1	STATE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
2			
3		FEDINCO	
4	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
5	5 Hearing		
6	б		
7	March 8, 2010 Jefferson City, Missouri Volume 1		
8			
9	9		
10		) )File No TX-2010-0160	
11	Amendment to 4 CSR 240-33.160, )File No. TX-2010-016 Customer Proprietary Network ) Information, )		
12			
13	3		
14		F, Presiding ULATORY LAW JUDGE	
15		ULATORT LAW UUDDE	
16	6		
17	7		
18		S. Mealy, CCR, CSR, RPR	
19	Midwest Litigation Services 3432 W. Truman Boulevard, Suite 207 Jefferson City, MO 65109		
20			
21	1		
22	2		
23	3		
24	4		
25	5		

1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission: 3 Ms. Colleen M. Dale Public Service Commission 4 200 Madison Street, 9th Floor P.O. Box 360 5 Jefferson City, MO 65102 (573) 751-4255 6 7 For Southwestern Bell Telephone Company  $d/b/a \ \mbox{AT}\&\ \mbox{T}$ Missouri: 8 Mr. Robert J. Gryzmala 9 Attorney at Law 909 Chesnut, Room 3516 10 St. Louis, MO 63101 (314) 235-2509 11 12 For MITG: 13 Mr. Craig Johnson Berry Wilson LLC 14 304 East High Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, MO 65102 (573) 638-7272 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Good morning. Welcome to the 3 comment hearing regarding a proposed rule-making on 4 customer propriety network information, Case No. 5 TX-2010-0160. 6 It's a little bit after 9:00, so we're going to 7 go ahead and get started. Let's begin by taking entries 8 of appearance, beginning with Staff. 9 MS. DALE: Colleen M. Dale, Post Office Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102, on behalf of the Staff of 10 11 the Missouri Public Service Commission. JUDGE WOODRUFF: And I see a representative of 12 AT&T here. 13 14 MR. GRYZMALA: Good morning, your Honor. Bob 15 Gryzmala at Southwestern Bell Telephone Company doing business as AT&T Missouri. We're at 909 Chestnut, Room 16 3516, St. Louis, Missouri, 63101. 17 18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you, Mr. Gryzmala. Any 19 other attorneys who wish to enter an appearance? All 20 right. 21 Well, as you're aware, this is a rule-making 22 hearing, so we're here to take comments from the public. 23 Let's begin with Staff who has filed some written 24 comments. 25 MS. DALE: As you know, your Honor, these rules

were filed on behalf of the Staff the Public Service
Commission attempting to streamline the filing of CPNI
information. We have with us John Van Ashen, who is the
head of Telecommunications Department, if you have any
questions of him.

6 Generally speaking, our comments that were 7 prefiled support the rule changes in order to make it 8 easier for companies to make their CPNI filing at the 9 Commission in conjunction with their annual reports. 10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And I noticed that AT&T did

11 file a written comment Friday.

12 MS. DALE: Yes.

13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Does staff have a response to 14 that?

MS. DALE: Staff doesn't have any problems with 15 AT&T's proposed changes with the exception of the 16 17 insertion of -- on the last page of their comments, they suggest the insertion of "or as otherwise permitted 18 19 without customer approval under the Commission's rules." 20 We are -- we are not supportive of that language insertion 21 at this time. 22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Do you want to have 23 Mr. Van Ashen testify to give an explanation for -- for

24 that position?

25 MS. DALE: That would be fine.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Mr. Van Ashen. 1 2 I'll swear you in as a witness, if you you'd please raise 3 your right hand. 4 JOHN VAN ASHEN, 5 being first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole 6 truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows: 7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. Can you respond to 8 AT&T's comments and why Staff has taken the position it 9 is? 10 MR. VAN ASHEN: I think we agree with the general concept of what AT&T is suggesting. And I -- I 11 have to admit, I was just looking at it this morning, 12 13 since I did not see this on Friday. 14 But we're still trying to digest, I think, what AT&T is proposing. And if I may just kind of speak out 15 loud as we're talking here, AT&T's proposal, as I 16 17 understand it, is to really insert the phrase "except to initiate, render, bill and collect for telecommunications 18 19 services." Is that the basic gist of what AT&T is --20 MR. GRYZMALA: That's one -- that's one piece. 21 MR. VAN ASHEN: That's one piece. 22 MR. GRYZMALA: Right. Right. 23 MR. VAN ASHEN: And maybe -- maybe it would help me if I just understood all the pieces, just to make sure 24 25 I understand AT&T's proposal.

MR. WOODRUFF: All right. Since we are --1 2 MR. VAN ASHEN: I think that piece, I think 3 we're okay with. 4 MR. GRYZMALA: The what? 5 MR. ASHEN: That piece. 6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. 7 MR. VAN ASHEN: It does match up with the other 8 part of our rules. 9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Well, Mr. Van 10 Ashen, we'll have you wait, then, and we'll go over to 11 Mr. Gryzmala. And, Mr. Gryzmala, I'll go ahead and swear 12 you in if you want to offer any comments. 13 ROBERT GRYZMALA, 14 being first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole 15 truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows: JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. What would you like 16 17 to tell us? 18 MR. GRYZMALA: Well, your Honor, there are two 19 pieces to our comments effectively. The first one is 20 that, as Ms. Dale pointed out, the impetus -- the core 21 impetus behind this proceeding is to streamline the 22 present procedures. And as our letter of March 5 23 indicates, we're squarely behind that. So having said 24 that, we'll move to the second piece. 25 The second piece goes to the breadth of the

б

language that is used. As Ms. Dale -- Ms. Dale 1 2 indicated and John, the present rule would propose that 3 the exception for the latitude in filing a CPNI FCC filed 4 document with this Commission, the exception would be with 5 independent contractors or joint venture partners. In б other words, if you have those, that option is not all 7 available to you, except if those independent contractors 8 or offer joint venture partners do certain things.

9 And one of them is, as the proposed rule points 10 out, except for billing and collection services, the point 11 being there that no approval -- no customer's approval is 12 required in order to convey or allow access to CPNI to 13 those folks who are working for the purpose of billing and 14 collecting for services.

15 Where does that come from? That comes from the Federal Act, Section 222(d), and it comes from the 16 17 Commission's own rules. The point that we make that Ms. -- Ms. Dale and Mr. Van Ashen alluded to is that not only 18 19 is there the exception for billing and collection, but 20 there is also the exception in the Commission's rules, and 21 we cite the citation in the letter, for initiating and 22 rendering telephone service to install it, to maintain it, 23 to repair it.

24 So we support Ms. -- the Staff's agreement, as I 25 hear it, that the portion of the language that we would

1 like to add to the rule where it would say, "except to 2 initiate, render, bill and collect for telecommunications 3 services," that's okay. In other words, that's what I'm 4 hearing.

5 The second piece of the second piece, in other 6 words, this exception, is the phrase that was pointed out, 7 "or as otherwise permitted without customer approval." No 8 customer approval is necessary for, as we've seen, 9 billing, collection and for installing and rendering 10 telephone service.

But there are other instances in which customer approval is not required either. And that is both under the Commission's rules and under the federal law. One example is to -- and, again, this is cited in the letter, your Honor -- to protect the rights or property of the telephone company, to protect users of our services, to protect against fraud, abusive, unlawful.

And we -- you know, we have instances of that, you know, various uses of the network by consumers or elsewhere for nefarious purposes. And we can use and exchange and convey CPNI to get to the root of that. That is the purpose of the phrase "as otherwise permitted without customer approval."

24 So that -- in other words, when all is said and 25 done, were you to except -- were the Commission to accept 1 AT&T Missouri's changes, you would have sync -- you know, 2 the rule here, the reporting rule here would be in sync 3 with federal law and State law. Not just B and C, not 4 just initiate, render and maintain service, but it would 5 be for other exceptions where under federal or State law, 6 no customer approvals is required.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: For the purposes of the record, could you give me a short explanation of what CPNI is and what kind of stuff is included in that?

10 MR. GRYZMALA: Absolutely. CPNI is an acronym 11 which stands for customer proprietary network information. 12 It is the kind of information we pick up from customers 13 and have access to from customers as their -- as a result 14 of their use of the network.

A classic example would be the long distance 15 phone numbers on your bill. That's sensitive. It's 16 17 proprietary. It's personal to you. The amount of your 18 bill, what services you prescribe to, the details, the 19 particulars, these are items of information for which a 20 reasonable consumer would expect privacy, and that's the 21 -- the point of CPNI and the rules of the FCC for many, many years in this Commission against disclosing it or 22 23 conveying it or allowing folks to have access to it 24 without proper safeguards.

25 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Now, it's --

1 MR. GRYZMALA: And there are exceptions where, 2 you know, the policy-makers and Legislators have made the 3 cut in order to run your network, in order to bill for 4 your service, to turn the screwdriver on the network to be 5 able to do work, to protect against fraud by customers who б commit fraud in using phone service. You don't need 7 approval to convey or allow access to CPNI. 8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: There's the consumer privacy interest. There is also the proprietary interest of the 9 10 phone company avoiding having competitors? 11 MR. GRYZMALA: You know, there may be, frankly, 12 your Honor, but that's not generally been the genesis of 13 the FCC's rule-makings nor the Commission's rule makes. 14 I'm more familiar with the FCC's rule-makings over the 15 past many years. The emphasis there has been with respect 16 to what are the appropriate safeguards for consumers. JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Mr. Van Ashen or Ms. 17 18 Dale, do you have a response? 19 MS. DALE: I --20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Ms. Dale, I should probably 21 swear you in as well. 22 COLLEEN DALE, 23 being first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole 24 truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows: 25 MS. DALE: Thank you. I wanted to point out

that the -- the exceptions that Mr. Gryzmala was talking 1 about are found at 4 CSR 240-33.160(2)(c). And then there 2 3 are four subsections under C. 4 It might be acceptable to us to -- instead of 5 saying under the Commission's rules, if we limited it to 6 4 CSR 240-33.160(2)(c). 7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. 8 MS. DALE: The Commission's rules being vast and 9 broad. MR. GRYZMALA: Can I just take a moment? 10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Sure. Go ahead. 11 MR. GRYZMALA: All right. Your Honor, may we 12 13 have just a moment to speak with my client? 14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Sure. MR. GRYZMALA: I'm sure we can provide a pretty 15 16 quick answer. JUDGE WOODRUFF: We'll go off the record for a 17 18 few moments. 19 (Break in proceedings.) JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. We're back on the 20 21 record. Mr. Gryzmala, what did the -- your client say? 22 Or what did you decide, I should say? 23 MR. GRYZMALA: Thank you, your Honor. I think we're agreeable. And let me make sure that I can lock 24 25 this down so that there's no uncertainty. At page 3 of

1 AT&T's comments, we have proposed language. So moving to 2 the parenthetical where it starts to, Except to, this is 3 the way it would read. "Except to initiate, render, bill 4 and collect for telecommunications services (or as 5 otherwise permitted under 4 CSR 240-33.160 (2)(C)). We're 6 agreeable to that if we understand it as -- as I read it. 7 MS. DALE: Yes. 8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Ms. Dale? 9 MS. DALE: That would be perfectly acceptable to 10 us. JUDGE WOODRUFF: Very good. I wish all disputes 11 could be worked out so easily. Mr. Gryzmala, was there 12 13 any other comments you wish to make? 14 MR. GRYZMALA: No, your Honor. Thank you for 15 the opportunity. JUDGE WOODRUFF: Ms. Dale, anything else? 16 MS. DALE: No. 17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: That's all the parties who have 18 19 filed written comments. Was there anyone else here who 20 would like to make any statements at this time? 21 All right. Well, thank you all very much, then. 22 With that, we are adjourned. Thank you. 23 (The proceedings were concluded at 9:16 a.m. on March 8, 2010.) 24 25

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	STATE OF MISSOURI )	
4	)ss. County of osage )	
5		
6	I, Monnie S. Mealy, Certified Shorthand Reporter,	
7	Certified Court Reporter #0538, and Registered	
8	Professional Reporter, and Notary Public, within and for	
9	the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that I was	
10	personally present at the proceedings as set forth in the	
11	caption sheet hereof; that I then and there took down in	
12	stenotype the proceedings had at said time and was	
13	thereafter transcribed by me, and is fully and accurately	
14	set forth in the preceding pages.	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	Monnie S. Mealy, CSR, CCR #0539	
22	Registered Professional Reporter	
23		
24		
25		

INDEX PAGE Testimony of John Van Ashen б Testimony of Robert Gryzmala Testimony of Colleen Dale б Reporter's Certificate