

**Current Inter-carrier Compensation
Issues Before the FCC
and
Potential Implications for Voice Peering**

K.C. Halm

1919 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20006

202-973-4287 / kchalm@dwt.com

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP



Overview

- **Major FCC overhaul of intercarrier compensation remains unsettled**
- **FCC has initiated several proceedings intended to reform existing intercarrier compensation**
 - **Compensation for ISP-bound traffic, and VoIP traffic, at the heart of those proceedings**
 - **Recent developments concerning access charge liability and Universal Service funding may represent first steps**
- **However, no *comprehensive* reform to date**

Overview (cont'd)

- **Recent targeted compensation reform proceedings initiated at FCC**
- **FCC Chairman: intercarrier compensation reform possible within six months**
- **Okay, so...**
 - **what are these specific issues?**
 - **what will come of these recent proposals?**
 - **what implications (if any) for peering?**

Primary Components of Intercarrier Compensation

- **Different forms of intercarrier compensation**
 - **Access Charges**
 - **Reciprocal Compensation**
 - **Universal Service**

Primary Components of Intercarrier Compensation

- **Access Charges**
 - **Termination and origination charges for toll, or long distance, traffic delivered to local telco networks**
 - **Legacy compensation scheme arising out of break up of Bell System**
 - **Rate variances based upon end points of call, and status of terminating LEC**
 - **Interstate**
 - **Intrastate**
 - **Rural telco**

Primary Components of Intercarrier Compensation

- **Reciprocal Compensation**
 - **Transport and termination charges associated with the exchange of “local” traffic**
 - **Primary component of network interconnection compensation under 1996 Telecom Act**
 - **Rate variances based upon type of traffic**
 - **Voice traffic**
 - **ISP-bound traffic**
 - **Significant disputes arising over what constitutes “local” traffic**

Primary Components of Intercarrier Compensation

- **Universal Service**
 - **Funding and subsidies for carriers, both incumbent and competitive, operating in “high cost” and rural areas**
 - **Form of indirect intercarrier compensation**
 - **All telecom and interconnected VoIP providers pay on interstate “telecommunications” end user revenue**

Select Intercarrier Compensation Issues Before the FCC

- **Recent Actions at FCC Raise Some New (and Some Old) Issues**
 - **Application of Access Charges to VoIP**
 - **Phantom Traffic**
 - **Traffic “Pumping” Arrangements**
 - **Universal Service Funding Caps**
 - **ISP-bound Traffic “Interim” Rate Proposal**

Select Intercarrier Compensation Issues Before the FCC

- **Application of Access Charges to VoIP**
- **Several current proceedings considering the following questions:**
 - **Access Charge “Avoidance” or “Arbitrage” Schemes**
 - **Whether access charges apply to IP-to-PSTN voice traffic terminated on the PSTN**
 - **Prohibitions on “Phantom Traffic”**
 - **Whether traditional PSTN call signaling parameters apply to voice over IP traffic terminated on the PSTN**

Select Intercarrier Compensation Issues Before the FCC

- **Traffic “Pumping” Issues**
 - **Rural telcos driving traffic to their networks**
 - **Partnerships with conference calling and call aggregation companies**
 - **Toll, or long distance, traffic volumes increase dramatically**
 - **Results: exponential increase in terminating access revenues for rural telcos**

Select Intercarrier Compensation Issues Before the FCC

- **Universal Service Funding Caps**
 - Recent problem: dramatic growth in USF high cost funds
 - Competitive carriers now receive funding
 - Competitors operating in rural areas receive subsidies based upon *incumbents* costs and revenues
 - Intercarrier compensation likely to reduce rural telco access revenue; to be offset by increase in USF funding
 - Support to competitors in rural areas would increase dramatically if rural telco access rates decline
 - FCC's solution: Cap on funding to competitors in high cost / rural areas

Select Intercarrier Compensation Issues Before the FCC

- **Universal Service Funding Caps (cont'd)**
 - FCC rationale
 - rural telco revenue from access charges significant % overall revenue
 - intercarrier compensation likely to reduce access charges
 - would increase rural carriers' reliance on USF
 - Ramifications
 - allow rurals to offset lost revenue from lower access charges with increased USF funding
 - simultaneously preventing competitors from receiving additional USF support
 - “Critical first step”
 - FCC believes decision will help control growth of USF, while providing a basis to reduce rural telco access rates

Select Intercarrier Compensation Issues Before the FCC

- **ISP-bound Traffic “Interim” Rate – Final Action Within 6 Months?**
 - 2001 - FCC establishes an “interim” rate of \$0.0007 per mou for terminating ISP-bound traffic
 - 2002 - Federal appeals court rejects FCC’s legal rationale, directs the FCC to develop new rationale, but declines to “vacate” the decision.
 - \$.0007 rate remains in effect to this day
 - 2008 - Six years after the federal appeals court rejected the rationale, no further FCC decision to address the court’s concerns
 - competitive LECs sued to force the FCC to act on final rate
 - May, 2008: FCC lawyer asks court to hold off because Chairman Martin believes agency can render a decision within next six months

Select Intercarrier Compensation Issues Before the FCC

■ Other Developments

- Coalition of carriers reportedly to offer new reform proposal
- AT&T, Verizon, Level 3, and Global Crossing
 - Comprehensive intercarrier compensation proposal
 - FCC jurisdiction (for compensation purposes) over all VoIP traffic
 - Reportedly considering single, unified rate
- No public details available at this time
- Tied to (?) Chairman's commitment to resolve intercarrier compensation issues in next 6 months

Implications for Voice Peering

- **Do federal regulatory compensation rules apply to voice peering?**
 - **FCC has begun to regulate voice over IP providers**
 - **“Interconnected VoIP” defined as possessing four essential functions:**
 1. **Enables real-time two-way voice service**
 2. **Requires a broadband connection**
 3. **Requires IP compatible CPE (customer premises equipment)**
 4. **Permits users to send *and* receive calls to the PSTN**

Implications for Voice Peering

- **Potential application...**
- **VoIP services that meet all four elements classified as “interconnected VoIP”**
- **Subject to certain FCC regulations:**
 1. **911**
 2. **Number porting**
 3. **Network surveillance (wiretapping)**
 4. **Customer privacy protections (CPNI)**
 5. **Voice relay services**
 6. **Universal service fund *contributions* (not subsidies)**
- **Interconnected VoIP service providers not directly subject to access charges and reciprocal compensation**

Implications for Voice Peering

- **Potential application...**
- **Key to avoiding FCC regulation as interconnected VoIP**
 - **ability to send and receive calls to/from PSTN**
- **No PSTN interconnection (pure peering) =**
 - **not subject to FCC jurisdiction**
- ***Some* PSTN interconnection (sending *or* receiving calls to PSTN) =**
 - **probably not subject to FCC jurisdiction**

Implications for Voice Peering

- **Rural telcos have significant political support in Congress**
- **FCC decision to cap USF high cost fund may signal attempts to reduce rural telco access charge rates**
- **But, at what cost?**
- **FCC may subject interconnected VoIP to explicit intercarrier compensation (access charges and reciprocal compensation)**
- **Elements of potential regulation**
 - **Calling Party Number (CPN), Jurisdictional Information Parameters (JIP), or other call identifying information, must be passed on all calls**
 - **VoIP calls terminating on the PSTN subject to LEC's terminating access charges**

Implications for Voice Peering

- **Rural and incumbent telcos will continue to pursue rules that require new entrants to pay for termination to the PSTN**
- **FCC unable to force providers to exchange on bill and keep terms**
 - **ISP-bound traffic's interim rate originally intended as transition to bill and keep**
 - **However, FCC has (to date) abandoned attempts to impose permanent bill and keep regime**
- **Thus, bill and keep only where both parties consent, and thru peering arrangements, like the Stealth exchange**
- **Peering will continue to present opportunities to avoid PSTN termination costs**
 - **But where traffic needs to reach the PSTN, there will likely continue to be *some cost* associated with such termination.**
 - **How those costs are assessed, distributed, and absorbed, will remain contentious**

Q&A

kchalm@dwt.com

(202) 973-4287

K.C. Halm | Davis Wright Tremain LLP

1919 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 200 | Washington, DC 20006

Tel: (202) 973-4287 | Fax: (202) 973-4499

Email: kchalm@dwt.com | Website: www.dwt.com

Anchorage | Bellevue | Los Angeles | New York | Portland | San Francisco | Seattle | Shanghai |
Washington, D.C.

Davis
Wright
Tremain
LLP

The logo for Davis Wright Tremain LLP, featuring a red square with the white letters 'dt' stacked vertically.