



706 FM 2325 - Suite D  
Wimberley, TX 78676

T (512) 410-1751  
Ed@convorelay.com

[www.convorelay.com](http://www.convorelay.com)

April 12, 2010

Marlene H. Drouth, Secretary  
Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Ex-Parte Letter: Meetings with Legal Advisors of Commissioners on  
Declaratory Ruling 10-51 Issues

Secretary Dortch:

This is an ex parte letter regarding recent meetings with legal advisors of  
Commissioners as well as with CGB/DRO Staff.

I had series of meetings with the following individuals on April 5, 6, and 7:

- Sherries Smith, Legal Advisor for Chairman Julius Genachowski
- Jennifer Schneider, Legal Advisor for Commissioner Michael Copps
- Christine Kurth, Policy Director & Wireline Counsel for Commissioner Robert McDonnell
- Angela Kronenberg, Legal Advisor for Commissioner Mignon Clyburn
- Christi Shewman, Legal Advisor for Commissioner Meredith Attwell Baker
- Karen Peltz Strauss, Deputy Bureau Chief of CGB
- Michael Jacobs, Legal Advisor to Chief of CGB
- Greg Hillock, Attorney Advisor of DRO

Telephone Call as Business Expense and Modified Reimbursement Rate

We discussed Convo's partial petition to the Declaratory Ruling for reconsideration of telephone calls made by VRS staff using its own VRS provider as a business expense. To incorporate telephone calls by deaf and hard of hearing staff using its own into business expense would raise reimbursement rate since NECA has to consider this as part of cost breakdown for VRS industry. Specifically that this is an ineffective business practice considering that VRS providers have different totals of deaf and hard of hearing employees which results the inequality of costs to each VRS providers. Inequality of cash flows causes competitive edge to go to the one with low total of deaf and hard of hearing persons as the VRS provider have less expense to pay for Video Interpreters thus having higher cash flow whereas VRS provider with high deaf and hard of hearing have less cash flow because of the added expense for video interpreters.

We then discussed alternative suggestion of modified reimbursement rate which would be limited only to cost of VRS CA and its associated costs thereby resulting equal cost for VRS providers with different total of deaf and hard of hearing employees. Convo strongly believes this is a win-win solution for FCC, VRS providers, and VRS employees who are deaf and hard of hearing. We discussed pro and cons of that.

#### Provisional Certification Suggestion

Final discussion was about idea of Provisional Certification for start-ups instead of white-label company that work under certified VRS providers. We discussed that Provisional certification can be worked between FCC and provisional certified providers. We discussed that provisional certification procedure include specific criteria of which start-ups must meet to be fully certified in 5 years time. We discussed pro and cons of this and how this Provisional Certification can resolve lot of current problematic issues.

Attached with the electronic file is the presentation used with the FCC staff.

If there any questions about the filing, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ed Bosson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**Ed Bosson**

Convo Communications, LLC  
Vice President of Regulatory Affairs

