



BOULT ■ CUMMINGS®
CONNERS ■ BERRY PLC

Henry Walker
(615) 252-2363
Fax: (615) 252-6363
Email: hwalker@boultcummings.com

05 JUL 20 PM 1 54

July 20, 2005 AUTHORITY
DOCKET ROOM

Ron Jones, Chairman
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243-0505

**Re: *In Re: Petition to Establish Generic Docket to Consider Amendments to
Interconnection Agreements Resulting from Changes of Law***
Docket No.: 04-00381

Dear Chairman Jones:

This is to correct the Final Joint Issues Matrix filed on June 29, 2005 in the above-captioned proceeding. Issues 7 and 21 should be removed from the matrix. A corrected matrix is attached.

Counsel for of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., has been notified of this correction and has no objection.

Very truly yours,

BOULT, CUMMINGS, CONNERS & BERRY, PLC

By:

Henry Walker

HW/djc

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been forwarded
via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to:

Guy M. Hicks
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
333 Commerce Street, Ste. 2101
Nashville, TN 37201-3300

James Murphy
Boult, Cummings, Conners & Berry
1600 Division Street, Ste. 700
Nashville, TN 37203

Ed Phillips
United Telephone -Southeast
1411 Capitol Blvd.
Wake Forest, NC 27587


H. LaDon Baltimore
Farrar & Bates
211 7th Avenue North, Ste. 320
Nashville, TN 37219-1823

John Heitmann
Kelley, Drye & Warren
1900 19th Street NW, Ste. 500
Washington, DC 20036

Charles B. Welch
Farris, Mathews, et al.
618 Church Street, Ste. 300
Nashville, TN 37219

Dana Shafer
XO Communications, Inc.
105 Malloy Street, Ste. 100
Nashville, TN 37201

on this the 20th day of July, 2005.



Henry M. Walker

CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET JOINT ISSUES MATRIX¹

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
1	TRRO / FINAL RULES: The Section 252 process requires negotiations and to the extent parties may not be able to negotiate resolution of particular issues arising out of the Final Rules/TRRO or to the extent that new issues related to the Final Rules/TRRO arise, issues related to those matters will be added to this list.
2	TRRO / FINAL RULES: What is the appropriate language to implement the FCC's transition plan for (1) switching, (2) high capacity loops and (3) dedicated transport as detailed in the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order ("TRRO"), issued February 4, 2005?
3	TRRO / FINAL RULES: a) How should existing ICAs be modified to address BellSouth's obligation to provide network elements that the FCC has found are no longer Section 251(c)(3) obligations? b) What is the appropriate way to implement in new agreements pending in arbitration any modifications to BellSouth's obligations to provide network elements that the FCC has found are no longer Section 251(c)(3) obligations?
4	TRRO / FINAL RULES: What is the appropriate language to implement BellSouth's obligation to provide Section 251 unbundled access to high capacity loops and dedicated transport and how should the following terms be defined? (i) Business Line (ii) Fiber-Based Collocation (iii) Building (iv) Route
5	TRRO / FINAL RULES: a) Does the Commission have the authority to determine whether or not BellSouth's application of the FCC's Section 251 non-impairment criteria for high-capacity loops and transport is appropriate? b) What procedures should be used to identify those wire centers that satisfy the FCC's Section 251 non-impairment criteria for high-capacity loops and transport? c) What language should be included in agreements to reflect the procedures identified in (b)?
6	TRRO / FINAL RULES: Are HDSL-capable copper loops the equivalent of DS1 loops for the purpose of evaluating impairment?

¹ This is a joint issues matrix between BellSouth, the member companies of CompSouth, SECCA, US LEC (all states but TN), XO, and Sprint. There is one issue that is in dispute in the states of South Carolina and Mississippi only, which is separately listed at the end of this matrix.

**CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET
ISSUES MATRIX**

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
8	TRRO / FINAL RULES: What conditions, if any, should be imposed on moving, adding, or changing orders to a CLEC's respective embedded bases of switching, high-capacity loops and dedicated transport, and what is the appropriate language to implement such conditions, if any?
9	TRRO/FINAL RULES: What rates, terms, and conditions should govern the transition of existing network elements that BellSouth is no longer obligated to provide as Section 251 UNEs to non-Section 251 network elements and other services and (a) what is the proper treatment for such network elements at the end of the transition period; and (b) what is the appropriate transition period, and what are the appropriate rates, terms and conditions during such transition period, for unbundled high capacity loops, high capacity transport, and dark fiber transport in and between wire centers that do not meet the FCC's non-impairment standards at this time, but that meet such standards in the future?
10	TRRO / FINAL RULES: What rates, terms and conditions, if any, should apply to UNEs that are not converted on or before March 11, 2006, and what impact, if any, should the conduct of the parties have upon the determination of the applicable rates, terms and conditions that apply in such circumstances?
11	TRRO / FINAL RULES: Should identifiable orders properly placed that should have been provisioned before March 11, 2005, but were not provisioned due to BellSouth errors in order processing or provisioning, be included in the "embedded base?"
12	TRRO / FINAL RULES: Should network elements de-listed under section 251(c) (3) be removed from the SQM/PMAP/SEEM?
13	TRO - COMMINGLING: What is the scope of commingling allowed under the FCC's rules and orders and what language should be included in Interconnection Agreements to implement commingling (including rates)?
14	TRO - CONVERSIONS: Is BellSouth required to provide conversion of special access circuits to UNE pricing, and, if so, at what rates, terms and conditions and during what timeframe should such new requests for such conversions be effectuated?

**CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET
ISSUES MATRIX**

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
15	TRO – CONVERSIONS: What are the appropriate rates, terms, conditions and effective dates, if any, for conversion requests that were pending on the effective date of the TRO?
16	TRO – LINE SHARING: Is BellSouth obligated pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and FCC Orders to provide line sharing to new CLEC customers after October 1, 2004?
17	TRO – LINE SHARING – TRANSITION: If the answer to foregoing issue is negative, what is the appropriate language for transitioning off a CLEC's existing line sharing arrangements?
18	TRO – LINE SPLITTING: What is the appropriate ICA language to implement BellSouth's obligations with regard to line splitting?
19	TRO – SUB-LOOP CONCENTRATION: a) What is the appropriate ICA language, if any, to address sub loop feeder or sub loop concentration? b) Do the FCC's rules for sub loops for multi-unit premises limit CLEC access to copper facilities only or do they also include access to fiber facilities? c) What are the suitable points of access for sub-loops for multi-unit premises?
20	TRO – CALL-RELATED DATABASES: What is the appropriate ICA language, if any, to address access to call related databases?
22	TRO – HYBRID LOOPS: What is the appropriate ICA language to implement BellSouth's obligation to provide unbundled access to hybrid loops?
23	TRO – END USER PREMISES: Under the FCC's definition of a loop found in 47 C.F.R. §51.319(a), is a mobile switching center or cell site an "end user customer's premises"?
24	TRO – ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATION: What is the appropriate ICA language to implement BellSouth's obligation to provide routine network modifications?
25	TRO – ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATION: What is the appropriate process for establishing a rate, if any, to allow for the cost of a routine network modification that is not already recovered in Commission-approved recurring or non-recurring rates? What is the appropriate language, if any, to incorporate into the ICAs?
26	TRO – FIBER TO THE HOME: What is the appropriate language, if any, to address access to overbuild deployments of fiber to the home and fiber to the curb facilities?

CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET ISSUES MATRIX

ISSUE DESCRIPTION	
NO.	
27	TRO - EELS AUDITS: What is the appropriate ICA language to implement BellSouth's EEL audit rights, if any, under the TRO?
28	252(i): What is the appropriate language to implement the FCC's "entire agreement" rule under Section 252(i)?
29	ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order: What language should be used to incorporate the FCC's <i>ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order</i> into interconnection agreements?
30	General Issue: How should the determinations made in this proceeding be incorporated into existing § 252 interconnection agreements?
* MS/ SC only	(a) (A) How should Line Conditioning be defined in the Agreement? (B) What should BellSouth's obligations be with respect to Line Conditioning? (b) Should the Agreement contain specific provisions limiting the availability of Line Conditioning to copper loops of 18,000 feet or less? (c) Under what rates, terms and conditions should BellSouth be required to perform Line Conditioning to remove bridged taps?

* In the states of MS and SC, the Commissions have moved certain issues from an existing arbitration proceeding between BellSouth and Nuvox and Xspedius to this docket. BellSouth's position is that these issues can be included as subparts (a), (b), and (c) to Issue 26 without separately creating a new issue; NuVox and Xspedius disagree and propose including a new TRO - Line Conditioning issue instead of subparts to existing Issue 26.