

Signed September 20, 2007

Harlin DeWayne Hale
United States Bankruptcy Judge

IN RE:

DEBTOR.

Plaintiff,

VS.

Defendants.

[illegible]

CASE NO. 05-31929-HDH-11

ADVERSARY NO. 06-03477-HDH

EXHIBIT 3

GLOBAL CROSSING BANDWIDTH,	§
INC. and GLOBAL CROSSING	§
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.,	§
	§
Third Party Plaintiffs,	§
	§
v.	§
	§
TRANSCOM ENHANCED SERVICES,	§
LLC and TRANSCOM	§
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,	§
	§
Third Party Defendants.	§
	§

ORDER GRANTING TRANSCOM’S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON THE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE THAT TRANSCOM QUALIFIES AS AN ENHANCED SERVICE PROVIDER

On this date, came on for consideration the Motion For Partial Summary Judgment On Counterplaintiffs’ Sole Remaining Counterclaim Based On The Affirmative Defense That Transcom Qualifies As An Enhanced Service Provider (the “Motion”) filed by Transcom Enhanced Services, Inc. (“Transcom” or “Counterdefendant”), in which Transcom seeks summary judgment on the sole remaining counterclaim (the “Counterclaim”) asserted by Counterplaintiffs’ Global Crossing Bandwidth, Inc. (“GX Bandwidth”) and Global Crossing Telecommunications, Inc. (“GX Telecommunications”) (collectively, “GX Entities” or “Counterplaintiffs”) based on the affirmative defense that Transcom qualifies as an enhanced service provider.

Twice previously, this Court has ruled that Transcom qualifies as an enhanced service provider, and therefore is not obligated to pay access charges, but rather must pay end user charges. In filing the motion, Transcom relied heavily on the evidence previously presented to this Court in contested hearings (the “ESP Hearings”) involving the SBC Telcos (collectively, “SBC”) and AT&T

**ORDER GRANTING TRANSCOM’S MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON THE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE THAT
TRANSCOM QUALIFIES AS AN ENHANCED SERVICE PROVIDER**

EXHIBIT 3

Corp. (“AT&T”) along with Affidavits from a principal of Transcom and one of Transcom’s expert witnesses establishing that Transcom’s system has not changed since the time of the ESP Hearings, that the services provided to the GX Entities by Transcom are the same as the services provided to all other Transcom customers, and that Transcom’s expert witness is still of the opinion that Transcom’s business operations fall within the definitions of “enhanced service provider” and “information service.”

In response to the Motion, Counterplaintiffs have asserted that they neither oppose nor consent to the relief sought in the Motion. In their responses to Transcom’s interrogatories, however, Counterplaintiffs asserted that Transcom did not qualify as an enhanced service provider because its service is merely an “IP-in-the-middle” service, which Transcom asserts is a reference to the FCC’s Order, *In The Matter Of Petition For Declaratory Ruling That AT&T’s Phone-to-Phone IP Telephony Services Are Exempt From Access Charges*, 19 FCC Rcd 7457, Release Number FCC 04-97, released April 21, 2004 (the “AT&T Order”).

During the ESP Hearings, a number of witnesses testified on the issue of whether Transcom is an enhanced service provider and therefore exempt from payment of access charges. The transcripts and exhibits from those hearings have been introduced as summary judgment evidence in support of the Motion. That record establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the service provided by Transcom is distinguishable from AT&T’s specific service (as described in the AT&T Order) in a number of material ways, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (a) Transcom is not an interexchange (long distance) carrier.
- (b) Transcom does not hold itself out as a long distance carrier.
- (c) Transcom has no retail long distance customers.

EXHIBIT 3

- (d) The efficiencies of Transcom's network result in reduced rates for its customers.
- (e) Transcom's system provides its customers with enhanced capabilities.
- (f) Transcom's system changes the content of every call that passes through it.

On its face, the AT&T Order is limited to AT&T and its specific services. This Court therefore holds again, as it did at the conclusion of the ESP hearings, that the AT&T Order does not control the determination of whether Transcom qualifies as an enhanced service provider.

The term "enhanced service" is defined at 47 C.F.R. § 67.702(a) as follows:

For the purpose of this subpart, the term enhanced service shall refer to services, offered over common carrier transmission facilities used in interstate communications, which employ computer processing applications that act on the format, content, code, protocol or similar aspects of the subscriber's transmitted information; provide the subscriber additional, different, or restructured information; or involve subscriber interaction with stored information. Enhanced services are not regulated under title II of the Act.

The term "information service" is defined at 47 USC § 153(20) as follows:

The term "information service" means the offering of a capability for generating, acquiring, storing, transforming, processing, retrieving, utilizing, or making available information via telecommunications, and includes electronic publishing, but does not include any use of any such capability for the management, control, or operation of a telecommunications system or the management of a telecommunications service.

The definitions of "enhanced service" and "information service" differ slightly, to the point that all enhanced services are information services, but not all information services are also enhanced services. See First Report And Order, *In the Matter of Implementation of the Non-Accounting Safeguards of Sections 271 and 272 of the Communications Act of 1934*, as amended, 11 FCC Rcd 21905 (1996) at ¶ 103.

The Telecom Act defines the terms "telecommunications" and "telecommunications service" in 47 USC § 153(43) and (46), respectively, as follows:

EXHIBIT 3

The term “telecommunications” means the transmission, between or among points specified by the user, of information of the user's choosing, *without change in the form or content* of the information as sent and received. (emphasis added).

The term “telecommunications service” means the offering of *telecommunications* for a fee directly to the public, or to such class of users as to be effectively available directly to the public, regardless of the facilities used. (emphasis added).

These definitions make clear that a service that routinely changes either the form or the content of the transmission would fall outside of the definition of “telecommunications” and therefore would not constitute a “telecommunications service.”

Whether a service pays access charges or end user charges is determined by 47 C.F.R. § 69.5, which states in relevant part as follows:

(a) End user charges shall be computed and assessed upon end users ... as defined in this subpart, and as provided in subpart B of this part. (b) Carrier's carrier charges [i.e., access charges] shall be computed and assessed upon all interexchange carriers that use local exchange switching facilities *for the provision of interstate or foreign telecommunications services*. (emphasis added).

As such, only telecommunications services pay access charges. The clear reading of the above provisions leads to the conclusion that a service that routinely changes either the form or the content of the telephone call is an enhanced service and an information service, not a telecommunications service, and therefore is required to pay end user charges, not access charges.

Based on the summary judgment evidence, the Court finds that Transcom's system fits squarely within the definitions of “enhanced service” and “information service,” as defined above. Moreover, the Court finds that Transcom's system falls outside of the definition of “telecommunications service” because Transcom's system routinely makes non-trivial changes to user-supplied information (content) during the entirety of every communication. Such changes fall outside the scope of the operations of traditional telecommunications networks, and are not

EXHIBIT 3

necessary for the ordinary management, control or operation of a telecommunications system or the management of a telecommunications service. As such, Transcom's service is not a "telecommunications service" subject to access charges, but rather is an information service and an enhanced service that must pay end user charges. Judge Felsenthal made a similar finding in his order approving the sale of the assets of DataVoN to Transcom, that DataVoN provided "enhanced information services." *See* Order Granting Motion to Sell, 02-38600-SAF-11, no. 465, entered May 29, 2003. Transcom now uses DataVoN's assets in its business.

In the Counterclaim, paragraph 94 makes the following assertion:

Under the Communications Agreement, the Debtor asserted that it was an enhanced service provider. Not only did the Debtor make this assertion, it agreed to indemnify GX Telecommunications in the event that assertion proved untrue.

The Counterclaim goes on to allege that Transcom failed to pay access charges, and that Transcom is therefore liable under the indemnification provision in the governing agreement to the extent that it does not qualify as an enhanced service provider. In response to the Counterclaim, Transcom asserted the affirmative defense that it does indeed qualify as an enhanced service provider, and therefore has no liability under the indemnification provision. The Motion seeks summary judgment on that specific affirmative defense.

The Court has previously ruled, and rules again today, that Transcom qualifies as an enhanced service provider. As such, it is the opinion of the Court that the Motion should be granted.

It is therefore ORDERED that the Motion is GRANTED, and Transcom is awarded summary judgment that the GX Entities take nothing by their Counterclaim.

###END OF ORDER###

EXHIBIT 3

G:\ORD-Server\activePDF\Sign\Temp\23834_411975.wpd