

Matthew A. Brill
Direct Dial: 202.637.1095
matthew.brill@lw.com

555 Eleventh Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
Tel: +1.202.637.2200 Fax: +1.202.637.2201
www.lw.com

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

FIRM / AFFILIATE OFFICES

Abu Dhabi	Moscow
Barcelona	Munich
Beijing	New Jersey
Brussels	New York
Chicago	Orange County
Doha	Paris
Dubai	Riyadh
Frankfurt	Rome
Hamburg	San Diego
Hong Kong	San Francisco
Houston	Shanghai
London	Silicon Valley
Los Angeles	Singapore
Madrid	Tokyo
Milan	Washington, D.C.

September 21, 2011

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Notification of Ex Parte, *Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime, CC Docket No. 01-92; High-Cost Universal Service Support, WC Docket No. 05-337; Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers, WC Docket No. 07-135; Connect America Fund, WC Docket No. 10-90; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future, GN Docket No. 09-51*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On September 19, 2011, Terri Natoli of Time Warner Cable Inc. (“TWC”) and the undersigned (representing TWC), together with Grace Koh and Barry Ohlson of Cox Enterprises, Inc. and J.G. Harrington of Dow Lohnes PLLC (all representing Cox Communications, Inc. (“Cox”)), met with the following members of the Wireline Competition Bureau staff regarding several intercarrier compensation (“ICC”) reform proposals advanced in the above-captioned proceedings: Albert Lewis, Randy Clarke, Lynn Engledow, Victoria Goldberg, Travis Litman, and Marcus Maher.

At this meeting, we argued that any ICC reform undertaken with respect to terminating access charges should clearly address the rights of competitive local exchange carriers (“CLECs”) that provide (a) wholesale telecommunications services to facilities-based interconnected VoIP providers, or (b) interconnected VoIP services directly to end users. We noted that today’s ICC regime is increasingly plagued by resource-draining disputes regarding the rights of such CLECs to collect terminating access charges. For example, even apart from disputes about the applicability of access charges to so-called “VoIP traffic,” some interexchange carriers contend that these CLECs do not provide certain functions (on the theory that those functions are instead provided by the CLEC’s affiliated interconnected VoIP provider) and thus cannot collect terminating access charges at the level imposed by incumbent LECs. As a result, we explained that any so-called “reforms” that merely address terminating access rates (without addressing these CLECs’ *right* to impose such rates) would only perpetuate—and quite possibly

exacerbate—such disputes. Rather, to accomplish genuine reform that brings certainty and predictability to the ICC regime, the Commission should define “terminating access” in a functionally neutral manner that includes either the termination of calls directly to retail customers or the delivery of traffic to facilities-based interconnected VoIP providers that in turn transmit calls to retail customers.

We explained that CLECs serving VoIP providers (or relying on VoIP in their role as retail providers) require such a clarification with respect to any interim regime applicable to terminating access as well as to confirm their ability to charge the final unified rate for all intercarrier compensation. We also noted that, when the Commission restricted CLECs from collecting terminating access insofar as they provided wholesale service to CMRS carriers, it did so because the Commission had specifically carved CMRS traffic out of the access charge regime. In contrast, IP-originated and IP-terminated traffic is not subject to any such carve-out. Nor is there any concern that multiple CLECs could impose terminating access charges in connection with a single telephone call. We explained that VoIP providers rely on a single CLEC to interconnect with any given incumbent LEC. However, to address the possibility that separate entities somehow could impose distinct charges, as a further safeguard we would support extension of the rule that prevents the imposition of aggregate access charges that exceed the applicable ILEC rate to apply to access involving VoIP providers.

We further argued that the Commission should reject the ABC Plan’s call for deregulating tandem transit services. We explained that such services are governed by Section 251(c) of the Act as a form of interconnection, as several state commissions and courts have held, and there often are no competitive alternatives to relying on an incumbent LEC’s facilities to transmit traffic to rural LECs via indirect interconnection arrangements. Authorizing incumbent LECs to charge inflated rates for transit would harm consumers and unreasonably disadvantage competitive voice providers. We also noted that the discussion on pages 13 to 15 of Cox’s August 24 comments in this proceeding provided more information on this issue.

Finally, we reiterated that, although TWC and Cox strongly believe that IP-originated and IP-terminated traffic on the PSTN should be treated no differently from any other telecommunications traffic, both companies are willing to support reforms that subject so-called “VoIP traffic” to interstate access rates during a transitional period (even if such traffic is jurisdictionally intrastate), if the Commission can develop a reliable means of identifying such traffic. We explained that any methodology that permits interexchange carriers to have a role in determining the percentage of IP-originated traffic would create incentives for those carriers to inflate the percentage of such traffic and that mechanisms that depend on signalling information would require significant development work that would burden only VoIP providers and that would be subject to manipulation in the same way that signalling is used to manipulate jurisdictional information of phantom traffic. We urged the Commission to consider only mechanisms that rely on data that can be verified externally or that is part of already-required reports filed at the Commission. We noted that we continue to have serious concerns about proposals in the record for distinguishing IP-originated traffic from TDM-originated traffic, but reiterated our willingness to work cooperatively with the Commission toward development of an appropriate methodology to determine the percentage of IP-originated traffic.

LATHAM & WATKINS^{LLP}

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions regarding these issues.

Sincerely,

/s/ Matthew A. Brill

Matthew A. Brill
Counsel for Time Warner Cable

cc: Albert Lewis
Randy Clarke
Lynn Engledow
Victoria Goldberg
Travis Litman
Marcus Maher