

factors applicable to Account 2121 likely will not change, and an extensive analysis of the buildings account probably will not be necessary within the next few years. In the interim, we believe that the data required under the streamlined study procedures will be adequate, and will allow price cap LECs to submit only these data for the buildings account.

15. Under our depreciation prescription process, one-third of the carriers for which we prescribe rates have their rates reviewed each year. LECs scheduled for review in 1996 and 1997 may file for changes in their

depreciation rates in 1995 as long as they use basic factors within the ranges we have selected and ranges chosen are consistent with their operations. These carriers must file these depreciation rate changes by July 1, 1995.

Ordering Clauses

16. Accordingly, it is ordered, pursuant to Section 4(i), 201-205 and 220(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 201-205 and 220(b), that the ranges for the future net salvage and the projection life factors for the accounts listed in the Appendix are Hereby Adopted as specified in the Appendix.

17. It is Further Ordered, that this order is effective thirty days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

18. It is Further Ordered, that carriers may use the ranges established herein for federal filing purposes prior to the effective date of this order.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 43

Communication common carriers, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Telephone.

Federal Communications Commission.

LaVera F. Marshall,
Acting Secretary.

APPENDIX.—ACCOUNTS AND RANGES

| Account No. | Account Name | Depreciation rate category | Projection life range (years) | | Future net salvage range (percent) | |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|------|
| | | | Low | High | Low | High |
| 2220 | Digital switching | Digital switching | 16 | 18 | 0 | 5 |
| 2220 | Operator systems | Combined | 8 | 12 | 0 | 5 |
| 2232 | Circuit equipment | Digital | 11 | 13 | 0 | 5 |
| 2411 | Poles | Poles | 25 | 35 | -75 | -50 |
| 2421 | Aerial cable | Metallic | 20 | 26 | -35 | -10 |
| 2423 | Buried cable | Metallic | 20 | 26 | -10 | 0 |
| 2426 | Intrabuilding network cable | Metallic | 20 | 25 | -30 | -5 |
| 2426 | Intrabuilding network cable | Non-metallic | 25 | 30 | -15 | 0 |

[FR Doc. 95-13565 Filed 6-1-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 61

[CC Docket No. 94-97, Phase I, FCC No. 95-200]

Local Exchange Carriers' Rates, Terms, and Conditions for Expanded Interconnection Through Virtual Collocation for Special Access and Switched Transport

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this Order, the Commission concludes that most of the local exchange carriers failed to demonstrate that the overhead loading levels established in their virtual collocation tariffs are just and reasonable. The Commission, therefore, finds these rates to be unlawful. In order to facilitate efficient entry into the interstate access service market, the Commission prescribes the maximum permissible overhead loading levels for virtual collocation rates. The intended effect of this action is to foster increased competition in the interstate access service market and to benefit consumers through increased efficiency, broader

access to services, reduced rates, and more rapid deployment of new technologies.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 5, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy Glatter or Mika Savir, (202) 418-1530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 11, 1995, the Commission adopted and released a Report and Order in CC Docket No. 94-97, Phase I, after reviewing local exchange carriers' (LECs') direct cases, opposition, and rebuttals in the matter of LECs' Rates, Terms, and Conditions for Expanded Interconnection through Virtual Collocation for Special Access and Switched Transport. The Commission concluded that most LECs have not justified their proposed overhead loadings, and that these LECs' rates for virtual collocation service are therefore unlawful.

In order to advance the competitive goals of this Commission's new mandatory collocation policy, we prescribed in this Order the maximum permissible overhead loading levels for these LECs' virtual collocations rates.

We prescribed on a permanent basis the maximum permissible overhead loading levels for virtual collocation rates filed by Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies, BellSouth

Telecommunications, Inc., GTE System Telephone Companies and GTE Telephone Operating Companies, United and Central Telephone Companies, and US West Communications, Inc. In addition, we prescribed on an interim basis the maximum permissible overhead loading levels for Southwestern Bell pending resolution of the carrier's request for confidential treatment of its cost support data. At the completion of our investigation, we will prescribe on a permanent basis just and reasonable overhead loading levels for SWB.

Finally, we affirmed on an interim basis the Common Carrier Bureau's earlier conclusion that the overhead loading levels of Ameritech Operating Companies and Cincinnati Bell Telephone Companies appear to comport with the Commission's overhead loading standard, pending resolution of these carrier's request for confidential treatment of their direct case cost support data.

The full text of this item is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239) of the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20554. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from

the Commission's duplicating contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc., 2100 M Street, NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037, (202) 857-3800.

List of Subjects of 47 CFR Part 61

Communications common carriers, Report and recordkeeping requirements.

Federal Communications Commission.

LaVera F. Marshall,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-13641 Filed 6-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 64

[CC Docket No. 91-281, FCC 95-187]

Calling Number Identification Service—Caller ID

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: On May 5, 1995, the Commission adopted an Order on Reconsideration (Reconsideration) and a Second Report and Order (Second R&O). Pursuant to the Reconsideration and Second R&O (collectively called Order), this document amends rules regarding the federal model for Caller ID. This action fosters development of new technologies while at the same time protecting privacy expectations of people making and receiving calls.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Sections 64.1600 and 64.1602 are effective April 12, 1995. Sections 64.1601 and 64.1603 are effective December 1, 1995, except Sections 64.1601 and 64.1603 do not apply to public payphones and partylines until January 1, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marian Gordon (202/634-4215) or Mike Specht (202/634-1816), Domestic Facilities Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This summarizes the Commission's Reconsideration and Second R&O in the matter of Rules and Policies Regarding Calling Number Identification Service—Caller ID, (CC Docket 91-281, adopted May 4, 1995, and released May 5, 1995). The file is available for inspection and copying during the weekday hours of 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the Commission's Reference Center, room 239, 1919 M St., NW., Washington DC, or copies may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, ITS, Inc. 2100 M St., NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037, phone (202/857-3800).

Analysis of Proceeding

On October 23, 1991, the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), summarized at 59 FR 18318 (April 18, 1994), seeking to develop effective policies to govern interstate calling party number (CPN) based services such as Caller ID. CPN based services are services depending on capabilities that are possible with new, out-of-band signalling techniques, the most recent being Signalling System Seven (SS7). The Commission found that as interexchange and local exchange carriers deploy SS7 and interconnect their signalling networks, interstate CPN-based services become possible. The Commission tentatively concluded that these new interstate services (the most widely known is Caller ID) would serve the public interest, but that federal policies had to be established to resolve uncertainties that appeared to be impeding their development. In particular, it identified billing issues among different carriers involved in passing CPN and varying state policies on the privacy rights of the parties on interstate calls as needing clarification.

On March 29, 1994, the Commission affirmed its tentative conclusion that interstate passage of CPN is in the public interest because, consistent with the statutory intent underlying Sections 1 and 7 of the Communications Act, it makes many new services and efficiencies possible. The Commission adopted a federal model to govern interstate transport and delivery of CPN, based largely on the proposals in the NPRM. The federal model included the following principles: (1) When a carrier uses SS7 to set up a call, it must transmit CPN and its associated privacy indicator for that call to connecting carriers; (2) calling parties should be able to conceal their number on an interstate call by dialing *67, and know that if they do not dial *67 their number may be revealed; (3) carriers in the transmission chain must honor the calling party's privacy election; (4) carriers may not charge connecting carriers for passage of CPN because its incremental costs are *de minimis*; (5) carriers may not charge calling parties for providing them the ability to conceal CPN by using *67, and must educate subscribers how to maintain confidentiality; (6) customers of charge number services such as 800 generally may not reuse charge number information without the permission of the calling party (charge number in SS7 technology is equivalent to Automatic Number Identification (ANI) that identifies a calling number in the older

multifrequency signalling technology); and (7) states are preempted from having policies that interfere with the federal policy.

In addition to articulating the principles that govern the federal caller ID model, the Commission sought further comment on whether it should prescribe precise requirements regarding exactly how carriers should educate consumers about maintaining privacy on CPN services and whether and how the policies it adopted should be extended to other identification services, such as calling party name. On March 17, 1995, the Commission stayed the effective date of Sections 1601 (CPN passage and privacy) and 1603 (education) of the rules.

In the order adopted May 4, 1994, the Commission considered petitions for reconsideration of its decision, addressed comments filed in response to the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and issued a Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to resolve issues raised by Private Branch Exchange (PBX) telephone services and private payphones in connection with CPN. The order affirms the Commission's fundamental finding that federal policies to govern the passage of Calling Party Number (CPN) over interstate facilities are necessary because uncertainty created by their absence impedes the development of potentially valuable CPN based interstate services. The order also resolves areas of uncertainty identified on reconsideration, including financial issues involving interstate passage of CPN and varying state requirements concerning the privacy rights of calling and called parties on interstate calls. It addresses comments filed in response to the Further Notice concerning application of federal Caller ID rules to other CPN based services and Commission prescribed educational requirements to support consumer use of Caller ID services. Finally, the Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeks comment on a reasonable timeframe for bringing PBX systems and private payphones into compliance with our rules.

Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*, the Commission's final analysis in this Order on Reconsideration and Second Report and Order is as follows:

I. Need and Purpose of This Action

This Order on Reconsideration and Second Report and Order amends the Commission's rules to require that the privacy requests of calling parties are