ATTACHMENT 1

Answer to Question 10

Rule 63.18 (c) Contact Information:

All correspondence and other communications concerning this application should be directed to:

John L. Clark Goodin, MacBride, Squeri Day & Lamprey, LLP 505 Sansome Street, 9th Floor San Francisco, California 94111

Tel: 415-765-8443 Fax: 415-398-4321

E-mail: <u>jclark@goodinmacbride.com</u>

Rule 63.18 (d) Authorizations

Blue Casa Telephone, LLC holds authority to provide global facilities-based and global resale services under File No. ITC-20030602-00265. (Blue Casa also holds blanket domestic operating authority pursuant to Rule 63.01, 47 C.F.R. § 63.01.) Neither Mr. Compton nor Mr. Brand hold any telecommunications operating authority or license.

Answer to Question 11

Rule 63.18(h) Ownership

(1) <u>Ownership of Blue Casa</u>: The following persons and entities currently hold 10% or greater direct ownership or control interests in Blue Casa Telephone, LLC, which is a California limited liability company:

Name and Address	Citizenship	Principal Business	Percentage Direct Ownership of Blue Casa
Jeff Compton 114 E. Haley Street, Suite A Santa Barbara, CA 93101	United States	Telecommunications Management	49%
Howard Brand 1732 Aviation Blvd., Suite 223 Redondo Beach, CA 90278	United States	Investment Manager	51%

No other person or entity holds or is attributed with a 10% or greater direct or

indirect ownership or control interest in Blue Casa and there are no interlocking directorships with any foreign carrier.

Answer to Question 13

Description of Transaction

This application seeks approval for the transfer of direct control of Blue Casa Telephone, LLC ("BCT") to two individuals, Jeff Compton (FRN 0024575094) and Howard Brand (FRN 0024575086).

BCT commenced operations in 2011, after acquiring the customer base and associated assets of Blue Casa Communications, Inc. ("BCC") via an assignment for the benefit of creditors. The assets acquired by BCT included BCC's International 214 operating authority, ITC-214-20030602-00265. The assignment of BCC's assets, including the 214 license, was authorized by the Commission under File No. ITC-ASG-20110204-00043.

At the time of the acquisition, BCT was a wholly-owned subsidiary of TCAST Communications, Inc. ("TCAST"), but under the day-to-day management of Mr. Compton and Mr. Brand. Approximately ten months later, ownership and control of BCT was acquired by Mr. Compton and Mr. Brand in exchange for cash payment, with Mr. Compton obtaining a 49% ownership interest and Mr. Brand obtaining a 51% ownership interest, but with Mr. Compton and Mr. Brand sharing control as limited liability company members. This transfer had been contemplated at the time of the BCC assignment but, for logistical reasons, ownership and control of BCT was maintained by TCAST on an interim basis. An application for approval of the transfer of control was filed with the California Public Utilities Commission in August 2011, and a decision granting the application was issued on February 1, 2012, with the transaction being consummated shortly thereafter. Although Mr. Brand and Mr. Compton were represented by an experienced, now-retired telecommunications attorney, the need to obtain Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") approval of the change in control was inadvertently overlooked, for reasons that are unknown at this time.

This oversight was discovered on May 4, 2014, following an inquiry by FCC International Bureau staff in connection with a very recently-filed, unrelated application for approval of a transfer of the customer base of Telscape Communications, Inc. to BCT.

Answer to Question 20

Rule 63.18(p) Streamlined Processing

This application is eligible for streamlined processing under Section 63.12 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR § 63.12. because none of the exceptions to streamlined processing specified by paragraph (c) of Section 63.12 applies. (This application is eligible for streamlined processing under Section 63.03 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR § 63.03, because the

¹ TCAST Communications, Inc. ceased operations after filing for bankruptcy in 2013.

proposed transaction would result in the transferee having a less than 10% share in the interstate, interexchange market, the transferee would provide competitive telephone exchange services or exchange services, if any, exclusively in geographic areas served by a dominant local exchange carrier that is not a party to the transactions, and none of the applicants is dominant with respect to any service. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 63.03(b)(2)(i).