July 24, 2015

VIA ECFS

Marlene H. Dortch, Esq.
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Applications of AT&T Inc. and DIRECTV for Consent To Assign or Transfer Control of Licenses and Authorizations, MB Docket No. 14-90, NOTICE OF ORAL EX PARTE PRESENTATION

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On July 23, 2015, Robert Quinn, Jr., Senior Vice President—Federal Regulatory, and David Lawson, Senior Vice President and Assistant General Counsel, of AT&T Inc. (“AT&T”); and Maureen Jeffreys, of Arnold & Porter LLP, had a telephone conference with Jamillia Ferris, Joel Rabinovitz, and Brendan Holland to discuss certain confidential materials submitted by AT&T in the above-referenced proceeding. In addition, Mr. Quinn and Ms. Jeffreys had a second telephone conference with Mr. Rabinovitz and Mr. Holland. During the calls, AT&T agreed that it no longer claims confidentiality with respect to the following items:

1. Consumer surplus estimates contained in the simulation analysis performed by Professor Michael Katz.
2. The number of cable programming channels that AT&T carries.
3. The titles of spreadsheets filed in this proceeding that do not reveal Confidential or Highly Confidential Information.
4. The number of DMAs® where AT&T offers U-verse video service.¹
5. The fact that AT&T entered into an interconnection agreement with GTT Corporation, Inc., which was announced on June 30, 2015.²

¹ DMA® is a registered trademark of The Nielsen Company. Used under license.

²
6. The second sentence of the first paragraph of page 21 of the paper entitled “Why the ‘Double Moral Hazard’ Problem Cannot Be Resolved by Contract” (November 12, 2014).

7. The first sentence of the second paragraph of page 10 of the paper entitled “Additional Evidence That Video and Broadband Are Complements” (November 12, 2014) (but not the footnotes thereto).

8. In the paper entitled “Additional Detail on Demand Estimation, Merger Simulation, and Investment Model Analysis Performed by Professor Katz” (July 28, 2104), (i) footnote 45; and (ii) paragraph 50 (but not the footnotes thereto).

9. In the paper entitled “Overview of AT&T FTTP Investment Model” (July 28, 2014), (i) the second paragraph on page 5; and (ii) the first sentence of footnote 8.

10. In the Declaration of Michael Katz (June 11, 2014), (i) paragraph 127 (but not the footnotes thereto); (ii) the second sentence of paragraph 36.

11. The general statement that AT&T’s FTTP Investment Model relies upon various assumptions, including prices, expenses, capital costs, penetration rates, churn, taxes, and depreciation.

12. The fact that AT&T provides U-verse service in Chicago and does not provide U-verse service in Phoenix.

13. The number of broadband and video providers identified by the web-scrape relied upon in the economic analysis performed by Professors Haile and Berry.

Footnote continued from previous page

In accordance with section 1.1206 of the Commission’s rules, this letter is being filed electronically with your office for inclusion in the public record.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen R. Jeffreys
Counsel for AT&T Inc.

cc (via email): Daniel Ball, Esq.
Jim Bird, Esq.
Jamillia Ferris, Esq.
Brendan Holland, Esq.
Ms. Vanessa Lemmé
Joel Rabinovitz, Esq.
Christopher Sova, Esq.
Best Copy and Printing, Inc.

3 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206.