

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation)	CC Docket No. 01-92
Regime)	
)	

ORDER

Adopted: December 20, 2006

Released: December 20, 2006

Reply Comments Due: January 5, 2007

By the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau:

1. On July 24, 2006, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners' (NARUC's) Task Force on Intercarrier Competition filed an intercarrier compensation reform plan (the "Missoula Plan").¹ Among other things, the Missoula Plan contained a Comprehensive Solution for Phantom Traffic, which called "for the filing of an industry proposal for a uniform process for the creation and exchange of call detail records."² On November 6, 2006, the Supporters of the Missoula Plan³ filed a written *ex parte* proposing an interim process to address phantom traffic issues and a related proposal for the creation and exchange of call detail records.⁴ On November 8, 2006, the Wireline Competition Bureau released a Public Notice requesting comment on the proposed phantom traffic

¹ Letter from Tony Clark, Commissioner and Chair, NARUC Committee on Telecommunications; Ray Baum, Commissioner and Chair, NARUC Task Force on Intercarrier Compensation; and Larry Landis, Commissioner and Vice-Chair, NARUC Task Force on Intercarrier Compensation, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, CC Docket No. 01-92 (filed July 24, 2006) (attaching the Missoula Plan) (Missoula Plan July 24 *Ex Parte*). On July 25, 2006, the Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB) released a Public Notice establishing a pleading cycle for comments on the Missoula Plan. *See Comment Sought on Missoula Intercarrier Compensation Reform Plan*, Public Notice, CC Docket No. 01-92, DA 06-1510 (WCB July 25, 2006). *See* 71 Fed. Reg. 45510. In response to a NARUC request for additional time, the pleading cycle on the Missoula Plan was extended so that comments were due October 25, 2006 and reply comments were due December 11, 2006. *See Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime*, Order, CC Docket No. 01-92, DA 06-1730 (WCB Aug. 29, 2006). *See* 71 Fed. Reg. 54008. On November 17, 2006, NARUC filed a motion requesting a further extension of the reply comment date to January 11, 2007, which was granted. *See Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime*, Order, CC Docket No. 01-92, DA 06-2339 (WCB Nov. 20, 2006). *See* 71 Fed. Reg. 70709.

² Letter from Supporters of the Missoula Plan to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, CC Docket No. 01-92 (filed November 6, 2006) (Missoula Plan Nov. 6 *Ex Parte*). *See* Missoula Plan July 24 *Ex Parte*, Exhibit 3 at 56-63.

³ Supporters of the original plan include AT&T, BellSouth Corp., Cingular Wireless, Global Crossing, Level 3 Communications, and 336 members of the Rural Alliance, among others. *See* Missoula Plan July 24 *Ex Parte*. *See also id.*, Attach. (providing a complete list of supporters).

⁴ *See* Missoula Plan Nov. 6 *Ex Parte*.

interim process and call detail record proposal.⁵ Thirty-nine (39) comments on this proposal were filed on December 7, 2006 and reply comments are due December 22, 2006.⁶ On December 18, 2006, the Supporters of the Missoula Plan filed a request for additional time to file reply comments on the phantom traffic proposal.⁷ Specifically, the Supporters of the Missoula Plan request that the Commission extend the time for reply comments by two weeks, to January 5, 2007.⁸ They state that, given the number and length of the comments filed, as well as the importance of the phantom traffic issue to the industry, a brief amount of additional time to prepare comprehensive replies to all of the issues raised would serve the public interest.⁹

2. We agree that providing additional time to file reply comments will facilitate the development of a more substantive and complete record in this proceeding. We note that it is the policy of the Commission that extensions of time shall not be routinely granted. However, given the number of comments filed, the complexity of the issues raised in the proposal, and the importance of the phantom traffic issue to the industry, we find that good cause exists to provide parties a brief extension of time, from December 22, 2006 to January 5, 2007 for filing reply comments in this proceeding.

3. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), and 5(c) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), 155(c), and sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.46 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, 1.46, the pleading cycle established in this matter shall be modified as follows:

Reply Comments Due: January 5, 2007

All other filing procedures remain unchanged from those previously established in this proceeding.¹⁰

4. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the request of the Supporters of the Missoula Plan for an Extension of Time is GRANTED, as set forth herein.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Thomas J. Navin
Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau

⁵ See *Comment Sought on Missoula Plan Phantom Traffic Interim Process and Call Detail Records Proposal*, Public Notice, CC Docket No. 01-92, DA 06-2294 (WCB Nov. 8, 2006) (Missoula Plan Phantom Traffic Public Notice). See 71 Fed Reg. 67509.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ Request of the Supporters of the Missoula Plan for Additional Time to File Reply Comments on the Phantom Traffic Proposal, CC Docket No. 01-92, at 1-2 (filed Dec. 18, 2006). The Supporters of the Missoula Plan have indicated to Commission staff their compliance with the oral notification requirements of section 1.46(c) of the Commission's rules. See 47 C.F.R. § 1.46(c).

⁸ *Id.* at 2.

⁹ *Id.* at 1.

¹⁰ See Missoula Plan Phantom Traffic Public Notice at 1-3.