

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Proposed tariff filing) DOCKET NO. 930704-TL
to withdraw Caller ID-Deluxe) ORDER NO. PSC-93-1319-FOF-TL
trial; additional request to) ISSUED: September 9, 1993
offer Caller ID-Deluxe statewide)
by BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS,)
INC. d/b/a SOUTHERN BELL)
TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY)

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

SUSAN F. CLARK
JULIA L. JOHNSON
LUIS J. LAUREDO

ORDER APPROVING TARIFF FILING

BY THE COMMISSION:

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company (Southern Bell or the Company) filed proposed revisions to its General Subscriber Service tariff on May 3, 1993. The purpose of the filing was to withdraw its Caller-ID Deluxe trial in Jacksonville and offer the service statewide. Caller ID-Deluxe is a feature similar to the Company's Caller ID-Basic service except it adds the calling subscriber's name to the number delivered to a Caller ID device. The feature will function in other ways identically to Caller ID-Basic and most equipment displaying Caller ID information will also be able to display names.

Southern Bell also proposes in this filing to include Anonymous Call Rejection (ACR) with Caller ID-Deluxe at no charge. ACR blocks calls that are sent "private" by the calling party. ACR would continue to be \$3.00 for all non-Caller ID-Deluxe residential subscribers and \$3.75 for business subscribers. Subscription to Caller ID services is not required to obtain ACR.

Southern Bell conducted significant marketing research and studies during its experiments with Caller ID-Deluxe in Jacksonville and other states. Customers' two largest complaints with Caller ID services were: the lack of identifying information other than the number sent (such as the caller's name) and the availability of blocking made the service less desirable. The

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

09736 SEP-93

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Company believes it will overcome those two objections to a large degree with this proposal. Caller ID-Deluxe will add the customer's name to the delivered number. This may not be the name of the actual person who is calling, but it will give the Caller ID-Deluxe subscriber additional information to screen incoming calls. Also, the Company believes the inclusion of ACR at no extra charge should help those customers who believe that the availability of per-call blocking devalues Caller ID's appeal.

The Company filed cost summary information with its proposed tariff. The cost information provided showed an estimated monthly cost of Caller ID-Deluxe/ACR of \$3.05 for residential customers, \$3.48 for businesses. The proposed rates for Caller ID-Deluxe/ACR are the rates currently charged for Caller ID-Basic: \$7.50 for residential and \$10.00 for business subscribers. Caller ID-Basic rates will drop to \$6.00 residential, and \$7.50 for business subscribers.

We believe that this filing is appropriate. The revenues projected for this upgrade appear to cover the Company's costs, the added features should bolster demand for Caller ID services, and the majority of subscribers should be better served by Caller ID-Deluxe's introduction.

In addition, we also believe it is appropriate to require the Company to offer per-line blocking to law enforcement officers and domestic violence intervention workers at their residences at no charge. By Order No. 24546, issued in Docket No. 891194-TL, the Commission required per-line blocking for law enforcement/ domestic violence offices. The blocking was not extended to agent's houses. The Commission had several concerns that prevented it from allowing per-line blocking to general subscribers or to law enforcement agents' private residences in that decision. Among the concerns were the diminished value of Caller ID as a deterrent for harassing calls, the default privacy advantage placed with the calling party instead of the called party, and the potential confusion over per-line blocking's function.

However, we have received some complaints from law enforcement personnel that not having per-line blocking at their residences is hindering their undercover crime prevention efforts with present Caller ID services (no name delivered). They have stated that they are hesitant to make return calls to possible suspects from their residences for fear that they may forget to dial *67, or their children may somehow return a call to a suspect. We are concerned

that Caller ID-Deluxe's delivery of the agent's name will elevate that concern. Many agents do not use their real names when conducting undercover investigations. Thus, we find it appropriate that per-line blocking should be extended to agents' residences at their option. We also find that crisis intervention personnel be afforded the same treatment.

An earlier concern that prevented us from previously requiring per-line blocking to agents' houses is still an issue. Per-line blocking acts as a toggle switch for blocking calls; if *67 is dialed from a line-blocked phone, it will turn the blocking off. This potential for confusion is of great concern to the Commission, so we shall require Southern Bell to counsel each agency and agent requesting per-line blocking of this potential danger.

At the August 17, 1993 Agenda Conference, Southern Bell agreed to file appropriate tariff changes and begin contacting the various agencies within 30 days after the effective date of this tariff. We note that the effect of this action will be to require per-line blocking of both Basic and Deluxe Caller ID services, as blocking provisions in the Company's switches cannot discern among the Caller ID variations. The Company shall also counsel the agencies and personnel on the potential advantages and disadvantages of per-line blocking.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company's tariff withdrawing the Caller ID-Deluxe trial and offering the service statewide is hereby approved, effective August 23, 1993. It is further

ORDERED that BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company shall file tariff revisions offering per-line blocking to law enforcement officers and domestic intervention workers at their residences at no charge, within 30 days after the effective date of this tariff. It is further

ORDERED that if a protest is filed in accordance with the requirement set forth below, the tariff shall remain in effect with any increase in revenues held subject to refund pending resolution of the protest. It is further

ORDER NO. PSC-93-1319-FOF-TL
DOCKET NO. 930704-TL
PAGE 4

ORDERED that if no protest is filed in accordance with the requirement set forth below, this docket shall be closed.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 9th day of September, 1993.



STEVE TRIBBLE, Director
Division of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

PAK

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

The Commission's decision on this tariff is interim in nature and will become final, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed files a petition for a formal proceeding, as provided by Rule 25-22.036(4), Florida Administrative Code, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036(7)(a)(d) and (e), Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting at his office at 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, by the close of business on September 30, 1993.

ORDER NO. PSC-93-1319-FOF-TL
DOCKET NO. 930704-TL
PAGE 5

In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become final on the day subsequent to the above date.

Any objection or protest filed in this docket before the issuance date of this Order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.

If this Order becomes final on the date described above, any party adversely affected may request judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or by the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days of the date this Order becomes final, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.