

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Next-G Communication, Inc.) File No. ITC-214-20091110-00468
)

**Comments and Request to Remove From Streamlined Processing or,
Alternatively, to Deny the Application**

TO: Chief, International Bureau

APCC Services, Inc., (“APCC Services”), on behalf of itself and the payphone service providers (“PSPs”) it represents, submits the following Comments and Request to Remove From Streamlined Processing or, Alternatively, to Deny the Application in the above referenced matter. The Application was placed on Public Notice on November 20, 2009 for streamlined processing.¹

APCC Services is an agent of PSPs for the billing and collection of payphone dial-around compensation.² *See generally* 47 CFR §§ 64.1300-1320 and Note 2. APCC Services and the

¹ Public Notice, Report No. TEL,-01397S (November 20, 2009). The Commission’s Rules specify no particular procedure or time for filing comments, requests, oppositions, or any other pleading with respect to streamlined international Section 214 applications. Accordingly, to the extent necessary to allow the acceptance of this pleading, APCC Services hereby requests a waiver of any necessary rules to allow the filing of this pleading, and/or that the Commission treat this pleading as an Informal Request for Commission Action pursuant to Section 1.41 of the Commission’s Rules, 47 CFR § 1.41.

² Dial-around compensation is prescribed by the FCC and is paid by carriers to PSPs as compensation for the use of payphones to place coinless calls using toll-free numbers. These calls are known as “dial-around calls” because, by dialing a toll-free number, the caller may “dial around” the carrier who is preselected by the PSP for carrying calls from the PSPs’ payphones. Section 276 of the Act required the Commission to “establish a per call compensation plan to ensure that all payphone service providers are fairly compensated for each and every completed intrastate and interstate call using their payphone.” 47 U.S.C. § 276(b)(1)(A). With respect to dial-around calls, the FCC concluded that, because PSPs could not otherwise obtain fair compensation for such calls, carriers that complete dial-around calls must (in the absence of individual agreements) pay the PSP compensation for each completed call at a prescribed “default” rate per call. Carriers’ dial-around compensation obligations are codified in Sections 64.1300-1320 of the Commission’s rules. 47 CFR §§ 64.1300-1320.

PSPs it represents are interested in this proceeding to the extent that the grant of the Application at this time will allow a carrier, Next-G, to continue in operation even though Next-G is out of compliance with the Commission's Dial Around Payphone Compensation Rules, despite just having entered into a Consent Decree pledging to comply with those Rules.³ Indeed, Next-G was out of compliance with those rules at the very time it was signing the decree.

BACKGROUND FACTS

On August 12, 2008, APCC Services converted to a formal complaint under Section 208 a long pending informal complaint.⁴ Extensive negotiations both for many months before the informal complaint was filed and during its pendency failed to get Next-G to comply with Next-G's obligations under the Commission's Dial Around Rules.⁵ The formal complaint, as had the informal complaint, covered Next-G's failure to pay the dial around compensation it owed from July, 2004 (the date upon which the Commission's requirement that carriers like Next-G assume the obligation to pay dial around compensation) through the end of the third quarter of 2005. Ultimately, APCC Services and Next-G settled that case⁶.

In the meantime, and separately, the Enforcement Bureau of the Commission was conducting its own separate investigation of Next-G's failure to comply with the Commission's Rules, as is evidenced by the entry of the *Next-G Order*. In addition to agreeing to make a voluntary contribution to the government, in the *Next-G Order*, Next-G pledged to appoint a compliance officer to oversee compliance with the Commission's payphone rules and Section 214, including a pledge to file the instant Application⁷. Yet even as Next-G was making that pledge, Next-G knew it would be in continuing violation of the Commission's payphone compensation rules.

³ *Next -G Communications, Inc.*, Order and Consent Decree, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, DA 09-2068 (released November 12, 2009) (*Next-G Order*). A copy of the *Next-G Order* is attached.

⁴ *See APCC Services, Inc. v. Next-G Communications, Inc.*, File No. EB-08-MD-006 (filed August 12, 2008).

⁵ *See APCC Services, Inc. v. Next-G Communications, Inc.*, File No. EB-08-MD-006 ¶¶ 21-27.

⁶ *See APCC Services, Inc. v. Next-G Communications, Inc.*, File No. EB-08-MD-006, Order of Dismissal (released December 5, 2008).

⁷ *See Next-G Order at ¶ 11(d).*

APCC Services' settlement with Next-G was reached during the fourth quarter of 2008, before the dial around payment for the third quarter of 2008 was due.⁸ Next-G did not make that payment, and has failed to pay payphone dial around compensation for every quarter since the third quarter of 2008. APCC Services has repeatedly attempted to get Next-G to pay this compensation on a timely basis, and had intermittent but continuing contact with Next-G in an attempt to collect the compensation and to remind Next-G of its obligations both to pay on a timely basis for current quarters as they came due and to make its payments under the settlement agreement with APCC Services.⁹

During this period, APCC Services, while generally aware from conversations with Next-G's counsel that there was an investigation by the Enforcement Bureau, was unaware of many of the particulars of the investigation or its progress. When the *Next-G Order* was released, APCC Services attempted to contact Next-G again, both through counsel and through its personnel, to remind Next-G of its obligation to pay the now past due compensation for the third quarter of 2008 and the first two quarters of 2009. APCC Services specifically indicated it did not want to be back in a regulatory forum but did want to be paid, and that payment was necessary to avoid further regulatory proceedings. To date, there has been no response to those entreaties.

DISCUSSION

In these circumstances, the Commission cannot grant the Application. The Application was filed solely as a result of the *Next-G Order* and to enable compliance with that order. It would make a mockery of the Commission's Rules for the Application to be granted even while Next-G continue its defiance of the Commission's Rules on payphone compensation. Indeed the predicate of the *Next-G Order* is that Next-G would be in compliance with the Rules. While APCC Services has no knowledge of the negotiations leading to the *Next-G Order*, logic compels the conclusion that the Commission Staff assumed (or was told) there was compliance with the payphone dial around rules by Next-G even though there was not. Indeed the *Next-G*

⁸ Dial around compensation payments are made by carriers on a quarterly basis with a one quarter lag.

⁹ See attached Declaration of Ruth M. Jaeger or APCC Services. APCC Services was in touch quite frequently since Next-G was also constantly late on its payments under the settlement agreement. (Indeed APCC Services ultimately had to sue Next-G to collect the settlement.) On many such occasions, APCC Services reminded Next-G that it was also in arrears on its quarterly dial around payments.


Order specifically addressed compliance with the Section 214 and the payphone Rules in the same compliance paragraph, after requiring specific compliance with the 214 requirements to which the Staff was aware Next-G was not adhering. Had the Staff been aware that there was not compliance with the payphone statute and rules, the *Next-G Order* would have also explicitly required compliance with the payphone compensation statute, as it did with the carrier certification statute and rules.

Moreover, Next-G's failure to bring itself into compliance with the Commission's payphone compensation rules in the face of the *Next-G Order* raises core issues about its qualifications to hold a Commission certificate. Next-G has clearly been aware of its obligations under those rules for a long time. For Next-G to have signed an order requiring compliance even while it was out of compliance surely raises questions as to whether the Commission can rely on Next-G to uphold the high standards of character of Commission grantees.

For these reasons, the Commission should remove the Application from streamlined status until it can investigate the status of Next-G's compliance with the Commission's Rules. Indeed in the circumstances present here, there are even questions as to whether Next-G withheld information or possibly misled Commission Staff as to the status of its compliance with Commission Rules. It would be highly inappropriate for the Commission to grant the Application without further inquiry.

Accordingly, the choices are for the Commission to deny the Application or remove it from streamlined processing while it conducts an appropriate inquiry and gives parties, such as APCC Services, the opportunity to present more facts. APCC Services requests such relief from the Commission.

Respectfully Submitted,



Albert H. Kramer
Dickstein Shapiro LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 420-2200
Fax (202) 420-2201

Attorneys for APCC Services, Inc.

Dated: December 2, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 2, 2009, I caused a copy of the foregoing Comments and Request to Remove From Streamlined Processing or, Alternatively, to Deny the Application, Application No. ITC-214-20091110-00468, to be served by Hand Delivery, E-Mail or First-Class Mail as indicated below, to the following:

(Electronic Filing)
Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

(By E-Mail and First-Class Mail)
Ted A. Cox, P.C.
Attorney at Law
4910 Dacoma, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77092
Ted@Tedacox.com

(Electronic Filing)
IBFS

(By E-Mail and First-Class Mail)
Jonathan S. Marashlian
Helein & Marashlian, LLC, The
CommLaw Group
1483 Chain Bridge Road, Suite 301
McLean, Virginia 22101
jsm@commlawgroup.com

(By E-Mail)
George S. Li
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
George.li@fcc.gov

(By E-Mail)
David Kretch
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
David.kretch@fcc.gov

(By E-Mail)
Hillary DeNigro
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
hillary.denigro@fcc.gov

(By E-Mail)
Genaro Fullano
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
Genaro.fullano@fcc.gov

(By E-Mail)
Tracy Bridgham
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
Tracy.bridgham@fcc.gov



Albert H. Kramer

ATTACHMENT

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)
) File No. ITC-214-20091110-00468
Next-G Communication, Inc.)
)

DECLARATION OF RUTH JAEGER

1. I am President and General Manager of APCC Services, Inc. ("APCC Services"). My business address is 625 Slaters Lane, Suite 104, Alexandria, VA 22314.

2. APCC Services is the leading dial-around compensation billing and collection clearinghouse for independent payphone service providers ("PSPs"). APCC Services acts as the agent of its PSP customers for the billing and collection of dial-around compensation. On behalf of our PSP customers, we invoice and collect dial-around compensation payments on a quarterly basis from the carriers who receive calls from our customers' payphones. In conjunction with our billing and collection efforts, we communicate on a regular basis with our customers, payor carriers, and the carriers' payment clearinghouses.

3. As the President and General Manager of APCC Services, I am familiar with all aspects of APCC Services' operations. I also have had extensive dealings with Next-G and dozens of other Completing Carriers and Intermediate Carriers.

4. Next-G has failed to make the quarterly dial around payment for every quarter since the third quarter of 2008 yet Next-G continues to receive hundreds of thousands of calls from APCC Services customers' payphones.

5. APCC Services has repeatedly attempted to get Next-G to pay this compensation on a timely basis. APCC Services Personnel, including me, have had intermittent but continuing contact with Next-G in an attempt to collect the compensation and to remind Next-G of its

obligations both to pay on a timely basis for current quarters as they came due and to make its payments under the settlement agreement with APCC Services. For example, APCC Services sends all carriers, including Next-G, that it is aware of who may have dial around compensation obligations quarterly statements seeking dial-around compensation on behalf of its PSP customers. When a carrier that APCC Services knows is obligated to pay, such as Next-G, fails to pay on a timely basis, APCC Services invoices that carrier back compensation due when it sends out the current quarter statements. Thus, Next-G received reminders that it was in arrears on its dial around payments. There is also other more intermittent contact between APCC Services personnel and carriers who are in arrears, and such contacts were had with Next-G.


6. APCC Services was also in touch quite frequently since Next-G was also virtually constantly late on its payments under the settlement agreement entered into to resolve APCC Services' formal complaint against APCC Services. (Indeed APCC Services ultimately had to sue Next-G to collect the settlement.) On many of the occasions for such contact, APCC Services reminded Next-G that it was also in arrears on its quarterly dial-around payments.

7. Shortly after the *Next-G Order* was announced, I also made an effort to reach out to Next-G's principal to remind him of the arrearages. I have received no response.

Remainder of this page intentionally left blank.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 2, 2009



Ruth Jaeger, President
APCC Services, Inc

ATTACHMENT

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	File No. EB-05-IH-2010
)	
Next-G Communication, Inc.)	Acct. No. 201032080007
)	
)	FRN No. 0010717874

ORDER

Adopted: November 9, 2009

Released: November 12, 2009

By the Enforcement Bureau:

1. In this Order, we adopt the attached Consent Decree entered into between the Enforcement Bureau ("Bureau") and Next-G Communication, Inc. ("Next-G"). The Consent Decree terminates an investigation by the Bureau against Next-G for possible violations of section 276 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act"),¹ and sections 64.1300, 64.1310(a), and 64.1320 of the Commission's rules,² relating to payphone compensation, and section 214 of the Act³ and section 63.18 of the Commission's rules,⁴ relating to the provision of international telecommunications service.

2. The Bureau and Next-G have negotiated the terms of the Consent Decree that resolve this matter. A copy of the Consent Decree is attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

3. After reviewing the terms of the Consent Decree and evaluating the facts before us, we find that the public interest would be served by adopting the Consent Decree and terminating the investigation.

4. In the absence of material new evidence relating to this matter, we conclude that our investigation raises no substantial or material questions of fact as to whether Next-G possesses the basic qualifications, including those related to character, to hold or obtain any Commission license or authorization.

5. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that, pursuant to section 4(i) of the Act⁵ and sections 0.111 and 0.311 of the Commission's rules,⁶ the Consent Decree attached to this Order **IS ADOPTED**.

6. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the above-captioned investigation **IS TERMINATED**.

¹ 47 U.S.C. § 276.

² 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1300, 64.1310(a), and 64.1320.

³ 47 U.S.C. § 214(a).

⁴ 47 C.F.R. § 63.18.

⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 154(i).

⁶ 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.111, 0.311.

7. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a copy of this Order and Consent Decree shall be sent by first class mail and certified mail, return receipt requested, to Jonathan S. Marashlian, Counsel for Next-G Communication, Inc., 1483 Chain Bridge Road, Suite 301, McLean, VA 22102.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

P. Michele Ellison
Chief, Enforcement Bureau

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	File No. EB-05-IH-2010
)	
)	Acct. No. 201032080007
Next-G Communication, Inc.)	
)	FRN No. 0010717874

CONSENT DECREE

1. The Enforcement Bureau ("Bureau") of the Federal Communications Commission ("Commission" or "FCC") and Next-G Communication, Inc. ("Next-G" or the "Company"), by their authorized representatives, hereby enter into this Consent Decree for the purpose of terminating the Bureau's investigation into whether Next-G violated section 276 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act"),¹ and sections 64.1300, 64.1310(a), and 64.1320 of the Commission's Rules,² relating to payphone compensation, and section 214 of the Act³ and section 63.18 of the Commission's Rules,⁴ relating to the provision of international telecommunications service.

I. DEFINITIONS

2. For the purposes of this Consent Decree, the following definitions shall apply:
- (a) "Act" means the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 151 *et seq.*
 - (b) "Adopting Order" means an Order of the Bureau adopting the terms of this Consent Decree without change, addition, deletion, or modification.
 - (c) "Bureau" means the Enforcement Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission.
 - (d) "Commission" and "FCC" mean the Federal Communications Commission and all of its bureaus and offices.
 - (e) "Compliance Plan" means the program described in this Consent Decree at paragraph 11.
 - (f) "Effective Date" means the date on which the Commission releases the Adopting Order.
 - (g) "Investigation" means the investigation commenced by the Bureau's November 15, 2005 Letter of Inquiry⁵ regarding, among other issues, whether Next-G violated section 276 of

¹ 47 U.S.C. § 276.

² 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1300, 64.1310(a), and 64.1320.

³ 47 U.S.C. § 214(a).

⁴ 47 C.F.R. § 63.18.

⁵ See Letter from Hillary S. DeNigro, Deputy Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, to Zee Ar, President, Next-G Communications, Inc. d/b/a U.S. Comm (Nov. 15, 2005).
Prepared by TheDCOffice.com for the exclusive use of its clients. Other uses are prohibited. -- Page 279/297

the Act⁶ and sections 64.1300, 64.1310, and 64.1320 of the Commission's rules,⁷ relating to payphone compensation.

- (h) "Next-G" or the "Company" means Next-G Communication, Inc. and its predecessors-in-interest and successors-in-interest.
- (i) "Parties" means Next-G Communication, Inc. and the Bureau.
- (j) "Rules" means the Commission's regulations found in Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
- (k) "Telecommunications" or "Telecommunications service" means telecommunications or telecommunications service as defined in sections 3(43) and 3(46) of the Act, respectively, 47 U.S.C. §§ 153(43), 153(46).

II. BACKGROUND

3. Pursuant to section 276 of the Act,⁸ the Commission has developed rules to ensure that all payphone service providers ("PSPs") are fairly compensated for each and every completed intrastate and interstate call using their payphones.⁹ As a general matter, the rules require "Completing Carriers" to compensate PSPs for completed payphone calls at a rate agreed upon by contract,¹⁰ or, in the absence of such an agreement, "at a per-call rate of \$.494."¹¹ A "Completing Carrier" is defined as "a long distance carrier or switch-based long distance reseller that completes a coinless access code or subscriber toll-free payphone call or a local exchange carrier that completes a local, coinless access code or subscriber toll-free payphone call."¹²

4. Unless the PSP consents to an alternative compensation arrangement, Completing Carriers must compensate PSPs in accordance with procedures specified in sections 64.1310(a) and 64.1320 of the Commission's rules.¹³ Those procedures require that the Completing Carrier, among other things: (1) establish a call tracking system that accurately tracks all toll-free payphone calls to completion;¹⁴ (2)

⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 276.

⁷ 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1300, 64.1310(a), and 64.1320.

⁸ 47 U.S.C. § 276(b)(1)(A).

⁹ See *Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 20541 (1996) (subsequent history omitted) ("First Payphone Order"). The Commission's current rules were adopted in 2003, and subsequently modified in 2004. See *Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Second Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 19975 (2003) (subsequent history omitted) ("Second Payphone Order"); *Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Order on Reconsideration, 19 FCC Rcd 21457 (2004) (subsequent history omitted) ("Payphone Reconsideration Order").

¹⁰ 47 C.F.R. § 64.1300(b).

¹¹ *Id.* at § 64.1300(d).

¹² *Id.* at § 64.1300(a).

¹³ *Id.* at §§ 64.1310(a), 64.1320.

¹⁴ *Id.* at § 64.1310(a)(1).

engage a third-party auditor who will verify that the call tracking system complies with the Commission's requirements, prepare a "System Audit Report" to be filed with the Commission, and verify the Completing Carrier's continuing compliance with the requirements annually thereafter;¹⁵ and (3) on a quarterly basis, compensate all PSPs for each completed coinless access code or subscriber toll-free payphone call, timely submit to each PSP a call data report that contains certain information about the calls the Completing Carrier completed from that PSP's payphone(s) during the quarter, and provide a sworn statement from its chief financial officer to each PSP certifying that the compensation paid for a quarter is accurate and complete.¹⁶

5. Section 214(a) of the Act prohibits any carrier from constructing, extending, or operating any line, and from engaging in transmission through any such line, "unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity" require, or will require, the construction, extension, or operation of the line.¹⁷ Section 63.18 of the Commission's rules requires that any carrier seeking to provide international telecommunications service apply for and obtain an international section 214 authorization prior to providing such service.¹⁸ The application requirement applies to carriers that resell the service of another authorized carrier.¹⁹

6. Next-G is a Texas-based telecommunications carrier that has provided pre-paid calling cards and international termination services since at least 2002.²⁰ On November 15, 2005 and February 28, 2006, the Bureau sent Next-G letters of inquiry ("LOIs") seeking certain documents and information related to the company's compliance with the payphone compensation rules.²¹ On December 21, 2005 and March 27, 2006, respectively, Next-G responded to the LOIs.²² At the request of Commission staff, Next-G thereafter supplemented the record several times regarding its compliance with the Commission's payphone compensation rules.²³ Next-G and the Bureau have executed several tolling agreements to date.²⁴

¹⁵ *Id.* at § 64.1320.

¹⁶ *Id.* at § 64.1310(a)(2)-(4).

¹⁷ 47 U.S.C. § 214(a).

¹⁸ 47 C.F.R. § 63.18.

¹⁹ *Id.*, at § 63.18(e)(2).

²⁰ Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, The Helein Law Group, P.C., counsel for Next-G, to Hillary DeNigro and Raelynn Tibayan Remy, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (Dec. 21, 2005), at 2 ("December 2005 LOI Response").

²¹ Letter from Hillary S. DeNigro, Deputy Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, to Zee Ar, President, Next-G Communications, Inc. d/b/a U.S. Comm (Nov. 15, 2005); Letter from Hillary S. DeNigro, Deputy Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, to Jonathan S. Marashlian, The Helein Law Group, P.C., counsel for Next-G (Feb. 28, 2006).

²² See December 2005 LOI Response; Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, The Helein Law Group, P.C., counsel for Next-G, to Hillary DeNigro and Raelynn Tibayan Remy, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (Mar. 27, 2006), at 2.

²³ See, e.g., Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, The Helein Law Group, P.C., counsel for Next-G, to Hillary DeNigro and Raelynn Tibayan Remy, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (May 5, 2006); Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, The Helein Law Group, P.C., counsel for Next-G, to Hillary DeNigro and Raelynn Tibayan Remy, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (July 14, 2006); Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, The Helein Law Group, P.C., counsel for Next-G, to Hillary DeNigro and Raelynn Tibayan Remy, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (Nov. 8, 2006); Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, Helein & Marashlian, LLC, counsel for Next-G, to Hillary DeNigro and Raelynn Tibayan Remy, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (Jan. 3, 2007); Letter from

III. TERMS OF AGREEMENT

7. **Adopting Order.** The Parties agree that the provisions of this Consent Decree shall be subject to final approval by the Bureau by incorporation of such provisions by reference in the Adopting Order without change, addition, modification, or deletion.

8. **Jurisdiction.** Next-G agrees that the Bureau has jurisdiction over it and the matters contained in this Consent Decree and has the authority to enter into and adopt this Consent Decree.

9. **Effective Date: Violations.** The Parties agree that this Consent Decree shall become effective on the date on which the FCC releases the Adopting Order. Upon release, the Adopting Order and this Consent Decree shall have the same force and effect as any other Bureau Order. Any violation of the Adopting Order or of the terms of this Consent Decree shall constitute a separate violation of a Bureau Order, entitling the Bureau to exercise any rights and remedies attendant to the enforcement of a Commission Order.

10. **Termination of Investigation.** In express reliance on the covenants and representations in this Consent Decree and to avoid further expenditure of public resources, the Bureau agrees to terminate its investigation. In consideration for the termination of said investigation, Next-G agrees to the terms, conditions, and procedures contained herein. The Bureau further agrees that in the absence of new material evidence, the Bureau will not use the facts developed in this investigation through the Effective Date of the Consent Decree, or the existence of this Consent Decree, to institute, on its own motion, any new proceeding, formal or informal, or take any action on its own motion against Next-G concerning the

Jonathan S. Marashlian, Helein & Marashlian, LLC, counsel for Next-G, to Hillary DeNigro and Raelynn Tibayan Remy, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (Nov. 9, 2007); Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, Helein & Marashlian, LLC, counsel for Next-G, to Hillary DeNigro and Raelynn Tibayan Remy, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (Nov. 19, 2007); Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, Helein & Marashlian, LLC, counsel for Next-G, to Trent Harkrader, Deputy Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, (Jan. 29, 2008); Letter from Jonathan S. Marashlian, Helein & Marashlian, LLC, counsel for Next-G, to Vickie Robinson and Chin Yoo, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (Dec. 29, 2008).

²⁴ Tolling Agreement, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, executed on June 29, 2006, by and between Christopher Olsen, Deputy Chief, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (on behalf of Kris Monteith, Chief, Enforcement Bureau, FCC) and Jonathan Marashlian, Counsel to Next-G; Tolling Agreement Extension, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, executed on September 19, 2006, by and between Gene Fullano, Deputy Chief, Enforcement Bureau, FCC (on behalf of Kris Monteith, Chief, Enforcement Bureau, FCC), and Jonathan Marashlian, Counsel to Next-G; Tolling Agreement Extension, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, executed on December 13, 2006, by and between Kris Monteith, Chief, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, and Jonathan Marashlian, Counsel to Next-G; Tolling Agreement Extension, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, executed on March 16, 2007, by and between Kris Monteith, Chief, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, and Jonathan Marashlian, Counsel to Next-G; Tolling Agreement Extension, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, executed on June 7, 2007, by and between Hillary S. DeNigro, Deputy Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, and Ted A. Cox, Counsel to Next-G; Tolling Agreement Extension, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, executed on June 12, 2009, by and between Trent B. Harkrader, Deputy Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, and Jonathan Marashlian, Counsel to Next-G; Tolling Agreement Extension, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, executed on August 14, 2009, by and between Hillary S. DeNigro, Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, and Jonathan Marashlian, Counsel to Next-G; Tolling Agreement Extension, File No. EB-05-IH-2010, executed on October 8, 2009, by and between Hillary S. DeNigro, Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, FCC, and Jonathan Marashlian, Counsel to Next-G.

matters that were the subject of the investigation. The Bureau also agrees that it will not use the facts developed in this investigation through the Effective Date of this Consent Decree, or the existence of this Consent Decree, to institute on its own motion any proceeding, formal or informal, or take any action on its own motion against Next-G with respect to Next-G's basic qualifications, including its character qualifications, to be a Commission licensee or authorized common carrier.

11. **Compliance Plan.** For purposes of settling the matters set forth herein, Next-G agrees to create within thirty (30) calendar days from the Effective Date a Compliance Plan related to future compliance with the provisions of the Act, the Rules, and the Commission's Orders. The Plan will include, at a minimum, the following components:

- (a) **"Red Light" Status.** Next-G will submit all outstanding payments due to the Commission and file such documents as are necessary to remove Next-G's "red light" status²⁵ within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date.
- (b) **International Section 214 Authorization.** Next-G will take all steps necessary within sixty (60) days of the Effective Date to obtain section 214 authority for its provision of international telecommunications service.
- (c) **Compliance Officer.** Next-G will designate a Compliance Officer that will be responsible for implementing and administering the Compliance Plan and serve as the point of contact for all FCC compliance matters.
- (d) **Compliance Training Program.** The Compliance Officer will be responsible for ensuring that any Next-G employee who engages in activities related to the FCC's payphone compensation and section 214 authorization requirements receives FCC compliance training. Such training will be completed within ninety (90) days of the Effective Date and any new employees will receive training within thirty (30) days of their employment.
- (e) **Review and Monitoring.** Next-G will review its FCC Compliance Training Program annually to ensure that it is maintained in a proper manner and continues to address the objectives set forth therein.
- (f) **Compliance Reports.** Next-G will file compliance reports with the Commission ninety (90) days after the Effective Date, twelve (12) months after the Effective Date, twenty-four (24) months after the Effective Date, and thirty-six (36) months after the Effective Date. Each compliance report shall include a compliance certificate from an officer, as an agent of Next-G, stating that the officer has personal knowledge that Next-G has established operating procedures intended to ensure compliance with this Consent Decree and outlining within that statement the basis for the officer's compliance certification. All compliance reports shall be submitted to Division Chief, Investigations and Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.
- (g) **Termination Date.** Unless stated otherwise, the requirements of this Consent Decree will expire thirty-six (36) months after the Effective Date.

²⁵ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.1910.

12. **Section 208 Complaints: Subsequent Investigations.** Nothing in this Consent Decree shall prevent the Commission or its delegated authority from adjudicating complaints filed pursuant to section 208 of the Act against Next-G or its affiliates for alleged violations of the Act, or for any other type of alleged misconduct, regardless of when such misconduct took place. The Commission's adjudication of any such complaint will be based solely on the record developed in that proceeding. Except as expressly provided in this Consent Decree, this Consent Decree shall not prevent the Commission from investigating new evidence of noncompliance by Next-G of the Act, the Rules, or any Commission Order.

13. **Voluntary Contribution.** Next-G agrees that it will make a voluntary contribution to the United States Treasury in the amount of two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00), with an initial payment of thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000.00) and the remainder paid in thirty-six (36) equal monthly installments of six thousand one hundred eleven dollars and twelve cents (\$6,111.12). The initial payment of \$30,000.00 shall be made within thirty (30) days after the Effective Date, and the monthly installments thereafter shall be made by the thirtieth (30th) day of each month following payment of the initial payment. Each payment must be made by check or similar instrument, payable to the order of the Federal Communications Commission. The payment must include the Account Number and FRN Number referenced in the caption to the Adopting Order. Payment by check or money order may be mailed to Federal Communications Commission, P.O. Box 979088, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000. Payment by overnight mail may be sent to U.S. Bank – Government Lockbox #979088, SL-MO-C2-GL, 1005 Convention Plaza, St. Louis, MO 63101. Payment by wire transfer may be made to ABA Number 021030004, receiving bank Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and account number 27000001. Next-G will also send an electronic notification within forty-eight (48) hours of the date of said payment to Chin Yoo at Chin.Yoo@fcc.gov.

14. **Waivers.** Next-G waives any and all rights it may have to seek administrative or judicial reconsideration, review, appeal, or stay, or to otherwise challenge or contest the validity of this Consent Decree and the Adopting Order, provided the Bureau issues the Adopting Order without change, addition, modification, or deletion. Next-G shall retain the right to challenge Commission interpretation of the Consent Decree or any terms contained herein. If either Party (or the United States on behalf of the Commission) brings a judicial action to enforce the terms of the Adopting Order, neither Next-G nor the Commission shall contest the validity of the Consent Decree or the Adopting Order, and Next-G shall waive any statutory right to a trial *de novo*. Next-G hereby agrees to waive any claims it may otherwise have under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. § 504 and 47 C.F.R. § 1.1501 *et seq.*, relating to the matters addressed in this Consent Decree.

15. **Subsequent Rule or Order.** The Parties agree that if any provision of the Consent Decree conflicts with any subsequent Rule or Order adopted by the Commission (except an order specifically intended to revise the terms of this Consent Decree to which Next-G does not expressly consent) that provision will be superseded by such Commission Rule or Order.

16. **Successors and Assigns.** Next-G agrees that the provisions of this Consent Decree shall be binding on its successors, assigns, and transferees.

17. **Final Settlement.** The Parties agree and acknowledge that this Consent Decree shall constitute a final settlement between the Parties. The Parties further agree that this Consent Decree does not constitute either an adjudication on the merits or a factual or legal finding or determination regarding any compliance or noncompliance with the requirements of the Act, the Rules, and the Commission's Orders.

Federal Communications Commission


DA 09-2068

18. Modifications. This Consent Decree cannot be modified without the advance written consent of both Parties.


19. Paragraph Headings. The headings of the paragraphs in this Consent Decree are inserted for convenience only and are not intended to affect the meaning or interpretation of this Consent Decree.

20. Authorized Representative. Each party represents and warrants to the other that it has full power and authority to enter into this Consent Decree.

21. Counterparts. This Consent Decree may be signed in any number of counterparts (including by facsimile), each of which, when executed and delivered, shall be an original, and all of which counterparts together shall constitute one and the same fully executed instrument.


Michele Ellison
Chief, Enforcement Bureau

November 9, 2009
Date


Zulfiqar AR
Vice President
Next-G Communication, Inc.

October 9, 2009
Date