BEFORE

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF

SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 89-638-C - ORDER NO. 91-1113

DECEMBER 12, 1991

IN RE: Application of Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company for Approval of Revisions to its General Subscriber Services Tariff (Caller ID)	) ORDER) GRANTING) MOTION TO) CONSIDER) PER-CALL AND) PER-LINE) BLOCKING

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission) by way of Motion filed on behalf of Steven W. Hamm, Consumer Advocate for the State of South Carolina (the Consumer Advocate) requesting the Commission to consider per-call and per-line blocking options for customers of Southern Bell when Caller ID and other similar services are approved for implementation in South Carolina. Southern Bell filed a Return in Opposition to the Motion of the Consumer Advocate.

The Commission has considered both the Motion of the Consumer Advocate and the reasons in support thereof and the Return in Opposition filed by Southern Bell and its reasons in opposition to granting the Motion. After duly considering of the reasons for and the reasons in opposition to the Motion, the Commission has determined that based on the following reasons, that the Consumer

Advocate's Motion to consider the issue of per-call and per-line blocking in the instant docket should be granted.

The Consumer Advocate alleges in its Motion that since the Commission's initial Orders in this proceeding in 1990, other Southern Bell service areas have had occasion to examine and rule on the issue of Caller ID blocking. The Consumer Advocate alleges that new evidence and developments regarding the provision of per-call and per-line blocking for customers of Southern Bell should be considered in the proceeding on rehearing which has now been rescheduled to commence January 6, 1992. The Consumer Advocate cites decisions by the North Carolina Public Utilities Commission, the Florida Public Service Commission and the Georgia Public Service Commission as having ruled on the issue of Caller ID and the issues of per-call or per-line blocking.

Additionally, the Consumer Advocate states that subsequent to the Commission's initial Orders in this proceeding in 1990, there have been other developments on a nationwide basis regarding the issue of Caller ID blocking. The Consumer Advocate cites a U.S. Senate Bill which is pending before Congress that would impact the provision of Caller ID and the blocking of telephone numbers. The Consumer Advocate cites other jurisdictions such as Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia as either considering or offering free per-call blocking for Caller ID service.

While the Commission is aware that in the previous proceeding and in Order No. 90-428, we denied the Consumer Advocate's request that blocking be required as a condition precedent to the service

being offered, subsequent events in other jurisdictions now cause the Commission to allow the issue of per-call and per-line blocking to be raised in this proceeding. The Commission is aware that initially, in Order No. 90-530, it limited the purpose of this rehearing to considering the rates charged for residential and business customers with Caller ID. However, the current events and decisions concerning Caller ID in other jurisdictions cause the Commission to want to at least consider the issue and hear evidence on the advantages and disadvantages of per-call and per-line blocking. The addition of this issue will not delay the proceeding and by the addition of this issue, the Commission is in no way indicating that it is predisposed to grant Caller ID with per-call or per-line blocking. Southern Bell cites several jurisdictions in the country where Caller ID service has been provided without blocking and there have been no complaints by the customers in those states. Southern Bell is entitled to present evidence during the hearing concerning those jurisdictions in support of its position, as well as any other evidence it wishes to present on the issue.

Therefore, the Commission grants the Motion of the Consumer Advocate to consider the issue of per-call and per-line blocking for the customers of Southern Bell regarding Caller ID service during the hearing scheduled for this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

Marjorie Amos-Frazier
Chairman

ATTEST:

Charles W. Dalton
Executive Director

(SEAL)