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# INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

 On June 30, 2011, tw telecom, inc. (TWTC) filed a petition with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) seeking a declaratory ruling. Specifically, TWTC seeks a ruling that Section 251(c)(2) of the Telecommunica­tions Act of 1996 (Act) author­izes it to establish direct Internet protocol-to-Internet proto­col (IP-to-IP) interconnec­tion with incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) for the transmis­sion and routing of its facilities-based voice over Internet protocol (VoIP) ser­vices as well as voice services that originate and terminate in Time Division Multiplexing (TDM) format, but are converted to IP format for transport (IP-in-the-middle) (Petition).[[1]](#footnote-1) The FCC estab­lished a comment period for the Petition with initial comments due by August 15, 2011 and reply comments due by August 30, 2011. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (Ohio Commission) believes that the Petition is consistent with its historic positions on the issues of IP interconnection and VoIP classification and it submits these brief com­ments supporting TWTC’s Petition for the FCC’s consideration.

# DISCUSSION

 Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act sets forth interconnection require­ments for telecommunications carriers.[[2]](#footnote-2) In particular, Section 251(c)(2) establishes intercon­nection obligations specific to ILECs. Among these is the duty to provide, for the facilities and equipment of any requesting telecommunications carrier, interconnec­tion with the ILEC’s network for the transmission and routing of telephone exchange ser­vice and exchange access at any technically feasible point within the carrier’s net­work.[[3]](#footnote-3) This obligation is not conditioned upon the use of a specific protocol or technol­ogy where the requesting party is a telecommunications carrier and the interconnection is used for the transmission and routing of telephone exchange and exchange access services.

 The Ohio Commission has long supported the classification of VoIP as a telecommuni­cations service[[4]](#footnote-4) and it agrees that TWTC’s facili­ties-based VoIP service meets the statutory definition of a telecommunications service.[[5]](#footnote-5) The FCC recently noted that VoIP traffic is “telecommunications” traffic.[[6]](#footnote-6) As telecommuni­cations that are offered to the public for a fee,[[7]](#footnote-7) TWTC’s facili­ties-based VoIP service is a telecommunica­tions service and, as a provider of telecommunica­tions service, TWTC is a telecommunications carrier.[[8]](#footnote-8)

 The Ohio Commission further agrees that TWTC’s facilities-based VoIP service is comparable to local exchange service because its subscribers may use TWTC’s facilities to originate and terminate a telecommunications service. As such, TWTC’s facilities-based VoIP service meets the statutory definitions of telephone exchange and exchange access services.[[9]](#footnote-9) Furthermore, TWTC states that it has successfully interconnected with two long distance providers and an E911 pro­vider using IP-to-IP for the exchange of facilities-based VoIP traffic.[[10]](#footnote-10) Section 51.305(c) of the FCC’s rules clearly recognizes such interconnection as substantial evidence that IP-to-IP intercon­nection is technically feasible at that point, or at substantially similar points, in networks employing substan­tially similar facilities. In the Ohio Commission’s view, the facilities of an inter-exchange carrier and an ILEC are substantially similar and interconnec­tion between TWTC and an ILEC should be deemed to be technically feas­ible. Consequently, the Ohio Commission supports TWTC’s right to establish direct IP-to-IP interconnection with ILEC facilities, at any technically feasible point within the ILEC’s network, for the transmission and routing of facilities-based VoIP service that is at least equal in quality to that provided by the ILEC to itself or any subsidiary, affiliate or any other party to which the ILEC provides direct IP-to-IP interconnection.

 In addition to facilities-based VoIP service, the Ohio Commission supports TWTC’s request for a declaratory ruling clarifying that it has the right to direct IP-to-IP interconnection with ILEC networks for IP-in-the-middle voice services. However, in the Ohio Commission’s view, IP-in-the-middle services are not facilities-based VoIP ser­vices as defined in the Petition, but rather are typical telephone exchange and exchange access services. Accordingly, the Ohio Commission believes that all of the obligations extended to ILECs under Section 251(c), including technical feasibil­ity and quality of service, should apply to IP-in-the-middle services.

# CONCLUSION

 The Ohio Commission supports TWTC’s petition seeking a declaratory ruling clarify­ing that TWTC has the right, under Section 251(c)(2) of the Act, to establish direct IP-to-IP interconnection of its facilities-based VoIP service and IP-in the-middle services with ILEC networks. As a telecommunications carrier providing telephone exchange and exchange access ser­vices, TWTC is entitled to interconnection at any technically feasible point with the ILEC network that is at least equal in quality to that provided by the ILEC to itself or any subsidiary, affiliate or any other party to which the ILEC provides interconnec­tion. Accord­ingly, the Ohio Commission urges the FCC to grant TWTC’s Petition.
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