

FULLNET COMMUNICATIONS INC

Form 10-K

March 31, 2009

**Table of Contents**

**UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20549  
FORM 10-K**

**(Mark One)**

**ANNUAL REPORT UNDER SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

**For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2008**

**TRANSITION REPORT UNDER SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

**For the transition period from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_**

**Commission File Number: 000-27031  
FULLNET COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
(Name of small business issuer in its Charter)**

**OKLAHOMA**

**73-1473361**

**(State or other jurisdiction of  
incorporation or organization)**

**(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)**

**201 Robert S. Kerr Avenue, Suite 210  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102  
(Address of principal executive offices)  
(405) 236-8200**

**(Issuer's telephone number)**

**Securities registered under Section 12(b) of the Act: None**

**Securities registered under to Section 12(g) of the Act:**

Title of class

Common Stock, \$0.00001 Par Value

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes  No

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or 15 (d) of the Exchange Act.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act during the past 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports) and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes  No

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K (§229.405 of this Chapter) is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of the registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a small reporting company.

Large accelerated filer

Accelerated filer

Non-accelerated filer

Smaller reporting company

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes  No

Edgar Filing: FULLNET COMMUNICATIONS INC - Form 10-K

The aggregate market value of the Common Stock held by non-affiliates computed by reference to the price at which the Common Stock was last sold, or the average bid and asked price of the Common Stock, as of the last business day (June 30, 2008) of registrant's completed second quarter was \$220,409.

As of March 27, 2009, 7,425,565 shares of the registrant's common stock, \$0.00001 par value, were outstanding.

---

**FULLNET COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**  
**FORM 10-K**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended December 31, 2008  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**PART I.**

<u>Item 1. Business</u>	4
<u>Item 1A. Risk Factors</u>	11
<u>Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	13
<u>Item 2. Properties</u>	13
<u>Item 3. Legal Proceedings</u>	13
<u>Item 4. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders</u>	13

**PART II.**

<u>Item 5. Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u>	14
<u>Item 6. Selected Financial Data</u>	15
<u>Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	15
<u>Item 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u>	20
<u>Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplemental Data</u>	20
<u>Item 9. Changes in and Disagreements With Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	20
<u>Item 9A. Controls and Procedures</u>	21
<u>Item 9A(T). Controls and Procedures</u>	21
<u>Item 9B. Other Information</u>	21

**PART III.**

<u>Item 10. Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u>	22
<u>Item 11. Executive Compensation</u>	23
	25

<u>Item 12. Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u>	
<u>Item 13. Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence</u>	26
<u>Item 14. Principal Accounting Fees and Services</u>	26
<u>Item 15. Exhibits, Financial Statement Schedules</u>	27
<u>SIGNATURES</u>	31
<u>Exhibit 31.1</u>	
<u>Exhibit 31.2</u>	
<u>Exhibit 32.1</u>	
<u>Exhibit 32.2</u>	

**Table of Contents**

Throughout this report the first personal plural pronoun in the nominative case form *we* and its objective case form *us*, its possessive and the intensive case forms *our* and *ourselves* and its reflexive form *ourselves* refer collectively to Fullnet Communications, Inc. and its subsidiaries, and its and their executive officers and directors.

**CAUTIONARY STATEMENT REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING INFORMATION**

This Annual Report on Form 10-K and the information incorporated by reference may include forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the *Securities Act*), and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the *Exchange Act*). In particular, we direct your attention to Item 1. Business, Item 1A. Risk Factors, Item 2. Properties, Item 3. Legal Proceedings, Item 7.

Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, and Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data. We intend the forward-looking statements to be covered by the safe harbor provisions for forward-looking statements in these sections. All statements regarding our expected financial position and operating results, our business strategy, our financing plans and the outcome of any contingencies are forward-looking statements. These statements can sometimes be identified by our use of forward-looking words such as *may*, *believe*, *plan*, *will*, *anticipate*, *estimate*, *expect*, *intend* and other phrases of similar meaning. Known unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors could cause the actual results to differ materially from those contemplated by the statements. The forward-looking information is based on various factors and was derived using numerous assumptions.

Although we believe that our expectations that are expressed in these forward-looking statements are reasonable, we cannot promise that our expectations will prove to be correct. Our actual results could be materially different from our expectations, including the following:

We may fail to prevail against AT&T on various disputed billings that total approximately \$7,970,000;

We may lose subscribers or fail to grow our subscriber base;

We may not successfully integrate new subscribers or assets obtained through acquisitions;

We may fail to compete with existing and new competitors;

We may not be able to sustain our current growth;

We may not adequately respond to technological developments impacting the Internet;

We may experience a major system failure;

We may not be able to find needed capital resources.

This list is intended to identify some of the principal factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from those described in the forward-looking statements included elsewhere in this report. These factors are not intended to represent a complete list of all risks and uncertainties inherent in our business, and should be read in conjunction with the more detailed cautionary statements included in this Report under the caption *Item 1A. Risk Factors*, our other Securities and Exchange Commission filings and our press releases.

**Table of Contents**

**PART I**

**Item 1. Business**

**General**

We are an integrated communications provider offering integrated communications and Internet connectivity to individuals, businesses, organizations, educational institutions and government agencies. Through our subsidiaries, we provide high quality, reliable and scalable Internet access, web hosting, equipment co-location and traditional telephone services. Our overall strategy is to become the dominant integrated communications provider for residents and small to medium-sized businesses in Oklahoma.

References to us in this Report include our subsidiaries: FullNet, Inc. ( FullNet ), FullTel, Inc. ( FullTel ), and FullWeb, Inc. ( FullWeb ). Our principal executive offices are located at 201 Robert S. Kerr Avenue, Suite 210, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102, and our telephone number is (405) 236-8200. We also maintain Internet sites on the World Wide Web ( WWW ) at [www.fullnet.net](http://www.fullnet.net) and [www.fulltel.net](http://www.fulltel.net). Information contained on our Websites is not, and should not be deemed to be, a part of this Report.

**Company History**

We were founded in 1995 as CEN-COM of Oklahoma, Inc., an Oklahoma corporation, to bring dial-up Internet access and education to rural locations in Oklahoma that did not have dial-up Internet access. We changed our name to FullNet Communications, Inc. in December 1995, and shifted our focus from offering dial-up services to providing wholesale and private label network connectivity and related services to other Internet service providers.

Our current business strategy is to become the dominant integrated communications provider in Oklahoma. We expect to grow through the acquisition of additional customers for our carrier-neutral co-location space and traditional telephone services, as well as through the acquisition of Internet service providers.

We market our carrier neutral co-location solutions in our network operations center to other competitive local exchange carriers, Internet service providers and web-hosting companies. Our co-location facility is carrier neutral, allowing customers to choose among competitive offerings rather than being restricted to one carrier. Our network operations center is Telco-grade and provides customers a high level of operative reliability and security. We offer flexible space arrangements for customers, 24-hour onsite support and both battery and generator backup.

Through FullTel, our wholly owned subsidiary, we are a fully licensed competitive local exchange carrier or CLEC in Oklahoma. At December 31, 2008 FullTel provided us with local telephone access in approximately 232 cities.

Our common stock trades on the OTC Bulletin Board under the symbol FULO. While our common stock trades on the OTC Bulletin Board, it is very thinly traded, and there can be no assurance that our stockholders will be able to sell their shares should they so desire. Any market for the common stock that may develop, in all likelihood, will be a limited one, and if such a market does develop, the market price may be volatile.

**Mergers and Acquisitions**

Our acquisition strategy is designed to leverage our existing network backbone and internal operations to enable us to enter new markets in Oklahoma, as well as to expand our presence in existing markets, and to benefit from economies of scale.

## **Table of Contents**

### **Our Business Strategy**

As an integrated communications provider, we intend to increase shareholder value by continuing to build scale through both acquisitions and internal growth and then leveraging increased revenues over our fixed-costs base. Our strategy is to meet the customer service requirements of retail, business, educational and government Internet users in our target markets, while benefiting from the scale advantages obtained through being a fully integrated backbone and broadband provider. The key elements of our overall strategy with respect to our principal business operations are as follows:

#### **Target Strategic Acquisitions**

The goal of our acquisition strategy is to accelerate market penetration by acquiring Internet service providers in Oklahoma communities and to acquire strategic Internet service providers in Oklahoma City and Tulsa. Additionally, we will continue to build upon our core competencies and expand our technical, customer service staff and sales force in Oklahoma communities. We evaluate acquisition candidates based on their compatibility with our overall business plan of penetrating rural and outlying markets as well as Oklahoma City and Tulsa. When a candidate is acquired, we will integrate our existing Internet, network connectivity and value-added services with the services offered by the acquired company and use either the local sales force or install our own dealer sales force to continue to increase market share. The types of acquisitions targeted by us include Internet service providers located in markets into which we want to expand or to which we may already provide private-label Internet connectivity. Other types of targeted acquisitions include local business-only Internet service providers in markets where we have established points of presence and would benefit from the acquired company's local sale and network solutions sales and technical staff and installed customer base through the potential increase in our network utilization. When assessing an acquisition candidate, we focus on the following criteria:

- Potential revenue and subscriber growth;
- Low subscriber turnover or churn rates;
- Density in the market as defined by a high ratio of subscribers to points of presence ( POPs );
- Favorable competitive environment;
- Low density network platforms that can be integrated readily into our backbone network; and
- Favorable consolidation savings.

#### **Generate Internal Sales Growth**

We intend to expand our customer base by increasing our marketing efforts. At December 31, 2008, our direct sales force consisted of one individual in our Oklahoma City office coordinating all our business-to-business solutions sales. We currently have independent re-sellers responsible for their individual markets. Our sales force is supported in its efforts by technical engineers and our senior management. In addition, we are exploring other strategies to increase our sales, including other marketing partners such as electric cooperatives. We currently have one of the 20 local Oklahoma electric cooperatives as a marketing partner.

#### **Grow Subscriber Base**

We intend to grow our subscriber base through a combination of internal and acquisition driven growth. We anticipate that this growth will increase the density of our subscriber base within a service area utilizing our available network operations, customer support, back office functions and management overhead without further cost increase or with minimal cost increase. We expect our local markets to generate internal subscriber growth primarily by enhancing subscribers' online experience, providing a sense of a national presence while maintaining local community content and developing a consumer recognized regional FullNet brand.

#### **Increase Rural Area Market Share**

We believe that the rural areas of Oklahoma are underserved by Internet service providers, and that significant profitable growth can be achieved in serving these markets by providing reliable Internet connectivity at a reasonable cost to the residents and businesses located in these areas. We believe we can obtain a significant Internet service provider and business-to-business market share in Oklahoma. To that end, through our wholly-owned subsidiary, FullTel, we became a licensed competitive local exchange carrier in Oklahoma. Since March 2003 when we installed our telephone switch, FullTel, as a competitive local exchange carrier, has provided local telephone numbers for Internet access.





## **Table of Contents**

### **Enhance Subscribers Online Experience**

We intend to maximize our subscriber retention and add new subscribers by enhancing our services in the following ways:

**Ease of Use** During the first quarter of 2001, we implemented a common, easy to use CD-ROM based software package that automatically configures all of the individual Internet access programs after a one-time entry by the user of a few required fields of information such as, name, user name and password.

### **Internet Access Services**

We provide Internet access services to individual and small business subscribers located in Oklahoma on both a retail and wholesale basis. Through FullNet, we provide our customers with a variety of dial-up and dedicated connectivity, as well as direct access to a wide range of Internet applications and resources, including electronic mail. FullNet's full range of services includes:

Private label retail and business direct dial-up connectivity to the Internet and  
Secure private networks through our backbone network

Our branded and private label Internet access services are provided through a statewide network with points-of-presence in 232 communities throughout Oklahoma. Points-of-presence are local telephone numbers through which subscribers can access the Internet. Our business services consist of high-speed Internet access services and other services that enable wholesale customers to outsource their Internet and electronic commerce activities. We had approximately 1,700 subscribers at December 31, 2008. Additionally, FullNet sells Internet access to other Internet service providers, who then resell Internet access to their own customers under their private label or under the FullNet brand name.

We intend to expand our subscriber base through a marketing campaign and through acquisitions. We are focusing our acquisition efforts on companies with forward-looking sales and marketing, high-quality customer service and solid local market dominance. See Item 1. Business Company History.

Currently, we offer the following two types of Internet connections:

#### **Dial-Up Connections**

The simplest connection to the Internet is the dial-up account. This method of service connects the user to the Internet through the use of a modem and standard telephone line. Currently, FullNet users can connect via dial-up at speeds up to 56 Kbps. We support these users through the use of sophisticated modem banks located in our facility in Oklahoma City that send data through a router and out to the Internet. We support the higher speed 56K, V.92 MOH and Integrated Services Digital Network connections with state-of-the-art digital modems. With a dial-up connection, a user can gain access to the Internet for e-mail, the World Wide Web, file transfer protocol, news groups, and a variety of other useful applications.

#### **Leased Line Connections**

Many businesses and some individuals have a need for more bandwidth to the Internet to support a network of users or a busy Website. We have the capacity to sell a leased line connection to users. This method of connection gives the user a full-time high-speed (up to 1.5 mbps) connection to the Internet. The leased line solution comes at greater expense to the user. These lines are leased through the telephone companies at a high installation and monthly fee. We believe that our Internet access services provide customers with the following benefits:

*Fast and Reliable Internet Access* We have implemented a network architecture providing exceptional quality and consistency in Internet services, making us one of the recognized backbone leaders in the Oklahoma Internet service provider industry. We offer unlimited, unrestricted and reliable Internet access at a low monthly price. We have designed our network such that our users never have to worry about busy signals due to a lack of available modems. Dial-up access is available for the following modem speeds: 14.4K, 28.8K, 33.6K, K56Flex, 56K V.90, v.92 MOH, ISDN 64K and ISDN 128K. Our dial-up access supports all major platforms and operating systems, including MS Windows, UNIX(R), Mac OS, OS/2 and LINUX. This allows simplified access to all Internet applications, including the World Wide Web, email, and news and file transfer protocol.



**Table of Contents**

*Cost-Effective Access* We offer high quality Internet connectivity and enhanced business services at price points that are generally lower than those charged by other Internet service providers with national coverage. Additionally, we offer pre-bundled access services packages under monthly or prepaid plans.

*Superior Customer Support* We provide superior customer service and support, with customer care and technical personnel available by telephone and on-line 24 hours per day, 365 days per year.

**CLEC Operations**

Through FullTel, our wholly owned subsidiary, we are a fully licensed competitive local exchange carrier or CLEC in Oklahoma. CLECs are new phone companies evolved from the Telecommunications Act of 1996

(Telecommunications Act) that requires the incumbent local exchange carriers or ILECs, generally the regional Bell companies including AT&T, to provide CLECs access to their local facilities, and to compensate CLECs for traffic originated by ILECs and terminated on the CLECs network. By adding our own telephone switch and infrastructure to the existing telephone network in March 2003, we offer certain local Internet access for dial-up services in most of Oklahoma. As a CLEC, we may subscribe to and resell all forms of local telephone service in Oklahoma.

While Internet access is the core focus of growth for us, we plan to also provide traditional telephone service throughout Oklahoma.

A core piece of our marketing strategy is the cross pollination between our Internet activities and FullTel's local dial-up service. By organizing and funding FullTel, we gained local dial-up Internet access to approximately 80% of Oklahoma. In return, FullTel gained access to our entire Internet service provider customer base.

The FullTel data center telephone switching equipment was installed in March 2003. At which time, FullTel began the process of activating local access telephone numbers for every city in Oklahoma within the AT&T service area. At December 31, 2008, FullTel provided us with local telephone access in approximately 232 cities. However, our ability to fully take advantage of these opportunities will be dependent upon the availability of additional capital.

**Sales and Marketing**

We focus on marketing our services to two distinct market segments: enterprises (primarily small and medium size businesses) and consumers. By attracting enterprise customers who use the network primarily during the daytime, and consumer customers who use the network primarily at night, we are able to utilize our network infrastructure more cost effectively.

**Competition**

The market for Internet connectivity and related services is extremely competitive. We anticipate that competition will continue to intensify as the use of the Internet continues to expand and grow. The tremendous growth and potential market size of the Internet access market has attracted many new start-ups as well as existing businesses from a variety of industries. We believe a reliable network, knowledgeable salespeople and the quality of technical support currently are the primary competitive factors in our targeted market and that price is usually secondary to these factors.

## **Table of Contents**

Our current and prospective competitors include, in addition to other national, regional and local Internet service providers, long distance and local exchange telecommunications companies, cable television, direct broadcast satellite, wireless communications providers and online service providers. While we believe that our network, products and customer service distinguish us from these competitors, most of these competitors have significantly greater market presence, brand recognition, financial, technical and personnel resources than us.

### **Internet Service Providers**

Our current primary competitors include other Internet service providers with a significant national presence that focuses on business customers, such as Cox Communications and AT&T. These competitors have greater market share, brand recognition, financial, technical and personnel resources than us. We also compete with regional and local Internet service providers in our targeted markets.

### **Telecommunications Carriers**

The major long distance companies, also known as inter-exchange carriers, including AT&T, Verizon, and Sprint, offer Internet access services and compete with us. Reforms in the federal regulation of the telecommunications industry have created greater opportunities for ILECs, including the Regional Bell Operating Companies or RBOCs, and other competitive local exchange carriers, to enter the Internet connectivity market. In order to address the Internet connectivity requirements of the business customers of long distance and local carriers, we believe that there is a move toward horizontal integration by ILECs and CLECs through acquisitions or joint ventures with, and the wholesale purchase of, connectivity from Internet service providers. The MCI/WorldCom merger (and the prior WorldCom/MFS/UUNet consolidation), GTE's acquisition of BBN, the acquisition by ICG Communications, Inc. of Netcom, Global Crossing's acquisition of Frontier Corp. (and Frontier's prior acquisition of Global Center) and AT&T's purchase of IBM's global communications network are indicative of this trend. Accordingly, we expect that we will experience increased competition from the traditional telecommunications carriers. These telecommunication carriers, in addition to their greater network coverage, market presence, financial, technical and personnel resources also have large existing commercial customer bases.

### **Cable Companies, Direct Broadcast Satellite and Wireless Communications Companies**

Many of the major cable companies are offering Internet connectivity, relying on the viability of cable modems and economical upgrades to their networks, including Media One and Time Warner Cablevision, Inc., Cox Communications and Tele-Communications, Inc. (TCI).

The companies that own these broadband networks could prevent us from delivering Internet access through the wire and cable connections that they own. Our ability to compete with telephone and cable television companies that are able to support broadband transmissions, and to provide better Internet services and products, may depend on future regulation to guarantee open access to the broadband networks. However, in January 1999, the Federal Communications Commission declined to take any action to mandate or otherwise regulate access by Internet service providers to broadband cable facilities at this time. It is unclear whether and to what extent local and state regulatory agencies will take any initiatives to implement this type of regulation, and whether they will be successful in establishing their authority to do so. Similarly, the Federal Communications Commission is considering proposals that could limit the right of Internet service providers to connect with their customers over broadband local telephone lines. In addition to competing directly in the Internet service provider market, both cable and television facilities operators are also aligning themselves with certain Internet service providers who would receive preferential or exclusive use of broadband local connections to end users. As high-speed broadband facilities increasingly become the preferred mode by which customers access the Internet, if we are unable to gain access to these facilities on reasonable terms, our business, financial condition and results of operations could be materially adversely affected.

### **Online Service Providers**

The dominant online service providers, including America Online, Incorporated, Comcast, AT&T, Road Runner, Verizon and Earthlink, have all entered the Internet access business by engineering their current proprietary networks to include Internet access capabilities. We compete to a lesser extent with these service providers, which currently are primarily focused on the consumer marketplace and offer their own content, including chat rooms, news updates, searchable reference databases, special interest groups and shopping.

However, America Online's merger with Time-Warner, its acquisition of Netscape Communications Corporation and related strategic alliance with Sun Microsystems enable it to offer a broader array of Internet-based services and products that could significantly enhance its ability to appeal to the business marketplace and, as a result, compete more directly with Internet service providers like us. CompuServe has also announced that it will target Internet connectivity for the small to medium sized business market.

## **Table of Contents**

We believe that our ability to attract business customers and to market value-added services is a key to our future success. However, there can be no assurance that our competitors will not introduce comparable services or products at similar or more attractive prices in the future or that we will not be required to reduce our prices to match competition. Recently, many competitive ISPs have shifted their focus from individual customers to business customers.

Moreover, there can be no assurance that more of our competitors will not shift their focus to attracting business customers, resulting in even more competition for us. There can be no assurance that we will be able to offset the effects of any such competition or resulting price reductions. Increased competition could result in erosion of our market share and could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

### **Government Regulations**

The following summary of regulatory developments and legislation is not complete. It does not describe all present and proposed federal, state, and local regulation and legislation affecting the Internet service provider and telecommunications industries. Existing federal and state regulations are currently subject to judicial proceedings, legislative hearings, and administrative proposals that could change, in varying degrees, the manner in which our businesses operate. We cannot predict the outcome of these proceedings or their impact upon the Internet service provider and telecommunications industries or upon our business.

The provision of Internet access service and the underlying telecommunications services are affected by federal, state, local and foreign regulation. The Federal Communications Commission or FCC exercises jurisdiction over all facilities of, and services offered by, telecommunications carriers to the extent that they involve the provision, origination or termination of jurisdictionally interstate or international communications. The state regulatory commissions retain jurisdiction over the same facilities and services to the extent they involve origination or termination of jurisdictionally intrastate communications. In addition, as a result of the passage of the Telecommunications Act, state and federal regulators share responsibility for implementing and enforcing the domestic pro-competitive policies of the Telecommunications Act. In particular, state regulatory commissions have substantial oversight over the provision of interconnection and non-discriminatory network access by ILECs. Municipal authorities generally have some jurisdiction over access to rights of way, franchises, zoning and other matters of local concern.

Our Internet operations are not currently subject to direct regulation by the FCC or any other U.S. governmental agency, other than regulations applicable to businesses generally. However, the FCC continues to review its regulatory position on the usage of the basic network and communications facilities by Internet service providers. Although in an April 1998 Report, the FCC determined that Internet service providers should not be treated as telecommunications carriers and therefore should not be regulated, it is expected that future Internet service provider regulatory status will continue to be uncertain. Indeed, in that report, the FCC concluded that certain services offered over the Internet, such as phone-to-phone Internet telephony, may be functionally indistinguishable from traditional telecommunications service offerings, and their non-regulated status may have to be reexamined.

Changes in the regulatory structure and environment affecting the Internet access market, including regulatory changes that directly or indirectly affect telecommunications costs or increase the likelihood of competition from RBOCs or other telecommunications companies, could have an adverse effect on our business. Although the FCC has decided not to allow local telephone companies to impose per-minute access charges on Internet service providers, and the reviewing court has upheld that decision, further regulatory and legislative consideration of this issue is likely. In addition, some telephone companies are seeking relief through state regulatory agencies. The imposition of access charges would affect our costs of serving dial-up customers and could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In addition to our Internet service provider operations, we have focused attention on acquiring telecommunications assets and facilities, which is a regulated activity. Fulltel, our subsidiary, has received competitive local exchange carrier or CLEC certification in Oklahoma. The Telecommunications Act requires CLECs not to prohibit or unduly restrict resale of their services; to provide dialing parity, number portability, and nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance, and directory listings; to afford access to poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way; and to establish reciprocal compensation arrangements for the transport and termination

of telecommunications traffic. In addition to federal regulation of CLECs, the states also impose regulatory obligations on CLECs. While these obligations vary from state to state, most states require CLECs to file a tariff for their services and charges; require CLECs to charge just and reasonable rates for their services, and not to discriminate among similarly-situated customers; to file periodic reports and pay certain fees; and to comply with certain services standards and consumer protection laws. As a provider of domestic basic telecommunications services, particularly competitive local exchange services, we could become subject to further regulation by the FCC or another regulatory agency, including state and local entities.



**Table of Contents**

The Telecommunications Act has caused fundamental changes in the markets for local exchange services. In particular, the Telecommunications Act and the related FCC promulgated rules mandate competition in local markets and require that ILECs interconnect with CLECs. Under the provisions of the Telecommunications Act, the FCC and state public utility commissions share jurisdiction over the implementation of local competition: the FCC was required to promulgate general rules and the state commissions were required to arbitrate and approve individual interconnection agreements. The courts have generally upheld the FCC in its promulgation of rules, including a January 25, 1999 U.S. Supreme Court ruling which determined that the FCC has jurisdiction to promulgate national rules in pricing for interconnection.

In July 2000, the Eighth Circuit Court issued a decision on the earlier remand from the Supreme Court and rejected, as contrary to the Telecommunications Act, the use of hypothetical network costs, including total element long-run incremental costs methodology ( TELRIC ), which the FCC had used in developing certain of its pricing rules. The Eighth Circuit Court also vacated the FCC's pricing rules related to unbundled network elements (UNEs), termination and transport, but upheld its prior decision that ILECs' universal service subsidies should not be included in the costs of providing network elements. Finally, the Eighth Circuit Court also vacated the FCC's rules requiring that: (1) ILECs recombine unbundled network elements for competitors in any technically feasible combination; (2) all preexisting interconnection agreements be submitted to the states for review; and (3) the burden of proof for retention of a rural exemption be shifted to the ILEC. The FCC sought review of the Eighth Circuit Court's invalidation of TELRIC and was granted certiorari. On May 13, 2002, the Supreme Court reversed certain of the Eighth Circuit Court's findings and affirmed that the FCC's rules concerning forward looking economic costs, including TELRIC, were proper under the Telecommunications Act. The Supreme Court also restored the FCC's requirement that the ILEC's combine UNEs for competitors when they are unable to do so themselves.

In November 1999, the FCC released an order making unbundling requirements applicable to all ILEC network elements uniformly. UNE-P is created when a competing carrier obtains all the network elements needed to provide service from the ILEC. In December 1999, the FCC released an order requiring the provision of unbundled local copper loops enabling CLECs to offer competitive Digital Subscriber Loop Internet access. The FCC reconsidered both orders in its first triennial review of its policies on UNEs completed in early 2003, as further discussed below. On August 21, 2003, the FCC released the text of its Triennial Review Order. In response to the remand of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit, the FCC adopted new rules governing the obligations of ILECs to unbundle the elements of their local networks for use by competitors. The FCC made national findings of impairment or non-impairment for loops, transport and, most significantly, switching. The FCC delegated to the states the authority to engage in additional fact finding and make alternative impairment findings based on a more granular impairment analysis including evaluation of applicability of FCC-established triggers. The FCC created mass market and enterprise market customer classifications that generally correspond to the residential and business markets, respectively. The FCC found that CLECs were not impaired without access to local circuit switching when serving enterprise market customers on a national level. CLECs, however, were found to be impaired on a national level without access to local switching when serving mass market customers. State commissions had 90 days to ask the FCC to waive the finding of no impairment without switching for enterprise market customers. The FCC presumption that CLECs are impaired without access to transport, high capacity loops and mass market switching is subject to a more granular nine month review by state commissions pursuant to FCC-established triggers and other economic and operational criteria.

The FCC also opened a further notice of proposed rulemaking to consider the pick and choose rules under which a competing carrier may select from among the various terms of interconnection offered by an ILEC in its various interconnection agreements. Comments have been filed, but the FCC has not issued a decision.

The Triennial Review Order also provided that:

ILECs are not required to unbundle packet switching as a stand-alone network element.

Two key components of the FCC's TELRIC pricing rules were clarified. First, the FCC clarified that the risk-adjusted cost of capital used in calculating UNE prices should reflect the risks associated with a competitive market. Second, the FCC declined to mandate the use of any particular set of asset lives for depreciation, but clarified that the use of an accelerated depreciation mechanism may present a more accurate method of

calculating economic depreciation.

CLECs continue to be prohibited from avoiding any liability under contractual early termination clauses in the event a CLEC converts a special access circuit to an UNE.

## **Table of Contents**

We are monitoring the Oklahoma state commission proceedings and participating where necessary as the commission undertakes the 90 day and nine month analyses to establish rules or make determinations as directed by the Triennial Review Order. In addition, numerous petitions and appeals have been filed in the courts and with the FCC challenging many of the findings in the Triennial Review Order and seeking a stay on certain portions of the order. The appeals have been consolidated in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. Oral arguments were heard on January 28, 2004. On March 2, 2004, a three-judge panel in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals overturned the FCC's Triennial Review Order with regard to network unbundling rules. A majority of the FCC Commissioners is seeking a court-ordered stay and plan to appeal the ruling to the Supreme Court. Until all of these proceedings are concluded, the impact of this order, if any, on our CLEC operations cannot be determined.

An important issue for CLECs is the right to receive reciprocal compensation for the transport and termination of Internet traffic. We believe that, under the Telecommunications Act, CLECs are entitled to receive reciprocal compensation from ILECs. However, some ILECs have disputed payment of reciprocal compensation for Internet traffic, arguing that Internet service provider traffic is not local traffic. Most states have required ILECs to pay CLECs reciprocal compensation. However, in October 1998, the FCC determined that dedicated digital subscriber line service is an interstate service and properly tariffed at the interstate level. In February 1999, the FCC concluded that at least a substantial portion of dial-up Internet service provider traffic is jurisdictionally interstate. The FCC also concluded that its jurisdictional decision does not alter the exemption from access charges currently enjoyed by Internet service providers. The FCC established a proceeding to consider an appropriate compensation mechanism for interstate Internet traffic. Pending the adoption of that mechanism, the FCC saw no reason to interfere with existing interconnection agreements and reciprocal compensation arrangements. The FCC order has been appealed. In addition, there is a risk that state public utility commissions that have previously considered this issue and ordered the payment of reciprocal compensation by the ILECs to the CLECs may be asked by the ILECs to revisit their determinations, or may revisit their determinations on their own motion. To date, at least one ILEC has filed suit seeking a refund from a carrier of reciprocal compensation that the ILEC had paid to that carrier. There can be no assurance that any future court, state regulatory or FCC decision on this matter will favor our position. An unfavorable result may have an adverse impact on our potential future revenues as a CLEC. Reciprocal compensation is unlikely to be a significant or a long-term revenue source for us.

As we become a competitor in local exchange markets, we will become subject to state requirements regarding provision of intrastate services. This may include the filing of tariffs containing rates and conditions. As a new entrant, without market power, we expect to face a relatively flexible regulatory environment. Nevertheless, it is possible that some states could require us to obtain the approval of the public utilities commission for the issuance of debt or equity or other transactions that would result in a lien on our property used to provide intrastate services.

### **Item 1A. Risk Factors.**

This Report includes forward looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act and Section 21E of the Exchange Act. Although we believe that our plans, intentions and expectations reflected in such forward looking statements are reasonable, we can give no assurance that such plans, intentions or expectations will be achieved. Important factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from our forward looking statements are set forth below and elsewhere in this Report. All forward looking statements attributable to us or persons acting on our behalf are expressly qualified in their entirety by the cautionary statements set forth below.

**Necessity of Obtaining an Acceptable Successor Interconnection Agreement.** We are dependent upon obtaining certain services from AT&T (formerly SBC) pursuant to our interconnection agreement with them. We along with many other telecommunications companies in Oklahoma are currently a party to one or more proceedings before the Oklahoma Corporation Commission (the OCC) relating to the terms of our interconnection agreements with AT&T and an anticipated successor to these interconnection agreements. Failure to obtain an acceptable successor interconnection agreement would have a material adverse effect on our business prospects, financial condition and results of operation.

**Necessity of Prevailing Against AT&T on Disputed Invoices.** AT&T (formerly SBC) has invoiced us for various amounts that total approximately \$7,970,000. AT&T stopped invoicing the us for these monthly services and simply sent monthly Inter Company Billing Statements reflecting the balance of approximately \$7,970,000 with no further additions. The last Inter Company Billing Statement we received was dated December 15, 2007 and reflected a

balance of approximately \$7,970,000. We believe that AT&T has no basis for these charges, are reviewing them with our attorneys and plan to vigorously dispute them. However, failure to prevail in the dispute of these invoices would have a material adverse effect on our business prospects, financial condition and results of operation.

Limited Operating History. We have a relatively limited operating history upon which an evaluation of our prospects can be made. Consequently, the likelihood of our success must be considered in view of all of the risks, expenses and delays inherent in the establishment and growth of a new business including, but not limited to, expenses, complications and delays which cannot be foreseen when a business is commenced, initiation of marketing activities, the uncertainty of market acceptance of new services, intense competition from larger more established competitors and other factors. Our ability to achieve profitability and growth will depend on successful development and commercialization of our current and proposed services. No assurance can be given that we will be able to introduce our proposed services or market our services on a commercially successful basis.

**Table of Contents**

**Necessity of Additional Financing.** In order for us to have any opportunity for significant commercial success and profitability, we must successfully obtain additional financing, either through borrowings, additional private placements or an initial public offering, or some combination thereof. Although we are actively pursuing a variety of funding sources, there can be no assurance that we will be successful in such pursuit.

**Limited Marketing Experience.** We have limited experience in developing and commercializing new services based on innovative technologies, and there is limited information available concerning the potential performance of our hardware or market acceptance of our proposed services. There can be no assurance that unanticipated expenses, problems or technical difficulties will not occur which would result in material delays in product commercialization or that our efforts will result in successful product commercialization.

**Uncertainty of Products/Services Development.** Although considerable time and financial resources were expended in the development of our services and products, there can be absolutely no assurance that problems will not develop which would have a material adverse effect on us. We will be required to commit considerable time, effort and resources to finalize our product/service development and adapt our products and services to satisfy specific requirements of potential customers. Continued system refinement, enhancement and development efforts are subject to all of the risks inherent in the development of new products/services and technologies, including unanticipated delays, expenses, technical problems or difficulties, as well as the possible insufficiency of funds to satisfactorily complete development, which could result in abandonment or substantial change in commercialization. There can be no assurance that development efforts will be successfully completed on a timely basis, or at all, that we will be able to successfully adapt our hardware or software to satisfy specific requirements of potential customers, or that unanticipated events will not occur which would result in increased costs or material delays in development or commercialization. In addition, the complex technologies planned to be incorporated into our products and services may contain errors that become apparent subsequent to commercial use. Remedying such errors could delay our plans and cause us to incur substantial additional costs.

**New Concept; Uncertainty of Market Acceptance and Commercialization Strategy.** As is typical in the case of a new business concept, demand and market acceptance for a newly introduced product or service is subject to a high level of uncertainty. Achieving market acceptance for this new concept will require significant efforts and expenditures by us to create awareness and demand by consumers. Our marketing strategy and preliminary and future marketing plans may be unsuccessful and are subject to change as a result of a number of factors, including progress or delays in our marketing efforts, changes in market conditions (including the emergence of potentially significant related market segments for applications of our technology), the nature of possible license and distribution arrangements which may or may not become available to us in the future and economic, regulatory and competitive factors. There can be no assurance that our strategy will result in successful product commercialization or that our efforts will result in initial or continued market acceptance for our proposed products.

**Competition; Technological Obsolescence.** The markets for our products and services are characterized by intense competition and an increasing number of potential new market entrants who have developed or are developing potentially competitive products and services. We will face competition from numerous sources, certain of which may have substantially greater financial, technical, marketing, distribution, personnel and other resources than us, permitting such companies to implement extensive marketing campaigns, both generally and in response to efforts by additional competitors to enter into new markets and market new products and services. In addition, our product and service markets are characterized by rapidly changing technology and evolving industry standards that could result in product obsolescence and short product life cycles. Accordingly, our ability to compete will be dependent upon our ability to complete the development of our products and to introduce our products and/or services into the marketplace in a timely manner, to continually enhance and improve our software and to successfully develop and market new products. There can be no assurance that we will be able to compete successfully, that competitors will not develop technologies or products that render our products and/or services obsolete or less marketable or that we will be able to successfully enhance our products or develop new products and/or services.

**Risks Relating to the Internet.** Businesses reliant on the Internet may be at risk due to inadequate development of the necessary infrastructure, including reliable network backbones or complementary services, high-speed modems and security procedures. The Internet has experienced, and is expected to continue to experience, significant growth in the

number of users and amount of traffic. There can be no assurance that the Internet infrastructure will continue to be able to support the demands placed on it by sustained growth. In addition, there may be delays in the development and adoption of new standards and protocols, the inability to handle increased levels of Internet activity or due to increased government regulation. If the necessary Internet infrastructure or complementary services are not developed to effectively support growth that may occur, our business, results of operations and financial condition would be materially adversely affected.

Potential Government Regulations. We are subject to state commission, Federal Communications Commission and court decisions as they relate to the interpretation and implementation of the Telecommunications Act, the interpretation of Competitive Local Exchange Carrier interconnection agreements in general and our interconnection agreements in particular. In some cases, we may become bound by the results of ongoing proceedings of these bodies or the legal outcomes of other contested interconnection agreements that are similar to agreements to which we are a party. The results of any of these proceedings could have a material adverse effect on our business, prospects, financial condition and results of operations.

## **Table of Contents**

**Dependence on Key Personnel.** Our success depends in large part upon the continued successful performance of our current executive officers and key employees, Messrs. Timothy J. Kilkenny, Roger P. Baresel and Jason C. Ayers, for our continued research, development, marketing and operation. Although we have employed, and will employ in the future, additional qualified employees as well as retaining consultants having significant experience, if Messrs. Kilkenny, Baresel or Ayers fail to perform any of their duties for any reason whatsoever, our ability to market, operate and support our products/services will be adversely affected. While we are located in areas where the available pool of people is substantial, there is also significant competition for qualified personnel.

**Limited Public Market.** During February 2000, our common stock began trading on the OTC Bulletin Board under the symbol FULO. While our common stock continues to trade on the OTC Bulletin Board, there can be no assurance that our stockholders will be able to sell their shares should they so desire. Any market for the common stock that may develop, in all likelihood, will be a limited one, and if such a market does develop, the market price may be volatile.

**No Payment of Dividends on Common Stock.** We have not paid any dividends on our common stock. For the foreseeable future, we anticipate that all earnings, if any, which may be generated from our operations, will be used to finance our growth and that cash dividends will not be paid to holders of the common stock.

**Penny Stock Regulation.** Broker-dealer practices in connection with transactions in penny stocks are regulated by certain penny stock rules adopted by the SEC. Penny stocks generally are equity securities with a price of less than \$5.00 (other than securities registered on certain national securities exchanges or quoted on the NASDAQ system). The penny stock rules require a broker-dealer, prior to a transaction in a penny stock not otherwise exempt from the rules, to deliver a standardized risk disclosure document that provides information about penny stocks and the nature and level of risks in the penny stock market. The broker-dealer also must provide the customer with current bid and offer quotations for the penny stock, the compensation of the broker-dealer and its salesperson in the transaction, and, if the broker dealer is the sole market-maker, the broker-dealer must disclose this fact and the broker-dealer's presumed control over the market, and monthly account statements showing the market value of each penny stock held in the customer's account. In addition, broker-dealers who sell such securities to persons other than established customers and accredited investors (generally, those persons with assets in excess of \$1,000,000 or annual income exceeding \$200,000 or \$300,000 together with their spouse), must make a special written determination that the penny stock is a suitable investment for the purchaser and receive the purchaser's written agreement to the transaction. Consequently, these requirements may have the effect of reducing the level of trading activity, if any, in the secondary market for a security that is or becomes subject to the penny stock rules. Our common stock is subject to the penny stock rules at the present time, and consequently our stockholders will find it more difficult to sell their shares.

### **Employees**

As of December 31, 2008, we had 13 employees employed in engineering, sales, marketing, customer support and related activities and general and administrative functions. None of our employees are represented by a labor union, and we consider our relations with our employees to be good. We also engage consultants from time to time with respect to various aspects of our business.

### **Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments.**

We do not have any unresolved staff comments to report.

### **Item 2. Properties**

We maintain our executive office in approximately 13,000 square feet at 201 Robert S. Kerr Avenue, Suite 210 in Oklahoma City, at an effective annual rental rate of \$10.20 per square foot. These premises are occupied pursuant to a ten-year lease that expires December 31, 2009.

### **Item 3. Legal Proceedings**

As a provider of telecommunications, we are affected by regulatory proceedings in the ordinary course of our business at the state and federal levels. These include proceedings before both the Federal Communications Commission and the Oklahoma Corporation Commission (OCC). In addition, in our operations we rely on obtaining many of our underlying telecommunications services and/or facilities from incumbent local exchange carriers or other carriers pursuant to interconnection or other agreements or arrangements. In January 2007, we concluded a regulatory proceeding pursuant to the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 before the OCC relating to the terms of our interconnection agreement with Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. d/b/a AT&T, which succeeds a prior

interconnection agreement. The OCC approved this agreement in May 2007. This agreement may be affected by regulatory proceedings at the federal and state levels, with possible adverse impacts on us. We are unable to accurately predict the outcomes of such regulatory proceedings at this time, but an unfavorable outcome could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations.

**Item 4. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders**

No matters were submitted to a vote of security holders during the fourth quarter of 2008.



**Table of Contents****PART II****Item 5. Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities.**

Our common stock is traded in the over-the-counter market and is quoted on the OTC Bulletin Board under the symbol FULO. The closing sale prices reflect inter-dealer prices without adjustment for retail markups, markdowns or commissions and may not reflect actual transactions. The following table sets forth the high and low closing sale prices of our common stock during the calendar quarters presented as reported by the OTC Bulletin Board.

	<b>Common Stock Closing Sale Prices</b>	
	<b>High</b>	<b>Low</b>
2008 Calendar Quarter Ended:		
March 31	\$ .04	\$ .04
June 30	.04	.04
September 30	.02	.01
December 31	.03	.02
2007 Calendar Quarter Ended:		
March 31	\$ .19	\$ .03
June 30	.08	.03
September 30	.05	.03
December 31	.06	.03

**Number of stockholders**

The number of beneficial holders of record of our common stock as of the close of business on March 27, 2009 was approximately 110.

**Dividend Policy**

To date, we have declared no cash dividends on our common stock, and do not expect to pay cash dividends in the near term. We intend to retain future earnings, if any, to provide funds for operations and the continued expansion of our business.

**Securities Authorized for Issuance under Equity Compensation Plans**

The following table sets forth as of December 31, 2008, information related to each category of equity compensation plan approved or not approved by our shareholders, including individual compensation arrangements with our non-employee directors. We do not have any equity compensation plans that have been approved by our shareholders. All of our outstanding stock option grants and warrants were pursuant to individual compensation arrangements and exercisable for the purchase of our common stock shares.

<b>Plan Category</b>	<b>Number of Shares Underlying Unexercised Options and Warrants</b>	<b>Weighted- Average Exercise Price of Outstanding Options and Warrants</b>	<b>Number of Securities Remaining Available for Future Issuance under Equity Compensation Plans</b>
----------------------	---	---	---

*Equity compensation plans approved by our shareholders:*

	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
None			
<i>Equity compensation plans not approved by our shareholders:</i>			
Stock option grants to non-employee directors		\$	
Stock options granted to employees	2,447,704	\$	.53
Warrants and certain stock options issued to non-employees	326,000	\$	.47
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,773,704</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>.52</b>

## **Table of Contents**

### Recent Sales of Unregistered Securities

Stock options exercisable for the purchase of 684,430 shares of our common stock were exercised in March 2008 for \$28,049. These common stock shares were offered and sold pursuant to Rule 506 of Regulation D of the Securities Act, and no commissions and fees were paid. With respect to the foregoing common stock transaction, we relied on Sections 4(2) and 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 and applicable registration exemptions of Rules 504 and 506 of Regulation D and applicable state securities laws.

### **Item 6. Selected Financial Data.**

As a smaller reporting company, we are not required and have not elected to report any information under this item (see Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data. ).

### **Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations.**

The following discussion should be read in conjunction with our Consolidated Financial Statements and notes thereto included in Part II, Item 8 of this Report. The results shown herein are not necessarily indicative of the results to be expected in any future periods. This discussion contains forward-looking statements based on current expectations that involve risks and uncertainties. Actual results and the timing of events could differ materially from the forward-looking statements as a result of a number of factors. For a discussion of the factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from the forward-looking statements, see Item 1A. Risk Factors and our other periodic reports and documents filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

#### Overview

We are an integrated communications provider offering integrated communications and Internet connectivity to individuals, businesses, organizations, educational institutions and government agencies. Through our subsidiaries, we provide high quality, reliable and scalable Internet access, web hosting, equipment co-location, and traditional telephone service.

Our overall strategy is to become the dominant integrated communications provider for residents and small to medium-sized businesses in Oklahoma. We believe that the rural areas of Oklahoma are underserved by Internet service providers, and that significant profitable growth can be achieved in serving these markets by providing reliable Internet connectivity and value-added services at a reasonable cost to the residents and businesses located in these areas. We believe we can obtain a significant Internet service provider and business-to-business market share in Oklahoma. Our wholly-owned subsidiary, FullTel, is a licensed competitive local exchange carrier or CLEC and provides local telephone numbers for Internet access.

The market for Internet connectivity and related services is extremely competitive. We anticipate that competition will continue to intensify. The tremendous growth and potential market size of the Internet access market has attracted many new start-ups as well as existing businesses from a variety of industries. We believe that a reliable network, knowledgeable sales people and the quality of technical support currently are the primary competitive factors in our targeted market and that price is usually secondary to these factors.

As a provider of telecommunications, we are affected by regulatory proceedings in the ordinary course of our business at the state and federal levels. These include proceedings before both the Federal Communications Commission and the Oklahoma Corporation Commission ( OCC ). In addition, in our operations we rely on obtaining many of our underlying telecommunications services and/or facilities from incumbent local exchange carriers or other carriers pursuant to interconnection or other agreements or arrangements. In January 2007, we concluded a regulatory proceeding pursuant to the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 before the OCC relating to the terms of our interconnection agreement with Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. d/b/a AT&T, which succeeds a prior interconnection agreement. The OCC approved this agreement in May 2007. This agreement may be affected by regulatory proceedings at the federal and state levels, with possible adverse impacts on us. We are unable to accurately predict the outcomes of such regulatory proceedings at this time, but an unfavorable outcome could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations.

During September 2005, we received an invoice from AT&T (formerly SBC) of approximately \$230,000 for services alleged to have been rendered to us between June 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. Since then, we have received a number of additional invoices from AT&T which cover services through February 2007 and total approximately \$7,970,000. AT&T stopped invoicing us for these monthly services and simply sent monthly Inter Company Billing Statements

reflecting the balance of approximately \$7,970,000 with no further additions. The last Inter Company Billing Statement we received was dated December 15, 2007 and reflected a balance of approximately \$7,970,000. The alleged services were eventually identified by AT&T as Switched Access services. We formally notified AT&T in writing that we dispute these invoices and requested that AT&T withdraw and/or credit all of these invoices in full. AT&T has not responded to our written dispute. We believe AT&T has no basis for these charges. Therefore, we have not recorded any expense or liability related to these billings. However, failure to prevail in the dispute of these invoices would have a material adverse effect on our business prospects, financial condition and results of operation.

**Table of Contents**

## Results of Operations

The following table sets forth certain statement of operations data as a percentage of revenues for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007:

	For the Years Ended December 31,			
	2008		2007	
	Amount	Percentage of revenues	Amount	Percentage of revenues
<b>Revenues:</b>				
Access service revenues	\$ 532,661	28.2%	\$ 643,155	33.9%
Co-location and other revenues	1,353,890	71.8	1,252,413	66.1
<b>Total revenues</b>	<b>1,886,551</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,895,568</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Operating costs and expenses:</b>				
Cost of access service revenues	235,638	12.5	233,931	12.3
Cost of co-location and other revenues	321,196	17.0	322,922	17.0
Selling, general and administrative expenses	1,371,259	72.7	1,334,285	70.4
Depreciation and amortization	252,338	13.4	297,176	15.7
Impairment expense			13,032	.7
<b>Total operating costs and expenses</b>	<b>2,180,431</b>	<b>115.6</b>	<b>2,201,346</b>	<b>116.1</b>
Loss from operations	(293,880)	(15.6)	(305,778)	(16.1)
Gain on debt forgiveness			54,795	2.9
Interest expense	(97,668)	(5.2)	(96,668)	(5.1)
<b>Net loss</b>	<b>\$ (391,548)</b>	<b>(20.8)%</b>	<b>\$ (347,651)</b>	<b>(18.3)%</b>

## Year Ended December 31, 2008 Compared to Year Ended December 31, 2007

## Revenues

Access service revenues decreased \$110,494 or 17.2% to \$532,661 for the year 2008 from \$643,155 for the year 2007 primarily due to a decline in the number of customers.

Co-location and other revenues increased \$101,477 or 8.1% to \$1,353,890 for the year 2008 from \$1,252,413 for the year 2007. This increase was primarily attributable to the addition of new customers and the sale of additional services to existing customers. During 2008 and 2007 we did not record reciprocal compensation revenue (fees for terminating AT&T (formerly SBC) customers' local calls onto our network). We began billing AT&T during 2004, and have billed for the periods of March 2003 through June 2006. AT&T failed to pay and is disputing approximately \$183,700. We are pursuing AT&T for all balances due, however there is significant uncertainty as to whether or not we will be successful. Upon the ultimate resolution of AT&T's challenge, we will recognize the associated revenue, if any. We do not expect reciprocal compensation to be a significant or a long-term revenue source.

## Operating Costs and Expenses

Cost of access service revenues remained relatively stable at \$235,638 for the year 2008 from \$233,931 for the year 2007. Cost of access service revenues as a percentage of access service revenues increased to 44.2% for the year 2008 from 36.4% for the year 2007 primarily due to the decrease in revenues.

Cost of co-location and other revenues remained relatively stable at \$321,196 for the year 2008 from \$322,922 for the year 2007. Cost of co-location and other revenues as a percentage of co-location and other revenues decreased to

23.7% for the year 2008 from 25.8% for the year 2007 primarily due to the increase in revenues.

**Table of Contents**

Selling, general and administrative expenses increased \$36,974 or 2.8% to \$1,371,259 for the year 2008 from \$1,334,285 for the year 2007 primarily due to an increase in employee costs. The employee costs increase of \$59,935 was primarily related to the addition of one full-time employee, one part-time employee, annual wage increases and health insurance increases. We also had an increase in agent commissions related to sales of traditional phone service of \$8,184. These increases were offset primarily by decreases in rent operating expenses and supplies of \$16,644 and \$14,920, respectively. Selling, general and administrative expenses as a percentage of total revenues increased to 72.7% during 2008 from 70.4% during 2007.

Depreciation and amortization expense decreased \$44,838 or 15.1% to \$252,338 for the year 2008 from \$297,176 for the year 2007 primarily related to several assets reaching full depreciation.

During 2007, we recorded an impairment expense of \$13,032 on property held for sale. We recorded no impairment expense in 2008.

**Gain on Debt Forgiveness**

We recorded no gain on debt forgiveness in 2008. During 2007, we negotiated and settled the following liabilities for less than their carrying values.

	<b>Carrying Value</b>	<b>Settlement Amount</b>	<b>Gain</b>
Accounts payable	\$ 54,795	\$ 0	\$ 54,795

**Interest Expense**

Interest expense remained relatively stable at \$97,668 for the year 2008 from \$96,668 for the year 2007.

**Liquidity and Capital Resources**

As of December 31, 2008, we had \$11,753 in cash and \$2,087,286 in current liabilities, including \$128,548 of deferred revenues that will not require settlement in cash.

At December 31, 2008, we had a working capital deficit of \$2,027,430, while at December 31, 2007 we had a deficit working capital of \$1,788,439. We do not have a line of credit or credit facility to serve as an additional source of liquidity. Historically we have relied on shareholder loans as an additional source of funds.

As of December 31, 2008, \$172,800 of the \$202,227 we owed to our trade creditors was past due. We have no formal agreements regarding payment of these amounts. At December 31, 2008, \$260,162 payable under a matured lease obligation was outstanding and we had outstanding principal and interest owed on matured notes totaling \$1,435,427. We have not made payment or negotiated an extension of the notes and the lenders have not made any payment demands. We are currently developing a plan to satisfy these notes on terms acceptable to the note holders.

During September 2005, we received an invoice from AT&T (formerly SBC) of approximately \$230,000 for services alleged to have been rendered to us between June 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. Since then, we have received a number of additional invoices from AT&T which cover services through February 2007 and total approximately \$7,970,000. AT&T stopped invoicing us for these monthly services and simply sent monthly Inter Company Billing Statements reflecting the balance of approximately \$7,970,000 with no further additions. The last Inter Company Billing Statement we received was dated December 15, 2007 and reflected a balance of approximately \$7,970,000. The alleged services were eventually identified by AT&T as Switched Access services. We formally notified AT&T in writing that we dispute these invoices and requested that AT&T withdraw and/or credit all of these invoices in full. AT&T has not responded to our written dispute. We believe AT&T has no basis for these charges. Therefore, we have not recorded any expense or liability related to these billings.

	<b>For the Years Ended December 31,</b>	
	<b>2008</b>	<b>2007</b>
Net cash flows provided by operations	\$ 46,261	\$ 165,503
Net cash flows used in investing activities	(51,826)	(83,844)
Net cash flows provided by (used in) financing activities	1,949	(82,297)





**Table of Contents**

Cash used for the purchases of equipment was \$51,826 and \$82,934, respectively, for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007.

Cash used for principal payments on notes payable was \$26,100 and \$82,297, respectively, for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007.

Cash provided by the exercise of stock options was \$28,049 for the year ended December 31, 2008.

The planned expansion of our business will require significant capital to fund capital expenditures, working capital needs, and debt service. Our principal capital expenditure requirements will include:

mergers and acquisitions and

further development of operations support systems and other automated back office systems

Because our cost of developing new networks and services, funding other strategic initiatives, and operating our business depend on a variety of factors (including, among other things, the number of subscribers and the service for which they subscribe, the nature and penetration of services that may be offered by us, regulatory changes, and actions taken by competitors in response to our strategic initiatives), it is almost certain that actual costs and revenues will materially vary from expected amounts and these variations are likely to increase our future capital requirements. Our current cash balances will not be sufficient to fund our current business plan beyond a few months. As a consequence, we are currently focusing on revenue enhancement and cost cutting opportunities as well as working to sell non-core assets and to extend vendor payment terms. We continue to seek additional convertible debt or equity financing as well as the placement of a credit facility to fund our liquidity needs. There is no assurance that we will be able to obtain additional capital on satisfactory terms or at all or on terms that will not dilute our shareholders' interests. In the event we are unable to obtain additional capital or to obtain it on acceptable terms or in sufficient amounts, we will be required to delay the further development of our network or take other actions. This could have a material adverse effect on our business, operating results and financial condition and our ability to achieve sufficient cash flows to service debt requirements.

Our ability to fund the capital expenditures and other costs contemplated by our business plan and to make scheduled payments with respect to bank borrowings will depend upon, among other things, our ability to seek and obtain additional financing in the near term. Capital will be needed in order to implement our business plan, deploy our network, expand our operations and obtain and retain a significant number of customers in our target markets. Each of these factors is, to a large extent, subject to economic, financial, competitive, political, regulatory, and other factors, many of which are beyond our control.

There is no assurance that we will be successful in developing and maintaining a level of cash flows from operations sufficient to permit payment of our outstanding indebtedness. If we are unable to generate sufficient cash flows from operations to service our indebtedness, we will be required to modify our growth plans, limit our capital expenditures, restructure or refinance our indebtedness or seek additional capital or liquidate our assets. There is no assurance that (i) any of these strategies could be effectuated on satisfactory terms, if at all, or on a timely basis or (ii) any of these strategies will yield sufficient proceeds to service our debt or otherwise adequately fund operations.

As of December 31, 2008, our material contractual obligations and commitments were:

	Total	Payments Due By Period			
		Less than 1 Year	1 - 3 Years	3 - 5 Years	More than 5 Years
Long-term debt (a)	\$ 804,536	\$ 545,436	\$ 104,400	\$ 104,400	\$ 50,300
Operating leases	196,376	196,376			
Other agreements (b)	260,162	5,988	17,964	17,964	218,246
Total contractual cash obligations	\$ 1,261,074	\$ 747,800	\$ 122,364	\$ 122,364	\$ 268,546

(a)

Included in this item are required principal payments under a \$293,900 note payable. Also included are principal payments under convertible promissory notes totaling \$510,636 that were matured at December 31, 2008. The convertible promissory notes are included in the Less than One Year total. We have not made payment or negotiated an extension of the convertible promissory notes, and the lenders have not made any demands. We are currently developing a plan to satisfy these notes subject to the approval of each individual note holder.

- (b) This item represents the required payments on a matured lease obligation.



## **Table of Contents**

### **Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates**

The preparation of our financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires us to make estimates and assumptions that affect certain reported amounts and disclosures. In applying our accounting principles, we must often make individual estimates and assumptions regarding expected outcomes or uncertainties. As you might expect, the actual results or outcomes are generally different than the estimated or assumed amounts. These differences are usually minor and are included in our consolidated financial statements as soon as they are known. Our estimates, judgments and assumptions are continually evaluated based on available information and experience. Because of the use of estimates inherent in the financial reporting process, actual results could differ from those estimates.

We periodically review the carrying value of our intangible assets when events and circumstances warrant such a review. One of the methods used for this review is performed using estimates of future cash flows. If the carrying value of our intangible assets is considered impaired, an impairment charge is recorded for the amount by which the carrying value of the intangible assets exceeds its fair value. We believe that the estimates of future cash flows and fair value are reasonable. Changes in estimates of such cash flows and fair value, however, could affect the calculation and result in additional impairment charges in future periods.

We review loss contingencies and evaluate the events and circumstances related to these contingencies. In accordance with Statement of Financial Accounting Standard ( SFAS ) No. 5 *Accounting for Contingencies*, we disclose material loss contingencies that are possible or probable, but cannot be estimated. For loss contingencies that are both estimable and probable the loss contingency is accrued and expense is recognized in the financial statements.

During September 2005, we received an invoice from AT&T (formerly SBC) of approximately \$230,000 for services alleged to have been rendered to us between June 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. Since then, we have received a number of additional invoices from AT&T which cover services through February 2007 and total approximately \$7,970,000. AT&T stopped invoicing us for these monthly services and simply sent monthly Inter Company Billing Statements reflecting the balance of approximately \$7,970,000 with no further additions. The last Inter Company Billing Statement we received was dated December 15, 2007 and reflected a balance of approximately \$7,970,000. The alleged services were eventually identified by AT&T as Switched Access services. We formally notified AT&T in writing that we dispute these invoices and requested that AT&T withdraw and/or credit all of these invoices in full. AT&T has not responded to our written dispute. We believe AT&T has no basis for these charges. Therefore, we have not recorded any expense or liability related to these billings.

We recognize revenue in accordance with Securities and Exchange Commission ( SEC ) Staff Accounting Bulletin ( SAB ) No. 104, *Revenue Recognition* . Access service revenues are recognized on a monthly basis over the life of each contract as services are provided. Contract periods range from monthly to yearly. Carrier-neutral telecommunications co-location revenues and traditional telephone services are recognized on a monthly basis over the life of the contract as services are provided. Revenue that is received in advance of the services provided is deferred until the services are provided by the Company. Revenue related to set up charges is also deferred and amortized over the life of the contract.

We began billing AT&T (formerly SBC) reciprocal compensation (fees for terminating AT&T customer s local calls onto our network) during 2004, and have billed for the periods of March 2003 through June 2006. AT&T failed to pay and is disputing approximately \$183,700. We are pursuing AT&T for all balances due, however there is significant uncertainty as to whether or not we will be successful. Upon the ultimate resolution of AT&T s challenge, we will recognize the associated revenue, if any. We do not expect reciprocal compensation to be a significant or a long-term revenue source.

### **Certain Accounting Matters**

In May 2008, the Financial Accounting Standards Board ( FASB ) issued the Statements of Financial Accounting Standards No. 162, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles* ( SFAS 162 ). SFAS 162 identifies the sources of accounting principles and the framework for selecting the principles to be used in the preparation of financial statements of nongovernmental entities that are presented in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles in the United States of America. SFAS 162 is effective sixty days following the SEC s approval of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board amendments to AU Section 411, *The Meaning of Present fairly in*

*conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.* We are currently evaluating the potential impact, if any, of the adoption of SFAS 162 on our consolidated financial statements, results of operations and cash flows.

In April 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position ( FSP ) No. 142-3, *Determination of the Useful Life of Intangible Assets* ( FSP 142-3 ). FSP 142-3 amends the factors an entity should consider in developing renewal or extension assumptions used in determining the useful life of recognized intangible assets under FASB Statement No. 142, *Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets*. This new guidance applies prospectively to intangible assets that are acquired individually or with a group of other assets in business combinations and asset acquisitions. FSP 142-3 is effective for us for fiscal years beginning January 1, 2009. We are evaluating the potential impact of the provisions of this statement on our consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

**Table of Contents**

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 141 (revised 2007), *Business Combinations* ( SFAS 141R ) and SFAS No. 160, *Noncontrolling Interests in Consolidated Financial Statements – an amendment of ARB No. 51* ( SFAS 160 ). SFAS 141R changes the accounting for business combinations, including the measurement of acquirer shares issued in consideration for a business combination, the recognition of contingent consideration, the accounting for pre-acquisition gain and loss contingencies, the recognition of capitalized in-process research and development, the accounting for acquisition-related restructuring cost accruals, the treatment of acquisition related transaction costs, and the recognition of changes in the acquirer's income tax valuation allowance. SFAS 160 will change the accounting and reporting for minority interests, reporting them as equity separate from the parent entity's equity, as well as requiring expanded disclosures. The provisions of SFAS 141R and SFAS 160 are effective for us for fiscal years beginning January 1, 2009. We are evaluating the provision of these statements on our consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

Effective December 30, 2007, we adopted the provisions of SFAS No. 157, *Fair Value Measurements* ( SFAS 157 ), which defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value and expands disclosures about fair value measurements required under other accounting pronouncements. Issued in February 2008, FSP 157-1 *Application of FASB Statement No. 157 to FASB Statement No. 13 and Other Accounting Pronouncements That Address Fair Value Measurements for Purposes of Lease Classification or Measurement under Statement 13*, removed leasing transactions accounted for under Statement 13 and related guidance from the scope of SFAS 157. FSP 157-2 *Partial Deferral of the Effective Date of Statement 157* ( FSP 157-2 ), deferred the effective date of SFAS 157 for all nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities to fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2008.

SFAS 157 clarifies that fair value is an exit price, representing the amount that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants. SFAS 157 also requires that a fair value measurement reflect the assumptions market participants would use in pricing an asset or liability based on the best information available. Assumptions include the risks inherent in a particular valuation technique (such as a pricing model) and/or the risks inherent in the inputs to the model. The adoption of SFAS 157 did not have a significant impact on our financial statements.

SFAS 157 establishes a fair value hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure fair value. The hierarchy gives the highest priority to unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (Level 1 measurements) and the lowest priority to unobservable inputs (Level 3 measurements). The three levels of the fair value hierarchy under SFAS No. 157 are described below:

- Level 1 Unadjusted quoted prices in active markets that are accessible at the measurement date for identical, unrestricted assets or liabilities;
- Level 2 Quoted prices in markets that are not active or financial instruments for which all significant inputs are observable, either directly or indirectly; and
- Level 3 Prices or valuations that require inputs that are both significant to the fair value measurement and unobservable.

In October 2008, the FASB issued FSP 157-3, *Determining the Fair Value of a Financial Asset When the Market for That Asset Is Not Active* ( FSP 157-3 ). The FSP clarifies the application of SFAS 157 in a market that is not active and provides an example to illustrate key considerations in determining the fair value of a financial asset when the market for that financial asset is not active. The FSP is effective October 10, 2008, and for prior periods for which financial statements have not been issued. We adopted the provisions of FSP 157-3 in our financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2008. The adoption did not have a material impact on our consolidated results of operations or financial position.

**Item 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk.**

As a smaller reporting company, we are not required and have not elected to report any information under this item.

**Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data.**

Our financial statements, prepared in accordance with Regulation S-K, are set forth in this Report beginning on page F-1.

**Item 9. Changes In and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure.**

During 2008 and 2007, we did not have disagreements with our principal independent accountants.



## **Table of Contents**

### **Item 9A. Controls and Procedures**

Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer are responsible primarily for establishing and maintaining disclosure controls and procedures designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed in our reports filed or submitted under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the Exchange Act ) is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the rules and forms of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. These controls and procedures are designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed in our reports filed or submitted under the Exchange Act is accumulated and communicated to our management, including our principal executive and principal financial officers, or persons performing similar functions, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.

Furthermore, our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer are responsible for the design and supervision of our internal controls over financial reporting that are then effected by and through our board of directors, management and other personnel, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of our financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. These policies and procedures

- (i) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of our assets;
  
- (ii) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that our receipts and expenditures are being made only in accordance with authorizations of our management and directors; and
  
- (iii) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use or disposition of our assets that could have a material effect on our financial statements.

Our Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer conducted their evaluation using the criteria set forth by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission in Internal Control Integrated Framework. Based upon their evaluation of the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures and the internal controls over financial reporting as of the last day of the period covered by this Report, they concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures and internal controls over financial reporting were fully effective during and as of the last day of the period covered by this Report and reported to our auditors and the audit committee of our board of directors that no change in our disclosure controls and procedures and internal control over financial reporting occurred during the period covered by this Report that would have materially affected or is reasonably likely to materially affect our disclosure controls and procedures or internal control over financial reporting. In conducting their evaluation of our disclosure controls and procedures and internal controls over financial reporting, these executive officers did not discover any fraud that involved management or other employees who have a significant role in our disclosure controls and procedures and internal controls over financial reporting. Furthermore, there were no significant changes in our disclosure controls and procedures, internal controls over financial reporting, or other factors that could significantly affect our disclosure controls and procedures or internal controls over financial reporting subsequent to the date of their evaluation. Because no significant deficiencies or material weaknesses were discovered, no corrective actions were necessary or taken to correct significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in our internal controls and disclosure controls and procedures.

### **Item 9A(T). Controls and Procedures.**

This annual report does not include an attestation report of our registered public accounting firm regarding internal control over financial reporting. Management's report was not subject to attestation by our registered public accounting firm pursuant to temporary rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission that permit us to provide only management's report in this annual report.

### **Item 9B. Other Information**

During the three months ended December 31, 2008 we did not have any events reportable on Form 8-K that were not reported.





**Table of Contents****PART III.****Item 10. Directors, Executive Officers, and Corporate Governance.**

The following information is furnished as of March 27, 2009 for each person who serves on our Board of Directors or serves as one of our executive officers. Our Board of Directors currently consists of two members, although we intend to increase the size of the Board in the future. The directors serve one-year terms until their successors are elected. Our executive officers are elected annually by our Board. The executive officers serve terms of one year or until their death, resignation or removal by our Board. There are no family relationships between our directors and executive officers. In addition, there was no arrangement or understanding between any executive officer and any other person pursuant to which any person was selected as an executive officer.

Name	Age	Position
Timothy J. Kilkenny	50	Chairman of the Board of Directors and CEO
Roger P. Baresel	53	Director, President, Chief Financial Officer and Secretary
Jason C. Ayers	34	Vice President of Operations
Patricia R. Shurley	52	Vice President of Finance
Michael D. Tomas	36	Vice President of Technology

Timothy J. Kilkenny has served as our Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of Directors since our inception in May 1995. Prior to that time, he spent 14 years in the financial planning business as a manager for both MetLife and Prudential. Mr. Kilkenny is a graduate of Central Bible College in Springfield, Missouri.

Roger P. Baresel became one of our directors and our Chief Financial Officer on November 9, 2000, and our President on October 13, 2003. Mr. Baresel is an accomplished senior executive and consultant who has served at a variety of companies. While serving as President and CFO of Advantage Marketing Systems, Inc., a publicly-held company engaged in the multi-level marketing of healthcare and dietary supplements, from June 1995 to May 2000, annual sales increased from \$2.5 million to in excess of \$22.4 million and annual earnings increased from \$80,000 to more than \$1.2 million. Also, during this period Advantage successfully completed two public offerings, four major acquisitions and its stock moved from the over the counter bulletin board to the American Stock Exchange.

Mr. Baresel has the following degrees from Central State University in Edmond, Oklahoma: BA Psychology, BS Accounting and MBA Finance, in which he graduated Summa Cum Laude. Mr. Baresel is also a certified public accountant.

Jason C. Ayers has been our Vice President of Operations since December 8, 2000 and prior to that served as President of Animus, a privately-held web hosting company which we acquired on April 1, 1998. Mr. Ayers received a BS degree from Southern Nazarene University in Bethany, Oklahoma in May 1996 with a triple major in Computer Science, Math and Physics. Upon graduating, he was a co-founder of Animus.

Patricia R. Shurley has been our Vice President of Finance since May 2001. Prior to that, she served for three years as the Controller for Advantage Marketing Systems, Inc., a publicly-held company engaged in the multi-level marketing of healthcare and dietary supplements. Prior to that she was self-employed and owned an accounting practice. She graduated from the University of Central Oklahoma in Edmond, Oklahoma with a BS degree in Accounting and is a certified public accountant.

Michael D. Tomas has been our Vice President of Technology since September 2003. Prior to that, he was our Information Systems Manager since June 1999 and our employee since July 1996. Mr. Tomas has formal training with Cisco, Win 3.1, Win95/98, and Windows NT 4.0 as well as LAN/WAN setup, including experience with wireless networking and is Lucent certified.

**Audit Committee Financial Expert**

Because our board of directors only consists of two directors, each of whom does not qualify as an independent director; our board performs the functions of an audit committee. Our board of directors has determined that Roger P. Baresel, our President and Chief Financial Officer qualifies as a financial expert. This determination was based upon Mr. Baresel's

understanding of generally accepted accounting principles and financial statements;

ability to assess the general application of generally accepted accounting principles in connection with the accounting for estimates, accruals and reserves;  
experience preparing, auditing, analyzing or evaluating financial statements that present the breadth and level of complexity of accounting issues that are generally comparable to the breadth and complexity of issues that can reasonably be expected to be raised by our financial statements, or experience actively supervising one or more persons engaged in such activities;  
understanding of internal controls and procedures for financial reporting; and  
understanding of audit committee functions.

**Table of Contents**

Mr. Baresel's experience and qualification as a financial expert were acquired through the active supervision of a principal financial officer, principal accounting officer, controller, public accountant, auditor or person performing similar functions and overseeing or assessing the performance of companies or public accountants with respect to the preparation, auditing or evaluation of financial statements.

Mr. Baresel is not an independent director. We have been unable to attract a person to serve as one of our directors and that would qualify both as an independent director and as a financial expert because of inability to compensate our directors and provide liability insurance protection.

**Compliance with Section 16(a) of the Exchange Act, Beneficial Ownership Reporting Requirements**

Section 16(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, requires our directors and executive officers and any persons who own more than 10% of a registered class of our equity securities to file with the Securities and Exchange Commission ( SEC ) and each exchange on which our securities are listed, reports of ownership and subsequent changes in ownership of our common stock and our other securities. Officers, directors and greater than 10% stockholders are required by SEC regulation to furnish us with copies of all Section 16(a) forms they file. Based solely on review of the copies of such reports furnished to us or written representations that no other reports were required, we believe that during 2008 all filing requirements applicable to our officers, directors and greater than 10% beneficial owners were met.

**Code of Ethics**

On March 25, 2003, our board of directors adopted our code of ethics that applies to all of our employees and directors, including our principal executive officer, principal financial officer, principal accounting officer or controller, and persons performing similar functions. A copy of the portion of this code of ethics that applies to our principal executive officer, principal financial officer, principal accounting officer or controller, and persons performing similar functions may be obtained by written request addressed to Mr. Roger P. Baresel, Corporate Secretary, Fullnet Communications, Inc., 201 Robert S. Kerr, Suite 210, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102.

**Item 11. Executive Compensation**

The following table sets forth, for the last three fiscal years, the cash compensation paid by us to our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer (the Named Executive Officers ). None of our other executive officers earned annual compensation in excess of \$100,000 during 2008.

Name and Principal Position	Fiscal Year	Annual Compensation		Long-Term Compensation Securities Underlying Options and Warrants (#) (1)
		Salary	Other Compensation	
Timothy J. Kilkenny Chairman and CEO	2008	\$ 115,187(2)	\$ 28,930(4)	
	2007	\$ 115,877(2)	\$ 27,539(5)	
	2006	\$ 101,722(3)	\$ 26,847(6)	
Roger P. Baresel President and CFO	2008	\$ 47,468(7)	\$ 31,366(10)	
	2007	\$ 60,536(8)	\$ 30,088(11)	
	2006	\$ 82,290(9)	\$ 32,349(12)	

(1) Options are granted with an exercise price equal to the fair market value of our common

stock on the date of the grant.

- (2) Includes \$40,121 of deferred compensation.
- (3) Includes \$32,948 of deferred compensation.
- (4) Represents \$8,400 of expense reimbursement for business use of Mr. Kilkenny's automobile, \$1,800 of expense reimbursement for Mr. Kilkenny's Internet connection and cell phone, \$16,433 of insurance premiums, and \$2,297 of post retirement benefits paid by us for the benefit of Mr. Kilkenny.
- (5) Represents \$8,400 of expense reimbursement for business use of Mr. Kilkenny's automobile, \$1,800 of expense reimbursement

for  
Mr. Kilkenny's  
Internet  
connection and  
cell phone,  
\$14,796 of  
insurance  
premiums, and  
\$2,543 of post  
retirement  
benefits paid by  
us for the  
benefit of  
Mr. Kilkenny.

- (6) Represents  
\$8,400 of  
expense  
reimbursement  
for business use  
of  
Mr. Kilkenny's  
automobile,  
\$1,800 of  
expense  
reimbursement  
for  
Mr. Kilkenny's  
Internet  
connection and  
cell phone,  
\$14,701 of  
insurance  
premiums, and  
\$1,946 of post  
retirement  
benefits paid by  
us for the  
benefit of  
Mr. Kilkenny.

- (7) Includes \$8,051  
of deferred  
compensation.

- (8) Includes \$6,051  
of deferred  
compensation.

- (9) Includes  
\$32,018 of

deferred  
compensation.

(10) Represents  
\$8,400 of  
expense  
reimbursement  
for business use  
of Mr. Baresel's  
automobile,  
\$4,560 of  
expense  
reimbursement  
for Mr. Baresel's  
home office and  
cell phone,  
\$16,551 of  
insurance  
premiums, and  
\$1,855 of post  
retirement  
benefits paid by  
us for the  
benefit of  
Mr. Baresel.

(11) Represents  
\$8,400 of  
expense  
reimbursement  
for business use  
of Mr. Baresel's  
automobile,  
\$5,040 of  
expense  
reimbursement  
for Mr. Baresel's  
home office and  
cell phone,  
\$14,797 of  
insurance  
premiums, and  
\$1,851 of post  
retirement  
benefits paid by  
us for the  
benefit of  
Mr. Baresel.

(12) Represents  
\$8,400 of

expense  
reimbursement  
for business use  
of Mr. Baresel's  
automobile,  
\$7,440 of  
expense  
reimbursement  
for Mr. Baresel's  
home office and  
cell phone,  
\$14,702 of  
insurance  
premiums and  
\$1,807 of post  
retirement  
benefits paid by  
us for the  
benefit of  
Mr. Baresel.



**Table of Contents****Stock Options Granted**

We do not have a written stock option plan. However, the Board of Directors granted to our employees stock options exercisable for the purchase of 6,000 shares of our common stock during 2008. No stock options were granted to Mr. Kilkenny during 2008.

All options granted during 2008 are nonqualified stock options. During 2008, an aggregate of 6,000 options were granted outside of a formal plan to employees. Options granted generally become exercisable in part after one year from the date of grant and generally have a term of ten years following the date of grant, unless sooner terminated in accordance with the terms of the stock option agreement.

**2008 Year End Option Values**

The following table sets forth information related to the exercise of stock options during 2008 and the number and value of options held by the following Named Executive Officers at December 31, 2008. During 2008, the Named Executive Officers did not exercise any options, nor did we reprice any outstanding options. For the purposes of this table, the value of an option is the difference between the estimated fair market value at December 31, 2008 of the shares of common stock subject to the option and the aggregate exercise price of such option.

Name	Number of Unexercised Options at December 31, 2008		Value of Unexercised In-the-Money Options at December 31, 2008 (1)	
	Exercisable	Unexercisable	Exercisable	Unexercisable
Timothy J. Kilkenny Chairman and CEO	714,000		\$	\$
Roger P. Baresel President and CFO	417,045		\$	\$

(1) Based on the December 31, 2008 estimated fair value of our common stock of \$.02 per share.

**Aggregate Stock Option Exercise**

The following table sets forth information related to the number of stock options held by the named executive officers at December 31, 2008. During 2008, no options to purchase our common stock were exercised by the named executive officers.

**Outstanding Equity Awards at December 31, 2008**

Name	Number of Common Stock Underlying Options		Option Exercise Price(1)	Option Expiration Date
	Exercisable	Unexercisable		
Timothy J. Kilkenny Chairman and CEO	452,000		\$ .04	10/09/13
	80,000		\$ .05	03/18/12
	32,000		\$ .11	11/16/11
	50,000		\$ .70	07/18/11
	100,000		\$ 1.00	12/08/10

Roger P. Baresel	200,848	\$	.04	10/09/13
President and CFO	40,000	\$	.05	03/18/12
	23,745	\$	.11	11/16/11
	52,452	\$	.50	10/16/11
	100,000	\$	1.00	10/13/10

(1) The closing sale price of our common stock as reported on the OTC Bulletin Board on December 31, 2008 was \$0.02.

**Director Compensation**

During the fiscal year ended December 31, 2008, our directors did not receive any compensation for serving in such capacities.

**Table of Contents****Employment Agreements and Lack of Keyman Insurance**

On July 31, 2002, we entered into employment agreements with Timothy J. Kilkenny and Roger P. Baresel. Each agreement is effective January 1, 2002, and has a term of two years; however, the term is automatically extended for additional one-year terms, unless we or the employee gives six-month advance notice of termination. These agreements provide, among other things, (i) an annual base salary of at least \$75,000 for Mr. Kilkenny (of which he has voluntarily agreed to defer \$25,000) and \$65,000 for Mr. Baresel (of which he has voluntarily agreed to defer \$15,000), (ii) bonuses at the discretion of the Board of Directors, (iii) entitlement to fringe benefits including medical and insurance benefits as may be provided to our other senior officers; and (iv) eligibility to participate in our incentive, bonus, benefit or similar plans. These agreements require the employee to devote the required time and attention to our business and affairs necessary to carry out his responsibilities and duties. These agreements may be terminated under certain circumstances and upon termination provide for (i) the employee to be released from personal liability for our debts and obligations, and (ii) the payment of any amounts we owe the employee. We do not maintain any keyman insurance covering the death or disability of our executive officers.

**Item 12. Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters.****Security Ownership**

The following table sets forth information as of March 27, 2009, concerning the beneficial ownership of our Common Stock by each person (other than our directors and executive officers) who is known by us to own more than 5% of the outstanding shares of our Common Stock. The information is based on Schedules 13D or 13G filed by the applicable beneficial owner with the Securities and Exchange Commission or other information provided to us by the beneficial owner or our stock transfer agent.

Beneficial Owner (1)	Common Stock	
	Number of Shares	Percent of Class (1)
Generation Capital Associates (2) 1085 Riverside Trace, Atlanta, Georgia 30328	778,108	9.9%
Karen Gustafson & Greg Kusnick(3) P.O. Box 22443, Seattle, Washington 98112	410,231	5.4%
Greg Lowney & Maryanne Snyder (4) 15207 N.E. 68 <sup>th</sup> Street, Redmond, Washington 98052	410,231	5.4%
Laura L. Kilkenny (5) 3160 Long Drive, Newcastle, Oklahoma 73065	465,000	6.3%

(1) Percent of class for any stockholder listed is calculated without regard to shares of common stock issuable to others upon exercise of outstanding stock options. Any shares a

stockholder is deemed to own by having the right to acquire by exercise of an option or warrant are considered to be outstanding solely for the purpose of calculating that stockholder's ownership percentage. We computed the percentage ownership amounts in accordance with the provisions of Rule 13d-3(d), which includes as beneficially owned all shares of common stock which the person or group has the right to acquire within the next 60 days, based upon 7,425,565 outstanding shares of common stock as of March 27, 2009.

- (2) **Generation Capital Associates** holds 267,608 shares of our common stock. The number of shares includes 345,000 shares of our common stock that are

subject to currently exercisable common stock purchase warrants. Amounts shown do not include 54,500 shares of our common stock that are subject to common stock purchase warrants that are not currently exercisable because they contain a provision prohibiting their exercise to the extent that they would increase Generation Capital Associates percentage ownership beyond 9.9% of our outstanding shares of common stock. We have an operating lease and an interim loan with Generation Capital. At December 31, 2008 we had recorded \$260,162 in unpaid lease payments and the outstanding principal and interest of the interim loan was \$514,454.

- (3) Ms. Gustafson & Mr. Kusnick hold 155,129 shares of our common stock. The number of shares includes 255,102 shares of our common stock that are subject to a currently convertible promissory note.
- (4) Mr. Lowney & Ms. Snyder hold 155,129 shares of our common stock. The number of shares includes 255,102 shares of our common stock that are subject to a currently convertible promissory note.
- (5) Ms. Kilkenny is the former-wife of Timothy J. Kilkenny, our Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer. Ms. Kilkenny holds 415,000 shares of our common stock. The number of shares includes 50,000 shares of our common stock that are subject to currently

exercisable  
common stock  
purchase  
options.

**Table of Contents**

The following table sets forth information as of March 27, 2009, concerning the beneficial ownership of our Common Stock by each of our directors, each executive officer named in the table under the heading Item 10. Directors and Executive Officers, and Corporate Governance and all of our directors and executive officers as a group. There are no family relationships amongst our executive officers and directors. Unless otherwise indicated, the beneficial owner has sole voting and investment power with respect to such stock.

Beneficial Owner (1)	Common Stock Beneficially Owned	
	Number of Shares	Percent of Class (1)
Timothy J. Kilkenny* (2)(3)	1,760,722	21.7%
Roger P. Baresel* (2)(4)	575,362	7.4%
Jason C. Ayers (2)(5)	405,795	5.5%
Patricia R. Shurley (6)	292,000	3.9%
Michael D. Tomas (7)	260,000	3.5%
All executive officers and directors as a group (5 individuals)	3,293,879	42.0%

\* Director

(1) Percent of class for any stockholder listed is calculated without regard to shares of common stock issuable to others upon exercise of outstanding stock options. Any shares a stockholder is deemed to own by having the right to acquire by exercise of an option or warrant are considered to be outstanding solely for the purpose of calculating that stockholder's



ownership percentage. We computed the percentage ownership amounts in accordance with the provisions of Rule 13d-3(d), which includes as beneficially owned all shares of common stock which the person or group has the right to acquire within the next 60 days, based upon 7,425,565 shares being outstanding at March 27, 2009.

- (2) Address is c/o  
201 Robert S.  
Kerr Avenue,  
Suite 210,  
Oklahoma City,  
Oklahoma  
73102.
  
- (3) Timothy J.  
Kilkenny and  
Barbara J.  
Kilkenny,  
husband and  
wife, hold  
946,722 and  
100,000 shares  
of our common  
stock,  
respectively.  
The number of  
shares includes  
714,000 shares  
of our common  
stock that are  
subject to  
currently

exercisable  
stock options  
held by  
Mr. Kilkenny.

- (4) Roger P. Baresel and Judith A. Baresel, husband and wife, hold 34,408 and 92,659 shares of our common stock, respectively. They hold 31,250 shares of our common stock as joint tenants. The number of shares includes 198,745 shares of our common stock subject to currently exercisable stock options held by Mr. Baresel, and 218,300 shares of our common stock subject to currently exercisable stock options held by Mrs. Baresel.
- (5) Jason C. Ayers holds 323,295 shares of our common stock. The number of shares includes 82,500 shares of our common stock that are subject to currently

exercisable  
common stock  
options held by  
Mr. Ayers.

- (6) Patricia R. Shurley holds 209,500 shares of our common stock. The number of shares includes 82,500 shares of our common stock that are subject to currently exercisable common stock purchase options held by Ms. Shurley.

- (7) Michael D. Tomas holds 177,500 shares of our common stock. The number of shares includes 82,500 shares of our common stock that are subject to currently exercisable common stock purchase options held by Mr. Tomas.

**Item 13. Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence**

We have an operating lease for certain equipment which is leased from one of our shareholders who also holds a \$293,900 interim loan (see Note E Notes Payable). The terms of the original lease, dated November 21, 2001, requires rental payments of \$6,088 per month for 12 months with a fair market purchase option at the end of the lease. Upon default on the lease, we were allowed to continue leasing the equipment on a month-to-month basis at the same monthly rate as the original lease. We have been unable to make the month-to-month payments. In January and November 2006, we agreed to extend the expiration date on 425,000 and 140,000, respectively, of common stock purchase warrants for the lessor in return for a credit of \$17,960 and \$3,940, respectively, on the operating lease. In September 2007, the lessor agreed to cease the monthly lease payments effective January 1, 2007 which generated a total of \$54,795 of forgiveness of debt income. The lessor also agreed to accept payments of \$499 per month on the balance owed. At December 31, 2008 we had recorded \$260,162 in unpaid lease payments. The loss of this equipment

would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. We have been unable to make all of the required payments pursuant to the terms of the September 2007 agreement. The lessor has not made any formal demands for payment or instituted collection action; however we are in discussions with the lessor to restructure this liability.

**Item 14. Principal Accountant Fees and Services**

The following table sets forth the aggregate fees, including expenses, billed to us for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 by our principal accountant.

	2008	2007
Audit Fees Eide Bailly LLP and its predecessor Murrell, Hall, McIntosh & Co., PLLP	\$ 39,100	\$ 35,500
Audit Related Fees		
Tax Fees		
All Other Fees		

The audit fees include services rendered by our principal accountant for the audit of our financial statements, review of financial statements included in our quarterly reports and other fees that are normally provided by the accountant in connection with statutory and regulatory filings or engagements. Because our Board of Directors only consists of two directors, each of whom does not qualify as an independent director; our Board of Directors performs the functions of an audit committee. It is our policy that the Board of Directors pre-approve all audit, tax and related services. All of the services described above in this Item 14 were approved in advance by our Board of Directors. No items were approved by the Board of Directors pursuant to paragraph (c)(7)(ii)(C) of Rule 2-01 of Regulation S-X.

**Table of Contents****Item 15. Exhibits, Financial Statement Schedules.**

(a) The following exhibits are filed as part of this Report:

<i>Exhibit Number</i>	<i>Exhibit</i>	<i>#</i>
3.1	Certificate of Incorporation, as amended (filed as Exhibit 2.1 to Registrant's Registration Statement on Form 10-SB, file number 000-27031 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
3.2	Bylaws (filed as Exhibit 2.2 to Registrant's Registration Statement on Form 10-SB, file number 000-27031 and incorporated herein by reference)	#
4.1	Specimen Certificate of Registrant's Common Stock (filed as Exhibit 4.1 to the Company's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1999, and incorporated herein by reference).	#
4.2	Certificate of Correction to the Amended Certificate of Incorporation and the Ninth Section of the Certificate of Incorporation (filed as Exhibit 2.1 to Registrant's Registration Statement on form 10-SB, file number 000-27031 and incorporated by reference).	#
4.3	Certificate of Correction to Articles II and V of Registrant's Bylaws (filed as Exhibit 2.1 to Registrant's Registration Statement on Form 10-SB, file number 000-27031 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
4.4	Form of Warrant Agreement for Interim Financing in the amount of \$505,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.1 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
4.5	Form of Warrant Certificate for Florida Investors for Interim Financing in the amount of \$505,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.2 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
4.6	Form of Promissory Note for Florida Investors for Interim Financing in the amount of \$505,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.3 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
4.7	Form of Warrant Certificate for Georgia Investors for Interim Financing in the amount of \$505,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.4 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
4.8	Form of Promissory Note for Georgia Investors for Interim Financing in the amount of \$505,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.5 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
4.9	Form of Warrant Certificate for Illinois Investors for Interim Financing in the amount of \$505,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.6 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
4.10	Form of Promissory Note for Illinois Investors for Interim Financing in the amount of \$505,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.7 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#

Edgar Filing: FULLNET COMMUNICATIONS INC - Form 10-K

- 4.11 Form of Warrant Agreement for Interim Financing in the amount of \$500,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.8 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference). #
- 4.12 Form of Warrant Certificate for Interim Financing in the amount of \$500,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.9 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference). #
- 4.13 Form of Promissory Note for Interim Financing in the amount of \$500,000 (filed as Exhibit 4.10 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference). #
- 4.14 Form of Convertible Promissory Note for September 29, 2000, private placement (filed as Exhibit 4.13 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference). #
- 4.15 Form of Warrant Agreement for September 29, 2000, private placement (filed as Exhibit 4.13 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference). #
- 4.16 Form of 2001 Exchange Warrant Agreement (filed as Exhibit 4.16 to Registrant's Form 10-QSB for the quarter ended June 30, 2001 and incorporated herein by reference) #
- 4.17 Form of 2001 Exchange Warrant Certificate (filed as Exhibit 4.17 to Registrant's Form 10-QSB for the quarter ended June 30, 2001 and incorporated herein by reference) #

**Table of Contents**

<i>Exhibit Number</i>	<i>Exhibit</i>	<i>#</i>
10.1	Financial Advisory Services Agreement between the Company and National Securities Corporation, dated September 17, 1999 (filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1999, and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.2	Lease Agreement between the Company and BOK Plaza Associates, LLC, dated December 2, 1999 (filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1999, and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.3	Interconnection agreement between Registrant and Southwestern Bell dated March 19, 1999 (filed as Exhibit 6.1 to Registrant's Registration Statement on Form 10-SB, file number 000-27031 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.4	Stock Purchase Agreement between the Company and Animus Communications, Inc. (filed as Exhibit 6.2 to Registrant's Registration Statement on Form 10-SB, file number 000-27031 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.5	Registrar Accreditation Agreement effective February 8, 2000, by and between Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers and FullWeb, Inc. d/b/a FullNic f/k/a Animus Communications, Inc. (filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended March 31, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.6	Master License Agreement For KMC Telecom V, Inc., dated June 20, 2000, by and between FullNet Communications, Inc. and KMC Telecom V, Inc. (filed as Exhibit 10.1 to the Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended June 30, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.7	Domain Registrar Project Completion Agreement, dated May 10, 2000, by and between FullNet Communications, Inc., FullWeb, Inc. d/b/a FullNic and Think Capital (filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended June 30, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.8	Amendment to Financial Advisory Services Agreement between Registrant and National Securities Corporation, dated April 21, 2000 (filed as Exhibit 10.3 to Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB for the Quarter ended June 30, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.9	Asset Purchase Agreement dated June 2, 2000, by and between FullNet of Nowata and FullNet Communications, Inc. (filed as Exhibit 99.1 to Registrant's Form 8-K filed on June 20, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.10	Asset Purchase Agreement dated February 4, 2000, by and between FullNet of Bartlesville and FullNet Communications, Inc. (filed as Exhibit 2.1 to Registrant's Form 8-K filed on February 18, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.11	Agreement and Plan of Merger Among FullNet Communications, Inc., FullNet, Inc. and Harvest Communications, Inc. dated February 29, 2000 (filed as Exhibit 2.1 to Registrant's	#

Edgar Filing: FULLNET COMMUNICATIONS INC - Form 10-K

Form 8-K filed on March 10, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).

10.12	Asset Purchase Agreement dated January 25, 2000, by and between FullNet of Tahlequah, and FullNet Communications, Inc. (filed as Exhibit 2.1 to Registrant's Form 8-K filed on February 9, 2000 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.13	Promissory Note dated August 2, 2000, issued to Timothy J. Kilkenny (filed as Exhibit 10.13 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.14	Warrant Agreement dated August 2, 2000, issued to Timothy J. Kilkenny (filed as Exhibit 10.14 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.15	Warrant Certificate dated August 2, 2000 issued to Timothy J. Kilkenny (filed as Exhibit 10.15 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.16	Stock Option Agreement dated December 8, 2000, issued to Timothy J. Kilkenny (filed as Exhibit 10.16 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#



**Table of Contents**

<i>Exhibit Number</i>	<i>Exhibit</i>	<i>#</i>
10.17	Warrant Agreement dated November 9, 2000, issued to Roger P. Baresel (filed as Exhibit 10.17 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.18	Warrant Agreement dated December 29, 2000, issued to Roger P. Baresel (filed as Exhibit 10.18 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.19	Stock Option Agreement dated February 29, 2000, issued to Wallace L Walcher (filed as Exhibit 10.19 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.20	Stock Option Agreement dated February 17, 1999, issued to Timothy J. Kilkenny (filed as Exhibit 3.1 to Registrant's Registration Statement on Form 10-SB, file number 000-27031 and incorporated herein by reference).	#
10.21	Stock Option Agreement dated October 19, 1999, issued to Wesdon C. Peacock (filed as Exhibit 10.21 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.22	Stock Option Agreement dated April 14, 2000, issued to Jason C. Ayers (filed as Exhibit 10.22 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.23	Stock Option Agreement dated May 1, 2000, issued to B. Don Turner (filed as Exhibit 10.23 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.24	Form of Stock Option Agreement dated December 8, 2000, issued to Jason C. Ayers, Wesdon C. Peacock, B. Don Turner and Wallace L. Walcher (filed as Exhibit 10.24 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.25	Warrant Certificate Dated November 9, 2000, issued to Roger P. Baresel (filed as Exhibit 10.25 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.26	Warrant Certificate Dated November 9, 2000, issued to Roger P. Baresel (filed as Exhibit 10.26 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.27	Warrant Certificate Dated December 29, 2000, issued to Roger P. Baresel (filed as Exhibit 10.27 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.28	Stock Option Agreement dated October 13, 2000, issued to Roger P. Baresel (filed as Exhibit 10.28 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.29	Stock Option Agreement dated October 12, 1999, issued to Travis Lane (filed as Exhibit 10.29 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.30	Promissory Note dated January 5, 2001, issued to Generation Capital Associates (filed as Exhibit 10.30 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).	#
10.31	Placement Agency Agreement dated November 8, 2000 between FullNet Communications, Inc. and National Securities Corporation (filed as Exhibit 10.31 to Registrant's Form 10-KSB for the	#

fiscal year ended December 31, 2000).

10.32	Promissory Note dated January 25, 2000, issued to Fullnet of Tahlequah, Inc.	#
10.33	Promissory Note dated February 7, 2000, issued to David Looper	#
10.34	Promissory Note dated February 29, 2000, issued to Wallace L. Walcher	#
10.35	Promissory Note dated June 2, 2000, issued to Lary Smith	#
10.36	Promissory Note dated June 15, 2001, issued to higganbotham.com L.L.C.	#
10.37	Promissory Note dated November 19, 2001, issued to Northeast Rural Services	#
10.38	Promissory Note dated November 19, 2001, issued to Northeast Rural Services	#

**Table of Contents**

<i>Exhibit Number</i>	<i>Exhibit</i>	
10.39	Form of Convertible Promissory Note dated September 6, 2002	#
10.40	Employment Agreement with Timothy J. Kilkenny dated July 31, 2002	#
10.41	Employment Agreement with Roger P. Baresel dated July 31, 2002	#
21.1	Subsidiaries of the Registrant	#
31.1	Certification pursuant to Rules 13a-14(a) and 15d-14(a) of Timothy J. Kilkenny	*
31.2	Certification pursuant to Rules 13a-14(a) and 15d-14(a) of Roger P. Baresel	*
32.1	Certification Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as Adopted Pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 by Timothy J. Kilkenny	*
32.2	Certification Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as Adopted Pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 by Roger P. Baresel	*

# Incorporated by reference.

\* Filed herewith.

**Table of Contents**

**SIGNATURES**

Pursuant to the requirements of the Exchange Act, the Registrant caused this Report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

**REGISTRANT:  
FULLNET COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

Date: March 31, 2009

By: /s/ TIMOTHY J. KILKENNY  
Timothy J. Kilkenny  
Chief Executive Officer

Date: March 31, 2009

By: /s/ ROGER P. BARESEL  
Roger P. Baresel  
President and Chief Financial and  
Accounting Officer

Pursuant to the requirements of the Exchange Act, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the Registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

Date: March 31, 2009

By: /s/ TIMOTHY J. KILKENNY  
Timothy J. Kilkenny,  
Chairman of the Board and Director

Date: March 31, 2009

By: /s/ ROGER P. BARESEL  
Roger P. Baresel, Director

**Table of Contents**

**Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm**

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of FullNet Communications, Inc. and Subsidiaries (the Company) as of December 31, 2008 and 2007, and the related consolidated statements of operations, stockholders deficit, and cash flows for the years then ended. These consolidated financial statements are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these consolidated financial statements based on our audit. The financial statements as of December 31, 2007, were audited by Murrell, Hall, McIntosh & Co., PLLP, who joined Eide Bailly LLP on August 1, 2008, and whose report dated March 28, 2008, expressed an unqualified opinion on those statements.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the consolidated financial statements are free of material misstatement. The Company has determined that it is not required to have, nor were we engaged to perform, an audit of its internal control over financial reporting. Our audits included consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the consolidated financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the consolidated financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of FullNet Communications, Inc. and Subsidiaries as of December 31, 2008 and 2007, and the consolidated results of its operations and its cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared assuming that the Company will continue as a going concern. As discussed in Note A to the financial statements, the Company's current liabilities exceed its current assets by \$2,027,430 as of December 31, 2008. The Company also had disputed back billings from one of its access providers. The Company disputes this claim and has not recorded any liability related to this claim as of December 31, 2008. An adverse outcome regarding this claim could have a materially adverse effect on the Company's ability to continue as a going concern. These matters, among others as discussed in Note A to the financial statements, raise substantial doubt about the ability of the Company to continue as a going concern. Management's plans in regard to these matters are described in Note A. The financial statements do not include any adjustments that might result from the outcome of this uncertainty.

/s/ Eide Bailly LLP

March 27, 2009 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

**Table of Contents**

**FullNet Communications, Inc. and Subsidiaries**  
**CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS**

	December 31,	
	2008	2007
<b>ASSETS</b>		
<b>CURRENT ASSETS</b>		
Cash	\$ 11,753	\$ 15,369
Accounts receivable, net	11,318	25,968
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	36,785	62,271
Total current assets	59,856	103,608
PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT, net	324,227	507,968
INTANGIBLE ASSETS, net	8,782	25,553
OTHER ASSETS	5,250	5,250
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 398,115</b>	<b>\$ 642,379</b>
 <b>LIABILITIES AND STOCKHOLDERS DEFICIT</b>		
<b>CURRENT LIABILITIES</b>		
Accounts payable, current portion	\$ 208,215	\$ 182,002
Accrued and other current liabilities, current portion	1,205,087	1,052,023
Notes payable, current portion	545,436	545,436
Deferred revenue	128,548	112,586
Total current liabilities	2,087,286	1,892,047
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE, less current portion	254,174	264,154
ACCRUED AND OTHER LIABILITIES, less current portion	185,755	225,849
NOTES PAYABLE, less current portion	259,100	285,200
Total liabilities	2,786,315	2,667,250
<b>STOCKHOLDERS DEFICIT</b>		
Common stock \$.00001 par value; authorized, 10,000,000 shares; issued and outstanding, 7,355,308 and 6,670,878 shares in 2008 and 2007, respectively	74	67
Common stock issuable, 70,257 shares in 2008 and 2007	57,596	57,596
Additional paid-in capital	8,378,467	8,350,255
Accumulated deficit	(10,824,337)	(10,432,789)

Total stockholders' deficit	(2,388,200)	(2,024,871)
TOTAL	\$ 398,115	\$ 642,379

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

F-2

---

**Table of Contents**

**FullNet Communications, Inc. and Subsidiaries**  
**CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS**

	Years ended December 31,	
	2008	2007
<b>REVENUES</b>		
Access service revenues	\$ 532,661	\$ 643,155
Co-location and other revenues	1,353,890	1,252,413
Total revenues	1,886,551	1,895,568
 <b>OPERATING COSTS AND EXPENSES</b>		
Cost of access service revenues	235,638	233,931
Cost of co-location and other revenues	321,196	322,922
Selling, general and administrative expenses	1,371,259	1,334,285
Depreciation and amortization	252,338	297,176
Impairment expense		13,032
Total operating costs and expenses	2,180,431	2,201,346
LOSS FROM OPERATIONS	(293,880)	(305,778)
GAIN ON DEBT FORGIVENESS		54,795
INTEREST EXPENSE	(97,668)	(96,668)
NET LOSS	\$ (391,548)	\$ (347,651)
Net loss per common share		
Basic	\$ (.05)	\$ (.05)
Assuming dilution	\$ (.05)	\$ (.05)
Weighted average number of common shares outstanding		
Basic	7,288,679	6,741,135
Assuming dilution	7,288,679	6,741,135

See accompanying notes to financial statements.



**Table of Contents**

**FullNet Communications, Inc. and Subsidiaries**  
**CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF STOCKHOLDERS DEFICIT**  
 Years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007

	Common stock		Common	Additional paid-in capital	Accumulated deficit	Total
	Shares	Amount	Stock issuable			
Balance at January 1, 2007	6,670,878	\$ 67	\$ 57,596	\$ 8,350,108	\$ (10,085,138)	\$ (1,677,367)
Stock compensation expense				147		147
Net loss					(347,651)	(347,651)
Balance at December 31, 2007	6,670,878	\$ 67	\$ 57,596	\$ 8,350,255	\$ (10,432,789)	\$ (2,024,871)
Stock options exercise	684,430	7		28,042		28,049
Stock compensation expense				170		170
Net loss					(391,548)	(391,548)
Balance at December 31, 2008	7,355,308	\$ 74	\$ 57,596	\$ 8,378,467	\$ (10,824,337)	\$ (2,388,200)

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**Table of Contents**

**FullNet Communications, Inc. and Subsidiaries**  
**CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS**

	Years ended December 31,	
	2008	2007
<b>CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES</b>		
Net loss	\$ (391,548)	\$ (347,651)
Adjustments to reconcile net loss to net cash provided by operating activities		
Depreciation and amortization	252,338	297,176
Gain on debt forgiveness		(54,795)
Impairment expense		13,032
Stock compensation	170	147
Provision for uncollectible accounts receivable	(108)	94
Net (increase) decrease in		
Accounts receivable	14,758	(1,655)
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	25,486	33,181
Net increase in		
Accounts payable	16,233	44,860
Accrued and other liabilities	112,970	176,965
Deferred revenue	15,962	4,149
Net cash provided by operating activities	46,261	165,503
<b>CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES</b>		
Purchases of property and equipment	(51,826)	(82,934)
Acquisition of assets		(910)
Net cash used in investing activities	(51,826)	(83,844)
<b>CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES</b>		
Principal payments on borrowings under notes payable	(26,100)	(82,297)
Proceeds from exercise of stock options	28,049	
Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities	1,949	(82,297)
<b>NET DECREASE IN CASH</b>	<b>(3,616)</b>	<b>(638)</b>
Cash at beginning of year	15,369	16,007
Cash at end of year	\$ 11,753	\$ 15,369

**SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURES OF CASH FLOW INFORMATION**

Cash paid for interest	\$ 31,299	\$ 13,456
------------------------	-----------	-----------

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

F-5

---

**Table of Contents**

**FullNet Communications, Inc. and Subsidiaries**  
**NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**  
December 31, 2008 and 2007

**NOTE A ORGANIZATION AND NATURE OF OPERATIONS**

FullNet Communications, Inc. and Subsidiaries (the Company) is an integrated communications provider (ICP) offering integrated communications, Internet connectivity and data storage to individuals, businesses, organizations, educational institutions and governmental agencies. Through its subsidiaries, FullNet, Inc., FullTel, Inc. and FullWeb, Inc., the Company provides high quality, reliable and scalable Internet solutions designed to meet customer needs. Services offered include:

Dial-up and direct high-speed connectivity to the Internet through the FullNet brand name;

Backbone services to private label Internet services providers (ISPs) and businesses;

Carrier-neutral telecommunications premise co-location;

Web page hosting;

Equipment co-location; and

Traditional telephone services.

The Company operates and grants credit, on an uncollateralized basis. Concentrations of credit risk with respect to accounts receivable are limited due to the large number of customers comprising the Company's customer base and their dispersion across different industries.

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles, which contemplate continuation of the Company as a going concern. However, the Company has sustained substantial net losses. At December 31, 2008 current liabilities exceeded current assets by \$2,027,430 and total liabilities exceeded total assets by \$2,388,200. In addition, during September 2005, the Company received an invoice from AT&T (formerly SBC) of approximately \$230,000 for services alleged to have been rendered to it between June 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. Since then, the Company has received a number of additional invoices from AT&T which cover services through February 2007 and total approximately \$7,970,000. AT&T then stopped invoicing the Company for these monthly services and simply sent monthly Inter Company Billing Statements reflecting the balance of approximately \$7,970,000 with no further additions. The last Inter Company Billing Statement received by the Company was dated December 15, 2007 and reflected a balance of approximately \$7,970,000. The alleged services were eventually identified by AT&T as Switched Access services. The Company formally notified AT&T in writing that it disputes these invoices and requested that AT&T withdraw and/or credit all of these invoices in full. AT&T has not responded to the Company's written dispute. The Company believes AT&T has no basis for these charges. Therefore, the Company has not recorded any expense or liability related to these billings. An adverse outcome regarding this claim could have a materially adverse effect on the Company's ability to continue as a going concern.

In view of the matters described in the preceding paragraph, the ability of the Company to continue as a going concern is dependent upon continued operations of the Company that in turn is dependent upon the Company's ability to meet its financing requirements on a continuing basis, to maintain present financing, to achieve the objectives of its business plan and to succeed in its future operations. The financial statements do not include any adjustments relating to the recoverability and classification of recorded asset amounts or amounts and classification of liabilities that might be necessary should the Company be unable to continue in existence.

The Company's business plan includes, among other things, expansion of its Internet access services through mergers and acquisitions and the development of its web hosting, co-location and traditional telephone services. Execution of the Company's business plan will require significant capital to fund capital expenditures, working capital needs and debt service. Current cash balances will not be sufficient to fund the Company's current business plan beyond the next

few months. As a consequence, the Company is currently focusing on revenue enhancement and cost cutting opportunities as well as working to sell non-core assets and to extend vendor payment terms. The Company continues to seek additional convertible debt or equity financing as well as the placement of a credit facility to fund the Company's liquidity. There can be no assurance that the Company will be able to obtain additional capital on satisfactory terms, or at all, or on terms that will not dilute the shareholders' interests.

**Table of Contents**

**NOTE B SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTING POLICIES**

A summary of the significant accounting policies consistently applied in the preparation of the accompanying consolidated financial statements follows.

**1. Consolidation**

The consolidated financial statements include the accounts of FullNet Communications, Inc. and its wholly owned subsidiaries. All material inter-company accounts and transactions have been eliminated.

**2. Revenue Recognition**

The Company recognizes revenue in accordance with Securities and Exchange Commission ( SEC ) Staff Accounting Bulletin ( SAB ) No. 104, *Revenue Recognition* . Access service revenues are recognized on a monthly basis over the life of each contract as services are provided. Contract periods range from monthly to yearly. Carrier-neutral telecommunications co-location revenues and traditional telephone services are recognized on a monthly basis over the life of the contract as services are provided. Revenue that is received in advance of the services provided is deferred until the services are provided by the Company. Revenue related to set up charges is also deferred and amortized over the life of the contract.

The Company began billing AT&T (formerly SBC) reciprocal compensation (fees for terminating AT&T customer s local calls onto the Company s network) during 2004, and has billed for the periods of March 2003 through June 2006. AT&T failed to pay and is disputing approximately \$183,700. The Company is pursuing AT&T for all balances due, however there is significant uncertainty as to whether or not the Company will be successful. Upon the ultimate resolution of AT&T s challenge, the Company will recognize the associated revenue, if any. The Company does not expect reciprocal compensation to be a significant or a long-term revenue source.

**Table of Contents****3. Accounts Receivable**

Accounts receivable consist of the following as of December 31:

	2008	2007
Accounts receivable	\$ 198,958	\$ 213,716
Less allowance for doubtful accounts	(187,640)	(187,748)
	\$ 11,318	\$ 25,968

Accounts receivable, other than certain large customer accounts which are evaluated individually, are considered past due for purposes of determining the allowance for doubtful accounts as follows:

1 - 29 days	1.5%
30 - 59 days	30%
60 - 89 days	50%
> 90 days	100%

**4. Property and Equipment**

Property and equipment are stated at cost. Depreciation is computed primarily using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the related assets as follows:

Software	3 years
Computers and equipment	5 years
Furniture and fixtures	7 years
Leasehold improvements	Shorter of estimated life of improvement or the lease term

**5. Intangible Assets**

Intangible assets consist primarily of acquired customer bases and covenants not to compete and are carried net of accumulated amortization. Upon initial application of Statement of Financial Accounting Standard ( SFAS ) No. 142, *Goodwill and Intangible Assets* ( SFAS No. 142 ), as of January 1, 2002, the Company reassessed useful lives and began amortizing these intangible assets over their estimated useful lives and in direct relation to any decreases in the acquired customer bases to which they relate. Management believes that such amortization reflects the pattern in which the economic benefits of the intangible asset are consumed or otherwise utilized.

**6. Long-Lived Assets**

The Company follows the provisions of SFAS No. 144, *Accounting for the Impairment or Disposal of Long-lived Assets* in determining impairment losses on long-term assets. All long-lived assets held and used by the Company, including intangible assets, are reviewed to determine whether any events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of the asset may not be recoverable. The Company bases its evaluation on such impairment indicators as the nature of the assets, the future economic benefit of the assets, any historical or future profitability measurements, as well as other external market conditions or factors that may be present. If such impairment indicators are present or other factors exist that indicate that the carrying amount of the asset may not be recoverable the Company determines whether an impairment has occurred through the use of an undiscounted cash flows analysis of the asset. If an impairment has occurred, the Company recognizes a loss for the difference between the carrying amount and the estimated value of the asset. Company recorded no impairments during the year ended December 31, 2008. The Company recorded an impairment expense of \$13,032 on property held for sale during the year ended December 31, 2007.





**Table of Contents****7. Accrued and Other Current Liabilities**

Accrued and other current liabilities consist of the following as of December 31:

	2008	2007
Accrued interest	\$ 445,137	\$ 384,361
Accrued deferred compensation	567,305	506,990
Accrued other liabilities	192,645	160,672
	\$ 1,205,087	\$ 1,052,023

Accrued net deferred compensation consists of the following as of December 31, 2008:

Accrued in:	
2008	\$ 60,315
2007	71,321
2006	81,752
2000-2005	353,917
	\$ 567,305

All of the Company's executive officers have voluntarily agreed to defer a portion of their compensation. This compensation is vested.

Accrued other liabilities includes \$83,501 and \$68,548 for unused vacation and sick leave at December 31, 2008 and 2007, respectively.

**8. Income Taxes**

The Company follows the liability method of accounting for income taxes. Under the liability method, deferred income taxes are provided on temporary differences between the tax basis of an asset or liability and its reported amount in the consolidated financial statements and carry forwards that will result in taxable or deductible amounts in future years. Deferred income tax assets or liabilities are determined by applying the presently enacted tax rates and laws. Additionally, the Company provides a valuation allowance on deferred tax assets if, based on the weight of available evidence, it is more likely than not that some portion or all of the deferred tax assets will not be realized. In June 2006, the Financial Accounting Standards Board ( FASB ) issued Interpretation No. 48, *Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes - an interpretation of FASB Statement No. 109* ( FIN 48 ). FIN 48 provides guidance for recognizing and measuring uncertain tax positions, as defined in SFAS 109, *Accounting for Income Taxes*. FIN 48 prescribes a threshold condition that a tax position must meet for any of the benefit of the uncertain tax position to be recognized in the financial statements. Guidance is also provided regarding de-recognition, classification and disclosure of these uncertain tax positions. FIN 48 was effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2006. The Company adopted the provisions of FIN 48 on January 1, 2007.

The Company recognizes interest and penalties related to unrecognized tax benefits in income tax expense and does not believe it has any material unrealized tax benefits at December 31, 2008. The Company files income tax returns in the U.S. federal jurisdiction and various state and local jurisdictions and is no longer subject to U.S. federal, state and local income tax examinations by tax authorities for years prior to 2004.

**Table of Contents****9. Loss per share**

Income (loss) per share basic is calculated by dividing net income by the weighted average number of shares of stock outstanding during the year, including shares issuable without additional consideration. Income per share assuming dilution is calculated by dividing net income by the weighted average number of shares outstanding during the year adjusted for the effect of dilutive potential shares calculated using the treasury stock method.

	2008	2007
Numerator:		
Net loss	\$ (391,548)	\$ (347,651)
Denominator:		
Weighted average shares and share equivalents outstanding basic	7,288,679	6,741,135
Effect of dilutive stock options		
Effect of dilutive warrants		
Effect of dilutive convertible promissory notes		
Weighted average shares and share equivalents outstanding assuming dilution	7,288,679	6,741,135
Net loss per share basic	\$ (.05)	\$ (.05)
Net loss per share assuming dilution	\$ (.05)	\$ (.05)

Basic and diluted losses per share were the same for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 because there was a net loss for the year.

Stock options exercisable for the purchase of 2,447,704 common stock shares at exercise prices ranging from \$.04 to \$3.00 per share were outstanding for the year ended December 31, 2008 but were not included in the calculation of income per share assuming dilution because there was a net loss for the year.

Stock options exercisable for the purchase of 3,132,134 common stock shares at exercise prices ranging from \$.01 to \$3.00 per share were outstanding for the year ended December 31, 2007 but were not included in the calculation of income per share assuming dilution because there was a net loss for the year.

Warrants exercisable for the purchase of 591,000 and 641,000 common stock shares at exercise prices ranging from \$.01 to \$1.00 per share were outstanding for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007, respectively, but were not included in the calculation of income per share assuming dilution because there was a net loss for the year.

Convertible promissory notes convertible into 1,003,659 common stock shares at a conversion prices ranging from \$.49 to \$.51 per share (see Note E Notes Payable) were outstanding for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 but were not included in the calculation of income per share assuming dilution because there was a net loss for the year.

**10. Stock Options and Warrants**

The Company's common stock trades on the OTC Bulletin Board under the symbol FULO. The fair values of the granted options have been estimated at the date of grant using the Black-Scholes option pricing model.

The following weighted average assumptions were used:

	2008	2007
Risk free interest rate	4.4%	4.4%
Expected lives (in years)	5	5
Expected volatility	140%	138%
Dividend yield	0%	0%



**Table of Contents**

The following table summarizes the Company's employee stock option activity for years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007:

	2008	Weighted Average Exercise Price	2007	Weighted Average Exercise Price
Options outstanding, beginning of year	3,132,134	.42	3,122,034	\$ .42
Options granted during the year	6,000	.04	48,000	.04
Options exercised during the year	(684,430)	.04		
Options forfeited during the year	(3,000)	.04		
Options cancelled during the year	(3,000)	.04	(37,900)	.09
Options outstanding, end of year	2,447,704	\$ .53	3,132,134	\$ .42
Options exercisable at end of year	2,403,704	\$ .54	3,085,134	\$ .43
Weighted average fair value of options granted during the year		\$ .04		\$ .04

The following table summarizes information about employee stock options outstanding at December 31, 2008:

Range of exercise prices	Number outstanding	Options outstanding		Options exercisable	
		Weighted- average remaining contractual life	Weighted- average exercise price	Number exercisable at	Weighted- average exercise price
\$0.04 \$0.70	1,652,281	4.34 years	\$ 0.15	1,608,281	\$ 0.15
\$1.00 \$1.50	671,290	1.85 years	\$ 1.07	671,290	\$ 1.07
\$1.81 \$3.00	124,133	1.32 years	\$ 2.62	124,133	\$ 2.62
	2,447,704	3.50 years	\$ 0.53	2,403,704	\$ 0.54

**Common Stock Warrants and Certain Stock Options** A summary of common stock purchase warrant and certain stock option activity for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 follows:

Common stock warrants and certain stock options exercisable for 50,000 shares of common stock expired during 2008 (weighted average exercise price \$.01 per share).

Edgar Filing: FULLNET COMMUNICATIONS INC - Form 10-K

Common stock warrants and certain stock options exercisable for 26,000 shares of common stock expired during 2007 (weighted average exercise price \$.07 per share).

Outstanding common stock purchase warrants and certain stock options issued to non-employees outstanding at December 31, 2008 are as follows:

Number of shares	Exercise price	Expiration year
275,000	1.00	2009
70,000	.13	2009
220,000	.01	2009
14,000	.10	2012
12,000	.08	2012
591,000		

F-11

---

**Table of Contents**

The following table summarizes the Company's common stock purchase warrant and certain stock option activity for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007:

	2008	Weighted Average Exercise Price	2007	Weighted Average Exercise Price
Warrants and certain stock options outstanding, beginning of year	641,000		667,000	\$ .44
Warrants and certain stock options expired during the year	(50,000)	.01	(26,000)	.07
Warrants and certain stock options outstanding, end of year	591,000	.49	641,000	\$ .45

**11. Advertising**

The Company expenses advertising production costs as they are incurred and advertising communication costs the first time the advertising takes place. Advertising expense for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 was \$34,434 and \$30,029, respectively.

**12. Use of Estimates**

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect certain reported amounts and disclosures; accordingly, actual results could differ from those estimates.

**13. Recently Issued Accounting Standards**

In May 2008, the Financial Accounting Standards Board ( FASB ) issued the Statements of Financial Accounting Standards ( SFAS ) No. 162, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles* ( SFAS 162 ). SFAS 162 identifies the sources of accounting principles and the framework for selecting the principles to be used in the preparation of financial statements of nongovernmental entities that are presented in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles in the United States of America. SFAS 162 is effective sixty days following the SEC's approval of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board amendments to AU Section 411, *The Meaning of Present fairly in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles*. The Company is currently evaluating the potential impact, if any, of the adoption of SFAS 162 on its consolidated financial statements, results of operations and cash flows.

In April 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position ( FSP ) No. 142-3, *Determination of the Useful Life of Intangible Assets* ( FSP 142-3 ). FSP 142-3 amends the factors an entity should consider in developing renewal or extension assumptions used in determining the useful life of recognized intangible assets under FASB Statement No. 142, *Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets*. This new guidance applies prospectively to intangible assets that are acquired individually or with a group of other assets in business combinations and asset acquisitions. FSP 142-3 is effective for the Company for fiscal years beginning January 1, 2009. The Company is evaluating the potential impact of the provisions of this statement on its consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

**Table of Contents**

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 141 (revised 2007), *Business Combinations* ( SFAS 141R ) and SFAS No. 160, *Noncontrolling Interests in Consolidated Financial Statements – an amendment of ARB No. 51* ( SFAS 160 ). SFAS 141R changes the accounting for business combinations, including the measurement of acquirer shares issued in consideration for a business combination, the recognition of contingent consideration, the accounting for pre-acquisition gain and loss contingencies, the recognition of capitalized in-process research and development, the accounting for acquisition-related restructuring cost accruals, the treatment of acquisition related transaction costs, and the recognition of changes in the acquirer's income tax valuation allowance. SFAS 160 will change the accounting and reporting for minority interests, reporting them as equity separate from the parent entity's equity, as well as requiring expanded disclosures. The provisions of SFAS 141R and SFAS 160 are effective for the Company for fiscal years beginning January 1, 2009. The Company is evaluating the provision of these statements on its consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

Effective December 30, 2007, the Company adopted the provisions of SFAS No. 157, *Fair Value Measurements* ( SFAS 157 ), which defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value and expands disclosures about fair value measurements required under other accounting pronouncements. Issued in February 2008, FSP 157-1 *Application of FASB Statement No. 157 to FASB Statement No. 13 and Other Accounting Pronouncements That Address Fair Value Measurements for Purposes of Lease Classification or Measurement under Statement 13*, removed leasing transactions accounted for under Statement 13 and related guidance from the scope of SFAS 157. FSP 157-2 *Partial Deferral of the Effective Date of Statement 157* ( FSP 157-2 ), deferred the effective date of SFAS 157 for all nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities to fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2008. SFAS 157 clarifies that fair value is an exit price, representing the amount that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants. SFAS 157 also requires that a fair value measurement reflect the assumptions market participants would use in pricing an asset or liability based on the best information available. Assumptions include the risks inherent in a particular valuation technique (such as a pricing model) and/or the risks inherent in the inputs to the model. The adoption of SFAS 157 did not have a significant impact on the Company's financial statements.

SFAS 157 establishes a fair value hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure fair value. The hierarchy gives the highest priority to unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (Level 1 measurements) and the lowest priority to unobservable inputs (Level 3 measurements). The three levels of the fair value hierarchy under SFAS No. 157 are described below:

Level 1 Unadjusted quoted prices in active markets that are accessible at the measurement date for identical, unrestricted assets or liabilities;

Level 2 Quoted prices in markets that are not active or financial instruments for which all significant inputs are observable, either directly or indirectly; and

Level 3 Prices or valuations that require inputs that are both significant to the fair value measurement and unobservable.

In October 2008, the FASB issued FSP 157-3, *Determining the Fair Value of a Financial Asset When the Market for That Asset Is Not Active* ( FSP 157-3 ). The FSP clarifies the application of SFAS 157 in a market that is not active and provides an example to illustrate key considerations in determining the fair value of a financial asset when the market for that financial asset is not active. The FSP is effective October 10, 2008, and for prior periods for which financial statements have not been issued. The Company has adopted the provisions of FSP 157-3 in its financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2008. The adoption did not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated results of operations or financial position.

**Table of Contents**14. Reclassifications

Certain reclassifications have been made to the 2007 financial statements to conform to the 2008 presentation.

## NOTE C PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Property and equipment consist of the following at December 31:

	2008	2007
Computers and equipment	\$ 1,470,952	\$ 1,420,177
Leasehold improvements	966,915	965,864
Software	57,337	57,337
Furniture and fixtures	28,521	28,521
	2,523,725	2,471,899
Less accumulated depreciation	(2,199,498)	(1,963,931)
	\$ 324,227	\$ 507,968

Depreciation expense for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 was \$235,567 and \$274,094, respectively.

## NOTE D INTANGIBLE ASSETS

Intangible assets consist primarily of acquired customer bases and covenants not to compete and relate to the purchases of certain business operations as follows:

	December 31,	
	2008	2007
InterCorp acquisition	\$ 4,119	\$ 4,119
Talihina acquisition	21,017	21,017
CWIS acquisition	105,638	105,638
LAWTONNET acquisition	65,000	65,000
SONET acquisition	42,547	42,547
IPDatacom acquisition	137,849	137,849
FOT acquisition	93,649	93,649
FOB acquisition	194,780	194,780
FON acquisition	139,650	139,650
Harvest merger	2,009,858	2,009,858
Animus acquisition	318,597	318,597
Tulsa acquisition	70,000	70,000
	3,202,704	3,202,704
Less accumulated amortization	(3,193,922)	(3,177,151)
	\$ 8,782	\$ 25,553

The Company's previously recognized intangible assets consist primarily of customer bases and covenants not to compete relating to those customer bases. Upon initial application of SFAS No. 142 as of January 1, 2002, the Company reassessed useful lives and began amortizing these intangible assets over their estimated useful lives and in direct relation to any decreases in the acquired customer bases to which they relate. Management believes that such amortization reflects the pattern in which the economic benefits of the intangible asset are consumed or otherwise used.





**Table of Contents**

Amortization expense for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 relating to intangible assets was \$16,771 and \$23,082, respectively.

**NOTE E NOTES PAYABLE**

Notes payable consist of the following:

	December 31, 2008	December 31, 2007
Interim loan from a shareholder, interest at 10%, requires payments equal to 50% of the net proceeds received by the Company from its private placement of convertible promissory notes, matured December 2001; unsecured (1)	\$ 293,900	\$ 320,000
Convertible promissory notes; interest at 12.5% of face amount, payable quarterly; these notes are unsecured and are matured at December 31, 2006 (convertible into approximately 1,003,659 shares at December 31, 2008 and December 31, 2007) (2)	510,636	510,636
	804,536	830,636
Less current portion	545,436	545,436
	\$ 259,100	\$ 285,200

(1) In September 2007, the lender agreed to accept monthly payments of \$5,800 beginning December 1, 2007 to be allocated 50% to principal and 50% to interest. At December 31, 2008, the outstanding principal and interest of the interim loan was \$514,454. The Company has been unable to make all of the required

payments pursuant to the terms of the September 2007 agreement. The lender has not made any formal demands for payment or instituted collection action; however we are in discussions with the lender to restructure this liability.

- (2) During 2000 and 2001, the Company issued 11% convertible promissory notes or converted other notes payable or accounts payable to convertible promissory notes in an amount totaling \$2,257,624. The terms of the Notes were 36 months with limited prepayment provisions. Each of the Notes may be converted by the holder at any time at \$1.00 per common stock share and by the Company upon registration and when the closing price of the Company's common stock has been at or above \$3.00 per

share for three consecutive trading days. Additionally, the Notes were accompanied by warrants exercisable for the purchase of the number of shares of Company's common stock equal to the number obtained by dividing 25% of the face amount of the Notes purchased by \$1.00. These warrants were exercisable at any time during the five years following issuance at an exercise price of \$.01 per share. Under the terms of the Notes, the Company was required to register the common stock underlying both the Notes and the detached warrants by filing a registration statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission within 45 days following the Final Expiration Date of the Offering (March 31, 2001). On May 31, 2001,

the Company exchanged 2,064,528 shares of its common stock and warrants (exercisable for the purchase of 436,748 shares of common stock at \$2.00 per share) for convertible promissory notes in the principal amount of \$1,746,988 (recorded at \$1,283,893) plus accrued interest of \$123,414. The warrants expired on May 31, 2006. This exchange was accounted for as an induced debt conversion and a debt conversion expense of \$370,308 was recorded.

F-15

---

**Table of Contents**

Pursuant to the provisions of the convertible promissory notes, the conversion price was reduced from \$1.00 per share on January 15, 2001 to \$.49 per share on December 31, 2003 for failure to register under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the common stock underlying the convertible promissory notes and underlying warrants on February 15, 2001. Reductions in conversion price were recognized at the date of reduction by an increase to additional paid-in capital and an increase in the discount on the convertible promissory notes. Furthermore, the interest rate was increased to 12.5% per annum from 11% per annum because the registration statement was not filed before March 1, 2001. At December 31, 2008, the outstanding principal and interest of the convertible promissory notes was \$920,973. On January 1, 2002, the Company recorded 11,815 shares of common stock issuable in payment of \$11,815 accrued interest on a portion of the Company's convertible promissory notes.

In November and December 2003 and March 2004, \$455,000, \$50,000 and \$5,636, respectively, of these convertible promissory notes matured. The Company has not made payment or negotiated an extension of these notes, and the lenders have not made any demands. The Company is currently developing a plan to satisfy these notes subject to the approval of each individual note holder.

Aggregate future maturities of notes payable at December 31, 2008 are as follows:

Year ending December 31	
2009	\$ 545,436
2010	34,800
2011	34,800
2012	34,800
2013 and thereafter	154,700
	\$ 804,536

**NOTE F COMMITMENTS****Operating Leases**

The Company leases certain office facilities used in its operations under non-cancelable operating leases expiring in 2009. Future minimum lease payments required at December 31, 2008 under non-cancelable operating leases that have initial lease terms exceeding one year are presented in the following table:

Year ending December 31	
2009	\$ 196,376
2010	
2011	
2012	
	\$ 196,376

Rental expense for all operating leases for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 was approximately \$179,407 and \$194,986, respectively.

The Company's long-term non-cancelable operating lease includes scheduled base rental increases over the term of the lease. The total amount of the base rental payments is charged to expense on the straight-line method over the term of the lease. The Company has recorded a deferred credit of \$29,991 and \$53,463 at December 31, 2008 and 2007, respectively, which is reflected in Other Long-term Liabilities on the Balance Sheet to reflect the net excess of rental expense over cash payments since inception of the lease. In addition to the base rent payments the Company pays a monthly allocation of the building's operating expenses.



**Table of Contents**

## NOTE G INCOME TAXES

The Company's effective income tax rate on net loss differed from the federal statutory rate of 34% as follows at December 31:

	2008	2007
Income taxes benefit at federal statutory rate	\$ (133,000)	\$ (120,000)
Tax effect of state income taxes benefit	(17,000)	(15,000)
Change in valuation allowance	225,000	(50,000)
Nondeductible expenses	3,000	3,000
Other	(78,000)	182,000
Total tax expense	\$	\$

The components of deferred income tax assets were as follows at December 31:

	2008	2007
Deferred income tax assets		
Basis difference in property and equipment and intangible assets	\$ 422,000	\$ 334,000
Deferred revenue	49,000	43,000
Net operating loss	1,209,000	1,070,000
Deferred compensation and other	251,000	259,000
Valuation allowance	(1,931,000)	(1,706,000)
Net deferred income tax asset		
Change in valuation allowance	\$ 225,000	\$ (50,000)

A valuation allowance is provided for deferred tax assets when it is more likely than not that some portion or all of the deferred tax assets will not be realized. At December 31, 2008, the Company has a net operating loss carry forward of approximately \$2,900,000 that will expire at various dates through 2027. As such carry forward can only be used to offset future taxable income of the Company, management has provided a valuation allowance until it is more likely than not that taxable income will be generated.

In June 2006, FASB issued Interpretation No. 48, *Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes - an interpretation of FASB Statement No. 109* (FIN 48). FIN 48 provides guidance for recognizing and measuring uncertain tax positions, as defined in SFAS 109, *Accounting for Income Taxes*. FIN 48 prescribes a threshold condition that a tax position must meet for any of the benefit of the uncertain tax position to be recognized in the financial statements. Guidance is also provided regarding de-recognition, classification and disclosure of these uncertain tax positions. FIN 48 was effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2006. The Company adopted the provisions of FIN 48 on January 1, 2007.

The Company recognizes interest and penalties related to unrecognized tax benefits in income tax expense and does not believe it has any material unrealized tax benefits at December 31, 2008. The Company files income tax returns in the U.S. federal jurisdiction and various state and local jurisdictions and is no longer subject to U.S. federal, state and local income tax examinations by tax authorities for years prior to 2004.



**Table of Contents****NOTE H COMMON STOCK**

Stock options for 684,430 shares of the Company's common stock were exercised in March 2008 for \$28,049.

**NOTE I CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS**

The Company has an operating lease for certain equipment which is leased from one of its shareholders who also holds a \$293,900 interim loan (see Note E Notes Payable). The original lease was dated November 21, 2001 and the terms were \$6,088 per month for 12 months with a fair market purchase option at the end of the lease. Upon default on the lease, the Company was allowed to continue leasing the equipment on a month-to-month basis at the same monthly rate as the original lease. The Company has been unable to make the month-to-month payments. In January and November 2006, the Company agreed to extend the expiration date on 425,000 and 140,000, respectively, of common stock purchase warrants for the lessor in return for a credit of \$17,960 and \$3,940, respectively, on the operating lease. In September 2007, the lessor agreed to cease the monthly lease payments effective January 1, 2007 which generated a total of \$54,795 of forgiveness of debt income. The lessor also agreed to accept payments of \$499 per month on the balance owed. At December 31, 2008 we had recorded \$270,142 in unpaid lease payments. The loss of this equipment would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. The Company has been unable to make all of the required payments pursuant to the terms of the September 2007 agreement. The lessor has not made any formal demands for payment or instituted collection action; however we are in discussions with the lessor to restructure this liability.

**NOTE J CREDITOR SETTLEMENTS AND DEBT FORGIVENESS**

During the year ended December 31, 2007, the Company negotiated and settled the following liabilities for less than their carrying values. The basic and diluted per share amount of the aggregate gain on debt forgiveness for the year ended December 31, 2007 was \$.01.

	Carrying Value	Settlement Amount	Gain
Accounts payable	\$ 54,795	\$ 0	\$ 54,795

**Table of Contents**

**NOTE K CONTINGENCIES**

During September 2005, the Company received an invoice from AT&T (formerly SBC) of approximately \$230,000 for services alleged to have been rendered to the Company between June 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. Through February 2006, the Company received a number of additional invoices from AT&T making adjustments to these amounts and expanding the service period through September 30, 2005, at which point the balance due was alleged to be approximately \$400,000.

AT&T then began invoicing the Company on a monthly basis (two months in arrears of the alleged service date) for these services and continued invoicing the Company for these monthly services through February 2007, at which point the alleged balance due was approximately \$7,970,000. AT&T then stopped invoicing the Company for these monthly services and simply sent monthly Inter Company Billing Statements reflecting the balance of approximately \$7,970,000 with no further additions.

The last Inter Company Billing Statement received by the Company was dated December 15, 2007 and reflected a balance of approximately \$7,970,000. The alleged services were eventually identified by AT&T as Switched Access services. The Company formally notified AT&T in writing that it disputed these billings and requested that AT&T withdraw and/or credit all of these billings in full. AT&T has not responded to the Company's written dispute, nor has it sent the Company any further Inter Company Billing Statements since December 15, 2007. AT&T has never taken any other steps to attempt to collect these amounts nor has it ever responded to the Company's written dispute of said amounts. The Company believes AT&T has no basis for these charges. Therefore, the Company has not recorded any expense or liability related to these billings.

As a provider of telecommunications, the Company is affected by regulatory proceedings in the ordinary course of its business at the state and federal levels. These include proceedings before both the Federal Communications Commission and the Oklahoma Corporation Commission ( OCC ). In addition, in its operations the Company relies on obtaining many of its underlying telecommunications services and/or facilities from incumbent local exchange carriers or other carriers pursuant to interconnection or other agreements or arrangements. In January 2007, the Company concluded a regulatory proceeding pursuant to the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 before the OCC relating to the terms of its interconnection agreement with Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. d/b/a AT&T, which succeeds a prior interconnection agreement. The OCC approved this agreement in May 2007. This agreement may be affected by regulatory proceedings at the federal and state levels, with possible adverse impacts on the Company. The Company is unable to accurately predict the outcomes of such regulatory proceedings at this time, but an unfavorable outcome could have a material adverse effect on the Company's business, financial condition or results of operations.

**NOTE L SUBSEQUENT EVENT**

On February 24, 2009, the Enforcement Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission issued an Omnibus Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture ( NAL ) to the Company in the amount of \$20,000 for failure to timely file a certification report concerning so-called Customer Proprietary Network Information ( CPNI ). There were approximately 690 other telecommunications companies included in the NAL. Each company has the opportunity to submit further evidence and arguments in response to the NAL to show that no forfeiture should be imposed or that some lesser amount should be assessed. The Company is in the process of preparing its response.

**Table of Contents**

**EXHIBIT INDEX**

<i>Exhibit Number</i>	<i>Exhibit</i>
31.1	Certification pursuant to Rules 13a-14(a) and 15d-14(a) of Timothy J. Kilkenny
31.2	Certification pursuant to Rules 13a-14(a) and 15d-14(a) of Roger P. Baresel
32.1	Certification Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as Adopted Pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 by Timothy J. Kilkenny
32.2	Certification Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as Adopted Pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 by Roger P. Baresel