

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation into the billing) DOCKET NO. 900035-TI
 requirement for the provision of 900)
 service (Gateway) by interexchange) ORDER NO. 22741
 carriers.)
 _____) ISSUED: 3-27-90

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

MICHAEL MCK. WILSON, Chairman
 THOMAS M. BEARD
 BETTY EASLEY
 GERALD L. GUNTER
 JOHN T. HERNDON

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION

ORDER REQUIRING ALL 900 SERVICE PROVIDERS
 TO PLACE THE NAME OF THE 900 PROGRAM NAME ON
 THE LOCAL EXCHANGE COMPANY OR INTEREXCHANGE
 CARRIER'S BILL; PROVIDING SCHEDULE FOR COMPLIANCE

BY THE COMMISSION:

NOTICE is hereby given by the Florida Public Service Commission that the action discussed herein is preliminary in nature and will become final unless a person whose interests are adversely affected files a petition for a formal proceeding, pursuant to Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code.

By Order No. 22456 effective February 19, 1990, we granted US Telecom, Inc., d/b/a Sprint Gateways a certificate to operate as an interexchange carrier (IXC) providing 900 service. In that Order, we required Sprint Gateways to place the name of the IXC providing the 900 service and the 900 program name on the customer bill issued by the local exchange company (LEC) or the IXC.

We did not believe it appropriate to place billing requirements on Sprint Gateways without placing the same requirements on other providers of 900 service. However, we were concerned with the amount of time it would take to implement the billing requirements and what economic impact

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02709 MAR 27 1990

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

ORDER NO. 22741
DOCKET NO. 900035-TI
PAGE 2

they might have on the LECs who usually provide the billing and collection services for 900 providers. Therefore, we requested our Staff to gather additional information from the 900 providers and the LECs to determine the impact, as well as a reasonable time frame for implementation.

AT&T Communications of the Southern States (ATT-C) is currently the only other certificated IXC providing 900 service. Under ATT-C's current billing arrangement, the end user is not provided with enough information to determine whether he/she made the call. Based on the LECs, ATT-C and Sprint Gateways' responses to our Staff's data request, it appears that the majority of the companies can conform to the proposed billing requirements with minimal cost and time frames, with the exception of United Telephone Company and ATT-C. Central Telephone Company of Florida (Centel), Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company (Southern Bell), and Sprint Gateways are currently in compliance with the billing requirements set out in Order No. 22456. GTE Florida, Inc., (General) indicated it would take it until August 1990 to modify its existing system. However, the smaller LECs, Alltel, Florala, Gulf, Indiantown, Northeast, Quincy, St. Joe and Vista-United, are dependent upon the IXCs providing the data in the required format.

It appears that United's toll processing and control system and the customer record and billing system contain over 145 programs combined that would have to be modified in order to provide the desired results. United is unable to implement these billing requirements until the second quarter of 1991.

ATT-C also stated that to modify its billing system would take until September 1990. It has been working on converting its system for several months. Due to the magnitude of its billing system and the fact that there is no separate state-specific billing system in place, nor are there any plans to design and implement such a system, the project is nationwide and requires additional time. Therefore, we find it appropriate to grant ATT-C's requested deadline of September 1990.

ATT-C expressed concern that it cannot cut over to the new system until the last LEC completes its modifications and sends ATT-C the unrated 900 calls. The way the billing system is designed, ATT-C can use only the current system, or flash cut

ORDER NO. 22741
DOCKET NO. 900035-TI
PAGE 3

to the newly modified system, but it is impossible to run the two systems in parallel, and it cannot cutover to the new billing system on a state by state basis.

Some of the smaller LECs, particularly Quincy, indicated concern over the upkeep of the 900 data base. They were unsure as to whether they or the IXC rated the recorded call. If it were the LEC's responsibility there would be cost and time involved to implement the proposed billing requirements. According to ATT-C, the LECs would record the 900 calls. The tape with the 900 calls would then be sent to ATT-C for rating. After ATT-C rates the calls, the tape would be returned to the LEC for billing. ATT-C would update and maintain the 900 data base. The same process is used by Sprint Gateways except it has a third party maintain and update the 900 data base and rate the 900 calls before they are returned to the LEC for billing.

The cost to implement the proposed billing requirements for the majority of the companies is minimal. Centel, Southern Bell and Sprint Gateways have already implemented the billing requirements. General estimates the cost to modify its system at \$10,400. United indicates the cost to modify its programs to comply with these billing requirements at \$512,000. ATT-C stated the project would cost a million dollars nationwide, but did not have the cost for Florida because 900 billing is done on a national, not on a state by state basis. The smaller companies did not expect to incur a cost as long as the 900 IXCs provided the required data.

Our decision that the program name should be required on the bill is based on our belief that the end user will be more likely to identify the program name with the call he has placed and, ultimately, this will reduce end user inquiries. Of those companies taking positions, only General believed the provider name instead of the program name should appear on the bill. General believes that using the program name increases customer confusion because the majority of 900 calls are made as interstate and appear without the program name in the "to city" position. However, all the other parties believed the program name should appear on the bill. The companies indicated that one provider may have more than one program up and running using different 900 numbers. Therefore, if the provider's name is shown instead of the program name, it would still be unclear which program was called. Because we believe the program name

ORDER NO. 22741
DOCKET NO. 900035-TI
PAGE 4

will best inform the consumer, we find it appropriate to require that all providers of 900 service shall meet the billing standards set out in Order No. 22456 in Docket No. 891086-TI. These standards require that the name of the 900 service provider and the 900 program name be reflected on the LEC or IXC bill. We find that the time schedule requested by the companies, other than United, is appropriate and we hereby approve it. Consequently, General shall comply within six months after the issuance of this Order. The smaller LECs shall comply by September 1990. ATT-C shall comply by September 1990. United shall submit a plan for full compliance with these requirements no later than March 1, 1991. As Centel, Southern Bell and Sprint Gateways are currently in compliance, this Order will require no new action on their parts.

Since no further action is required in this docket, it shall be closed upon the expiration of the protest period if no protest is received.

Based on the foregoing, it is, therefore,

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that all providers of 900 service are required to assure that the name of the interexchange carrier providing 900 service and the 900 program name be reflected on the customer bill issued by the local exchange company or the interexchange carrier. It is further

ORDERED that the schedule set forth in the body of this Order shall be complied with by all providers of 900 service. It is further

ORDERED that the provisions of this Order are issued as proposed agency action and shall become final unless a petition in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036, Florida Administrative Code, is received by the Director of the Division of Records and Reporting at his office at 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, by the close of business on the date set out in the Notice of Further Proceedings below. It is further

ORDERED that, if no protest is received within the protest period set out in the Notice of Further Proceedings below, this docket shall be closed.

ORDER NO. 22741
DOCKET NO. 900035-TI
PAGE 5

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission,
this 27th day of MARCH, 1990.



STEVE TRIBBLE
Director of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

SFS

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 action proposed herein is preliminary in nature and will not become effective or final, except as provided by Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed by this order may file a petition for a formal proceeding, as provided by Rule 25-22.029(4), Florida Administrative Code, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036(7)(a) and (f), 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 April 17, 1990.

In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become effective on the day subsequent to the above date as provided by Rule 25-22.029(6), Florida Administrative Code, and as reflected in a subsequent order.

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

ORDER NO. 22741
DOCKET NO. 900035-TI
PAGE 6

specified protest period.

If this order becomes final and effective 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 sewer 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 effective date of this order, 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.