

Your Donations are Needed



The burden is **GREAT**, and your help is required to continue this fight for all CMRS Providers.

LEC's are changing their Interconnection Agreements to reflect the results of the Mountain Order.

Qwest customers and non-Qwest customers are effected.

The FCC is stalling.

Qwest believes their chips are stacked higher and will win as our industry perishes.

More money is needed to continue our fight for consistent and accurate rulings from the FCC.

Victory is a sure savings at the negotiation table when your ICA comes due.....

Loss is sure change, costing you money every month for your interconnected services

Can You Afford Not to Help ?

Other Reading ...

Metrocall -vs- Concord

TSR Wireless -vs- U S West Comm

Mountain Communications -vs- FCC

Virginia Order

Know the Players ...

Robert McKenna —
Qwest Associate General Counsel

Jonathan Reel —
Federal Communications Commission

Verizon Wireless — Intervener for FCC

□ □ □ □

Benjamin Aron —
Schwaninger & Associates
bjaron@sa-lawyers.net
1331 H Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
202.347.8580

Interveners for Mountain:
Arch Wireless
T-Mobile USA
AT&T Wireless
Sprint Spectrum LP
Western Wireless Corp
Allied National Paging Assn

Case 02-1255
US Court of Appeals for the
District of Columbia

THE QUEST TO TAME QWEST

**Mountain
Communications
Inc.**

2520 N Freeway
Pueblo, CO
81003

www.mtncomm.com

David Balsick

dbalsick@mtncomm.com
719-253-7762 ofc
719-253-7767 fax

SCA
Wireless Forum 2004

Important Facts You Need To Know !
Your Help is Required !
Our Fight for Interconnection Justice is
the Responsibility of All CMRS providers

Nov 96 — Communications Act Revised, New Rules for CMRS providers.

Mar 98 — Formal dispute with USWC. Stopped paying for charges.

Mar 98 — Filed Formal Complaint with FCC on USWC.

Jan 02 — FCC Denied Formal Complaint, Issued Damaging MO& O

Feb 02 — Filed Review of Order w/FCC

Jul 02 — FCC Denied Review, Issued Order on Review.

Aug 02 — Qwest attempts collections, proceeds with disconnection

Apr 03 — Filed US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Case 02-1255 against the FCC. Request the DC Court require the FCC to rule consistently with the written law.

Nov 03 — Oral arguments before judges.

Jan 04 — Court of Appeals rules in favor of Mountain, remands the case back to the FCC, finds the FCC decision on this issue as "arbitrary and capricious"

Feb 04 — FCC requests briefs on issues.

Apr 04 — No agreement on issues, FCC advised parties can not agree.

Jun 04 — Proceed with formal complaint against Qwest.

For what are we fighting? Why is it so important?

Mountain believes that USWC, now Qwest, and other ILECs have improperly charged Mountain and many other wireless carriers for facilities, numbers and termination costs; that they should not charge wireless carriers a transit traffic charge, and that the FCC has violated the Administrative Procedure Act by changing the rules without following the correct procedures.

Facilities Charges:

Before

Any interconnecting carrier could obtain a single Point of Interconnection (POI) in each LATA or MTA.

Could obtain local numbers in each incumbent LEC (ILEC) local calling area (LCA) where they provide service.

AND the ILEC could not charge the competitive carrier for the costs to deliver its customers traffic to the competitive carriers single Point of Interconnection, even if the calls are carried from one LCA to another LCA.

After

An interconnecting carrier can still obtain a single POI if they forfeit their right to obtain local numbers in the LCA, thereby resulting in no facility charges.

Or an interconnection carrier can avoid facility charges and obtain local telephone numbers in a LCA if it forfeits its right to establish a single POI with the installation of a CMRS switch in each LCA.

Transit Traffic Charges:

Before

Any carrier can directly or indirectly connect to another carrier to deliver a call. When directly connected, the originating carrier is responsible for delivering its traffic to the termination carriers switch serving the called party, and it is prohibited from charging the terminating carrier for the delivery of the traffic. The originating carrier charges their originating customer. They pay the terminating carrier to deliver the call.

With indirect interconnection, the originating carrier chooses to use the transit services of a third party. Same rules apply, charge the originator, pay for termination.

After

Qwest and other ILECs wish to charge a percentage of the unlawful facilities charges to cover the costs of delivery of transit traffic to the called party. In effect they are charging the originating party and the terminating party for delivery of the call.

