Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program	)	CG Docket No. 03-123
Waivers of iTRS Mandatory Minimum Standards	)	

COMMENTS OF SORENSON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Sorenson Communications, Inc., submits these comments in response to the Commission's Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("FNPRM") released August 22, 2014.[1] In the FNPRM, the Commission proposes to modify the definition of Telecommunications Relay Service ("TRS") codified at 47 C.F.R. § 64.601(a)(32) to reflect that deaf, hearing-impaired, and speech-disabled users are permitted to place compensable TRS calls to other deaf, hearing-impaired, and speech-disabled individuals. The FNPRM correctly recognizes that Congress has adopted legislation expanding TRS to include communications between two hearing- or speech-disabled individuals. *See* Communications and Video Accessibility Act ("CVAA"), 47 U.S.C. § 225(a)(3). Therefore, it is appropriate for the Commission to modify the definition of TRS codified in the Code of Federal Regulations to make clear that calls between two hearing- or speech-disabled users are compensable.

[1] *In the Matter of Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals With Hearing and Speech Disabilities; Waivers Of ITRS Mandatory Minimum Standards*, Report and Order, Order, Declaratory Ruling, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 14-125, 29 FCC Rcd. 10,697 (2014) ("FNPRM").

This modification does not, however, change the compensability of dual-relay calls. The Commission has already recognized that "the CVAA expands the definition of TRS to allow VRS conversations to also take place with persons who may also have a hearing or speech disability but who use other forms of TRS."[2] Thus, as Sorenson has explained in its previous filings with the Commission, providers have long understood that dual-relay calls are already compensable (except when they involve VRS-to-VRS calls or similar calls that can be connected point-to-point) and have acted accordingly.[3] Accordingly, while the Commission's August 22 order correctly recognizes three categories of dual-relay calls that are already compensable,[4] the FNPRM is not correct to suggest that the change to § 64.601(a)(32) will affect the compensability of other types of dual-relay calls (for example, VRS to TTY). The Commission has already made clear that, with the exception of VRS-to-VRS or similar calls that can be connected point-to-point, dual-relay calls are compensable, and providers have acted in reliance on these statements by processing, and seeking compensation for, dual-relay calls.

---

[2] *Implementation of Sections 716 and 717 of The Communications Act Of 1934, as Enacted by the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 11-37, 26 FCC Rcd. 3133, 3148 ¶ 37 n.100 (2011); *see also id.* at 3146 ¶ 33 n.90 (same for IP Relay).

[3] *See* Request for Clarification of Sorenson Communications, Inc., CG Docket Nos. 10-51 and 10-213 (filed Jul. 28, 2011) (noting Sorenson's belief that dual-relay calls are compensable).

[4] *See* FNPRM at 10,718-9 ¶49 n.189; *id.* at Appendix A § 64.604(b)(14).

Finally, it bears emphasis that a rule purporting to prohibit dual-relay calls between a VRS user and a TTY (or similar) user would be impossible to implement because VRS providers have no way of knowing if the non-VRS leg of the call is a TTY user.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Nakahata
Christopher J. Wright
Mark D. Davis

HARRIS, WILTSHIRE & GRANNIS LLP
1919 M Street NW, 8th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 730-1300
jnakahata@hwglaw.com

November 20, 2014

Counsel for Sorenson Communications, Inc.,