For the sake of millions of dollars in lobbyist money though I suspect our politicians will throw all that out the window.

Thanks for listening. Actually, you should be thanking me for my input as I am a tax payer and us tax payers do pay all federal wages. I won't even get a personal reply from this note, and what I do receive in return will not address anything that I have brought up. If my boss got that kind of response from me she would fire me...

John Chevalier  
5/7/96

RECEIVED

MAY - 7 1996

**From:** Jonathan Day <jonathan.day@umist.ac.uk>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 2:55pm  
**Subject:** Informal comment on ACTA Petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

WRT ACTA Petition, RM No. 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear sir,

I would like to voice my concern over the ACTA petition for regulating Internet communications. I am writing as a concerned individual, for although I am an English citizen, living in England, the precise wording of the petition could have a significant international impact, especially in the areas that I work, that of Computer Aided Learning, software engineering and network management.

Firstly, I would like to comment on ACTA's claim that long-distance communications are 'given away' on the Internet and that this endangers the telecommunications infrastructure. In my experience as a network manager, I would like to note that this is not entirely an accurate representation. Each Internet provider links to further Internet providers through some form of telecommunication system, each link being paid for by that provider. Thus, the complaint, which only refers to end-user payments to the telecommunications industry and not to the payments by Internet providers for the maintenance of the actual links themselves, is incomplete and potentially misleading.

Secondly, I would like to comment on ACTA's suggestion that the Commission issue a declaration stating that it has authority over telecommunications services using the Internet. As a software engineer, I would like to note that it is not possible to distinguish between types of information on the Internet. A single unit of information (known as a packet) contains a simple stream of digital information. For the period of time that the packet is traversing the Internet, there is no reasonable distinction between a packet containing audio data and a packet containing electronic mail. Thus, whilst it is fair to argue that regulation is required, it is unreasonable to place that regulation on the network itself, as there is no viable method of enforcing the regulation at that specific point.

Thirdly, I would like to question all references to international communication over the Internet and the proposal that the Commission regulate this communication. The Internet operates by passing a message onto the next computer in a chain. A packet exists only in one point in the Internet and a line of communication only exists between the current stage and the next. Furthermore, each packet is able to take a unique, distinct path, without reference to the path taken by any other packet. This is distinct from a telephone conversation, in which there is an identifiable, distinct line from transmitter to receiver which is reserved for the duration of the conversation. Because the only open line of communication is between "adjacent" machines, the only identifiable international communication takes place at the point at which that communication crosses a national boundary. At no time prior, or subsequent, to such a crossing, is there any identifiable international communication.

Lastly, I would like to question the impact of any regulation on countries outside of the FCC's authority. Because it is impossible to specify the path taken by any given packet of information, from source to final destination, it is entirely possible for communications directed from one European country to another to travel through the US. But each packet will travel by its own route. Thus, blanket regulations within the US may result in European communications being edited, as and when packets are diverted. In my capacity of developing techniques in computer aided learning, it is important for me to clarify if and how any US law will affect the teaching of students over the Internet within Europe. It would obviously be of no value as a tool for teaching if I have absolutely no means of determining if teaching material is going to be censored as a result of an automatic re-routing by an Internet provider many stages down the chain of communication.

Apologies for the length of this informal comment and thank you in advance for any information on the points raised in it.

Jonathan Day jonathan.day@umist.ac.uk

1

RECEIVED

MAY - 7 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

**From:** Bill Davis <bdavis@accessusa.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 4:26pm  
**Subject:** RM No. 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

A quote from the "Conclusion" of the petition:

> Permitting long distance service to be given away is not in  
> the public interest.

Permitting long distance service to be given away is in the public interest. It's just not in any long distance phone companies interest.

The Internet is going to cause problems for all phone companies.  
Is the FCC simply going to regulate all innovation from the Internet?

Bill Davis.

SEARCHED \_\_\_\_\_  
SERIALIZED \_\_\_\_\_  
MAY 7 1996  
FBI - WASH DC

RECEIVED

MAY - 7 1996

**From:** William Cole <cole@mindspring.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 5/7/96 5:30pm  
**Subject:** Internet Phones

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

With regard to the regulation of technologies that allow people to make long distant calling over the internet, I think a ruling against such technology would be a mistake. The petition filed by ACTA is indicative of the kind of generational envy promoted by all modern day luddites and special interest/old technology industries. It's like ruling in favor of restricting the manufacture of the automobile to save the horse drawn carriage. Once again it seems like a political move by a dying technology to save its own hide.

William Cole cole@chatt.mindspring.com

SEARCHED INDEXED SERIALIZED FILED  
MAY 7 1996  
FBI - MEMPHIS

RECEIVED

MAY 27 1996

From: Tracie Monk <tmonk@ito.snap.org>  
To: A16.A16(rm8775)  
Date: 5/7/96 3:12pm  
Subject: FNC Response to FCC call for comments on the ACTA Petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

All -

The following is an electronic version of a letter submitted to the FCC by the Federal Networking Council.

Tracie Monk  
DynCorp / FNC <http://www.fnc.gov>  
(703)284-8226  
(703)522-7161

+++++

May 4, 1996

Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street  
Washington, DC 20554

Reference: Rulemaking 8775 - ACTA Petition on Internet Voice

Honorable Members of the Commission:

These informal comments are submitted on behalf of the membership of the Federal Networking Council (FNC) which provide a forum for networking collaborations among Federal agencies to meet their research, education, and operational mission goals. The FNC reports to the National Science and Technology Council's Committee on Information and Communications (CIC).

Current Internet Environment:

The ACTA Petition of March 4, 1996 reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of the transmission mechanisms of the Internet and of the relationship between consumers and providers of Internet services. The Petition refers to "non-tariffed, uncertified entities" which putatively provide inter exchange services via the Internet. There are in fact no such entities nor in fact are there any inter exchange services on the existing Internet.

The notion of a specific 'service' assumes an ability to route or otherwise differentially transmit packets on the basis of content. In fact, packets across the Internet are indistinguishable during transmission. The only difference between packets used for non-voice functions such as file transfer and those used for voice communication is the software used to process the packets on the computers ultimately interacting with each other. These computers and software are provisioned by the end-users themselves independently of transmission. Furthermore they are general purpose resources, used for a variety of functions, including, but not limited to, voice communication.

The ACTA Petition also asks that an order be issued to stop provisioning of Internet phone hardware and software. No special purpose hardware is needed for voice communication over the Internet, but rather, general purpose sound digitization and generation hardware is used. Increasingly, desk top personal computers come equipped with such hardware as standard equipment. Software facilitating such communications is globally available, both through a multitude of vendors and as shareware or freeware

In contrast to this Internet environment, tariffed and certified telephone carriers provide dedicated end-to-end service for a fee to their subscribers. A consistent business model applies across common carrier telephone networks.

As such, subscribers can depend upon availability of specified service offerings and minimum level of service, which carriers can use in calculating tariffs and defending them in public hearings.

Within the Internet no entity plays the role of the tariffed and certified telephone carrier, and there is no consistent Internet business model. The Internet is a framework in which a variety of commercial provider backbones and

SEARCHED  
INDEXED  
SERIALIZED  
FILED