



CTIA

Building The Wireless Future™
Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association

February 9, 2000

Via E-mail

Mr. Ari Fitzgerald
Mr. Peter Tenhula
Mr. Bryan Tramont
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St. SW
Washington DC 20554

RE: WT Docket No. 97-207 - Calling Party Pays

Dear Messrs. Fitzgerald, Tenhula, and Tramont:

Attached is the FCC's September 15, 1999, News Release regarding the FCC's Third Report and Order and Fourth FNPRM in CC Docket No. 96-98 on the Unbundling of Network Elements. Page 3 of the News Release includes a bullet on "signaling and call-related databases" to which Incumbent LECs are obligated to provide unbundled access, including the Line Information (LIDB) database.

Also attached is a PDF file for CTIA's Comments filed in WT Docket No. 97-207. I want to point out that pages 37-38 of CTIA's Comments note the obligation of LECs to provide CMRS carriers' with access to "sufficient information to do their own billing and collection" consistent with Section 47 U.S.C. Sec. 251(d)(2)(B). See page 38 at n.93 and related text.

Also attached is a PDF file for CTIA's Reply Comments filed in WT Docket No. 97-207. Pages 21-22 of CTIA's Comments, and pages 15-17 of CTIA's Reply Comments, discuss the reasons why the Commission should not require carriers to use unique service codes (either special area codes or CPP-specific numbers) as wasteful of numbering resources. See CTIA Comments at p.22; CTIA Reply Comments at p.17.

Likewise, pages 25-30 of CTIA's Reply Comments further rebut the proposition that service-specific codes are an appropriate solution for PBX leakage, repeating this is a waste of scarce numbering resources, and arguing "Commission regulation intended to address PBX leakage and blockage is unwarranted at this time." CTIA Reply Comments at pp.27, 26.





CTIA

Building The Wireless Future™
Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association

As CTIA's Reply Comments note, Nortel, Illuminet and other companies have suggested that the solution to PBX leakage rests in the LIDB database and other functions already built into the public switched network. See CTIA Reply Comments at pp.28-30. Thus, with these capabilities and the market incentives which CMRS providers already have, Commission intervention is not necessary to resolve the issue of PBX leakage.

Furthermore, pages 18-25 of CTIA's Reply Comments address the competitive status of the billing and collection industry in the U.S., including summary data on pages 19-22 about the size of the U.S. billing industry, and a discussion on pages 23-24 regarding dial-around providers' agreements with LECs.

As these pages indicate, with 60+ billing vendors working with and for CMRS, IXC, LEC, CLEC, and other telecommunications providers, the billing industry is dynamically competitive, and there are many options available to providers of Calling Party Pays (CPP).

Given this situation, LECs should not be required to provide billing and collection services (although they are obligated to provide billing name and address information under existing rules, which makes it possible for third parties - and CMRS carriers - to perform CPP billing), and CPP providers should be free to contract with whatever billing service provider they choose.

If you require any further information with respect to the issue of Calling Party Pays, please do not hesitate to give me a call at 202-736-3255.

Sincerely,

Dr. Robert F. Roche,
Assistant Vice President
for Policy and Research

Attachments

cc: FCC Secretary

