

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

ORIGINAL

In the Matter of)
)
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION)
)
Petition for Rulemaking Regarding Billing and Collection)
Services Provided By Local Exchange Carriers for Non-)
Subscribed Interexchange Services)
)

RM-9108

RECEIVED

DEC - 4 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF RULEMAKING AND
REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED ACTION**

Nevadacom, Inc. ("Nevadacom") hereby submits these comments in support of MCI's petition requesting the Commission to initiate a proceeding promulgating rules to govern local exchange carriers' ("LECs") billing and collection ("B&C") services. In light of recent LEC termination of B&C agreements with clearinghouses, Nevadacom requests that the Commission act expeditiously on MCI's petition. As discussed below, the continued uncertainty surrounding LEC B&C arrangements threatens the viability of small carriers such as Nevadacom and the valuable services such carriers provide to the public.

Nevadacom supports MCI's proposal that LECs provide B&C services on a nondiscriminatory basis to unaffiliated entities. Specifically, Nevadacom requests that the FCC take action to prevent LECs from discriminating against service providers not responsible for cramming complaints. Nevadacom proposes that if a LEC terminates, imposes conditions on, or refuses to enter into a billing and collection agreement with a service provider or clearinghouse based on cramming concerns, such action should not adversely affect those service providers not responsible for the cramming complaints. LEC billing is crucial to the survival of service providers such as Nevadacom which do not have a cost-effective alternative to LEC billing. Although never

No. of Copies rec'd 0+4
List ABCDE

the source of a cramming complaint, Nevadacom has struggled to maintain LEC B&C arrangements through its clearinghouses as a result of the unpredictable and unilateral action of the LECs who impose unreasonable conditions in, or in some cases, even terminate B&C agreements without regard for the impact of such actions.

Nevadacom also requests that the FCC consider retariffing LEC B&C services pursuant to Title II, thereby ensuring that such services are available pursuant to the anti-discrimination provisions of the Communications Act. Because of high set-up fees and monthly minimum charges, direct relationships with LECs for billing are reserved for only the largest carriers. Retariffing LEC B&C services will ensure that such services are available to all service providers regardless of their size.

Background

Nevadacom provides domestic and international telegram and cablegram services to customers worldwide. Nevadacom's approximately 500 agents and several thousand couriers provide service to every United States and Canadian address. Nevadacom often transmits messages to rural areas and regions affected by natural disasters and emergencies where no other means of communication is available.

Nevadacom provides its services pursuant to FCC authorization and duly filed tariffs.^{1/} As a result, Nevadacom is subject to common carrier regulation pursuant to Title II of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. Among other obligations as a common carrier, Nevadacom must provide service to all who request it, may not discriminate, and is subject to Section 208 complaint proceedings.

^{1/} Order and Authorization, File No. ITC-95-620 (rel. January 15, 1996); *see also* Nevadacom's FCC Tariff No. 1.

To send a telegram via Nevadacom, customers dial an 800 number to reach a representative who will transcribe the customer's message and have it delivered to the intended recipient via fax, hand delivery, phone, or mail. The charge for the telegram is based on the number of words and the method of delivery.

More than half of Nevadacom's customers choose to bill the cost of service to their local phone bill. Nevadacom can provide this type of billing through its contracts with billing clearinghouses which have B&C agreements with the LECs. Telephone billing is particularly important considering that many of Nevadacom's customers have phones but not credit cards, thereby making credit card billing impossible. Nevadacom may also bill through debits to bank accounts and, in some cases, through cash payments to agents. Notwithstanding, LEC billing remains the most cost-effective means for billing what are generally one or two transactions per year by a customer.^{2/}

Within the last two years, LECs began terminating or modifying their B&C agreements with billing clearinghouses. In some cases, the LEC will simply refuse to bill for a particular service or type of call record even if the LEC has not received a complaint regarding a particular service provider. Further, as they are pressured by the LECs, billing clearinghouses have begun to impose dollar limits on the amount a vendor can charge per transaction and per account per month. These practices threaten the continued viability of Nevadacom and similar service providers who rely on LEC billing.

By recent example, Nevadacom contracted with a billing clearinghouse to handle its billing

^{2/} Nevadacom attempted direct billing in the past and found that less than 37% of direct billed customers paid their bills, while more than 90 percent will pay for the same services when billed by the LEC. This disparity is heightened by the fact that charges for Nevadacom's services, generally \$40-\$60, are not worth pursuing in a collection proceeding.

in the US West region. US West terminated its Special Services and Products (“SS&P”) Addendum to its B&C agreement with the clearinghouse.^{3/} With no input from Nevadacom or its clearinghouse, US West unilaterally decided to classify telegrams as “specialized services.”^{4/} Accordingly, the clearinghouse was unable to continue billing for Nevadacom’s telegram services. Despite the fact that Nevadacom was not responsible for any complaints, it was forced to seek another vendor for billing in the US West region and suffered a significant loss in business. In looking for another billing clearinghouse, Nevadacom discovered that LECs have begun to pressure clearinghouses to impose dollar limits on the amount service providers can charge per transaction or per account.^{5/} To maintain their business relationships with the LECs, clearinghouses often impose more stringent dollar limits than those required by the LECs. Because the cost of an individual telegram may often exceed \$50, such restrictions severely limit the services Nevadacom may offer its customers.

LECs also subject providers of “specialized services” to more stringent dollar limits than providers of MTS. LECs unilaterally determine which service providers are “specialized” and

^{3/} See Letter from Glenn Richards, Counsel for Nevadacom, to Norman Curtwright, Senior Attorney, US West (March 19, 1998) (attached as Exhibit 1); Letter from Norman Curtwright, Senior Attorney, US West, to Glenn Richards, Counsel for Nevadacom (April 6, 1998) (attached as Exhibit 2).

^{4/} Like interstate toll services, telegram services are common carrier services regulated under Title II of the Communications Act. LECs such as US West, however, often treat telegram services as information services, thereby classifying them as nondeniable pursuant to the FCC’s pay-per-call rules. US West’s classification of telegram services as nondeniable and “specialized” subjects telegram services to different treatment than Message Toll Service (“MTS”) charges. Telegram services are common carrier services regulated under Title II and should not be treated differently than interstate toll services.

^{5/} Attached as Exhibit 3 is a print out of records rejected by one of Nevadacom’s clearinghouses. This print out shows that the charges for the first three records were \$60.01, \$74.70, and \$67.05. As indicated in the attached reject code key, these records were rejected because the “transaction amount exceeds limit set for this type of transaction.”

then require clearinghouses to limit the amount such providers can bill per transaction or per account.

I. LEC-Provided Billing and Collection Is Essential to the Continued Viability of Carriers Such as Nevadacom.

Without LEC-provided billing and collection, Nevadacom's ability to offer its services to the public is in jeopardy. Feasible and cost-effective alternatives to LEC billing do not exist in the present marketplace. For a small carrier such as Nevadacom, direct billing is simply not an option. Among other costs, direct billing requires producing billing statements and inserts and mailing bills. A small carrier simply does not have the resources to perform such functions on a cost-effective basis, particularly when a customer uses Nevadacom's services but once or twice per year. Further, Nevadacom's past attempts at direct billing have demonstrated that customers are less likely to pay a bill when that bill is received from Nevadacom than when a bill is received from a LEC. In addition to the diminished ability of smaller carriers such as Nevadacom to continue as a going concern without LEC billing, customers who have no other means to pay except by phone bill will be cut off from the American telegram network without LEC billing.

Nevadacom's efforts to establish direct relationships with the LECs for billing have also proven infeasible. LECs impose exorbitant set-up fees and high monthly minimum charges which make direct relationships with the LECs impossible for small carriers. For these reasons, LEC-provided billing and collection through clearinghouses is essential to small carriers such as Nevadacom.

The FCC should consider retariffing LEC B&C services pursuant to Title II, thereby ensuring that such services are available pursuant to the anti-discrimination provisions of the Communications Act. Such regulation will ensure that LEC B&C services are available to all

providers, regardless of their size.

II. The FCC Should Forbid LECs From Terminating or Imposing Unreasonable Conditions on B&C Agreements Based on Cramming Concerns Against Individual Service Providers.

Nevadacom recognizes that cramming is a serious concern. The LEC approach to combating cramming, however, has not served the public interest. As indicated above, LEC termination of or imposition of unreasonable conditions in B&C agreements, such as dollar limits per transaction and per telephone bill, will make it difficult for service providers such as Nevadacom to provide service.

Consequently, Nevadacom requests within this proceeding that the FCC forbid LECs from unilaterally terminating or imposing unreasonable conditions in B&C agreements, including discriminatory treatment of “specialized” service providers. Nevadacom agrees that LECs should be able to discontinue billing for individual service providers that have been the cause of an excessive number of cramming complaints. However, the FCC should forbid LECs from terminating or imposing unreasonable conditions in B&C agreements when such action adversely affects service providers that have not been the cause of cramming complaints.

Particularly egregious is the LECs’ practice of combining all of the cramming complaints generated by various service providers and then using this number to justify terminating a B&C agreement with a clearinghouse. When a LEC terminates one B&C agreement with a clearinghouse based on excessive cramming complaints, both innocent and guilty service providers are punished alike.

LECs have attempted to justify their termination or modification of B&C agreements based on an increase in the number of cramming complaints. Recently, however, both the FCC and the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) have initiated proceedings proposing new disclosure

and dispute resolution procedures designed to significantly reduce incidences of cramming.^{6/}

The Commission's proposal to organize bills by provider will help to eliminate customer confusion that the LEC is somehow responsible for additional charges.^{7/} When charges for different providers' services are visually separated on a phone bill, customers will be able to separate a service provider's charges with the charges imposed by the LEC. Further, providing the name, address, and a toll-free number of each service provider responsible for a charge will eliminate consumer inquiries and complaints directed towards LECs for non-LEC charges.^{8/}

III. The FCC Has Ancillary Jurisdiction Under Title I to Regulate LEC Billing.

In 1986, the Commission detariffed billing and collection services, determining that such services were not common carrier services subject to Title II regulation.^{9/} The Commission did find, however, that billing and collection is "incidental" to the transmission of wire communications and, therefore, is a communications service within the meaning of Section 3(a) of the Communications Act.^{10/} Accordingly, the Commission may invoke ancillary jurisdiction under

^{6/} Truth-in-Billing and Billing Format, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, CC Docket No. 98-170 (rel. September 17, 1998) ("NPRM"). The FTC has proposed to modify its pay-per-call rules to combat cramming. *See* 16 C.F.R. part 308; *see also* Pay-Per-Call Rule, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (available at <http://www.ftc.gov/opa/1998/9810/ninerule.htm>).

^{7/} NPRM at ¶ 17.

^{8/} NPRM at ¶ 34.

^{9/} Detariffing of Billing and Collection Services, Report and Order, 102 FCC 2d 1150 (Jan. 29, 1986) ("Detariffing Order").

^{10/} *Id.* ¶ 36; Policies and Rules Concerning Local Exchange Carrier Validation and Billing Information for Joint Use Calling Cards, *Report and Order and Request for Supplemental Comment*, 7 FCC Rcd 3528, n.50 (May 8, 1992). The definition of "wire communications," formerly codified at Section 3(a), is currently codified at Section 3(51) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 153(51).

Title I of the Communications Act over LEC billing and collection.^{11/} The Commission has held that “Title I permits us to exercise ancillary jurisdiction over communications services if such regulation is ‘necessary to ensure the achievement of [our] . . . statutory responsibilities.’”^{12/}

The Commission should exercise its Title I jurisdiction and prevent LECs from terminating or modifying B&C agreements in any manner that will adversely affect service providers that have not been the cause of cramming complaints. This exercise of Title I jurisdiction is necessary to achieve the Commission’s statutory responsibilities to preserve and advance universal service and to promote “safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communication.”^{13/} The FCC will achieve these statutory objectives by regulating LEC billing in the manner indicated herein, thereby maintaining and continuing the viability of the American telegram network.

As discussed above, the current LEC practice of terminating or imposing unreasonable conditions on B&C agreements due to cramming complaints will hurt many small service providers who rely on LEC billing, such as Nevadacom. Telegrams provide one of the only means of communication for Americans in emergency situations.^{14/} Telegrams are also one of the only means of communication with Americans who do not own phones or for certain critical communications abroad. Without telegrams, the United States will lose an essential means of communication, thereby thwarting the Commission’s statutory responsibility to promote and advance universal service.

^{11/} Detariffing Order, ¶ 35.

^{12/} Audio Communications, Inc., *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 8 FCC Rcd 8697, ¶ 23 (Dec. 20, 1993) (citations omitted).

^{13/} 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 254.


^{14/} The Commission and the International Telecommunications Union have recognized that telegrams are a means of communications in emergency situations. Domestic Public Message Services, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 71 FCC 2d 471 (March 28, 1979).

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, Nevadacom requests that the Commission take action consistent with the recommendations discussed herein.

Respectfully submitted,

NEVADACOM, INC.



Glenn S. Richards

David S. Konczal

FISHER WAYLAND COOPER LEADER
AND ZARAGOZA L.L.P.

2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Suite 400

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 659-3494 (phone)

(202) 296-6518 (fax)

Dated: December 4, 1998

Exhibit 1

FISHER WAYLAND COOPER LEADER & ZARAGOZA L.L.P.

2001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.

SUITE 400

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006-1851

TELEPHONE (202) 659-3494

FACSIMILE (202) 296-6518

WEBSITE <http://www.fwclz.com>

March 19, 1998

**Via Federal Express and
Facsimile (303) 295-6977**

Mr. Norm Curtwright
US West Communications, Inc
Suite 5100
1801 California St.
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Mr. Curtwright:

On behalf of our client, Nevadacom, we hereby request that US West immediately resume billing and collection of Nevadacom's telegram records through its billing clearinghouse, Integretel.

Nevadacom is a federally tariffed provider of telegram services and has received authority from the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") under Section 214 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide international common carrier services (FCC File No. ITC-95-620). Since 1992, US West has been billing and collecting Nevadacom's telegram billing records through Integretel. Initially, we understand that billing and collection was through a single contract between US West and Integretel. Subsequently, US West required Integretel to bill telegram pursuant to its specialized services and products ("SSP") agreement. Recently, however, we understand that US West terminated Integretel's SSP agreement based on high chargebacks for certain market segments billed under the SSP agreement. We understand that Nevadacom's telegram services were not a contributing factor to the chargeback problem. Nevertheless, this unforeseen and inexplicable action has resulted in substantial disruption in our client's business dealings.

As we understand the situation, despite seven years of billing Nevadacom's telegram records through Integretel, US West has decided to terminate such billing. Apparently, high inquiry rates associated with non-telegram records have prompted this action. Nevadacom, however, has not been the source of these inquiries. We request that Integretel be permitted to bill Nevadacom's telegram services with other Message Toll Service ("MTS") charges by, if necessary, a simple amendment of US West's MTS agreement with Integretel. Nevadacom's services are regulated common carrier services and, therefore, are deniable telecommunications

Mr. Norm Curtwright

March 19, 1998


Page 2

charges. Because Nevadacom's services are deniable, they are eligible for billing under Integretel's MTS agreement. The regional Bell Operating Companies and GTE have all accepted the position that telegrams are deniable telecommunications charges. Indeed, we understand that US West continues to bill for 900 services, which are nondeniable under Integretel's MTS agreement.

Moreover, we bring to your attention that we understand that US West provides billing and collection services to Nevadacom's competitor, Western Union, which also provides telegram services. It is unclear to us why Western Union's telegram records are billed in a different manner by US West than those of Nevadacom. Such blatant discrimination among similarly situated carriers is a violation of Section 202 of the Communications Act of 1934. We are unaware of any statutory or regulatory basis for US West's discrimination against Nevadacom in this fashion.

In light of the foregoing, Nevadacom requests that US West immediately resume billing and collecting for Nevadacom's telegram records through its billing clearinghouse, Integretel.

Sincerely,



Glenn S. Richards
Counsel for Nevadacom

cc: Roger J. Meyers, COO, Nevadacom
Linda Benito, VP, Integretel

Exhibit 2

U S WEST, Inc.
1801 California Street, Suite 5100
Denver, Colorado 80202
(303) 672-2817
Facsimile 303 295-6977
E-Mail ncurtri@uswest.com



Norman G. Curtright
Senior Attorney

April 6, 1998

Glenn S. Richards
Fisher Wayland Cooper Leader & Zaragoza L.L.P.
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20006-1851

Dear Mr. Richards:

This is written in reply to your letter of March 19, 1998, in which you request that U S WEST Communications resume billing and collecting for Nevadacom's telegram records through its billing clearinghouse, Integretel.

It is apparent from your letter that Integretel has informed you that U S WEST has terminated the SS&P Addendum to the U S WEST / Integretel Agreement. Since U S WEST is in privity of contract with Integretel, not Nevadacom, U S WEST is limited in its ability to deal directly with Nevadacom through the Integretel agreement.

I am able to respond to some of the assertions in your letter, however, as they relate to misunderstandings of U S WEST's policies. While your client's telegram service may be tariffed by the FCC, U S WEST does not agree that telegram services are "deniable." U S WEST does not bill telegram service with other Message Toll Service charges, and believes it would be inappropriate to do so. U S WEST's takes the position that telegram services are "Specialized Services" and should be billed as such. U S WEST thinks it is appropriate to protect telephone consumers from possible disconnection of local or long distance telephone services for non-payment of telegram and other "Specialized Services and Products."

It is also necessary to correct your statement that 900 services are billed under Integretel's MTS agreement. As is the case with all billing customers, U S WEST bills for 900 information services separately from MTS charges, under a special contract addendum.


You state that U S WEST currently provides billing services for your client's competitor, Western Union. U S WEST does not have a contract with Western Union. If Western Union telegram services (or any other companies' telegram services) are being billed as

Glenn S. Richards
April 6, 1998
Page 2

MTS charges, it would be in violation of U S WEST's contract with the clearinghouse. These telegram services would be billed in the same manner as your client's services were billed by Integretel. as Specialized Services, which are considered non-deniable.

U S WEST regrets that Nevadacom has been inconvenienced by the termination of the Specialized Services Addendum with Integretel. As you can see, however, U S WEST has not discriminated among similarly situated carriers with respect to its billing services, which billing services. in any event, are not regulated telecommunications services. Nevadacom may wish to explore using other clearinghouses which have agreements that are intact.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Norman G. Curtright". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Norman G. Curtright

cc: Cynthia Humphrey
Pamela Jenkins
Mary Halula

Exhibit 3



Documents - Up-Front Reject Codes



Up-Front Reject Error Codes
 Updated as of 5/15/1998

NBE Code	Return Code	Edit
03	0301	Duplicate record
04	0401	Transaction amount not populated
09	0901	Batch record count is out of balance
	0902	Batch revenue amount is out of balance
	0903	Batch credit record count is out of balance
	0904	Batch credit revenue amount is out of balance
	0905	Batch debit record count is out of balance
	0906	Batch debit revenue amount is out of balance
	0907	File record count is out of balance
	0908	File revenue amount is out of balance
	0909	File credit record count is out of balance
	0910	File credit revenue amount is out of balance
	0911	File debit record count is out of balance
	0912	File debit revenue amount is out of balance
	0913	Current process (batch) exceeded maximum threshold
12	1201	Invalid intrastate billing - not certified
17	1701	Transaction amount exceeds limit set for this type of transaction
	1702	Total amount of charges for this Btn during current cycle exceeds set limit
18	1801	Invalid regulation indicator
33	3301	Invalid credit indicator for this ESM text phrase
35	3501	Btn Block - FCC Complaint
	3502	Btn Block - State PUC/PSC Complaint
	3503	Btn Block - State Secretary General Complaint

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jacqueline Solomon, a secretary with the law firm of Fisher Wayland Cooper Leader and Zaragoza, L.L.P., do hereby certify that I have this 4th day of December 1998, mailed by first-class United States mail, postage prepaid, copies of the foregoing **“COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF RULEMAKING AND REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED ACTION”** to the following:

Mary L. Brown
Donna M. Roberts
MCI Telecommunications Corp.
1801 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

David Alan Nall
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
1201 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
P.O. Box 407
Washington, DC 20044
(Attorney for MCI
Telecommunications Corp.)

Raul R. Rodriguez
Walter P. Jacob
Leventhal, Senter, & Lerman,
P.L.L.C.
2000 K Street, N.W., #600
Washington, DC 20006
(Attorneys for Americatel Corp.)

C. Joel Van Over
Ronald J. Jarvis
Michael R. Romano
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered
3000 K Street, N.W., #300
Washington, DC 20007
(Attorneys for Consoliated Commu-
nications Telecom Services, Inc.;
Excel Communications, Inc.; Hold
Billing Services, Ltd; OAN
Services, and Integretal, Inc.; and
Teleco Comm. Group, Inc.)

James G. Pachulski
Edward D. Young III
Michael E. Glover
Bell Atlantic Telephone Co.'s
1320 N. Court House Road
Eighth Floor
Arlington, VA 22201

M. Robert Sutherland
Richard M. Sbaratta
BellSouth Corporation
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E., #1700
Atlanta, GA 30309-3386

William J. Balcerski
NYNEX Telephone Companies
1095 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

Rachel J. Rothstein
Cable & Wireless, Inc.
8219 Leesburg Pike
Vienna, VA 22182

Jack B. Harrison
Frost & Jacobs, LLP
2500 PNC Center
201 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(Attorneys for Cincinnati Bell
Telephone Co.)

Thomas E. Taylor
Cincinnati Bell Telephone Co.
201 East Fourth Street, 6th Floor
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Genevieve Morelli
Competitive Telecommuni-
cations Association
1900 M Street, N.W., #800
Washington, DC 20036

Robert J. Aamoeth
Joan M. Griffin
Kelly Drye & Warren, L.L.P.
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W., #500
Washington, DC 20036
(Attorneys for Competitive
Telecommunications Assoc.)

Ellyn Elise Crutcher
Consolidated Communications
Telecom Services, Inc.
121 South Seventeenth Street
Mattoon, IL 61938

Michael S. Pabian
Ameritech
2000 West Ameritech Center Dr.
Room 4H82
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Mitchell F. Brecher
Stephen E. Holsten
Fleischman and Walsh, L.L.P.
1400 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
(Attorneys for Digital Network
Services, Inc.)

J. Christopher Dance
Robin Johnson
Excel Communications, Inc.
8750 North Central Expressway
Dallas, TX 75231

Michael J. Shortley, III
Frontier Corporation
180 South Clinton Avenue
Rochester, NY 14646

Jerome S. Ginsberg
PhoneTime, Inc.
30-50 Whitestone Expressway
Flushing, NY 11354

Edwin N. Lavergne
Jay S. Newman
Ginsburg, Feldman & Bress
1250 Connecticut Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
(Attorneys for Interactive
Services Association)

Margaret M. Charles
Antony Richard Petrilla
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered
3000 K Street, N.W., #300
Washington, DC 20007
(Attorneys for PhoneTime, Inc.)

Robert M. Lynch
Durward D. Dupre
Michael J. Zpevak
Robert J. Gryzmala
SBC Communications, Inc.
One Bell Center, Room 3520
St. Louis, MO 63101

Leon M. Kestenbaum
Michael B. Fingerhut
Sprint Communications Co., L.P.
1850 M Street, N.W., 11th Fl.
Washington, DC 20036

Wendy Bluemling
The Southern New England
Telephone Company
227 Church Street
New Haven, CT 06510-1806

Charles C. Hunter
Catherine M. Hannan
Hunter Communications Law Group
1620 I Street, N.W., #Suite 701
Washington, DC 20006
(Attorneys for Telecommunica
Resellers Association)

Kathryn Marie Krause
Dan L. Poole
US West, Inc.
1020 Nineteenth Street, N.W., #700
Washington, DC 20036

Bryan Rachlin
Teleco Communications Group, Inc.
4219 Lafayette Center Drive
Chantilly, VA 20151

Michael G. Hoffman
Vartec Telecom, Inc.
3200 West Pleasant Run Road
Lancaster, TX 75146

Catherine R. Sloan
Richard S. Whitt
WorldCom, Inc.
1120 Connecticut Ave., N.W., #400
Washington, DC 20036

Douglas F. Brent
WorldCom, Inc.
9300 Shelbyville Rd., #700
Louisville, KY 40222

David L. Jones
CommoniGroup of KC, Inc.
6950 West Fifty-Sixth Street
Mission, KS 66202

James H. Bolin, Jr.
Mark C. Rosenblum
Ava B. Kleinman
AT&T Corporation
295 North Maple Avenue
Room 3247H3
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Charles H. Helein
Robert M. McDowell
Helein & Associates, P.C.
8180 Greensboro Drive, #700
McLean, VA 22102
(Attorneys for ACTA)


Alan W. Saltzman
Billing Information Concepts, Inc.
7411 John Smith Drive, #200
San Antonio, TX 78229-4898

Gail L. Polivy
GTE Service Corporation
1850 M Street, N.W., #1200
Washington, DC 20036

Carolyn C. Hill
ALLTEL Telephone Services Corp.
655 15th Street, N.W., #220
Washington, DC 20005

Danny E. Adams
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W., #500
Washington, DC 20036
(Attorney for Billing Concepts, Inc.)

Scott Blake Harris
Jonathan B. Mirsky
Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis, LLP
1200 Eighteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
(Attorneys for Pilgram Telephone
Co.)


Jacqueline Solomon

J:\DATA\CLIENT\82\8230\MCICERT.SVC

Gail L. Polivy
GTE Service Corporation
1850 M Street, N.W., #1200
Washington, DC 20036

Carolyn C. Hill
ALLTEL Telephone Services Corp.
655 15th Street, N.W., #220
Washington, DC 20005

Danny E. Adams
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W., #500
Washington, DC 20036
(Attorney for Billing Concepts, Inc.)

Scott Blake Harris
Jonathan B. Mirsky
Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis, LLP
1200 Eighteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
(Attorneys for Pilgram Telephone
Co.)

Darius B. Withers*
Federal Communications
Commission
2025 M Street, NW, Room 6333
Washington, DC 20554


Jacqueline Solomon

* By Hand Delivery

J:\DATA\CLIENT\82\8230\MCICERT.SVC