

ORIGINAL

Handout by staff
at 12/5/01 special
ag - Issue 16

Special Agenda - Modifications
12/5/2001
Docket No. 000075-TP

1. Page 99, first paragraph under "STAFF ANALYSIS"...

The issue before the Commission is to determine the appropriate definition of IP telephony, and what intercarrier compensation mechanism to apply to this traffic. ~~Staff notes that all parties to this proceeding (except BellSouth)~~ Staff notes that the majority of parties to this proceeding (including Verizon) filed a Joint Position Statement on July 5, 2001, stating:

2. Page 102, second full paragraph....

~~The only party to this proceeding that did not take part in the Joint Position Statement mentioned above is BellSouth.~~ BellSouth witness Ruscilli states that "IP telephony is, in very simple and basic terms, a mode or method of completing a telephone call." (TR 68) He states that phone-to-phone IP telephony is a telecommunications service that is provided using IP for one or more segments of the call. (TR 68) Witness Ruscilli explains:

3. Page 106, second full paragraph under "Analysis"...

~~The only party that did not participate in the Joint Position Statement, BellSouth, BellSouth, who did not participate in the Joint Position Statement,~~ argues that a phone-to-phone IP telephony call should be treated no differently than a traditional circuit switched call for purposes of determining the type of compensation due. (BR 23) BellSouth requests that the Commission confirm that "the type of network used to transport a call is irrelevant to the charges that apply, whether reciprocal compensation, toll or switched access. Further, the jurisdiction of a call will be determined by its endpoints, irrespective of the protocol used in the transmission." (BR 25) BellSouth cites to an earlier Commission decision in the BellSouth/Intermedia arbitration, in which the Commission stated:

- APP
- CAF
- CMP
- COM
- CTR
- ECR
- LEG
- OPC
- PAI
- RGQ
- SEC
- SER
- OTH

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
15240 DEC-56
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK