RM-8725

From: <MARIA_SARULLO@hp-santaclara-om10.om.hp.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/14/96 5:08pm
Subject: No Fees Please!

RECEIVED

DEC 1 6 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Item Subject: cc:Mail Text

I am writing on behalf of all internet users, who have a big concern with potential fees applied to internet use via telephone lines. In an effort to save money on telephone calls, and to have the ability to communicate effectively and efficiently worldwide, the internet has been a gift and a great tool. Please fight to keep these fees from being implored- if this were to happen, not only would it generate much protest, but it would greatly discourage users and reduce internet usage.

Thank you.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RM-8775

RECEIVED

DEC 16 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Kevin Werbach
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("bite@bigfoot.com")
Date: 12/16/96 9:14am
Subject: Internet Telephony -Reply

Thank you for your comments. I have forwarded your message to the mailbox, <rm8775@fcc.gov> for receiving input on this issue.

>>> <bite@bigfoot.com> 12/12/96 05:09pm >>>
I have a daughter in college and am barely able to sustain her there, let alone my other 10-grade son. The only contact I have with her is through these free services, like NetMeeting, CoolTalk, and FreeTel
(through her roomate's computer and mine). If you were to ban such means of communication, not only I but many, many (I am quite certain that there are VERY many) could lose frequent touch with their respective sons and daughters in college (or anywhere's away from home.
Like in austrailia, or japan, or russia, or europe, or ....etc.) We all rely on this service, and in some case actually NEED it. Please don't
"pull the plug" on this paradigm of technological innovation.
--
Brian Bittman
Bite@Bigfoot.com

CC: rm8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

DEC 1 6 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Mark Wall <markwall@sprynet.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 12/16/96 2:21am
Subject: 'International Interexchange Telecommunications VIA the Inter

I claim to know neither the entire contents of the above-titled proposal, nor even the grounds on which telephone service providers justify their current application, as I understand it, for permission to charge Internet Service Providers by the minute; but the argument is, on the face of it, absurd and based entirely on greed, to the degree that I understand it.

If the telephone service providers ("Telco's") are faced with an infrastructural shortcoming in the form of insufficient equipment to provide access and carry the demand presented by the many Internet Users in the United States today,then their job is to provide more and at least adequate if not better service. If the question is one of finding a way to pay for the equipment, staffing and access management (in the form of computers and switching equipment), then the Telco's are obliged to provide a comprehensive plan, not a piecemeal plan which will only lead to further patchwork fixes that will only lead to more confusion and generally poor service for all users.

The issue of added demand for services as represented by Internet subscribers is a "straw man," an argument made addressing that which is not the real issue. The real issue is a matter of determining to what degree the Telco's have (1) in the past made adequate provision for current usage demand, (2) made adequate provision for future growth in their current plans, and (3) developed sufficient overall billing and profit schemes that will enable them to plan for and to profit from usage demands. If Telco's have shown inadequate planning in the past, then that is a matter for them to correct with their current planning. If in their current plans, Telco's have made adequate provision for increased demand by "technology users" as distinguished from "voice users," then this planning should also be reflected in their equipment deployment and profit projections; if not, then are they asking for a reward for bad planning? Are they attempting to correct for inadequate planning? Are they presenting comprehensive plans or only ad hoc projections, that is, are they betting that Internet usage will diminish as a fad fades away, or perhaps instead are they just trying to get something for almost nothing -- namely increased profits from one particular market segment with slow or slim improvements in service?

Once again, no amount of complaints by the Telco's about any one sector of their customer base can justify singling out that segment for
"special treatment" in the form of "charging more now, so that they can charge less later." If the Telco's continue to protest that they cannot provide adequate service, then perhaps consideration should be given to the potential for satellite- and or cable-based systems to provide these so-called "special services."

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE