

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20006-6801

202-955-3000
FAX 202-955-5564
www.hklaw.com

Annapolis	San Francisco
Atlanta	Seattle
Bethesda	Tallahassee
Boston	Tampa
Bradenton	Washington, D.C.
Chicago*	West Palm Beach
Fort Lauderdale	
Jacksonville	International Offices:
Lakeland	Caracas**
Los Angeles	Helsinki
Miami	Mexico City
New York	Rio de Janeiro
Northern Virginia	São Paulo
Orlando	Tel Aviv**
Portland	Tokyo
Providence	
St. Petersburg	*Holland & Knight LLC
San Antonio	**Representative Office

July 11, 2003

DAVID A. O'CONNOR
202-828-1889
doconnor@hklaw.com

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Marlene H. Dortch, Esquire
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals, 445 Twelfth Street, SW
Room TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

Re: **EX PARTE PRESENTATION**

In the Matter of Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, CC Docket No. 98-67

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On July 10, 2003, Phillip Nelson, Gary Warren and Dixie Ziegler of Hamilton Relay, Inc. ("Hamilton"), and the undersigned, on behalf of Hamilton, met with Tom Chandler, Warren O'Hearn, Gregory Hlibok, and Sean O'More of the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. The focus of the discussion was Hamilton's June 13, 2003 submission of projected cost data for the provision of video relay services ("VRS"). Commission staff provided Hamilton with a privileged and confidential staff analysis of Hamilton's cost data submission.

Hamilton also discussed the upcoming December 31, 2003 expiration of the Commission's temporary waiver of certain mandatory minimum requirements for providing VRS. Hamilton indicated that, due to the continued technological

infeasibility of the requirements, an extension of the waiver was necessary and that a Petition requesting such relief would be filed in the near future.

Additionally, the group discussed the pending Petition for Reconsideration filed by Sprint Corporation ("Sprint") regarding retroactive compensation for certain providers of Internet Protocol Relay. Hamilton represented that, contrary to Sprint's allegation in its June 26, 2003 Reply Comments, Hamilton provided international calling via IP Relay until directed not to do so. Hamilton also explained the extent to which it was competitively harmed when it complied with Commission rules and did not enter the IP Relay market until the Commission granted necessary waivers in March 2003.

Finally, Hamilton updated the Commission staff on Hamilton's efforts to combat the abuse of Communications Assistants who provide services via IP Relay. Hamilton indicated that it has implemented various procedures for responding to CA abuse and that the problem of CA abuse appears to be under control.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP



David A. O'Connor
Counsel for Hamilton Relay, Inc.

cc: Tom Chandler
Warren O'Hearn
Gregory Hlibok
Sean O'More