Exhibit No.:

Issues: Enhanced Record

Exchange Rule

Witness: William L. Voight

Sponsoring Party: MO PSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony

File No.: TC-2012-0331

Date Testimony Prepared: June 4, 2012

# MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION REGULATORY REVIEW DIVISION

**DIRECT TESTIMONY** 

**OF** 

WILLIAM L. VOIGHT

HALO WIRELESS, INC.

FILE NO. TC-2012-0331

Jefferson City, Missouri June 2012

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

# OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Halo Wireless, Inc.	)
v.	) ) Case No. TC-2012-0331
Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative, Inc., et al.	)
AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM L. VOIGHT	
STATE OF MISSOURI ) ) ss COUNTY OF COLE )	
William L. Voight, of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the following Direct Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of pages of Direct Testimony to be presented in the above case, that the answers in the following Direct Testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.	
	Bin William L. Voight
Subscribed and sworn to before me this	day of June, 2012.
SUSAN L. SUNDERMEYER Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Callaway County My Commission Expires: October 03, 2014 Commission Number: 10942086	Susan A Sundermeyer Notary Public

#### **DIRECT TESTIMONY**

OF

#### WILLIAM L. VOIGHT

#### HALO WIRELESS, INC.

#### FILE NO. TC-2012-0331

# Q. Please state your name and give your business address.

A. My name is William L. Voight and my business address is P.O. Box 360, 200 Madison Street, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360.

## Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission Telecommunications Rates and Tariff Supervisor. I have general supervisory responsibility for staff recommendations pertaining to tariff filings, certificate applications, interconnection agreements, I-VoIP registration, statewide video authorization and telephone company In conjunction with other staff persons, I provide staff mergers and acquisitions. recommendations on a wide variety of other matters before the Commission including rule makings, complaints filed with the Commission, and Commission comments to the Federal Communication Commission (FCC). My duties have also involved participation as a member of the Commission's Arbitration Advisory Staff, which is comprised of subject matter experts who assist an arbitrator in disputes involving the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. Lastly, I participate in and coordinate special projects, as assigned by management. Examples of special projects include Case No. TW-2004-0324, a Study of Voice over Internet Protocol in Missouri, and the Commissioners' Report on Broadband Availability, a 2007 analysis and comparison of broadband availability throughout the telephone exchange areas of Missouri. In

2010 I served as a member of the MoBroadbandNow Task Force. As necessary and appropriate, I also provide assistance to the Commission, upper management, and members of the General Assembly on legislative matters.

#### Q. What is your education and previous work experience?

A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree with a major in economics from Lincoln University in Jefferson City, Missouri. A copy of relevant work history is attached as Schedule 1.

### Q. Have you previously testified before the Commission?

A. Yes, a copy of previous testimonies is attached as Schedule 2.

# Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony in this case?

A. On April 4, 2012, HALO Wireless, Inc. ("HALO") filed a formal complaint pursuant to 4 CSR 240-29 (9) & (10), the Enhanced Record Exchange Rules (the "ERE" rule) of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission). HALO was responding to traffic blocking requests submitted by numerous small incumbent local telephone companies in which the small companies had requested AT&T Missouri to stop the flow of HALO's Feature Group C traffic to the small companies. The small companies were alleging that they were not being paid by HALO for calls sent by HALO to the small companies' networks. Additionally, the small companies were alleging a lack of Calling Party Number identification on calls received from HALO. Pursuant to the Commission's ERE rule, companies whose traffic is subject to blockage are permitted to petition the Commission for resolution of the matter, which is what HALO has done to create this case. The purpose of my direct testimony is to provide the Telecommunication's Staff (Staff) position on the matter. Ultimately, the

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Staff wants to make a recommendation to the Commission on whether to permit the blockage to continue.

## Q. Please explain the purpose of the ERE rule.

A. In my view, one of the greatest challenges brought about by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was the requirement for state commission to find ways to open up local intrastate networks to competitive entry. Local networks which had previously been established exclusively under oversight by the Commission and which were available only to traditional local telephone companies, were all of a sudden required to be shared equally with new entries. Almost immediately, something known as transiting traffic came to be an issue. Transiting traffic is that which is transmitted by a company but which neither originates nor terminates on that company's network. In this example, AT&T Missouri is said to be the transiting company because it is using its facilities to make a connection between HALO and the small companies. In this role, AT&T takes the call from HALO and sends it to the small companies to be completed to a small company end-user. The ERE rule became effective on July 30, 2005. It was established to avert incidences of unidentifiable, or phantom, traffic. The ERE rule was put into place to ensure all companies on the call-path were adequately compensated for use of their networks. Central to the goal of full and fair compensation was a requirement for tandem switch providers, such as AT&T Missouri and CenturyTel, to create billing records and for all companies to ensure calling party telephone number (CPN) information is provided and transmitted for all types of traffic. The ERE rule establishes a framework to help ensure: (1) CPN is transmitted on each call; (2) a record of the call is created and made available to terminating carriers; and, (3) carriers are paid for the use of their networks. If companies are not paid for use of their networks or if companies fail

to transmit CPN or otherwise disguise the jurisdiction of the call, the aggrieved company may request blockage of the offender's traffic. It is important to note that the ERE rule applies only to calls that are jurisdictionally under the jurisdiction of the MoPSC and does not, for example, extend to the Feature Group D network commonly used for interstate delivery of traffic. Consequently, carriers who find traffic being blocked on the Feature Group C network may continue to have traffic delivered uninterrupted on the Feature Group D network.

- Q. The case involves HALO's request for the Commission to deny various requests for its traffic to be blocked. Does the Staff support HALO's request?
- A. The Staff has reviewed numerous unsworn statements of attorneys and parties in this case as well as various pleadings, motions and allegations. However, the Staff would prefer to read the witnesses' testimony prior to making its recommendation to the Commission. Therefore, the Staff defers any further comment until further rounds of testimony are filed.
  - Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
  - A. Yes, it does.