



Judy Sello
Senior Attorney

Room 3A229
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921
Tel: 908-532-1846
Fax: 908-532-1218
Email: jsello@att.com

April 18, 2005

Ex Parte

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W., Room TW-B204
Washington, DC 20554

Re: ***AT&T Corp. Petition for Declaratory Ruling Regarding
Enhanced Prepaid Card Services, WC Docket No. 03-133 &
Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 05-41,
WC Docket No. 05-68***

Dear Ms. Dortch:

AT&T hereby replies to Sprint's April 5, 2005 *ex parte* response to AT&T's March 28, 2005 Motion for a Stay Pending Appeal of the Commission's February 23, 2005 Order in the above-captioned matter.¹ In its stay motion, AT&T identified the fact it appeared that a number of carriers, including Sprint, are delivering such traffic without the originating calling party number ("CPN") that would permit its jurisdictional identification. *Id.* at 4-5.

Sprint, while expressly conceding that it "does *not* deliver the complete calling party number on prepaid card calls in the call detail information that is furnished to the terminating carrier," disputes AT&T's conclusion that this action appears to result in an access charge advantage for Sprint. Sprint *ex parte* at 2 (emphasis added).

¹ April 5, 2005 *ex parte* Letter from Michael B. Fingerhut, Sprint to Marlene H. Dortch ("Sprint *ex parte*").

Sprint's ostensible reason for "omitting the full calling party number in the call detail record is to ensure that when the call detail record is sent through Sprint's billing system, the originating number will not be mistakenly billed for the prepaid call." This explanation, however, raises concern.

First, even assuming, as Sprint asserts (*ex parte* at 2), that there were some anomaly with Sprint's billing system that required "Sprint's platform [to] strip[] the originating ANI from the call record that is sent to its billing system and to the terminating LEC," Sprint could nonetheless pass along six digits (NPA-NXX) so that the terminating LEC would be able to bill on a jurisdictional basis in accordance with carrier access billing conventions, *without any risk* that Sprint would erroneously bill a prepaid card call to the originating number. Thus, the Commission should carefully scrutinize Sprint's assertion that its PIU factors are developed to properly account for the jurisdiction of prepaid card calls.

Second, if Sprint's billing system is dependent on CPN for billing the end user, Sprint presumably would also have to strip the CPN from other types of calls with alternate billing arrangements, such as calling card, third party billed, collect and toll-free (8YY) calls. This raises serious questions about Sprint's compliance with the duty to pass CPN per the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1601, as well as the extent to which Sprint must rely on PIU factors to properly account for access charges.

One electronic copy of this Notice is being submitted to the Secretary of the FCC in accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Judy Sello

cc: Daniel Gonzalez
John Stanley
Jessica Rosenworcel
Scott Bergmann
Michelle Carey
Tom Navin
Tamara Preiss
Lisa Gelb
Steve Morris