

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

333 Commerce Street
Suite 2101
Nashville, TN 37201-3300

guy.hicks@bellsouth.com

Guy M. Hicks
General Counsel

615 214 6301
Fax 615 214 7406

March 15, 2006

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Filed Electronically in Docket Office 03/15/06

Hon. Ron Jones, Chairman
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37238

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


Dear Chairman Jones:

On February 10, 2006, BellSouth submitted copies of the Vote Sheet of the Public Service Commission of Florida ("FL PSC") in its generic change of law docket. On March 2, 2006, the FL PSC issued its written *Order* in Docket No. 041269-TP, *Petition to Establish Generic Docket to Consider Amendments to Interconnection Agreements Resulting from Changes of Law, by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.*

With respect to the Section 271 issue, the FL PSC's *Order* is consistent with the Commission Vote Sheet previously filed with the Authority. An additional order addressing the line sharing and commingling issues is expected soon. Copies of the *Order* are attached.

A copy of this letter has been provided to counsel of record.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Guy M. Hicks", with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

GH:ch

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition to establish generic docket to consider amendments to interconnection agreements resulting from changes in law, by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

DOCKET NO. 041269-TP
ORDER NO. PSC-06-0172-FOF-TP
ISSUED: March 2, 2006

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

LISA POLAK EDGAR, Chairman
J. TERRY DEASON
ISILIO ARRIAGA

APPEARANCES:

NANCY B. WHITE, Esquire, c/o Nancy Sims, 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400, Tallahassee, Florida 32301; and R. DOUGLAS LACKEY, Esquire, ANDREW D. SHORE, Esquire and MEREDITH E. MAYES, Esquire, Suite 4300, 675 W. Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30375

On behalf of BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BST")

MATTHEW FEIL, Esquire, 2301 Lucien Way, Suite 200, Maitland, Florida 32751

On behalf of FLORIDA DIGITAL NETWORK, INC. d/b/a FDN COMMUNICATIONS ("FDN")

CHARLES A. GUYTON, Esquire, Squire Sanders & Dempsey LLP, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

On behalf of City of Gainesville, d/b/a GRUCom ("GRUCom")

BILL MAGNESS, Esquire, Casey, Gentz & Magness, L.L.P., 98 San Jacinto Blvd., Ste. 1400, Austin, Texas 78701

On behalf of The Competitive Carriers of the South, Inc. ("CompSouth" or "JT CLECS")

VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, Esquire, Moyle Flanigan Katz Raymond & Sheehan, PA, 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

On behalf of The Competitive Carriers of the South, Inc. (CompSouth) and DIECA Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company ("Covad" or "JT CLECS")

TRACY HATCH, Esquire, AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, 101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

On behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC ("AT&T" or "JT CLECS")

CHARLES (GENE) E. WATKINS, Esquire, Government & External Affairs, Covad Communications Company, 1230 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1900, Atlanta, Georgia 30309

On behalf of DIECA Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company ("Covad" or "JT CLECS")

C. EVERETT BOYD, JR., Esquire, Sutherland Asbill Law Firm, 3600 Maclay Blvd. S., Suite 202, Tallahassee, FL 32312-1267

On behalf of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. ("ITC^DeltaCom" or "JT CLECS")

DONNA CANZANO McNULTY, Esquire, MCI, Inc., 1203 Governors Square Boulevard, Suite 201, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, and FLOYD R. SELF, Esquire, Messer, Caparello & Self, PA, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

On behalf of MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC ("MCI" or "JT CLECS")

NORMAN HORTON, JR., Esquire, Messer, Caparello & Self, PA, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

On behalf of NuVox Communications, Inc. (NuVox) and Xspedius Communications, LLC ("Xspedius" or "JT CLECS")

DANA SHAFFER, Esquire, XO Communications, Inc., 105 Molloy Street, Suite 300, Nashville, Tennessee 37201

On behalf of XO Communications, Inc. ("XO" or "JT CLECS")

KENNETH HOFFMAN, Esquire, and MARTIN MCDONNELL, Esquire, Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, PA, P.O. Box 551, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

On behalf of US LEC of Florida, Inc. (US LEC) and Southeastern Competitive Carrier Association ("SECCA" or "JT CLECS")

SUSAN S. MASTERTON, Esquire, P.O. Box 2214, Tallahassee, Florida 32316

On behalf of Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership ("SPRINT")

ADAM J. TEITZMAN, Esquire and KIRA SCOTT, Esquire, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

On behalf of the Commission ("STAFF").

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Act	Telecommunications Act of 1996
ADSL	Asymmetric Digital Subscriber Line
AICPA	American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
ARMIS	Automated Reporting Management Information System
ASR	Access Service Request
BOC	Bell Operating Company
BR	Brief
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CLEC	Competitive Local Exchange Carrier
CMRS	Commercial Mobile Radio Service
CNL	Carrier Notification Letter
CO	Central Office
DACS	Digital Access Cross-Connect System
d/b/a	Doing Business As
DLC	Digital Loop Carrier
DN	Docket Number
DS0	Digital Signal, level Zero. DS0 is 64,000 bits per second.
DS1	Digital Signal, level One. A 1.544 million bits per second digital signal carried on a T-1 transmission facility. A DS1 is the equivalent of 24 DS0s.
DS3	Digital Signal, level Three. A DS3 is the equivalent of 28 DS1s.
DSL	Digital Subscriber Line
DSLAM	Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer
EEL	Enhanced Extended Link
ESF	Extended SuperFrame
EXH	Exhibit
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FDN	Florida Digital Network, Inc. d/b/a FDN Communications
FPSC	Florida Public Service Commission
FTTC	Fiber to the Curb
FTTH	Fiber to the Home
FTTP	Fiber to the Premises
HDSL	High-bit-rate Digital Subscriber Line
HFPL	High Frequency Portion of the (Copper) Loop
ICA	Interconnection Agreement

IDLC	Integrated Digital Loop Carrier
IDT	Integrated Digital Terminal
ILEC	Incumbent Local Exchange Company
ISDN	Integrated Services Digital Network
Kbps	Kilobits per second
LATA	Local Access and Transport Area
LEC	Local Exchange Carrier
LMU	Loop Make-Up
MCI	MCIMetro Access Transmission Services, LLC
MDF	Main Distribution Frame
MDU	Multiple Dwelling Unit
MPOE	Minimum Point of Entry
NDA	Nondisclosure Agreement
NID	Network Interface Device
Telecom Dictionary	<i>Newton's Telecom Dictionary: The Official Dictionary of Telecommunications & the Internet, 15th Updated, Expanded and Much Improved Edition.</i> (New York: Miller Freeman, Inc. 1999)
NGDLC	Next Generation Digital Loop Carrier
NRC	Nonrecurring Charge
OCn	Optical Carrier level N. An optical interface designed to work with a Synchronous Optical Network (SONET). OCn transmission facilities are deployed as SONET channels having a bandwidth of typically 155.52 Mbps (OC3 or the equivalent capacity of 3 DS3s) and higher, e.g., OC12 (622.08 Mbps); OC48 (2.488 Gbps); etc.
OCD	Optical Concentration Device
PAP	Performance Assessment Plan
PCM	Pulse Code Modulation
PON	Passive Optical Networking
POTS	Plain Old Telephone Service
RADSL	Rate-Adaptive Digital Subscriber Line
RDT	Remote Digital Terminal
RNM	Routine Network Modification
RT	Remote Terminal
SEEM	Self Effectuating Enforcement Mechanism
SGAT	Statement of Generally Available Terms
SPOI	Single Point of Interconnection
Sprint	Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership
SQM	Service Quality Measurement

T1	Trunk Level 1
TDM	Time Division Multiplexing
TELRIC	Total Element Long-Run Incremental Cost
TR	Transcript
TSI	Time Slot Interchange
UDLC	Universal Digital Loop Carrier
ULM	Unbundled Loop Modification
UNE	Unbundled Network Element
UNE-L	Unbundled Network Element-Loop
UNE-P	Unbundled Network Element-Platform
USC	United States Code
VG	Voice Grade
xDSL	“x” distinguishes various types of DSL

Legal Citations

Reference Used in Order	Full Citation
Court Decisions	
8th Circuit 1997	<u>Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC</u> , decided July 18, 1997, 120 F.3d 753.
8th Circuit 2000	<u>Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC</u> , decided July 18, 2000, 219 F.3d 744.
USTA I	<u>United States Telecom Association v. FCC</u> , decided May 24, 2002, 290 F. 3d 415 (D.C. Cir. 2002).
USTA II	<u>United States Telecom Association v. FCC</u> , decided March 2, 2004, 359 F. 3d 554 (D.C. Cir. 2004).
FCC Orders	
Local Competition Order	Order No. FCC 96-325, released August 8, 1996, CC Docket Nos. 96-98 and 95-185, <u>In Re: Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996</u> , and <u>Interconnection between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers</u> , First Report and Order.
UNE Remand Order	Order No. FCC 99-238, released November 5, 1999, CC Docket No. 96-98, <u>In Re: Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996</u> , Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
Supplemental Order	Order No. FCC 99-370, released November 24, 1999, CC Docket No. 96-98, <u>In Re: Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996</u> , Supplemental Order.
Line Sharing Order	Order No. FCC 99-355, released December 9, 1999, CC Docket Nos. 98-147 and 96-98, <u>In Re: Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996</u> , Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 98-147 and Fourth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98.
MDU Order	Order No. FCC 04-191, released August 9, 2004, CC Docket Nos. CC Docket No. 01-338, CC Docket No. 96-98, <u>In Re: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers</u>
Supplemental Order Clarification	Order No. FCC 00-183, released June 2, 2000, CC Docket No. 96-98, <u>In Re: Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996</u> , Supplemental Order Clarification.
ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order	Order No. FCC 04-241, released October 18, 2004, WC Docket No. 03-171, <u>In Re: Petition of Core Communications, Inc. for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. 160(c) from Application of the ISP Remand Order</u> .

Reference Used in Order	Full Citation
TRO	Order No. FCC 03-36, released August 21, 2003, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, and 98-147, <u>In Re: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability</u> , Report and Order and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
TRO Errata	Order No. FCC 03-227, released September 17, 2003, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, and 98-147, <u>In Re: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability</u> , Errata.
Interim Order	Order No. FCC 04-179, released August 20, 2004, WC Docket No. 04-313 and CC Docket No. 01-338, <u>In Re: Unbundled Access to Network Elements; Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers</u> , Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
FTTC Recon Order	Order No. FCC 04-248, released October 18, 2004, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, and 98-147, <u>In Re: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability</u> , Order on Reconsideration.
TRRO	Order No. FCC 04-290, released February 4, 2005, WC Docket No. 04-313 and CC Docket No. 01-338, <u>In Re: Unbundled Access to Network Elements and Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers</u> , Order on Remand.
Florida Public Service Commission Orders	
Prehearing Order	Order No. PSC-05-1054-PHO-TP, issued October 31, 2005, in Docket No. 041269-TP, <u>In Re: Petition to establish generic docket to consider amendments to interconnection agreements resulting from changes in law, by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.</u>

Reference Used in Order	Full Citation
No-New-Adds Order	Order No. PSC-05-0492-FOF-TP, issued May 5, 2005, in Docket No. 041269-TP, <u>In Re: Petition to establish generic docket to consider amendments to interconnection agreements resulting from changes in law, by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.;</u> Docket No. 050171-TP, <u>In Re: Emergency petition of Ganoco, Inc. d/b/a American Dial Tone, Inc. for Commission order directing BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. to continue to accept new unbundled network element orders pending completion of negotiations required by “change of law” provisions of interconnection agreement in order to address the FCC’s recent Triennial Review Remand Order (TRRO);</u> Docket No. 050172-TP, <u>In Re: Emergency petition of Ganoco, Inc. d/b/a American Dial Tone, Inc. for Commission order directing Verizon Florida Inc. to continue to accept new unbundled network element orders pending completion of negotiations required by “change of law” provisions of interconnection agreement in order to address the FCC’s recent Triennial Review Remand Order (TRRO).</u> This order has been appealed.
Joint Petitioner's Order	Order No. PSC-05-0975-FOF-TP, issued October 11, 2005, in Docket No. 040130-TP, <u>In Re: Joint petition by NewSouth Communications Corp., NuVox Communications, Inc., and Xspedius Communications, LLC, on behalf of its operating subsidiaries Xspedius Management Co. Switched Services, LLC and Xspedius Management Co. of Jacksonville, LLC, for arbitration of certain issues arising in negotiation of interconnection agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications. Inc.</u>
Verizon Arbitration Order ¹	Order No. PSC-05-1200-FOF-TP, issued December 5, 2005, in Docket No. 040156-TP, <u>In Re: Petition for arbitration of amendment to interconnection agreements with certain competitive local exchange carriers and commercial mobile radio service providers in Florida by Verizon Florida Inc.</u>
Embedded Base Order	Order No. PSC-05-1127-FOF-TP, issued November 8, 2005, in Docket No. 041269-TP, <u>In Re: Petition to Establish Generic Docket to Consider Amendments to Interconnection Agreements Resulting from Changes in Law, By BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.</u>
BellSouth UNE Order	Order No. PSC-01-2051-FOF-TP, issued October 18, 2001, in Docket No. 990649-TP, <u>In Re: Investigation into Pricing of Unbundled Network Elements</u>
Other Commission Orders	

¹On December 20, 2005, four separate Motions were filed seeking Reconsideration or Clarification of Order No. PSC-05-1200-FOF-TP. By Order No. PSC-06-0078-FOF-TP, issued February 3, 2006, these motions were addressed.

Reference Used in Order	Full Citation
Texas Arbitration Award	Arbitration Award – Track II Issues, issued June 20, 2005, in Texas Public Utility Commission, Docket No. 28821, <u>Arbitration of Non- Costing Issues for Successor Agreements to the Texas 271 Agreement</u>

ORDER ON GENERIC PROCEEDING

BY THE COMMISSION:

I. CASE BACKGROUND

On August 21, 2003, the FCC released its Triennial Review Order (TRO), which contained revised unbundling rules and responded to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals' remand decision in USTA I.

On March 2, 2004, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals released its decision in USTA II, which vacated and remanded certain provisions of the TRO. In particular, the D.C. Circuit held that the FCC's delegation of authority to state commissions to make impairment findings was unlawful, and further found that the national findings of impairment for mass market switching and high-capacity transport were improper.

The FCC released an Order and Notice (Interim Order) on August 20, 2004, requiring ILECs to continue providing unbundled access to mass market local circuit switching, high capacity loops, and dedicated transport until the earlier of the effective date of final FCC unbundling rules or six months after publication of the Interim Order in the Federal Register. On February 4, 2005, the FCC released the TRRO, wherein the FCC's final unbundling rules were adopted with an effective date of March 11, 2005.

In response to the decisions handed down in USTA II and the FCC's Orders, BellSouth filed on November 1, 2004, its Petition to establish a generic docket to consider amendments to interconnection agreements resulting from changes of law. Specifically, BellSouth asked that we determine what changes are required in existing, approved interconnection agreements between BellSouth and CLECs in Florida as a result of changes in law. Pursuant to Order No. PSC-05-0736-PCO-TP, Order Establishing Procedure, issued on July 11, 2005, 31 issues were identified.

On May 5, 2005, we issued the No-New-Adds Order, finding that the TRRO is specific, as is the revised FCC rule, that CLECs are prohibited from adding new local switching as a UNE, effective March 11, 2005.

On July 15, 2005, BellSouth filed a Motion for Summary Final Order or, in the alternative, Motion for Declaratory Ruling. On July 22, 2005, CompSouth responded to the Motion and filed a Cross Motion for Summary Final Order or Declaratory Ruling.

On August 22, 2005, Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc. filed its Emergency Motion to Require BellSouth to Effectuate Orders for Supra's Embedded Customer Base. On November 8, 2005, we issued our Embedded Base Order, which denied Supra's motion and found that the TRO prohibits CLECs from adding any new local switching UNE arrangements.

On September 29, 2005, parties filed prehearing statements. The administrative hearing was conducted on November 2-4, 2005. At the commencement of the administrative hearing, we

denied BellSouth's Motion for Summary Final Order or, in the alternative, Motion for Declaratory Ruling and CompSouth's Cross-Motion or Declaratory Ruling. Post-hearing briefs were filed on November 30, 2005.

At our agenda conference on February 7, 2006, we rendered a decision on all remaining issues in this docket. Given the impending March 11, 2006, deadline in the TRRO, we directed that interconnection agreements or amendments reflecting our decisions be filed by February 27, 2006, so that they could be reviewed and approved administratively by our staff by March 10, 2006.

On February 17, 2006, our staff filed a recommendation that the Commission, on its own motion and in an abundance of caution, should vacate its decision on Issues 5, 13, 16-18, and 22(b) due to misconduct by a Commission employee that created a perception of bias with regard to these issues. This recommendation was scheduled for consideration at our February 28, 2006, agenda conference.

On February 21, 2006, with the agreement of Covad and BellSouth, the Prehearing Officer entered an order extending the deadline for parties to file conforming interconnection agreements and amendments until March 10, 2006, so that the filed agreements could reflect any additional decisions made at the February 28, 2006, agenda conference..

On February 28, 2006, counsel for NuVox and Xspedius urged that the Commission should vacate its decision on Issues 25 and 26, in addition to those covered by the staff's recommendation. Upon consideration, we vacated our decisions only on Issues 5, 12, 16-18, and 22(b). Recognizing the March 10, 2006 date established by the Prehearing Officer for the filing of interconnection agreements and amendments, and the March 11, 2006 deadline in the TRRO, we directed that the agreements and amendments filed on that date should specify that they will take effect on March 11, 2006, provided they are ultimately approved by the Commission. We also directed that our order on the non-vacated issues be issued immediately.

Upon subsequent resolution of the vacated issues, we expect to issue a further order that addresses both the timetable for filing amendments reflecting our decisions on those issues and the effective date of those decisions.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FCC'S TRANSITION PLAN FOR

(1) SWITCHING,

(2) HIGH CAPACITY LOOPS AND

(3) DEDICATED TRANSPORT.

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

Definition of the "Embedded Base" of Customers

Witness Blake believes that BellSouth's definition of the "embedded base" follows the UNE service arrangement or carrier requesting service guidelines of the TRRO. In contrast, asserts the BellSouth witness, CompSouth witness Gillan defines the "embedded base" to mean the CLEC's customers. This difference, contends witness Blake, impacts whether a CLEC can order new UNE service arrangements for an existing customer (whether at the same or a new location) during the transition period.

CompSouth witness Gillan recommends ICA language to address the definition of "embedded base" and the related restrictions imposed by the TRRO. Specifically, witness Gillan defines the "embedded base" in terms of CLEC customers existing as of March 10, 2005. The witness' suggested language provides that CLECs are entitled to order local switching and UNE-P, and DS1 and DS3 loops for the purpose of serving the CLEC's embedded customer base during the transition period. For DS1 and DS3 loops, CLECs will self-certify, if requested by BellSouth, that the CLEC orders will be used to serve the embedded customer base. BellSouth has the right to dispute the self-certification; the dispute is governed by the ICA dispute resolution process. With regard to local circuit switching and UNE-P, CompSouth's proposed language provides that additions to the CLEC embedded customer base include "any additional elements that are required to be provided in conjunction therewith."

Transition Pricing

BellSouth asserts in its brief that the transitional rates contained in the TRRO revised unbundling rules should be included in the ICAs. BellSouth witness Tipton believes that the revised rules are clear that the transition rate for local circuit switching is the higher of the rate the CLEC paid for the element or combination of elements on June 15, 2004, plus one dollar, or the rate this Commission established, if any, between June 16, 2004, and March 10, 2005, the effective date of the TRRO, for that combination of network elements, plus one dollar. For high-capacity loops and transport, the transition rate is the higher of 115 percent of the rate the CLEC paid on June 15, 2004, or 115 percent of the rate this Commission established between June 16, 2004, and March 10, 2005, for that element. (TRRO Appendix B, p. 148) Additionally, contends witness Tipton, the TRRO clearly indicates that transition period pricing will be effective with the amendment to the ICA and is subject to true-up to March 11, 2005.

For UNE-P, the BellSouth witness contends that transitional pricing also applies to those circuits priced at market rates for the FCC's four or more line carve-out established in the UNE Remand Order and affirmed in the TRO. (TRO fn 1376) To the extent that existing ICAs include a market based rate for switching for "enterprise" customers served by DS0 level switching that met the FCC's four or more line carve-out, witness Tipton asserts that these terms and rates were in effect on June 15, 2004. Therefore, these rates plus the TRRO additive is the appropriate transition rate to apply. However, witness Tipton qualifies that BellSouth does not advocate adding the transitional additive to the market rate; BellSouth is simply charging CLECs the market rate they were already paying on June 15, 2004.

CompSouth witness Gillan asserts that the TRRO makes clear that the term "mass market" includes all lines used to serve customers that use less than a DS1 capacity and that the transitional rules apply. The witness believes that footnote 625 of the TRRO clearly provides

that CLECs are entitled to pay TELRIC rates plus one dollar for all analog customers, including any DS0 level enterprise switching customers that previously met the four or more line carve-out. Witness Gillan asserts that if the FCC modified ICAs to provide higher transitional rates, one of the transitional rates is for customers being served at less than DS1 capacity level.

CompSouth witness Gillan agrees that transitional rates become effective through the amended ICA and are to be applied retroactively to March 11, 2005. However, the witness contends that the new unbundling requirements adopted in the TRO nearly three years ago, such as provisions incorporating revised EEL eligibility, commingling, and conversions should likewise be effective retroactively to March 11, 2005. To do otherwise, argues the witness, would mean that only those portions of the FCC's unbundling framework that enable BellSouth to charge higher rates would be effective, while the options CLECs need to adjust to the new unbundling regime would not be in place.

Application of Transition Rates

BellSouth witness Tipton believes that the TRRO is clear that transitional rates only apply until the de-listed UNEs are converted to alternative arrangements. Therefore, contends the witness, transition rates apply until the earlier of March 10, 2006, or September 10, 2006, for dark fiber, or the date the de-listed UNEs are converted to alternative arrangements. (TRRO ¶¶145, 198, and 228) The witness acknowledges that in the Verizon Arbitration Order, we concluded that transitional rates apply until the end of the transition period.

The Joint CLECs affirm their willingness to work cooperatively with BellSouth to ensure an orderly transition to alternative arrangements. However, argue the Joint CLECs, BellSouth's proposals feature a premature end to the transition pricing mandated in the TRRO. The Joint CLECs believe that the TRRO clearly entitles CLECs to transition rates for de-listed UNEs until March 10, 2006, for local circuit switching and high-capacity loops and transport, and until September 10, 2006, for dark fiber. CompSouth witness Gillan and the Joint CLECs believe that the TRRO is clear that CLECs are only required to submit their conversion orders "within twelve months of the effective date of this Order." (TRRO ¶¶227, 143, 196) While CLECs have a strong interest in an orderly transition to alternative arrangements, the Joint CLECs believe that this should not be at the expense of being forced to pay higher rates than the TRRO authorized.

Transition Period

BellSouth witness Tipton affirms that the parties agree, either through testimony or proposed contract language, that the transition period began March 11, 2005, and will end on March 10, 2006, for local circuit switching and DS1 and DS3 loops and transport, and September 10, 2006, for dark fiber. The issue between the parties, asserts the BellSouth witness, is what activity should occur during the transition period. The witness believes that the transition process must begin and end within the transition period. Indeed, opines the witness, the TRRO revised unbundling rules are clear that the deadline of March 10, 2006, (September 10, 2006, for dark fiber) is a fixed date; CLECs are not entitled to maintain their embedded bases beyond this date. (TRRO ¶¶142, 195)

The BellSouth witness contends that the TRRO is clear that the purpose of the transition period is so the transitioning of de-listed UNEs will be completed by the end of the 12- or 18-month period, not simply for CLECs to submit conversion orders. (TRRO ¶227) The witness opines that the FCC held that the transition period is to provide time to perform “the tasks necessary to an orderly transition,” and “the time necessary to migrate to alternative fiber arrangements.” (TRRO ¶¶143-144, 196, 198, and 227) To this end, asserts the witness, the CLECs’ position is contrary to the FCC’s specific directives and is an attempt to generate additional time for access to de-listed UNEs at TELRIC rates. Moreover, claims the witness, from an operational standpoint and to ensure continuity of service, BellSouth is not physically capable of converting all of the embedded base on the last day of the transition period. Witness Tipton opines that BellSouth is committed to working with CLECs to make the transition as seamless as possible for the CLECs’ end-users, but this can only be accomplished if the CLECs are willing to communicate and work cooperatively with BellSouth to complete the necessary work before the expiration of the transition period.

In order to ensure that an orderly transition is completed by March 10, 2006, BellSouth witness Tipton proposes procedures for each de-listed element. The witness proposes that CLECs be required to identify their embedded base of UNE-P and stand-alone local switching via spreadsheets and submit conversion or disconnect orders “as soon as possible.”² For high-capacity loops and dedicated transport, BellSouth witness Tipton explains that there are two categories that must be addressed: the embedded base and “excess” DS1 and DS3 loops and transport. The embedded base consists of high capacity loops and transport that were in service on March 11, 2005, in non-impaired wire centers.³ Excess DS1 and DS3 loops are those in excess of the cap of ten DS1 circuits and one DS3 loop per building. The parties have agreed that Excess DS1 and DS3 transport are those in excess of 12 DS3 circuits on each route where DS3 transport is available as a UNE, and in excess of 10 DS1 circuits on each route where there is no unbundling obligation for DS3 transport but for which impairment exists for DS1 transport. These excess DS1 or DS3 loops and transport are also subject to the 12-month transition period. BellSouth witness Tipton proposes that CLECs be required to submit spreadsheets as soon as possible,⁴ identifying the embedded base and excess DS1 and DS3 loops and transport and the embedded base of entrance facilities⁵ to be disconnected or converted to other BellSouth services. Regarding dark fiber transport and dark fiber entrance facilities, BellSouth witness Tipton proposes that CLECs be required to submit spreadsheets that identify their embedded base of dark fiber to be either disconnected or converted to other services by June 10, 2006.

To encourage CLECs to work with BellSouth rather than waiting until the end of the transition period, witness Tipton proposes that if the CLECs submit their spreadsheets identifying the respective embedded bases and excess DS1 and DS3 loops and transport in a

² BellSouth initially proposed that such orders be issued by October 1, 2005. BellSouth’s alternative date is December 1, 2005.

³ Non-impaired wire centers are addressed in Section V.

⁴ BellSouth initially proposed that such orders be issued by December 9, 2005. BellSouth’s alternative date is January 15, 2006.

⁵ While the TRRO did not require a transition period for entrance facilities, BellSouth has proposed to transition the applicable embedded base over the same transition period applicable to high-capacity loops and transport, rather than effectuating a flash-cut.

timely manner, BellSouth will charge CLECs its proposed “switch-as-is” conversion rates and will forego disconnect charges. On the other hand, if CLECs do not submit their orders and spreadsheets in a timeframe that allows the orders to be completed by March 10, 2006 (September 10, 2006 for dark fiber transport and entrance facilities), witness Tipton proposes that BellSouth be permitted to convert a CLEC’s remaining de-listed arrangements itself, and charge CLECs disconnection charges, as well as full nonrecurring charges as approved by this Commission in the BellSouth UNE Order for the conversions. Accordingly, witness Tipton proposes that BellSouth be permitted to convert UNE-P lines to the resale equivalent and disconnect remaining stand-alone switch ports no later than March 11, 2006. The witness explains that BellSouth offers no tariffed or wholesale alternative to stand-alone switch ports, but CLECs may obtain the switching capability through a commercial agreement, use of their own switches, or the switches of other CLECs. For the remaining embedded or excess high capacity loops and interoffice transport or dark fiber transport, BellSouth proposes to convert these arrangements to the corresponding tariffed service offerings. Witness Tipton asserts that although the language proposed by BellSouth and CompSouth is similar, BellSouth will not agree to the CompSouth proposed language. The witness opines that CompSouth’s proposed language allows more time to transition these de-listed UNEs and puts the onus on BellSouth to absorb the nonrecurring charges associated with converting these services to equivalent BellSouth tariffed services in the event that BellSouth has to initiate the conversion process.

BellSouth witness Tipton proposes “switch-as-is” rates to apply on UNE circuits to special access services conversions. In a “switch-as-is” arrangement, explains the witness, no physical changes to the circuit are required. Where a conversion involves physical changes to the circuit, BellSouth proposes that the full nonrecurring disconnect and installation charges should apply. Additionally, witness Tipton asserts that “conversions should be considered termination for purposes of any applicable volume and term discount plan or grandfathered arrangements.” The proposed “switch-as-is” rates are shown below.

BellSouth’s Proposed “Switch-As-Is” Nonrecurring Conversion Rates			
Element	Description	First Single	Additional
R2.1	DS1 loop, single LSR*	\$24.97	\$3.52
R2.2	DS1 loop, LSR generated via spreadsheet	\$26.46	\$5.01
R.1	DS3 or higher loop, single LSR	\$40.28	\$13.52
R.2	DS3 or higher loop, LSR generated via spreadsheet	\$64.09	\$25.64
R.1.1	SNESAI**, per circuit	\$36.82	\$16.12
R.1.2	SNESAI with 15 or more circuits, per circuit	\$1.49	\$1.49
	additive		

* Local Service Request.

**Single Network Element Special Access circuit conversion from UNE.

Source: EXH 4, p. 13

BellSouth witness Tipton acknowledges that we previously ordered in the BellSouth UNE Order an EEL conversion⁶ rate of \$8.98. The rate for converting a UNE to special access is no different than the rate for converting from special access to a UNE for the same type of circuit. For “switch-as-is” rates for converting de-listed UNEs to a wholesale service, BellSouth utilized studies that developed costs for special access to UNE conversions (SPA-to-UNE) as a surrogate. BellSouth asserts that while there may be differences between the work groups that perform the two conversions, the activities and thus the cost should generally be similar.

Witness Tipton states that the BellSouth proposed rates are TELRIC-based rates supported by a cost study that was provided in response to our staff’s discovery. BellSouth is simply asking this Commission to establish a switch-as-is rate for a single element conversion. Witness Tipton asserts that when BellSouth performed its cost study in the last UNE proceeding, it did not have experience with switch-as-is conversions and consequently understated the associated activities and work groups involved, and the percentage of fall-out circuits. The witness acknowledges that BellSouth did not provide a cost witness nor did it sponsor any testimony concerning the cost study submitted here. The witness also acknowledges that the cost study was provided only one week prior to the hearing in this case.

Witness Tipton opines that the proposed deadlines for CLECs to submit their spreadsheets are reasonable for BellSouth to have time to work with each CLEC to ensure all embedded base circuits are identified, negotiate project timelines, issue and process service orders, update billing records, and perform the necessary conversions by the end of the transition period. The alternative is for BellSouth to attempt to identify the embedded base, and then have the CLECs, in turn, decide what they want to do and notify BellSouth of their decision. Witness Tipton asserts that this is not very efficient when each individual CLEC can use its own resources to identify its own embedded base.

Contrary to BellSouth witness Tipton’s assertion that the TRRO requires CLECs to complete all transitions by March 10, 2006, (September 10, 2006, for dark fiber transport), CompSouth witness Gillan believes the TRRO is clear that CLECs may submit their conversion orders at any time prior to the end of the transition period. The TRRO does not require that the conversions must be completed by the end of the transition period. The Joint CLECs note in their brief that ¶227 of the TRRO states that “[w]e require competitive LECs to submit the necessary orders to convert their mass market customers to an alternative service arrangement within twelve months of the effective date of this Order.” (TRRO ¶227) Further, assert the Joint CLECs, the FCC held in the TRRO that CLECs are required to transition all affected de-listed UNEs at the end of the transition period. (TRRO ¶¶143, 196, and 227) CompSouth witness Gillan contends that the general expectation of the TRRO is that CLECs have a year to determine alternative arrangements for de-listed UNEs.

Witness Gillan asserts that there is no provision in the TRRO permitting BellSouth to require dates in advance of March 10, 2006, for submission of CLEC orders. With respect to loop and transport arrangements, witness Gillan contends that until CLECs have a final listing of

⁶ An EEL conversion is a “switch-as-is” from special access to UNE or UNE to special access of a loop/transport arrangement. (Tipton TR 698)

the non-impaired wire centers and transport routes, and without knowledge as to the alternative §271 offerings, specific plans to transition facilities cannot be developed. Regardless, contends witness Gillan, once a CLEC has placed an order with BellSouth to migrate an arrangement, it is then up to BellSouth to effectuate that order. Witness Gillan believes that CLECs should not be penalized by paying higher prices for orders that BellSouth has not filled. Moreover, states the witness, BellSouth's proposal to unilaterally convert all remaining UNE-P lines to resale on March 11, 2006, makes it hard to conclude that it would be unable to handle other orders in a reasonable manner.

Witness Gillan asserts that because BellSouth is the party withdrawing the service, it should identify the circuits no longer being offered as UNEs, and allow CLECs to review the identification and inform BellSouth of disagreements. Furthermore, contends witness Gillan, CLECs should not be required to pay other charges associated with a conversion to or establishment of an alternative service arrangement. The witness asserts that CLECs will pay higher costs with the alternative service arrangements; "they should not also be required to pay order placement charges, disconnect charges or nonrecurring charges associated with a conversion to or establishment of an alternative service arrangement."

Section 271 Checklist Items

BellSouth witness Tipton contends that only elements under §251 should be included in ICAs. BellSouth argues in its brief that there is no legal basis for including contract language in a §252 agreement that would allow CLECs to transition from UNEs to state regulated §271 services. Furthermore, argues BellSouth, this Commission has no authority to dictate the rates, terms, and conditions of BellSouth's §271 obligations. Moreover, the TRRO makes no mention of transitioning to state-regulated §271 elements. (TRRO ¶¶142, 195, and 227)

CompSouth witness Gillan believes that the withdrawal of §251 network elements must be accompanied by the introduction of replacement offerings, such as §271 alternatives. CompSouth witness Gillan believes that BellSouth has a separate obligation under §271 to offer checklist items (switching, high-capacity loops, and transport) in the ICA, even where these items are not required under §251. The witness contends that the most important alternative arrangement to CLECs for transitioning de-listed UNEs will be a commercially viable BellSouth §271 offering that parallels the §251 offering being withdrawn, albeit at a higher price. Witness Gillan recommends that we establish interim prices for the §271 alternative offerings based on the TRRO transition rates. These interim rates, contends the witness, represent a reasonable first approximation of the §201 and §202 "just and reasonable" pricing standard and should remain in effect until a permanent cost proceeding is conducted. (TRRO ¶ 663)

B. ANALYSIS

Definition of the "Embedded Base" of Customers

In the TRRO, the FCC concluded that the 12-month transition period applies to the embedded base of end-user customers and that CLECs may not obtain any new de-listed switching, high-capacity loops and transport UNEs (no-new-adds), effective March 11, 2005.

(TRRO ¶227) In the Embedded Base Order, issued November 8, 2005, in the instant docket, we explicitly specified that the embedded customer base relates to arrangements, not just to customers. Specifically, we found that the embedded customer base referenced in the TRRO means customers being served on March 11, 2005. We concluded that:

While CLECs retain access to unbundled local circuit switching during the 12-month transition period for their embedded end-user customers, that access is limited to the arrangements existing on March 11, 2005. Orders requiring a new UNE-P arrangement, such as a customer move to another location or an additional line, are not permitted pursuant to the FCC's TRRO. (Embedded Base Order, p. 6)

Based on the above, we find that BellSouth's proposed definition of embedded base recognizes that the embedded base as used in the TRRO relates to arrangements. Therefore, we adopt BellSouth's language that effectuates this policy.

BellSouth measures the embedded bases of the de-listed UNEs as of March 11, 2005; CompSouth measures the embedded bases as of the effective date of the ICA. We observe that the effective date of the TRRO is March 11, 2005. (TRRO ¶235) Additionally, we note that the TRRO specifically states that carriers have 12 months to transition from local circuit switching and high-capacity loops and transport, and 18 months from dark fiber, "from the effective date of this Order." (TRRO ¶¶142, 195, and 227) Therefore, we agree with BellSouth that the embedded base of de-listed UNEs relates to those arrangements existing on March 11, 2005, the effective date of the TRRO.

Transition Pricing

The parties disagree with how the transition rates should be determined. CompSouth proposes language that bases transition rates on the "TELRIC" rate the CLEC paid on June 15, 2004, plus an additive. CompSouth believes this is appropriate, asserting that the FCC explained in ¶228 of the TRRO that:

We believe that the moderate price increases help ensure an orderly transition by mitigating the rate shock that could be suffered by competitive LECs if TELRIC pricing were immediately eliminated for these network elements, while at the same time, these price increases, and the limited duration of the transition, provide some protection of the interests of incumbent LECs in those situations where unbundling is not required. (TRRO ¶228)

In contrast, BellSouth believes that the TRRO and the attached revised unbundling rules are clear that transition pricing is to be determined based on the higher of the rate the CLEC paid on June 15, 2004, or the rate the state commission approved for that element or combination of elements between June 16, 2004, and March 11, 2005, plus the applicable additive. For example, the rule regarding DS1 loops specifically states that that the transition rate:

. . . shall be available for lease from the incumbent LEC at a rate equal to the higher of (1) 115 percent of the rate the requesting carrier paid for the loops

element on June 15, 2004, or (2) 115% of the rate the state commission has established or establishes, if any, between June 16, 2004, and the effective date of the Triennial Review Remand Order, for that loop element. (emphasis in original) (TRRO Appendix B, p. 147)

The witness notes that the TRRO revised unbundling rules prescribes similar language for all de-listed UNEs, except the additive for local circuit switching is different. (TRRO Appendix B, pp. 147-148, and 150-152)

We observe that while the text of the TRRO uses the term “TELRIC” when addressing transition pricing, the revised unbundling rules implementing the TRRO do not reference the term at all. We find that the language in the TRRO and the language in the revised unbundling rules can lead to different conclusions regarding the determination of the transition rates. However, we must look to the rule for guidance. If the parties believe the TRRO is not clear on this matter, they should seek clarification from the FCC. Therefore, for purposes of the ICA, we find the transition rates must be determined as stated in the rules, not in the text of the TRRO. We find that the ICA shall specifically state that transitional rates are to be based on the higher of the rate the CLEC paid for that element or combination of elements on June 15, 2004, or the rate this Commission approved for that element or combination of elements between June 16, 2004, and March 11, 2005. (TRRO Appendix B, pp. 147-148, and 150-152)

We observe that the TRO distinguished local circuit switching based on mass market and enterprise market differences. Mass market customers were defined as analog voice customers being served at the DS0 capacity level; enterprise market customers were defined as customers served at the DS1 capacity and above. (TRO ¶¶7, 451, 459, and, 497) The FCC concluded in the TRO that CLECs were not impaired with respect to enterprise switching, but allowed states to petition the FCC in cases in which the general national finding did not apply. (TRO ¶¶17, and 451-458) Further, the TRO retained the four or more line carve-out⁷ from the unbundled local circuit switching obligation on an interim basis. (TRO ¶525)

In the TRRO, the FCC concludes there is no impairment with respect to local circuit switching arrangements and adopts a transition period that “applies to all unbundled local circuit switching arrangements used to serve customers at less than the DS1 capacity level as of the effective date of this Order.” (TRRO ¶226 fn 625) We find the TRRO is clear with regard to how the transitional rate for DS0 level switching is to be determined. The FCC concludes that the applicable transition rate is the higher of the rate existing as of June 15, 2004, or the state commission rate established between June 16, 2004, and March 11, 2005, plus the additive. (TRRO ¶228) While ¶199 of the TRRO states that CLECs will continue to have access to UNE-P priced at TELRIC plus one dollar, the fact is that TELRIC rates were not in effect on June 15, 2004, for BellSouth’s DS0 level capacity switching for customers subject to the four or more line carve-out. Moreover, we agree with BellSouth that there is no suggestion in the TRRO that the rates included in ICAs should be restated before the transition period additive is applied. We

⁷ In the UNE Remand Order, the FCC determined that ILECs were not obligated to provide unbundled local circuit switching to CLECs for serving customers with four or more DS0 loops in density zone one of the top fifty Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs).

agree with BellSouth that the transition rate for DS0 level capacity switching for customers subject to the four or more line carve-out is the rate in existing contracts plus the TRRO additive, although BellSouth is proposing only charging the market rate without the additive.

We note that there is also a dispute regarding the effective date of the TRRO transitional rates. BellSouth believes the rates are effective upon the signing of the ICA with a retroactive true-up to March 11, 2005. BellSouth asserts that the TRRO specifically held that the transition rates would involve a retroactive true-up. CompSouth witness Gillan believes that if there is a retroactive true-up for the TRRO transition rates, then the TRO new unbundling obligations regarding revised EEL eligibility, commingling and conversions should likewise be effective retroactively to March 11, 2005. To do otherwise, argues the witness, would mean that only those portions of the FCC's unbundling framework that enable BellSouth to charge higher rates would be effective, while the options CLECs need to adjust to the new unbundling regime would not be in place.

We observe that footnotes 408, 524, and 630 of the TRRO state that switching, high-capacity loops and transport arrangements "no longer subject to unbundling shall be subject to true-up to the applicable transition rate upon amendment of the relevant interconnection agreements, including any applicable change of law processes." (TRRO fn 408, fn 524, and fn 630) The TRRO is clear that, once parties have amended their ICAs, a true-up of transition pricing to March 11, 2005, is required. In contrast, we note that the TRO effectuated changes in its requirements through the change-of-law process in existing ICAs; the FCC specifically declined overriding that process and unilaterally changing ICAs. (TRO ¶¶700-701) We observe that there is nothing in the TRRO that indicates the required true-up for switching, and high-capacity loops and transport, also applies to the new requirements of the TRO. Therefore, we agree with BellSouth that the new unbundling obligations required in the TRO shall be effective with the ICA amendment and not retroactive to March 11, 2005. The TRRO-established transition rates, however, are effective at the time of the ICA amendment and are subject to true-up back to March 11, 2005.

Application of Transitional Rates

BellSouth witness Tipton contends that transition pricing ends the earlier of March 10, 2006, for local circuit switching and affected high-capacity loops and transport (September 10, 2006, for dark fiber loops and transport), or when the de-listed UNE is converted. The Joint CLECs contend that the TRRO entitles CLECs to transition rates for the de-listed UNEs until the end of the applicable transition period.

Paragraph 199 of the TRRO appears to support BellSouth's interpretation that transitional rates are only applicable until the CLEC submits a conversion request. Specifically, the paragraph establishes a 12-month transition period in which CLECs ". . . will continue to have access to UNE-P priced at TELRIC plus one dollar until the incumbent LEC successfully migrates those UNE-P customers to the competitive LECs' switches or to alternative access arrangements negotiated by the carriers." (TRRO ¶199) Notwithstanding the requirement for CLECs to migrate their embedded base of customers away from unbundled local circuit switching to an alternative arrangement by March 10, 2006, we note that the TRRO revised rule

specifically states that, “for a 12-month period from the effective date of the Triennial Review Remand Order, an incumbent LEC shall provide access to local circuit switching on an unbundled basis for a requesting carrier to serve its embedded base of end-user customers.” (TRRO Appendix B, p. 148) Paragraphs 145 and 198 of the TRRO state that transition rates for high-capacity loops and transport apply “during the relevant transition period.” The relevant transition periods are March 11, 2005, through March 10, 2006, for affected DS1 and DS3 loops and transport and through September 10, 2006, for dark fiber loops and transport.

Based on the above and consistent with our finding in the Verizon Arbitration Order, we find that regardless of when CLECs submit their conversion orders during the transition period, the TRRO rule entitles them to receive the transitional rates for the entire applicable transition period (March 11, 2005 – March 10, 2006 for local circuit switching and high-capacity loops and transport, and March 11, 2005 – September 10, 2006, for dark fiber loops and transport).⁸ (Verizon Arbitration Order at p. 23) We find this policy will provide the orderly and smooth transition from de-listed UNEs to alternative arrangements as intended by the FCC in the TRRO by providing CLECs an incentive to submit conversion requests over the applicable 12- and 18-month transition periods rather than submitting them all at one time at the end. To do otherwise would encourage CLECs to wait until the end of the applicable transition periods⁹ to submit their conversion orders for the de-listed UNEs, and thus not provide the orderly and smooth transition the TRRO contemplates. Notwithstanding this, we find that access at transitional rates ends on March 10, 2006, or September 10, 2006, as applicable, whether or not the circuits have been converted. Thereafter, BellSouth’s applicable resale or tariffed rate applies. Additionally, we find that BellSouth shall be permitted to disconnect any stand-alone switching ports remaining on March 11, 2006. There should be no reason why CLECs cannot identify their embedded base and notify BellSouth whether to disconnect or convert to an alternative service or provider.

We note that BellSouth has agreed to treat the embedded base of entrance facilities to the 12-month transition period applicable to high-capacity loops and transport, although not required to by the TRO or TRRO. BellSouth cites to Exhibit A as the source of the transition rates for entrance facilities; we presume that the rates in the exhibit are those that would be apply throughout the transition period.

Transition Period

We observe that there are two central disputes between the parties with regard to the transition period process: (1) whether conversions are required to be completed by the end of the applicable transition period; and (2) whether there should be a required date for identification of the respective embedded bases of the de-listed UNE. We find that resolution of the first dispute is dependent on the meaning of the phrase “to transition.” We observe that nowhere in the TRRO does the FCC equate “to transition” to “complete conversions,” as BellSouth contends. The text of the TRRO only requires CLECs to submit orders within the applicable transition

⁸ We additionally note that BellSouth witness Tipton agreed that there is nothing in the revised TRRO rules that requires transition rates to only apply until a conversion has occurred.

⁹ March 10, 2006, is the end of the transition period for local circuit switching and affected high-capacity loops and transport; September 10, 2006, is the end of the transition period for dark fiber.

period. (TRRO ¶¶216 and 227) We also note that ¶¶143 and 196 state that “[a]t the end of the end of the transition period, requesting carriers must transition . . .” the affected de-listed UNEs to alternative facilities or arrangements. The revised unbundling rules state that the applicable transition period begins on the effective date of the TRRO, March 11, 2005. (TRRO Appendix B, pp. 147-148, and 150-152) Therefore, we find that CLECs are given the entire transition period, March 11, 2005, through March 10, 2006, (September 10, 2006, for dark fiber) to submit conversion or disconnect orders. There is no requirement that conversions must be completed by the end of the applicable transition period. However, we note that absent receipt of a conversion order by the end of the applicable transition period, BellSouth has no obligation to provide the de-listed services. In fact, we observe that BellSouth does not offer stand-alone switching ports except through a commercial agreement. We find that BellSouth shall be allowed to disconnect any such arrangements once the transition period ends, absent a CLEC conversion order. We find that BellSouth’s proposal to convert the de-listed high-capacity loops and transport and dark fiber to its resale or tariffed products is beneficial to the CLECs who, for whatever reason, have not made alternative arrangements for the de-listed services.

We observe there is also a dispute between the parties regarding who should identify the specific arrangements to be converted or disconnected. BellSouth witness Tipton believes that CLECs should be required to submit spreadsheets by a date certain that identify the embedded base of de-listed UNEs that are subject to being converted or disconnected. If CLECs identify and submit spreadsheets in accord with BellSouth’s deadlines, witness Tipton proposes that CLECs be charged the BellSouth proposed “switch-as-is” conversion rates without any disconnect charges. The witness proposes that if CLECs do not submit orders “in a timely manner” in accord with BellSouth’s deadlines so conversions can be made by March 10, 2006, then BellSouth should be permitted to identify the affected UNE arrangements and convert them to the equivalent wholesale service.

In contrast, CompSouth disputes BellSouth’s claim that the CLEC has the first responsibility to identify any de-listed circuits. CompSouth proposes language that requires BellSouth, not the CLEC, to provide written notice that identifies the de-listed arrangements that are to be required to be transitioned to other facilities. CompSouth witness Gillan asserts that there is nothing in the TRRO that requires the identification of the embedded base that is subject to conversion or disconnection, by a date certain. CompSouth also believes that regardless of when conversion orders are submitted, no nonrecurring charges should apply. Furthermore, the Joint CLECs and CompSouth contend that de-listed arrangements not converted by March 10, 2006, should be converted to the parallel §271 arrangements priced at the TRRO transitional rates until a rate proceeding is held.

We find that CLECs, not BellSouth, should identify the embedded base of de-listed UNEs and submit the conversion orders. We find the TRRO is clear that at the end of the transition period, CLECs are required to transition the affected de-listed UNEs to alternative arrangements. (TRRO ¶¶143, 196, 227) We note that for local circuit switching, the FCC specifically held that “[w]e require competitive LECs to submit the necessary orders to convert their mass market customers to an alternative service arrangement within 12 months of the effective date of this Order.” (TRRO ¶227) While similar language is not found in the TRRO for

high-capacity loops and transport, we agree with BellSouth that the CLECs are in the best position to identify their respective embedded bases. Moreover, we disagree with CompSouth witness Gillan that BellSouth is the party withdrawing the service, and therefore it should identify the circuits no longer being offered as UNEs, and allow CLECs to review the identification and inform BellSouth of disagreements. Contrary to witness Gillan's claim, we believe that it is the FCC, not BellSouth that has required these offerings to be withdrawn.

However, we observe that there is nothing in the TRRO that permits BellSouth to establish deadlines for CLECs to submit spreadsheets identifying the de-listed UNEs subject to the transition period. The only requirement is that the transition period ends after 12 months or eighteen months, and de-listed arrangements must be transitioned to alternative services at that time. Indeed, BellSouth witness Tipton recognized that the deadlines cannot be an absolute cutoff and it is "certainly within the Commission's discretion to establish alternative dates." Because we find that the TRRO-established transition pricing is applicable throughout the transition period, there should be no reason why CLECs would not work cooperatively with BellSouth and identify the embedded base of circuits as soon as possible. Nonetheless, if CLECs do not identify the respective embedded bases by the end of the applicable transition period, we agree that BellSouth shall be permitted to (1) identify the arrangements itself, (2) charge CLECs the applicable UNE disconnect charges and full installation charges, and (3) charge CLECs the resale or wholesale tariffed rate thereafter, regardless of when the conversion is completed. Strictly speaking, we find that BellSouth is entitled to assess Commission-approved UNE disconnect charges and, e.g., special access nonrecurring charges before the end of the transition period. BellSouth's offer to not assess these charges serves as an incentive for early conversion.

Regarding BellSouth's proposed "switch-as-is" conversion rates, we observe that BellSouth witness Tipton acknowledged that the cost study supporting the proposed rates was provided one week prior to the hearing in response to our staff's discovery; BellSouth did not sponsor any testimony concerning the cost study or its assumptions; and BellSouth did not offer any witness that parties could have deposed or questioned at the hearing concerning the cost study. The facts as presented make it difficult for approval of BellSouth's proposed "switch-as-is" rates. We find BellSouth has not provided sufficient evidence to support the appropriateness of its proposed rates. Notwithstanding this, we find that nothing precludes BellSouth from initiating a cost proceeding where "switch-as-is" conversion rates can be appropriately addressed.

Section 271 Checklist Items

BellSouth asserts that it offers §271 switching via a commercial agreement and §271 loops and transport via special access tariffs. CompSouth witness Gillan disputes BellSouth's assertion that de-listed circuits remaining on March 11, 2006, should be moved to interstate special access service, BellSouth's claim that interstate special access is sufficient to satisfy §271 obligations, and that BellSouth's interstate special access rates meet the "just and reasonable" standard of §201 and §202. The witness believes that a parallel §271 service should be offered as a viable alternative arrangement for CLECs to transition from de-listed UNEs, and that we should set interim rates at the TRRO transition rates until a cost proceeding is held to address the appropriate rates for the §271 services.

As discussed in more detail in Section VI, we find that we do not have the authority to require BellSouth to include §271 elements in §252 interconnection agreements. We note that in the TRO, the FCC explicitly stated that whether a particular §271 element's rate satisfies the just and reasonable pricing standard of §201 and §202 is a fact-specific inquiry that the FCC will undertake, whether in an application for §271 authority or an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to §271(d)(6). Based on our decision in Section VI, we find that §252 ICAs should not include §271 elements and that any dispute that BellSouth's special access rates are not "just and reasonable" should be filed as a complaint with the FCC, not this Commission.

C. DECISION

We find that the embedded base as used in the TRRO relates to de-listed UNE arrangements existing on March 11, 2005. We find that the TRRO transition rates be based on the higher of the rate the CLEC paid for that element or combination of elements on June 15, 2004, or the rate this Commission approved for that element or combination of elements between June 16, 2004, and March 11, 2005, plus the applicable additive (one dollar for local circuit switching and 15 percent for high-capacity loops and transport and dark fiber). Accordingly, the transition rate for DS0 level capacity switching for customers subject to the four or more line carve-out is the rate in existing contracts. Additionally, we find that the TRRO transitional rates for the de-listed UNEs are effective at the time of the ICA amendment and subject to true-up back to March 11, 2005; the TRO new unbundling obligations shall be effective with the ICA amendment.

Consistent with our finding in the Verizon Arbitration Order, we find that regardless of when CLECs submit their conversion orders during the transition period, the TRRO rules entitle them to receive the transitional rates for the full 12 months, March 11, 2005 – March 10, 2006, for local circuit switching, high-capacity loops and transport, and 18 months, March 11, 2005 – September 10, 2006, for dark fiber loops and transport. However, transitional pricing ends March 10, 2006, and September 10, 2006, for the affected de-listed arrangements, whether or not the former UNEs have been converted.

With regard to the transition period process, we find that (1) CLECs are required to submit conversion orders for the affected de-listed arrangements by the end of the transition period, but conversions do not have to be completed by the end of the applicable transition period (March 10, 2006, for local circuit switching and affected high-capacity loops and transport and September 10, 2006, for dark fiber loops and transport); and (2) there should not be a required date for CLECs to identify the respective embedded bases of the de-listed UNEs. However, if CLECs do not identify the applicable embedded bases by March 10, 2006, and by September 10, 2006, respectively, we find that BellSouth shall be permitted to (1) identify the arrangements itself, (2) charge CLECs the applicable disconnect charges and full installation charges, and (3) charge CLECs the resale or wholesale tariffed rate beginning March 11, 2006, for local circuit switching and affected high-capacity loops and transport (September 11, 2006, for dark fiber loops and transport), regardless of when the conversion is completed.

We find that there is a lack of competent evidence to approve BellSouth's proposed "switch-as-is" conversion rates. However, BellSouth is not precluded from initiating a cost proceeding later to address "switch-as-is" conversion rates.

We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth nor CompSouth is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that parts of the language proposed by BellSouth and CompSouth should be combined and adopted as discussed in our analysis. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

III. BELLSOUTH'S OBLIGATIONS TO PROVIDE NETWORK ELEMENTS THAT ARE NO LONGER SECTION 251(C) (3) OBLIGATIONS

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth contends that carriers must implement amendments to their interconnection agreements consistent with the TRRO.¹⁰ Accordingly, BellSouth argues that carriers must remove the availability of de-listed UNEs from their existing interconnection agreements. BellSouth further contends that all remaining¹¹ CLECs should be required to execute an amendment with Commission-approved contract language subsequent to issuance of our order in this Docket.

The Joint CLECs contend that amendments to the ICAs should be based on our decisions in this proceeding. Furthermore, the Joint CLECs state that the amendments should be implemented in a timely¹² manner subsequent to this proceeding, unless the parties have specifically agreed otherwise. The Joint CLECs also contend that modifications to existing ICAs should be limited to disputed issues that are within the scope of this proceeding.

The Joint CLECs argue that the way in which implementation should occur depends on whether the issue resolved in this proceeding is an unresolved disputed issue in a pending arbitration or if the issue resolved in this proceeding is not an unresolved disputed issue in a pending arbitration, and the parties to the arbitration have made agreements notwithstanding the outcome in this proceeding. The former would require that our decisions in this proceeding govern the resolution of the arbitration, and the latter would require that the agreements stand. Without an agreement either party may invoke the change of law provisions of the ICA upon Commission approval of the agreement.

¹⁰ TRRO at ¶ 233.

¹¹ More than 130 CLECs in Florida have amended or entered into new ICAs in order to implement the changes in law as a result of the TRRO.

¹² The Joint CLECs state that the parties should have a reasonable period of time to implement the amendments to accurately reflect our decisions.

B. ANALYSIS

The FCC ruled that ILECs and CLECs must implement amendments to their ICAs consistent with the findings in the TRRO.¹³ We find that the TRRO is clear, in that the FCC ruled that any existing ICAs are to be modified during the established transition periods and implemented via the §252 process. Accordingly, we find that the availability of de-listed UNEs shall be removed from ICAs. The TRRO has changed BellSouth's unbundling obligations under §251(c)(3). As such, we find that amendments to existing ICAs shall reflect those changes to BellSouth's unbundling obligations. Both BellSouth and the Joint CLECs appear to agree in their post-hearing briefs that our decisions, as to contract language, in this proceeding will form the basis for amendments to ICAs, unless the parties have agreed otherwise. Also, there is no clear dispute regarding whether non-parties should be bound by the decisions in this proceeding. BellSouth contends that the amendments to ICAs will apply to ICAs that are currently being arbitrated as well as those yet to be arbitrated, while the Joint CLECs take no position. Commission Order No. PSC-05-0639-PCO-TP, which established the scope of this proceeding, made it clear that all Florida CLECs in BellSouth's territory will be bound by the findings in this proceeding.¹⁴ Accordingly, we find that all Florida CLECs having ICAs with BellSouth will be bound by the decisions in this proceeding effective upon issuance of the final order.

C. DECISION

a) The TRO and the TRRO have changed BellSouth's obligation to provide unbundled network elements pursuant to its §251(c)(3) obligation. Therefore, we find that existing ICAs shall be amended to reflect those changes to BellSouth's obligations. b) Amendments to new ICAs pending arbitration shall be based on our decisions in this proceeding, unless the parties have specifically agreed otherwise. Accordingly, we find that all Florida CLECs having ICAs with BellSouth shall be bound by the decisions in this proceeding effective upon issuance of the final order approving the amendments or agreements.

¹³ TRRO at ¶233.

¹⁴ *Petition to establish generic docket to consider amendments to interconnection agreements resulting from changes in law by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.*, Docket 041269-TP, FPSC Order No. PSC-05-0639-PCO-TP at 1, Issued June 14, 2005.

IV. BELLSOUTH'S OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE SECTION 251 UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO HIGH CAPACITY LOOPS AND DEDICATED TRANSPORT AND DEFINITION OF THE FOLLOWING TERMS:

- (i) **BUSINESS LINE**
- (ii) **FIBER-BASED COLLOCATION**
- (iii) **BUILDING**
- (iv) **ROUTE**

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

DS1/DS3 and Dark Fiber Loops

Witness Tipton advises that BellSouth provided a list of wire centers that meet the threshold non-impairment criteria in its Carrier Notification Letter (CNL) dated April 15, 2005, which is posted on BellSouth's website. She states that BellSouth initially based its non-impairment determination on 2003 data, but updated the wire center list using December 2004 data. She notes that for Florida, wire centers meeting the DS1 loop threshold criteria did not change as a result of the update. Witness Tipton asserts that BellSouth is no longer required to provide unbundled access to new dark fiber loops in accordance with the CFR.

Witness Tipton states that it appears BellSouth can agree with the language proposed by CompSouth witness Gillan regarding the caps on DS1 and DS3 loops. She explains that the caps apply even where the test requires DS3 loop unbundling. (TRRO ¶177, ¶ 181) She advises that no rates, terms, or conditions are proposed for dark fiber loops for new interconnection agreements.

DS1/DS3 Dedicated Transport and Dark Fiber Transport

Witness Tipton notes that wire centers listed in BellSouth's April 15, 2005 CNL as "Tier 1" meet the non-impairment thresholds for DS1 dedicated interoffice transport. She states that BellSouth is no longer obligated to provide DS3 dedicated transport on an unbundled basis on routes for which at least one end-point of the route is in a wire center with at least 24,000 business lines or at least three fiber-based collocators. Witness Tipton explains that once a wire center meets the threshold criteria, dedicated transport to or from that wire center will no longer be unbundled when the route originates from or terminates to a wire center also meeting the non-impairment thresholds. Witness Tipton explains that "[t]hose wire centers designated as either 'Tier 1' or 'Tier 2' in [EXH 20] meet the thresholds for DS3 dedicated interoffice transport and unbundling is no longer required between Tier 1 wire centers, between Tier 2 wire centers, or between a Tier 1 wire center and a Tier 2 wire center." Witness Tipton states that BellSouth is no longer obligated to provide dark fiber dedicated transport on an unbundled basis on routes for which at least one end-point of the route is in a wire center with at least 24,000 business lines or at least three fiber-based collocators.

Witness Tipton explains that the business line count and collocation data was merged into a single list with wire centers listed by the proper Tier. She notes that the FCC defines Tiers in 47 CFR 51.319(e)(3) as follows:

- Tier 1 wire centers are those ILEC wire centers that contain at least four fiber-based collocators, at least 38,000 business lines, or both. Once a wire center is determined to be a Tier 1 wire center, that wire center is not subject to later reclassification as a Tier 2 or Tier 3 wire center.
- Tier 2 wire centers are those ILEC wire centers that are not Tier 1 wire centers, but contain at least three fiber-based collocators, at least 24,000 business lines, or both. Once a wire center is determined to be a Tier 2 wire center, that wire center is not subject to later reclassification as a Tier 3 wire center.
- Tier 3 wire centers are those ILEC wire centers that do not meet the criteria for Tier 1 or Tier 2 wire centers.

Witness Tipton states that the issue with regard to the DS1 transport cap has been resolved. She adds that, where still available, CLECs may only obtain twelve (12) unbundled DS3 dedicated transport circuits per route. No further information was provided and BellSouth did not address the caps in its brief.

Entrance Facilities

Witness Tipton explains that an entrance facility is dedicated transport that does not connect a pair of BellSouth wire centers. She advises that BellSouth is no longer obligated to provide entrance facilities.

EELs

Witness Tipton opines that the principles that apply to loops and dedicated interoffice transport also apply to EELs, because these are the elements that make up EELs. She notes that the route for an EEL is determined by the end points of the dedicated transport portion of the EEL. She explains that, once the non-impairment threshold for the wire center serving the loop location or transport route is met, BellSouth no longer has an obligation to provision the non-impaired portion of the EEL as a UNE. She continues that if the thresholds for both the dedicated transport and loop portions of the EEL have been met, EELs need no longer be provided.

Joint CLECs

US LEC witness Montano argues that “BellSouth’s language focuses solely on the embedded base and the transition period and does not affirmatively state when it must provide access to the unbundled high capacity loops and transport.” She states that US LEC is willing to agree to BellSouth’s language “so long as BellSouth compromised on the language addressing the date on which orders for the ‘embedded base’ transition was required to be submitted as well

as the length of any subsequent transition periods and the process by which the parties would agree on the identification of non-impaired wire centers.” She complains that “the parties have reached an impasse on the wire center identification issue.”

Definitions

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Tipton notes that the FCC set non-impairment thresholds for high capacity loops and dedicated transport. She adds that references to business lines and fiber-based collocation are contained in the specifics for each type of threshold. She advises that the non-impairment rules for loops also include the term “building,” while the rules for dedicated transport non-impairment contain the term “route.” She opines that the definitions of these terms are important because they impact the conclusion as to the wire centers where CLECs are not impaired with regard to high capacity loops or transport.

(i) Business Line

Witness Tipton states that the FCC defined a business line in 47 CFR 51.5 as:

. . . an incumbent LEC-owned switched access line used to serve a business customer, whether by the incumbent LEC itself or by a competitive LEC that leases the line from the incumbent LEC. The number of business lines in a wire center shall equal the sum of all incumbent LEC business switched access lines, plus the sum of all UNE loops connected to that wire center, including UNE loops provisioned in combination with other unbundled elements. Among these requirements, business line tallies (1) shall include only those access lines connecting end-user customers with incumbent LEC end-offices for switched services, (2) shall not include non-switched special access lines, (3) shall account for ISDN and other digital access lines by counting each 64 kbps-equivalent as one line. For example, a DS1 line corresponds to 24 64 kbps-equivalents, and therefore to 24 “business lines.”

Witness Tipton states that a number of points are at issue with regard to the types of loops that should be included in the count. She asserts, for example, that the FCC’s definition requires that BellSouth include all UNE loops, even those that are not switched, like DSL lines. She contends that the FCC’s rule does not exclude any particular type of unbundled loop for the business line count. She also notes that BellSouth counted retail lines used to serve business customers with switched voice lines, including lines or trunks provided over high capacity transport links.

Witness Tipton states that the ARMIS reports do not count all of the lines that the FCC included in its definition of business lines. She explains that unbundled loops, whether stand-alone or provisioned in combination with other network elements, are not included in BellSouth’s switched access line counts in ARMIS. She advises that BellSouth included all UNE loops connected to a wire center, including those provisioned in combination with other

unbundled elements, as well as business UNE-P arrangements. She also notes that BellSouth did not include UNE-P residential lines in the business line count. She opines that this represents a more conservative view of business access lines, since these types of lines were not adjusted to full capacity.

Witness Tipton asserts that the FCC's definition of a business line includes UNE-L and UNE-P data not captured in ARMIS. She explains that the FCC's Policy Division Staff instructed ILECs to include UNE-P used to serve business customers as well as all UNE-L. She advises that the FCC acknowledged in ¶150 of the TRRO the inclusion of UNE-L, stating, "We adopt this definition of business lines because it fairly represents the business opportunities in a wire center, including through the use of UNEs." She contends that the inclusion of all UNE loops is in keeping with the FCC's goal to determine where there is sufficient competition to justify a finding of no impairment. She avers that the presence of UNE-L in a wire center demonstrates the existence of competition in a wire center. She adds that the FCC rules also specify that all UNE loops connected to a wire center should be included in the business line count.¹⁵

Witness Tipton explains that BellSouth identified all 64 Kbps equivalents that were associated with voice equivalent channels, but excluded those that were used for data services. She advises that a business line on which both a voice and a data service were provided was counted as one line. She notes that BellSouth did not count UNE-P residential lines in its business line count. She adds that BellSouth did not count any residential retail or resold lines, if a CLEC was providing a data service over the same line, such as in a line-sharing arrangement.

Witness Tipton explains that to identify the retail and resale high capacity circuits to be counted in the business line analysis, BellSouth used only those which had a USOC with a designation that indicated the circuit was used to provide voice service. She notes that BellSouth excluded from its analysis those USOCs indicating that a high capacity circuit was used for data or for an integrated voice and data offering.

Witness Tipton asserts that the definition of business line proposed by the Joint CLECs goes beyond the FCC's definition. She explains that the Joint CLECs' proposed modifications exclude non-switched UNE loop facilities from the business line count, which would potentially exclude some UNE loops. She notes that the proposal also excludes unused capacity on channelized high capacity loops, even though the FCC's definition specifies that digital access lines should be counted with each 64 kbps-equivalent as one line.

Witness Tipton states that certain arguments of CompSouth witness Gillan "conflict with the FCC's instructions as to how BellSouth should count business lines." She notes that the FCC did not impose a requirement to determine which UNE-L lines are used to provide switched services. She cites the FCC's rule which states

The number of business lines in a wire center shall equal the sum of all incumbent LEC switched access lines, *plus the sum of all UNE loops connected to that wire*

¹⁵ 47 CFR 51.5.

center, including UNE loops provisioned in combination with other unbundled elements. (47 CFR 51.5) (emphasis by witness)

Witness Tipton opines that this definition makes sense because “the objective here is to determine where the CLECs are not impaired without access to BellSouth’s facilities as UNEs.” She states that the fact that a CLEC has purchased UNE loops in a particular wire center, regardless of the service provided over those loops, is an indication that the CLECs are not impaired in that wire center. She opines that the FCC recognized that the ILECs would not be able to determine what UNE loops are used for, and as a result, set a requirement that all UNE loops be included in the business line count.

Joint CLECs

CompSouth witness Gillan states that the number of business lines in a wire center is based on the summation of three values: 1) the number of business switched access lines; 2) the number of UNE loops (including loops used with other unbundled elements); and 3) the number of business UNE-P. He explains that there are certain directives that must be followed in performing the calculation. He advises that the business line count includes only those access lines that connect end-user customers with ILEC end-offices for switched services, that do not include non-switched special access lines, and that includes ISDN and other digital access lines by counting each 64 kbps-equivalent as one line. He notes that these additional requirements apply only to UNE lines. He asserts that BellSouth has an incentive to incorrectly assign wire centers to reduce its unbundling obligations.

Witness Gillan argues that the ARMIS 43-08 Business Switched Access Lines already conform to the FCC’s requirements. He provides the FCC definition for calculating ARMIS business lines, which is comprised of total voice-grade equivalent analog or digital switched access lines to business customers, including single business access lines, the total of analog and digital multiline business access lines, and payphone lines.

Witness Gillan notes the FCC’s definition of a business line in the CFR includes the statement “[t]he number of business lines in a wire center shall equal the sum of all incumbent LEC business switched access lines, plus the sum of all UNE loops connected to that wire center, including UNE loops provisioned in combination with other unbundled elements.” (47 CFR 51.5) He asserts that BellSouth interprets the second sentence of the rule as a waiver of the first sentence, thus allowing BellSouth to count the maximum potential capacity of every UNE-L circuit regardless of the way in which the circuit is actually used. Witness Gillan emphasizes that the business line tallies should only include those access lines that connect end-user customers with ILEC end-offices for use in the provision of switched services. He asserts that BellSouth manipulated its own ARMIS data to make it consistent with BellSouth’s UNE-L assumption.

Witness Gillan contends that there is no reason for BellSouth to modify the number of business lines included in the ARMIS report. He states that UNE-L and business UNE-P lines should be added to the ARMIS figure to arrive at the business line count necessary to determine

whether a wire center meets the non-impairment criteria. Witness Gillan asserts that UNE-P is a switched service, and thus falls under the ARMIS requirements for calculation. However, he explains that the FCC did not provide guidance for the determination of UNE-L lines.

Witness Gillan notes that BellSouth's treatment of UNE-L accounts for 20 percent of the total business lines claimed by BellSouth. He notes that BellSouth is asking for substantially more wire centers to be considered non-impaired than what it originally advised the FCC would be the case. He notes that BellSouth now claims its wire centers have 20 percent more business lines than it claimed in December 2004. Witness Gillan concedes that "the FCC did not provide specific guidance as to the best way to ensure that UNE-L counts appropriately include only those access lines used to provide switched services to business customers." Nevertheless, he argues that BellSouth's approach is unreasonable and "dramatically overstates" the line count at each wire center. He states that "[a]ll that the Commission needs to do is to accept the simple and straightforward assumption that the average utilization for the CLECs is equal to the average utilization for BellSouth."

Witness Gillan states that nothing in the TRRO justifies treatment of HDSL-capable loops as if they were DS1 loops, with conversion to 24 business lines. He contends that only digital access lines are to be converted to voice-grade equivalents, citing 47 CFR 51.5. He asserts that "[a]n HDSL-capable loop is exactly that—a dry copper line that is not a digital facility without the addition of CLEC equipment." (emphasis by witness) He advises that the additional capacity constitutes a CLEC-created loop. He asserts that the FCC rejected any approach that would be the equivalent of counting CLEC capacity.

Witness Gillan contends that the provision in the rule requiring that digital access lines should be counted with each 64 kbps-equivalent does not override the rest of the rule. He asserts that when the rule is read in its entirety, it is clear that a circuit must satisfy all requirements in the rule in order to be counted; that is, it must be a LEC-owned switched access line and it must be ILEC-owned that is used to serve a business customer. He avers that the provision that each 64 kbps channel used to provide switched service to a business customer should be counted as one line does not permit BellSouth "to count unused capacity or capacity that is not used to provide switched services to a business customer merely because it is part of a digital circuit."

Witness Gillan provides a revised business line count in which he eliminates BellSouth's adjustments to its ARMIS business line count in which BellSouth increased actual business lines to include the maximum potential capacity. He also changes UNE-L assumptions to reflect the average utilization of CLEC digital UNE-L used to provide switched access service to business customers, thus effectively eliminating residential utilization. He contends that it is reasonable to assume that CLECs use approximately the same percentage of their potential digital capacity to provide switched access line services to business customers as BellSouth uses. He explains the percentage he applied is the average over the wire centers that BellSouth claims satisfy one or more criteria for non-impairment.

The Joint CLECs argue in their brief that BellSouth misreads the FCC's definition of business lines to include UNE-L used by CLECs to provide residential services. They state that

BellSouth downplays the first sentence of the definition to support its position. The first sentence states that “[a] business line is an incumbent LEC-owned switched access line used to serve a business customer, whether by the incumbent LEC itself or by a competitive LEC that leases the line from the incumbent LEC.” (47 CFR 51.5) The Joint CLECs assert that this is the core requirement of the rule, requiring that only business lines be counted.

Sprint

Sprint witness Maples notes that the FCC defines ‘business lines’ in 47 CFR 51.5. He asserts that the term should be included in the agreement, due to its importance in determining which wire centers meet the FCC criteria for non-impairment. He states that the definitions can either be incorporated verbatim from the FCC’s rules or can be incorporated by reference.

(ii) Fiber-Based Collocation

BellSouth

Witness Tipton notes that the TRRO specifies in 47 CFR 51.5 that fiber-based collocation means:

... any carrier, unaffiliated with the incumbent LEC, that maintains a collocation arrangement in an incumbent LEC wire center, with active electrical power supply, and operates a fiber-optic cable or comparable transmission facility that (1) terminates at a collocation arrangement within the wire center; (2) leaves the incumbent LEC wire center premises; and (3) is owned by a party other than the incumbent LEC or any affiliate of the incumbent LEC, except as set forth in this paragraph. Dark fiber obtained from an incumbent LEC on an indefeasible right of use basis shall be treated as non-incumbent LEC fiber-optic cable. Two or more affiliated fiber-based collocators in a single wire center shall collectively be counted as a single fiber-based collocator. For purposes of this paragraph, the term affiliated is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(l) and any relevant interpretation of the Title.

Witness Tipton states that the definition of fiber-based collocator should not go beyond what is stated in the FCC rules. She complains that the Joint CLECs’ proposed definition combines two firms who have discussed a merger into one fiber-based collocator instead of two. She asserts that non-impairment determinations must be based upon the facts as of a certain date. She opines that “[t]he key factor is what companies are actually merged or affiliated on the date in which the non-impairment determination is made, whether that is the TRRO effective date or a future date when BellSouth designates additional unimpaired wire centers.” (emphasis by witness)

Witness Tipton avers that BellSouth counted the number of collocators that have fiber-fed arrangements, rather than the number of fiber ‘providers’ who supply fiber to a given wire center. She contends that this is consistent with the FCC’s approach to determining how many arrangements are fiber-based. She states that CompSouth witness Gillan attempts to exclude

arrangements where one collocated carrier obtains fiber capacity from another collocated carrier. She explains that where a carrier has fiber that it obtained from another collocated carrier connected to terminating equipment in its collocation arrangement, both collocated carriers, if actively powered, qualify as fiber-based collocators. She adds that BellSouth only included in its count of fiber-based collocators those arrangements served by fiber, even though the FCC's definition of a business line allows the inclusion of a comparable transmission facility.

Witness Tipton states that BellSouth made a physical check of the collocation arrangements in each wire center that it believed had at least three fiber-based collocation arrangements. She explains that BellSouth did not count those arrangements that were not fed by competitive fiber or contained equipment that was not actively powered. She advises that BellSouth also did not count affiliated carriers' collocation arrangements as multiple fiber-based collocation arrangements in a given wire center. She adds that BellSouth manually checked its records to determine if affiliated carriers had fiber-based collocations in any wire center, and counted any that were found as one fiber-based collocation arrangement. Witness Tipton asserts that BellSouth did not alter, to serve its own interests, the findings of its visits to wire centers to verify the presence of fiber-based collocators reflected in its billing records.

Witness Tipton states that she does not object to referring to the FCC's definition of fiber-based collocator in the ICAs as suggested by Sprint witness Maples. She expresses unwillingness to include the language proposed by CompSouth.

Joint CLECs

Witness Gillan states that he validated BellSouth's claims regarding the number of fiber-based collocators which would be provided in a revised exhibit JPG-5. He contends that the key is to assure that the fiber-based collocators meet the definition of 47 CFR 51.5. He advises that the pending AT&T-SBC merger must be recognized, such that their fiber-based collocations are counted as one entrant, and not two.

Sprint

Sprint witness Maples notes that the FCC defines 'fiber based collocator' in 47 CFR 51.5. As with the definition of 'business line,' he asserts that the term should be included in the agreement, due to its importance in determining which wire centers meet the FCC criteria for non-impairment, and can be incorporated verbatim or by reference.

(iii) Building

The term 'building' is not defined by the FCC.

BellSouth

Witness Tipton states that BellSouth has not proposed a definition for the word "building." She asserts that a 'reasonable person' standard should be applied in case of a dispute. She explains by way of example that this means an office complex of a number of

buildings is not a single building; however, one building with multiple tenants is a single building, regardless of the number of tenants in it.

Witness Tipton states that the definition of a building proposed by CompSouth witness Gillan is unreasonable. She complains that “[b]y attempting to define individual tenant space in a multi-tenant building as its own ‘building,’ a CLEC would have virtually unlimited access to UNE DS1 loops and DS3 loops to the one building housing all of these tenants in clear violation of the caps imposed by the FCC for these elements.”

Joint CLECs

CompSouth witness Gillan notes that he has revised his proposed definition of a building, starting with BellSouth’s “reasonable person” concept. He advises that the primary difference between his definition and BellSouth’s is the concept of a “reasonable *telecom* person.” (Emphasis by witness) He states the definition of a building should be based on an area served by a single point of entry for telecom services. He explains by way of example that “a high-rise building with a general telecommunications equipment room would be considered a single building, while a strip mall with separate telecom-service points for each individual business in the mall would not.” He argues that such a configuration should qualify as individual premises, even though businesses may share a common wall.

(iv) Route

The term ‘route’ is defined within the FCC’s rule for dedicated transport:

51.319(e) Dedicated transport. An incumbent LEC shall provide a requesting telecommunications carrier with nondiscriminatory access to dedicated transport on an unbundled basis, in accordance with section 251(c)(3) of the Act and this part, as set forth in paragraphs (e) through (e)(4) of this section. A “route” is a transmission path between one of an incumbent LEC’s wire centers or switches and another of the incumbent LEC’s wire centers or switches. A route between two points (*e.g.*, wire center or switch “A” and wire center or switch “Z”) may pass through one or more intermediate wire centers or switches (*e.g.*, wire center or switch “X”). Transmission paths between identical end points (*e.g.*, wire center or switch “A” and wire center or switch “Z”) are the same “route,” irrespective of whether they pass through the same intermediate wire centers or switches, if any. (47 CFR 51.319(3))

BellSouth

Witness Tipton explains that the term “route” is defined in 47 CFR 51.319(e). She provides no further testimony on this definition.

Joint CLECs

XO witness Shulman contends that the definition of a route should not limit access to high-capacity transport UNEs on routes where the FCC has determined that CLECs are impaired without such UNEs. (TR 178) She states that “CLECs need to be able to collocate in a Tier 2 or Tier 3 wire center and obtain unbundled transport connecting that collocation to multiple Tier 1 or Tier 2 centers.” (TR 178) She explains that although a CLEC can use a cross-connect in an existing collocation arrangement to take the place of a route, a CLEC should nevertheless not be precluded from obtaining the route if it otherwise would be available.

Sprint

Sprint witness Maples asserts that there are no exceptions to one end of the route having to be an ILEC wire center or switch. He states that “the FCC includes non-ILEC locations where an ILEC has collocated switching equipment in its definition of what constitutes a wire center. This is called ‘reverse collocation.’” Witness Maples opines that this is in keeping with the TRRO where it states that the definition of wire center “also includes any incumbent LEC switches with line-side functionality that terminate loops that are ‘reverse collocated’ in non-incumbent LEC collocation hotels.” (TRRO ¶87 fn 251)

B. ANALYSIS

Loops/Transport

There is no disagreement on the specific part of the language pertaining to the availability of unbundled loops and transport and the non-impairment thresholds. Although initially there was disagreement over the DS1 caps, the parties indicate that it has now been resolved. BellSouth states that it can agree with the language proposed by CompSouth witness Gillan regarding the caps on DS1 and DS3 loops. The language is included under Section II.

Business Line

In its discussion of business line counts in the TRRO, the FCC specified that

. . . [t]he BOC wire center data that we analyze in this Order is based on ARMIS 43-08 business lines, plus business UNE-P, plus UNE-loops. We adopt this definition of business lines because it fairly represents the business opportunities in a wire center, including business opportunities already being captured by competing carriers through the use of UNEs. . . . (TRRO ¶105, fns omitted)

BellSouth states in its brief that this text requires BellSouth to include business UNE-P in its line counts. BellSouth notes that the CLECs have not suggested BellSouth should have included residential UNE-P. However, BellSouth contends that the CLECs take issue with BellSouth including all UNE loops. BellSouth argues that “[t]he FCC intentionally required all UNE loops (excluding only residential UNE-P) to be included as business lines, because it

gauges ‘the business opportunities in a wire center, including business opportunities already being captured by competing carriers through the use of UNEs.’”

We note that the CFR specifies that “the number of business lines in a wire center shall equal the sum of all incumbent LEC business switched access lines, plus the sum of all UNE loops connected to the wire center, including UNE loops provisioned in combination with other unbundled elements.” (47 CFR 51.5) We note that the rule refers to ILEC “business” switched access lines, but does not specify any particular UNE loops; rather, it says “all” UNE loops connected to the wire center, including UNE loops provisioned in combination with other unbundled elements. This is consistent with the language from the text of the TRRO, cited above. We find that this distinction is significant and indicates that ILEC switched business access lines and UNE loops should be treated differently. Accordingly, we disagree with CompSouth witness Gillan’s adjustment to UNE-L, which is based upon his assumption that UNE-L should include only those lines used to provision business service, rather than being counted at full capacity as done by BellSouth.

We also agree with BellSouth that unused capacity on channelized high capacity loops should be counted in the business lines. As noted by BellSouth witness Tipton, the FCC rules specifically state that “the business line tallies . . . shall account for ISDN and other digital access lines by counting each 64 kbps-equivalent as one line.” (47 CFR 51.5) The FCC rule further explains by way of example that a DS1 line should be counted as 24 business lines because it corresponds to 24 64 kbps-equivalents.

The rule does not specifically use the term “UNE-P.” We find it is encompassed in ILEC business switched access lines. BellSouth has taken a conservative approach in counting only business UNE-P, excluding residential, which appears to be in accord with the FCC’s intent. Accordingly, we find this approach should be accepted.

Fiber-Based Collocation

We agree with BellSouth that the number of fiber-based collocators in a given wire center should be counted as of a specific date. We recognize that once a wire center is considered non-impaired, it will not revert to an impaired designation. Thus, CLECs will not be able to obtain the particular element in the future at TELRIC rates. The transition period for non-impaired loops and transport began on March 11, 2005, and we find that is the date that the initial measurement should be taken for purposes of those wire centers that met the non-impairment criteria on that date for a specific service.

Because high capacity loop non-impairment is based on *both* business lines and fiber-based collocations, this approach impacts certain wire centers differently than for purposes of transport non-impairment. (emphasis added) The de-listing of unbundled DS1 and DS3 transport is based on an either/or condition, and thus is not impacted in the same way. At such time as these or any wire centers meet the non-impairment criteria in the future, we find the count should be made based on current information at that time.

For purposes of the current interconnection agreements we find, the fiber-based collocator count should be based on the conditions present at the beginning of the transition period. Accordingly, AT&T and SBC should be counted as two separate collocators.

BellSouth proposed a modification to the language provided by CompSouth witness Gillan. We find that language, as modified, is appropriate.

Building

The key to the dispute over the term “building” is the loop cap that restricts the number of DS1 or DS3 loops that a CLEC may obtain per building. A more liberal definition of “building” would allow a CLEC to obtain more unbundled loops. While the parties have reached an agreement on the caps themselves, as previously discussed, the issue remains with regard to the building definition. There is no definition in the CFR.

The parties suggest two different approaches. BellSouth advocates a “reasonable person” definition, while CompSouth modifies it to a “reasonable telecom person.” BellSouth’s definition would treat all multi-tenant buildings as a single building. The CompSouth definition would be based on the area served by a single point of entry for telecom services. In other words, a structure with a single point of entry, e.g., a single telephone equipment room, would be considered one building, while a building with multiple entry points would be considered multiple buildings.

There is no guidance for this definition in the TRO or the TRRO. While both definitions rely on a “reasonable person” approach, we find the modification provided by CompSouth is the better approach, because we find it contemplates the manner in which services would be provided to a customer. A location in which each customer location has its own telecom facilities should not be denied additional service just because the particular premises are attached to another customer location. Accordingly, we find the language provided by CompSouth witness Gillan is the appropriate definition of a “building.”

Route

The Joint CLECs noted in their brief that there is no dispute among the parties with the definition of a route as contained in 47 CFR 51.319(e). CompSouth clarified that “[a] route is defined by its end-points, not by whatever decision BellSouth employs as to how it will ultimately provide transport between those points.”

BellSouth proposed language that is essentially the definition contained in the CFR. Sprint provided one change to the language, by adding the statement, “For purposes of determining routes wire centers include non-BellSouth locations where BellSouth has reverse collocated switches with line side functionality that terminate loops.” While Sprint has reached agreement with BellSouth on this issue, as indicated in its position above, we note the language it provided is useful for the remaining parties’ agreements. We find the appropriate language to include is that proposed by BellSouth with the clarification provided by Sprint.

C. DECISION

A business line shall include all business UNE-P lines and all UNE-L lines. Fiber-based collocation shall be based on the number of fiber-based collocators present in a wire-center at the time the count is made. The definition of a building shall be based on a “reasonable telecom person” approach such that a multi-tenant building with multiple telecom entry points will be considered multiple buildings for purposes of DS1/DS3 caps. The FCC’s definition of a route is appropriate. We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth nor CompSouth is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that parts of the language proposed by BellSouth and CompSouth should be combined and adopted as discussed in our analysis. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

V. FCC’S SECTION 251 NON-IMPAIRMENT CRITERIA

A. PARTIES’ ARGUMENTS

a) Commission Authority

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Tipton states that the FCC is the appropriate agency to determine whether BellSouth has properly applied the impairment criteria in the TRRO. Nevertheless, she concedes that this Commission may need to decide which wire centers satisfy the FCC’s rules so that the contract language can be approved.

Witness Tipton states that “[a]s a practical matter, this Commission must verify BellSouth’s application of the FCC’s non-impairment criteria in order for de-listed UNEs to be transitioned to alternative arrangements by the end of the transition period.” She adds that although dispute resolution can occur before a state commission, in accordance with ¶234 of the TRRO, disputes with individual CLECs may be eliminated by validating the wire center threshold criteria in this proceeding.

Joint CLECs

Witness Montano asserts that if the parties are unable to agree to the wire centers that meet the threshold non-impairment criteria, this Commission must make the determination through the arbitration process. She disagrees with BellSouth’s position that this Commission does not have the authority to make the determination. She states that US LEC has withdrawn its agreement to BellSouth’s proposed language that would place jurisdiction over disputes on the wire center lists with the FCC because BellSouth will not agree that CLECs have a right to reach agreement on the list before it is incorporated into the ICA. She opines that by allowing CLECs to verify the data used in compiling the wire center lists, fewer disputes will arise. Witness Montano avers that state commissions need not make a determination of non-impairment, but rather, must simply ascertain the ILECs have met the requirements set out by the FCC.

b) Procedures

BellSouth

Witness Tipton states that the FCC has established guidelines and procedures to determine where there is no impairment in wire centers. She notes that under ¶234 of the TRRO a CLEC must make a reasonably diligent inquiry and self-certify based on that inquiry that, to the best of its knowledge it is entitled to order high-capacity loops and/or transport as UNEs out of the subject wire center. She explains that this requires, at a minimum, that CLECs review BellSouth's line count and fiber-based collocation data. She asserts that "[i]f a CLEC does not meet its due diligence requirements, BellSouth may seek recourse through the dispute resolution process in the CLEC's interconnection agreement if the CLEC does not meet these requirements." She contends that BellSouth is entitled to recover "1) any costs it incurred unnecessarily provisioning UNEs to a CLEC, and 2) the difference between the rate for that element in the CLEC's agreement and the tariffed rate for the corresponding service for any delisted UNE that was provisioned at UNE rates in error."

Witness Tipton explains that BellSouth started its business line count with the Automated Reporting Measurement Information System (ARMIS) reports that it files with the FCC. She advises that BellSouth updated the line counts in February 2005, following the release of the TRRO. She adds that BellSouth recently updated its wire center results to include the December 2004 ARMIS data and the December 2004 UNE loop and UNE-P data. She asserts that the data was "used to provide a consistent view of line counts and to meet the FCC's intent to use line counts that were publicly available, at least at a summary level." She notes that the ARMIS data was restated on a wire center basis. Witness Tipton explains that BellSouth "retained an independent third-party, Deloitte & Touche ('Deloitte') to confirm that BellSouth performed the analysis as stated and to confirm the conclusions that BellSouth reached in implementing the non-impairment thresholds set for the TRRO and to identify the specific wire centers where those thresholds have been met. "

Witness Tipton advises that business high-capacity digital switched access lines in each wire center, as well as high-capacity UNE loops, are included at full system capacity. She explains by way of example that, for TRRO purposes, a DS1 Carrier System would have a full system capacity of 24 business lines, even if the full capacity was not in use. She clarifies that certain other UNE loops, such as HDSL, ADSL, and IDSL, are counted on a one-for-one basis. She adds that only in-service DS1 and UNE HDSL loops were included.

Witness Tipton states that CLECs should use the April 15, 2005 Carrier Notification Letter (CNL) provided by BellSouth to determine where alternative arrangements for service need to be made. She asserts that BellSouth took precautions to ensure that the current wire center list in the CNL was correctly compiled before posting it on BellSouth's website. She pledges that BellSouth will make any necessary revisions to incorporate the results of discovery. She also states that "BellSouth is prepared to make CLECs whole in the event a CLEC timely reacts to BellSouth's posted wire center list, and at a later date, the list is found to be incorrect."

Witness Tipton proposes that BellSouth notify CLECs of additional wire centers that are found to meet the FCC's non-impairment criteria by additional CNLs. She states that ten business days after posting the CNL, BellSouth would no longer be obligated to offer high cap loops and dedicated transport as UNEs in such wire centers, except pursuant to the self-certification process. She explains that high cap loop and transport UNEs that were already in service will remain available as UNEs for 90 days after the tenth business day following posting of the CNL, or 104 days in total; CLECs must identify UNEs to be converted to alternative services within 40 days from the date of the CNL.

Witness Tipton disagrees with both methods proposed by US LEC witness Montano regarding the determination of wire centers that meet the FCC's impairment thresholds. She states that the proposed method that would require parties to mutually agree on facts to identify the wire centers that meet the FCC's criteria is not feasible since BellSouth could not go through that process with every CLEC in the state. Witness Tipton also disagrees that the wire center list should be approved through the arbitration process, although she notes that this would be acceptable for the initial list. She contends that it would not be an efficient use of our resources or BellSouth's resources to arbitrate modifications to the list with each CLEC. She asserts that a more expedited approach should be taken.

BellSouth states in its brief that it is "unwilling to agree to a process that limits its right to designate future wire centers on an annual basis. Nothing in the federal rules supports this limitation."

Joint CLECs

Witness Gillan states that the Deloitte analysis merely confirms "that BellSouth's spreadsheets were free of mathematical error." However, he explains that the report does not validate the definition of business lines or methodology used by BellSouth or verify the accuracy of the source data and the systems used to obtain it.

Witness Gillan recommends that this Commission establish the appropriate wire center designations, subject to an annual-update process. He states that the update should be based on BellSouth's annual ARMIS filing made on April 1. He contends that any adjustments to be made should be proposed at the same time the ARMIS filing is made. He asserts that all supporting documentation for any wire center to be added to the non-impairment list be included. He asserts that CLECs should have until May 1 to challenge any added wire center. He advises that this "Commission should have a standing hearing date reserved (by June 1) to take evidence on any disputed wire center, and issue a decision by June 15." He proposes that the new wire center list should become effective on July 1 of each year.

US LEC witness Montano asserts that her company must have an opportunity to review the data on which BellSouth based its determination that each wire center met the non-impairment threshold. She notes that this includes the number of fiber-based collocators at each wire center, as well as business lines, with the manner in which high-capacity lines are counted and how business lines are differentiated from residential lines. She adds that it is important to make sure the numbers are correct so that lengthy and costly disputes can be avoided.

Witness Montano disputes that BellSouth can incorporate its list of non-impaired wire centers into the ICA by reference, without the agreement of the CLECs as to its accuracy. She opines that the list of wire centers requested by the FCC was “to assist the CLECs in gathering the factual information from the RBOCs, and to ensure that an expeditious implementation of the ‘fact-dependent rules’ into a revised interconnection agreements [sic] was completed.” She contends that non-impairment determinations must be mutual, and incorporated into the agreement by reference to paragraphs 233 and 234 of the TRRO.

XO

XO witness Shulman states that she agrees with CompSouth witness Gillan’s proposal for an annual proceeding to review business line counts. She concurs with his opinion that BellSouth has an incentive to overstate business line counts in order to minimize its unbundling obligations. She emphasizes the importance of a thorough review by this Commission of the line count data before BellSouth is relieved of any unbundling obligations. She notes that the ARMIS data that is used as a basis for the line counts is filed annually.

Witness Shulman also expresses concern with the notice procedures proposed by BellSouth. She contends that with only two weeks’ notice that the loop or transport circuit required to serve a particular prospective customer will not be available at TELRIC rates, CLECs will not be able to properly market their services. She states that XO supports the proposal of CompSouth witness Gillan.

Witness Shulman contends that while updates of line count data may only be feasible once per year, new fiber-based collocations could be addressed through a notice on BellSouth’s web site whenever BellSouth receives an order for new or modified collocation space that might result in a wire center exceeding the non-impairment threshold. She admits that BellSouth would not necessarily know whether the collocation would meet the FCC’s definition of a fiber-based collocation. She asserts, however, that early notification would allow CLECs to better adjust their business plans if necessary. She states that a follow-up notice from BellSouth should be provided as soon as it has the information necessary to determine whether the new or modified collocation will impact the availability of UNEs in a particular wire center.

c) Language

BellSouth

Witness Tipton states that BellSouth does not oppose the inclusion of the initial wire center list in the ICAs. However, she argues that the inclusion of any subsequent lists “would require unnecessary administrative work when the same result can be achieved more efficiently.” She opines that a reference in the ICAs to BellSouth’s website makes more sense for the latest wire center lists. She advises that this is the manner in which other notifications are provided, such as CLEC guides, collocation space exhaust lists and other instruction guides that impact the availability, ordering and provisioning of services offered pursuant to the interconnection agreement.

Joint CLECs

Witness Montano states that the language proposed by US LEC includes a provision that US LEC is certifying that it has used due diligence in determining the status of a wire center and the availability of UNEs in that wire center. She adds that the section also requires that BellSouth must provision the requested UNEs, and then dispute the non-impairment status of the wire center. She asserts that the proposed language is consistent with the FCC's provisions in the TRRO.

CompSouth witness Gillan provided language that incorporates his recommended procedures.

B. ANALYSIS

Authority

The only specific state role provided in the TRRO is resolution of an ILEC's challenges to a CLEC self-certification, under an ICA's dispute resolution process. (TRRO ¶234) There is no other specific authority stated in the TRRO for this Commission to determine whether BellSouth has properly applied the non-impairment criteria to its wire centers outside of the dispute process. It is clear that the parties are not in agreement over the application of the criteria for the de-listing of UNEs, as discussed in Section IV. However, the parties do appear to agree in general that Commission approval of the initial list in this proceeding would reduce the number of later disputes. Thus, regulatory economy may be achieved by our approving the initial list.

Procedures

We agree with BellSouth that neither the federal rules nor the TRRO limits future designations of non-impaired wire centers to only once per year, as advocated by the Joint CLECs. The procedures have been fully outlined in the TRRO for the initial determinations, but it is essentially silent about the procedures to follow for determining non-impairment after the initial transition period. While BellSouth may update its non-impaired wire center lists more than once per year, reasonable notice should be provided. The only steps outlined by the FCC for disputing a non-impaired wire center designation include:

- Before submitting an order for a high-capacity loop or transport UNE, the CLEC must undertake a reasonably diligent inquiry and, based on that inquiry, self-certify that, to the best of its knowledge, its request is consistent with the requirements of the TRRO and that it is therefore entitled to unbundled access to the particular UNE sought pursuant to § 251(c)(3);
- The ILEC must immediately process the request upon receipt;

- The ILEC may subsequently bring any dispute regarding access to that UNE before a state commission or other appropriate authority. (TRRO ¶234)

We find this is the appropriate procedure. Continually amending the ICA to incorporate future changes to the wire center list would be a moving target that would serve no purpose. As discussed in Section IV, we agree with the initial wire center designations proposed by BellSouth. Those designations are shown in the table included as part of the language for Section V in Appendix A. BellSouth has placed a CNL containing its wire center list on its website and proposes to update the website ten days before any UNE is de-listed. The record shows that the BellSouth website is routinely used by BellSouth to notify carriers of other changes and procedures that would be of concern to them. Thus, it is a method already in place and with which CLECs are familiar.

As discussed further in Section VIII, we find this is the appropriate procedure. Effective thirty calendar days following issuance of the CNL, CLECs are not permitted to add new DS1 and DS3 loops or transport or dark fiber UNEs in the impacted wire centers. A projected transition period for circuits to be converted to other services or disconnected is also discussed in Section VIII.

Language

BellSouth has agreed to the inclusion of the initial wire center list in the agreement. Thus, it may be included as shown in the language of appendix A. The agreement should incorporate by reference future updates to the wire center list posted on BellSouth's website. The language in the agreement should reflect the dispute resolution process of the TRRO.

C. DECISION

We find this Commission has authority to resolve an ILEC's challenges to a CLEC self-certification, under an ICA's dispute resolution process. This Commission should also approve the initial wire center lists as requested by the parties. CLECs should exercise due diligence in making inquiries about the availability of UNEs and must self-certify that they are entitled to the UNE. BellSouth should provision such UNEs, but may bring disputes to this Commission for resolution in accordance with the TRRO. We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth nor the Joint CLECs is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that parts of the language proposed by BellSouth and the Joint CLECs should be combined and adopted as discussed in our analysis. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

VI. SECTION 271 AUTHORITY

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

In its brief, BellSouth argues that §252 of the Act explicitly limits the rate-setting and arbitration powers of state commissions to §251 elements and thus precludes this Commission from requiring BellSouth to include §271 elements in a §252 agreement. BellSouth asserts the CLECs are asking this Commission to impermissibly read one portion of the statute but ignore the fact that §252 never refers to §271, although it contains express references to §251.

BellSouth's position is based on three contentions:

- (1) There is no legal basis for a state commission to force BellSouth to include §271 network elements in a §252 interconnection agreement;
- (2) Section 252 limits state commission rate-setting authority to §251 elements; and
- (3) The FCC has exclusive authority over the enforcement of §271 elements.

There is no legal basis for a state commission to force BellSouth to include §271 network elements in a §252 interconnection agreement.

BellSouth argues in its brief that a state commission's authority to arbitrate §252 agreements is limited to ensuring the contracts comply with §251. BellSouth asserts that the Act provides that when BellSouth receives "a request for interconnection, services, or network elements pursuant to §251," it is obligated to "negotiate in good faith in accordance with §252 the particular terms and conditions" of agreements that address those §251 obligations and therefore, interconnection agreements address §251 obligations, and those obligations are the only topics that are required to be included in a §252 interconnection agreement. BellSouth contends that a state commission's authority is limited to those agreements entered into "pursuant to §251" and, when arbitration occurs, state commissions must ensure that agreements "meet the requirements of §251."

BellSouth argues that an ILEC is not required to negotiate, in the context of a §252 agreement, any and all issues CLECs may wish to discuss, such as access to elements ILECs may be required to provide under §271. BellSouth acknowledges that an ILEC may voluntarily agree to negotiate things that would normally be outside the purview of §251 obligations and when it does, such matters may be considered by state commissions under prevailing law. With regard to the inclusion of §271 elements in §252 agreements, BellSouth asserts it has steadfastly refused to negotiate inclusion of these elements, and there is nothing contained in the record to suggest otherwise.

In support of its assertions BellSouth cites the Eleventh Circuit which stated that, “The scheme and text of [the Act] . . . lists only a limited number of issues on which incumbents are mandated to negotiate”¹⁶ and the Fifth Circuit, which stated that “[a]n ILEC is clearly free to refuse to negotiate any issues other than those it has a duty to negotiate under the Act when a CLEC requests negotiation pursuant to §251 and 252.”¹⁷

§252 limits state commission rate-setting authority to §251 elements

BellSouth asserts that the bottom line on all of the 271-related arguments is the common-sense reality that if the CLECs were to prevail, the CLECs will have effectively used this Commission to override the FCC’s decision about market-based, real competition. BellSouth argues that it is clear state commissions do not have the authority to set rates for §271 elements because the language in §252 limits state commission rate-setting authority to §251 elements. BellSouth cites §252(d)(1) which provides that state commissions may set rates for network elements only “for purposes of subsection (c)(3) of such § [251].” BellSouth points out that in the TRO the FCC further clarified that §252(d)(1) “is quite specific in that it only applies for the purposes of implementation of §251(c)(3)” and does not, by its terms grant the states any authority as to “network elements that are required under §271.”¹⁸

BellSouth contends that even if there could be a legitimate question about how to interpret these statutes, the FCC has already answered the question when it stated that the §251 pricing standards do not apply to checklist elements under §271 and furthermore, whether or not the applicable pricing standards are met will be decided by the FCC either in the context of a §271 application for long distance authority or, thereafter, in an enforcement proceeding.¹⁹ BellSouth asserts that the FCC has further held that rates for §271 elements are subject to the standards set forth in §§201 and 202 which are applied and enforced by the FCC.²⁰ In support of this assertion BellSouth cites the D.C. Circuit which has noted that §§201(b) and 202(a) “authorized the [FCC] to establish just and reasonable rates, provided that they are not unduly discriminatory.”²¹

¹⁶ MCI Telecom. Corp. et al. v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. et al., 298 F.3d 1269, 1274 (11th Cir. 2002).

¹⁷ Coserv Limited Liability Corp. v. Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., 350 F.3d 482, 488 (5th Cir. 2003).

¹⁸ TRO at ¶ 657.

¹⁹ TRO at ¶¶ 662, 664.

²⁰ TRO at ¶¶ 656; 664.

²¹ *Competitive Telecommunications Association v. FCC*, 87 F.3d 522 (D.C. Cir. 1996).

BellSouth argues that contrary to the CLECs' assertions, a provider sets its rates in accordance with the just and reasonable standard, and the FCC resolves any disputes that arise surrounding those rates. BellSouth asserts that in a competitive market, regulators should not step in until there is a need. BellSouth argues that in the context of regulation of §271 elements, this makes sense because §§251(b) and (c) set forth the provisions that Congress deemed essential to the development of local competition and without such a CLEC is legally "impaired" within the meaning of §251(c)(1). On the other hand, the FCC has determined that CLECs are not impaired without access to §271 elements that no longer meet the §251 test. BellSouth asserts the FCC has reached these conclusions based on an evidentiary finding that competitive alternatives for such elements are readily available in the marketplace.

BellSouth disputes witness Gillan's suggestion that §271(c)(1) means that "checklist items [must] be offered through interconnection agreements approved under §252 of the Act." BellSouth contends to the contrary that §271(c)(1) provides that to comply with §271, a BOC must meet the requirements of either subparagraph (A) or (B), which require that a BOC has entered into one or more §252 agreements or provide an SGAT. BellSouth asserts §271(c)(1) does not require that §271 elements are to be incorporated into §252 agreements.

The FCC has exclusive authority over the enforcement of §271 elements.

BellSouth asserts that once a BOC obtains §271 authority, continuing enforcement of §271 obligations rests solely with the FCC under §271(d)(6)(A) of the Act. BellSouth notes that in the TRO the FCC was clear that the prices, terms, and conditions of §271 checklist item access, and a BOC's compliance with them, are within the FCC's exclusive purview in the context of a BOC's application for 271 authority or in an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to §271(d)(6).²² BellSouth contends that Congress only granted states a consultative role in the §271 approval process. In support, BellSouth cites the D.C. Circuit which held that Congress "has clearly charged the FCC, and not the State commissions," with assessing BOC compliance with §271.²³

The Joint CLECs argue that the establishment of §271 alternatives for the loop, switching and transport elements de-listed under §251 is a key component of determining the terms and timing of the transition from §251 elements to other unbundling offerings. The Joint CLECs argue that they do not contest that UNE-P as it currently exists under §251 may not continue unchanged pursuant to §271. However, they assert that this does not mean that BellSouth's obligation to provide unbundled switching under §271 should not be included in the parties' interconnection agreements. The Joint CLECs contend that this Commission has the authority to require BellSouth to include in its §252 ICAs the availability and price of network elements under §271.

²² TRO at ¶664.

²³ *SBC Communications Inc. v. FCC*, 138 F. 3d 410, 416-17 (D.C. Cir. 1998).

The Joint CLECs support their position with four contentions:

- (1) §271 explicitly states that the checklist items the BOCs are required to unbundle must be included in §252 interconnection agreements;
- (2) Approval of rates, terms, and conditions for §271 checklist elements does not constitute “enforcement” of BellSouth’s §271 obligations by this Commission;
- (3) The interim §271 rates proposed in the CompSouth contract language meet the “just and reasonable” standard applicable to §271 checklist elements; and
- (4) BellSouth’s claims that it “satisfies” its §271 obligations for loops, transport, and switching should be rejected.

§271 explicitly states that the checklist items the BOCs are required to unbundle must be included in §252 interconnection agreements

In their brief, the Joint CLECs contend that §271 requires the BOCs to provide the local loop, local transport, and local switching as part of the competitive checklist. The Joint CLECs assert the FCC has found that the BOC’s obligation to make §271 checklist items available to CLECs is independent of the obligation to provide access to network elements under §251.²⁴ The Joint CLECs argue that Congress required that the checklist items be incorporated into the interconnection agreements that result from the §252 negotiation and arbitration process. In support of this assertion the Joint CLECs cite §271(c)(2)(A) which they assert links the duty of a BOC to satisfy its obligations under the competitive checklist to the BOC providing that access through an interconnection agreement or a SGAT approved by a state commission pursuant to §252:

(A) AGREEMENT REQUIRED – A Bell operating company meets the requirements of this paragraph if, within the State for which the authorization is sought:

- (i) such company is providing access and interconnection pursuant to one or more agreements described in paragraph (1)(A) [interconnection agreement], or
- (ii) such company is generally offering access and interconnection pursuant to a statement described in paragraph (1)(B) [a SGAT], and such access and interconnection meets the requirements of subparagraph (B) of this paragraph [the competitive checklist].

²⁴ TRO at ¶ 659.

The Joint CLECs contend that by directly referencing §271(c)(1)(A) and (B), the Act ties compliance with the competitive checklist to the review process described in §252, a review process that is by definition conducted by state commissions.

In furtherance of their assertion, the Joint CLECs cite §271(c)(1) which states:

- (1) AGREEMENT OR STATEMENT – A Bell operating company meets the requirements of this subparagraph if it meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) of this paragraph for each State for which the authorization is sought.

(A) PRESENCE OF A FACILITIES-BASED COMPETITOR.

– A Bell operating company meets the requirements of this subparagraph if it has entered into one or more binding agreements that have been approved under §252 specifying the terms and conditions under which the Bell operating company is providing access and interconnection to its network facilities for the network facilities of one or more unaffiliated competing providers of telephone exchange service (as defined in §3(47)(A), but excluding exchange access) to residential and business subscribers.

The Joint CLECs argue that this establishes that the terms and conditions for the checklist items in §271 must be in an approved interconnection agreement. The Joint CLECs note that the statute is explicit that the agreements must be “approved under §252” which is granted exclusively by state commissions as part of the statutory negotiation and arbitration process. The Joint CLECs argue that §271 refers back to the §252 state commission review and approval process, and it invokes that process when it describes how the competitive checklist is to be implemented. The Joint CLECs assert it is difficult to understand what else Congress could have meant by §271’s reference to “agreements approved under §252” as the place where checklist compliance is to be memorialized.

The Joint CLECs argue that BellSouth’s arguments seek to read out of §271 the explicit references back to §252. The Joint CLECs assert that the statutory language contemplates a linkage between agreements over which state commission have authority under §252 and the terms and conditions for competitive checklist items in §271.

The Joint CLECs argue further that this linkage comports with how the FCC has treated §271 checklist items. The Joint CLECs assert that in the TRO the FCC held that §271 checklist network elements that BOCs no longer are required to provide under §251 do not have to be priced at TELRIC rates but rather are to be priced at “just and reasonable” rates. The Joint CLECs contend that much like TELRIC rates for §251 network elements that have been determined in §252 proceedings and incorporated into §252 agreements, rates for §271 checklist items should be established using the state commission §252 negotiation and arbitration process.

Approval of rates, terms, and conditions for §271 checklist elements does not constitute “enforcement” of BellSouth’s §271 obligations by this Commission.

The thrust of the Joint CLECs’ argument is that state commission authority to resolve disputes regarding rates, terms, and conditions for §271 checklist elements derives directly from the statutory interplay between §§271 and 252. The Joint CLECs maintain that requiring inclusion of the rates, terms, and conditions for §271 checklist items in agreements approved under §252 does not constitute enforcement of §271. The Joint CLECs assert they are not suggesting this Commission take steps to enforce §271 obligations, but rather to use the authority expressly provided for in §§271 and 252 to approve ICAs that include §271 checklist items.

The Joint CLECs agree with BellSouth that the FCC has the exclusive jurisdiction to address whether or not a §271 checklist element’s rate comports with the “just and reasonable” standard. The Joint CLECs argue that the fact that the FCC could review a §271 checklist rate in the context of §271(d)(6) enforcement does not impact whether the statute requires the rate to be set initially by a state commission under §252. In support of its contention the Joint CLECs cite the Tennessee Regulatory Authority which recently explained that:

The FCC recognized [in the TRO] that the pricing standards of §271 elements must be the same as the pricing standards used before the Federal Act such as those standards in §§201 and 202. Nevertheless, it is significant that the FCC did not change the division of pricing responsibility defined in the Federal Act. While the FCC will continue to set the pricing standards, it continues to be incumbent upon state commissions to apply those standards in the process of establishing rates. The FCC did not change the process utilized to resolve pricing disputes of §271 elements. There is no indication that the FCC intended to remove §271 elements from state arbitrations or from approval of interconnection agreements consistent with §252.

The Joint CLECs assert that along with §271(d)(6) enforcement authority, the FCC also retains the authority to grant the BOCs “forbearance” from their §271 obligations. The Joint CLECs argue further that inclusion of §271 checklist items in §252 interconnection agreements would not limit or negate federal forbearance authority. The Joint CLECs assert that this Commission’s establishment of a “just and reasonable” rate for §271 checklist elements merely implements the requirement in §271 that rates, terms, and conditions for §271 checklist items be included in interconnection agreements approved under §252.

The interim §271 rates proposed in the CompSouth contract language meet the “just and reasonable” standard applicable to §271 checklist elements.

The Joint CLECs propose interim rates for high-capacity loop and transport elements and for unbundled local switching that are patterned after the transitional rates adopted by the FCC in the TRRO. The Joint CLECs’ proposed rates permit CLEC access to high-capacity loops and

transport at a price equal to 115% of the existing TELRIC rate, and access to UNE-P at one dollar above the TELRIC rate paid on June 15, 2004.²⁵

The Joint CLECs assert that the TRRO transition rates provide a reasonable basis for interim rates for three reasons. First, the Joint CLECs assert the FCC presumably would not have adopted these rates unless it considered them “just and reasonable.” Next, the Joint CLECs contend the transition rates exceed TELRIC levels applicable to UNEs available under §251. And finally, the Joint CLECs assert that the evidence demonstrates that BellSouth has filed testimony in the past arguing that TELRIC rates for unbundled switching and transport set by this Commission recover BellSouth’s costs and provide a reasonable proxy for “just and reasonable” rates.

The Joint CLECs argue that although the TRRO transition rates are not appropriate permanent rates, they urge this Commission to approve their proposed rates on an interim basis until this Commission can fully review the parties’ arguments over what a permanent just and reasonable rate should be.

BellSouth’s claims that it “satisfies” its §271 obligations for loops, transport, and switching should be rejected.

As discussed in detail above, the Joint CLECs argue that BellSouth does not satisfy its §271 obligations unless those obligations are reflected in an “agreement approved under §252.” The Joint CLECs assert further that the rates, terms and conditions under which BellSouth purports to offer §271 checklist elements do not satisfy “just and reasonable” standards. The Joint CLECs note that when the FCC discussed how a §271 “just and reasonable” standard could be met, it stated that a BOC “might satisfy the standard” by demonstrating that its §271 rate is “at or below” its similar tariffed offering, or that the BOC has entered into “arms-length agreements” for the elements at particular rates.²⁶ The Joint CLECs argue that the FCC did not state that tariffed alternatives or arms-length agreements provide conclusive evidence that the rate offered by the BOC is just and reasonable, rather than points of reference.

The Joint CLECs assert that they disagree with BellSouth’s position that even though there is an independent obligation to offer loops, transport, and switching under §271, that it can satisfy those obligations simply offering what it would have offered if such obligations did not exist. The Joint CLECs assert that BellSouth’s position renders the §271 checklist meaningless and could not be what the FCC meant when it found in the TRO that §271 unbundling obligations exist even when §251 unbundling is no longer required.

The Joint CLECs argue that BellSouth’s interstate special access tariffed rates are between two and three times higher than the current UNE rates and imposition of interstate special access tariffed rates would dramatically increase CLECs’ cost of serving customers who need DS1 or DS3 level services. The Joint CLECs contend that the prices offered by BellSouth

²⁵ TRRO at ¶ 5.

²⁶ TRRO at ¶ 664.

as §271-compliant simply do not meet the “just and reasonable” standard, and this Commission should thoroughly review what constitutes a “just and reasonable” rate in a subsequent generic proceeding on §271 rates.

B. ANALYSIS

Upon thorough analysis of FCC orders, the Act, case law, and the record in this proceeding, we find that this Commission does not have authority to require BellSouth to include in §252 interconnection agreements §271 elements. We acknowledge that this is a complex issue, the resolution of which is burdened by the lack of a clear declaration by the FCC and the existence of a significant, yet inconsistent body of law.²⁷ However, we find that the regulatory framework set forth by the FCC in both the TRO and the TRRO leads reasonably to the conclusion that jurisdiction over §271 matters lies with the FCC rather than this Commission.

The Joint CLECs’ argument is based on their contention that the Act contemplates a link between agreements over which state commissions have authority under §252 and the terms and conditions for competitive checklist items in §271. We disagree with this assertion. Rather, we agree with BellSouth that §271(c)(1) only provides that to comply with §271, a BOC must meet the requirements of either subparagraph (A) or (B), which require that a BOC has entered into one or more §252 agreements or provide an SGAT. Contrary to the Joint CLECs’ assertions, we do not read from this a requirement that §271 elements are to be included in §252 agreements.

We find it is material that in setting forth the standards for arbitration, §252(c) makes no reference to §271. Rather, §252(c) only requires that a State commission ensure that “resolution and conditions meet the requirements of Section 251, including the regulations prescribed by this Commission pursuant to Section 251.”

We note that it is not disputed by the Joint CLECs that the FCC has exclusive authority over the enforcement of §271 elements. However, the Joint CLECs assert that there is a distinction between implementation of §271 and enforcement of §271. To the contrary, we find this is a distinction without a difference. Under the CLECs’ interpretation, upon setting forth rates, terms, and conditions for §271 elements, this Commission would be rendered powerless to enforce its rulings. The FCC explicitly stated in the TRO that whether a particular §271 element’s rate satisfies the just and reasonable pricing standard of §201 and 202 is a fact-specific inquiry that the FCC will undertake whether in an application for §271 authority or an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to §271(d)(6).²⁸

BellSouth maintains that the CLECs’ proposed contract language and positions addressing §271 contravene the FCC’s ultimate decisions on impairment and competition. In both the TRO and the TRRO, the FCC set forth a national policy encouraging facilities-based

²⁷ In their briefs, both parties cite several federal court and state commission decisions which purportedly support their position. We have thoroughly reviewed these decisions and believe that due to their significantly inconsistent holdings, little guidance can be taken from these prior decisions.

²⁸ TRRO at ¶ 664.

competition in order to foster increased investment and innovation.²⁹ This policy has been previously acknowledged by this Commission in the No New Adds Order. We find continued regulation of network elements, which were or may be delisted under §251, would run contrary to the FCC's goals of encouraging facilities-based competition.

In the TRO, the FCC concluded that the state authority preserved by §251(d)(3) is limited to state unbundling actions that are consistent with the requirements of §251 and do not "substantially prevent" the implementation of the federal regulatory regime.³⁰ We note that §271 obligations are not referenced in §251. Therefore, it appears from this finding that the FCC did not envision state regulation of §271 elements or their inclusion in interconnection agreements. This is further supported by the FCC consistently holding that it is the regulatory body with sole enforcement authority over §271 and §271(d)(2)'s express language that states are limited to a consultative role in the §271 approval process. Accordingly, we find that if this Commission were to require the inclusion of §271 elements in a §252 interconnection agreement, it would contravene the regulatory regime set forth by the FCC in the TRO and the TRRO and by Congress in the Act.

We note that CLECs are not without remedy if they believe BellSouth is not meeting the requirements of §271. Section 271(d)(6) permits CLECs to file complaints with the FCC concerning failures by Bell operating companies to meet conditions required for §271 approval. Pursuant to §271(d)(6)(b), the FCC shall act on such complaints within 90 days.

In conclusion, we find that the inclusion of §271 elements in a §252 agreement would be contrary to both the plain language of §§251 and 252 and the regulatory regime set forth by the FCC in the TRO and the TRRO. Although such a finding by this Commission may arguably have a negative impact on CLECs' business plans in the short term, we firmly believe that in the long term, our finding that BellSouth is not required to include §271 elements in §252 agreements, will further bolster the FCC's stated policy of encouraging strong facility-based competitors.

C. DECISION

We find that we do not have authority to require BellSouth to include in §252 interconnection agreements §271 elements. We find that the inclusion of §271 elements in a §252 agreement would be contrary to both the plain language of §§251 and 252 and the regulatory regime set forth by the FCC in the TRO and the TRRO.

²⁹ In the No New Adds Order, we acknowledged that the FCC had set forth a policy of encouraging facilities-based competition in the TRRO.

³⁰ TRO at ¶193.

VII. EMBEDDED BASES OF SWITCHING, HIGH-CAPACITY LOOPS AND DEDICATED TRANSPORT

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth witness Blake asserts that CLECs should neither be allowed to add new UNE arrangements that have been de-listed nor should they be allowed to move an existing customer's service to another location. With respect to local circuit switching, the witness notes that this Commission concluded in the No-New-Adds Order that the TRRO precluded the addition of new local circuit switching as a UNE after March 11, 2005. Therefore, asserts the witness, the addition of any new UNE-P arrangements to serve an embedded customer is prohibited. Likewise, explains witness Blake, when a CLEC moves their service, the old service is disconnected and the new service is considered a "new" order. A new order, contends the witness, represents a new arrangement that is precluded by the "no-new-adds" policy in the TRRO. However, the witness states that BellSouth will process orders during the transition period for changes to an existing customer's service, i.e., adding or removing vertical features, because these do not constitute an order for new service.

BellSouth witness Tipton believes that CompSouth's assertion that CLECs may order new DS1 and DS3 loops, and DS1, DS3, and dark fiber dedicated transport to serve their embedded base during the applicable transition period is inconsistent both with the language of the TRRO and its accompanying rules. (TRRO ¶146; TRRO ¶182; TRRO ¶234) BellSouth witness Blake explains that the TRRO permits CLECs to self-certify in wire centers if a CLEC believes that, after a "reasonably diligent inquiry," it is entitled to unbundled dedicated transport or dark fiber transport between particular wire centers. (TRRO ¶234) Once a "self-certifying" order has been provisioned, BellSouth is entitled, under the TRRO, to challenge the self-certification pursuant to the dispute resolution provisions in parties' ICAs.

Witness Tipton asserts that CompSouth does not include self-certification requirement language in its proposal, but simply claims it is entitled to add loops and transport during the transition period. Nonetheless, BellSouth argues that once this Commission affirms the list of non-impaired wire centers (Section V), CLECs have no basis to self-certify orders for high-capacity loops and dedicated transport in the confirmed wire centers.

Regarding entrance facilities, BellSouth witness Tipton explains that the FCC concluded in the TRO that CLECs were not impaired without unbundled access to entrance facilities, and that finding was affirmed in the TRRO. (TRO ¶366, fn. 1116; TRRO ¶66) While not required by either the TRO or the TRRO, witness Tipton asserts that BellSouth is offering to allow the embedded base of UNE entrance facilities to transition to alternative arrangements over a 12-month period to help effectuate an orderly transition process. However, contends the witness, CLECs have no right to order new UNE entrance facilities as CompSouth proposes.

Witness Tipton also believes that the TRRO and its revised rules are clear that CLECs may not add new UNE switch ports for UNE-P lines during the 12-month transition period as CompSouth witness Gillan suggests. At ¶199 of the TRRO, asserts the witness, the FCC specifically states that the transition period applies only to the embedded customer base.

Moreover, the revised rules attached to the TRRO regarding switching are clear that CLECs are not permitted to add new local switching as a UNE during the transition period. (TRRO Appendix B, p. 148) Thus, claims the witness, CompSouth's proposed language is not appropriate. CompSouth's proposal that CLECs should be permitted to order new local switching for the purpose of serving their embedded customer base is in conflict with the TRRO and its revised rules.

The Joint CLECs argue in their brief that the dispute is whether a "move" of a de-listed UNE loop or dedicated transport on behalf of a customer that was served by the CLEC as of March 11, 2005 should be permitted. The Joint CLECs believe that the TRRO is clear that the transition plans apply to the base of embedded customers, rather than to embedded lines or circuits. (TRRO ¶¶142, 195) Therefore, surmise the Joint CLECs, modifications or changes to the customer's service should be processed during the transition period. The Joint CLECs assert that where the embedded customer is moving to a location within the same non-impaired wire center, and no disconnect order or new install order is issued, then there has been no addition and the move should be permitted.

The Joint CLECs assert that the ICA amendments should clarify that the definition of "embedded base" permits adds, moves, or changes to be made by a CLEC at the request of a customer that was served by the CLEC on or before March 11, 2005. CompSouth witness Gillan recommends ICA language provisions to address the definition of "embedded base" and the related restrictions imposed by the TRRO. Specifically, witness Gillan defines the "embedded base" in terms of CLEC customers existing as of March 10, 2005. The witness' proposed language provides that CLECs are entitled to order local switching and UNE-P, and DS1 and DS3 loops for the purpose of serving the CLEC's embedded customer base during the transition period. For DS1 and DS3 loops, CLECs will self-certify, if requested by BellSouth, that the CLEC orders will be used to serve the embedded customer base. BellSouth has the right to dispute the self-certification; the dispute is governed by the ICA dispute resolution process. With regards to local circuit switching and UNE-P, CompSouth's proposed language provides that additions to the CLEC embedded customer base include "any additional elements that are required to be provided in conjunction therewith."

B. ANALYSIS

While discovery responses would seem to indicate that this issue has been resolved, the parties continue to propose competing language, and therefore we presume a dispute continues to exist.

In the TRRO, the FCC concluded that the 12-month transition period applies to the embedded base of end-user customers and that CLECs may not obtain any new local switching (no-new-adds) as an unbundled network element, effective March 11, 2005. (TRRO ¶227) In the No-New-Adds Order, we found that the TRRO is specific, as is the revised FCC rule, that CLECs are prohibited from adding new local switching arrangements as a UNE, effective March 11, 2005. (No-New-Adds Order, p. 6) As such, no amendment to existing ICAs is needed before ILECs can cease providing new unbundled local circuit switching. Furthermore, in the Embedded Base Order, in the instant docket, we explicitly specified that the no-new-adds

directive applies to the embedded customer base, not just to new customers. Specifically, we found that the embedded customer base referenced in the TRRO means unbundled local circuit switching arrangements existing on March 11, 2005. We concluded that:

While CLECs retain access to unbundled local circuit switching during the 12-month transition period for their embedded end-user customers, that access is limited to the arrangements existing on March 11, 2005. Orders requiring a new UNE-P arrangement, such as a customer move to another location or an additional line, are not permitted pursuant to the FCC's *TRRO*. (Embedded Base Order, p. 6)

Moreover, in the Verizon Arbitration Order, we reached a similar conclusion that additions, moves or changes are not allowed within the CLEC's embedded customer base either for switching or high-capacity loops and transport because they constitute a new arrangement. (Verizon Arbitration Order, p. 22) We find that CompSouth has presented no compelling evidence why we should render a different decision now. For this reason, we find that CompSouth's definition of "embedded base" in terms of customers is inappropriate. BellSouth's definition in terms of arrangements is more in line with the TRRO, and we find more appropriate.

In their brief, the Joint CLECs argue that the Eleventh Circuit recently addressed conditions under which CLECs may move, add, or change services for the embedded base. The Eleventh Circuit upheld the district court's decision granting a preliminary injunction that barred enforcement of an order of the Georgia Public Service Commission requiring BellSouth to negotiate the terms of the TRRO. This decision indicates nothing addressing conditions alleged by the Joint CLECs.

Therefore, while we agree that CLECs retain access to unbundled local circuit switching and DS1 and DS3 high-capacity loops and transport during the applicable transition period for their embedded end-user customers, we find that access is limited to the arrangements existing on March 11, 2005. When a CLEC seeks to move a customer's service to a different location, BellSouth witness Blake explains that there is a disconnection at the original location and the placement of a new order at a new location. A new order constitutes a new arrangement. On the other hand, changes to an existing service do not constitute an order for new service. BellSouth agrees to process orders to modify an existing customer's service by, for example, adding or removing vertical features, during the transition period. We agree with BellSouth that anything requiring a new arrangement, such as a customer move to another location or an additional line, is not permitted under the TRRO.

As for high-capacity loops and dedicated transport, we found in the No-New-Adds Order that a:

. . . requesting CLEC shall self-certify its order for high-capacity loops or dedicated transport. Thereafter, the ILEC shall provision the high capacity loops or dedicated transport pursuant to the CLEC's certification. The ILEC may subsequently dispute whether the CLEC is entitled to such loop or transport, pursuant to the parties' existing dispute resolution provisions. This process, as

delineated in Paragraph 234 of the *TRRO*, shall remain in place pending any appeals by BellSouth or Verizon of the FCC's decision on this aspect of the *TRRO*. (No-New-Adds Order at p. 6)

BellSouth witness Tipton asserts that BellSouth has been accepting and processing CLEC orders for new high-capacity loops and dedicated transport even in wire centers and for those routes that BellSouth has identified as not being impaired pursuant to the threshold criteria set forth in the *TRRO*. However, BellSouth asserts that at the conclusion of this instant proceeding, we should validate and confirm the Florida wire centers that satisfy the FCC's impairment thresholds. At that time, BellSouth believes that CLECs should no longer be able to self-certify in the confirmed non-impaired wire centers.

All the parties in this proceeding agree that we should validate and confirm a list of wire centers that currently meet the impairment criteria set forth in the *TRRO*. (See Section V) Given this, we find that the instant proceeding represents the dispute resolution process where challenges to BellSouth's wire center list are addressed and resolved. For this reason, we agree with BellSouth that once this proceeding concludes, CLECs should be foreclosed from self-certifying in the wire centers ordered in Section V. Also, we find that CLECs shall no longer be permitted to submit new orders for high-capacity loops and transport in these non-impaired wire centers.

C. DECISION

We find that moving or adding orders to a CLEC's respective embedded bases of switching, high-capacity loops and dedicated transport are not allowed. However, changes to an existing service, such as adding or removing vertical features, are permitted during the applicable transition period. We find that no language is needed to effectuate this policy.

VIII. TRANSITION OF EXISTING NETWORK ELEMENTS THAT BELL SOUTH IS NO LONGER OBLIGATED TO PROVIDE AS SECTION 251 UNES

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

Transition of UNES de-listed in the TRO

BellSouth witness Tipton notes that the *TRO* eliminated ILEC unbundling obligations with respect to entrance facilities, enterprise or DS1 level switching, OCN loops and transport, fiber to the home, fiber sub-loop feeder, "greenfield" fiber build, and packet switching almost two years ago. With the exception of entrance facilities,³¹ witness Tipton believes that no transition obligation for the affected elements de-listed in the *TRO* should be imposed since the *TRO* did not require any. Furthermore, any rates, terms, and conditions in CLEC ICAs regarding these specific elements should be removed.

³¹ BellSouth proposes that the embedded base of entrance facilities be subject to a 12-month transition period, as addressed in Section II.

If a CLEC has any de-listed TRO elements or arrangements in place after the effective date of the change of law amendment, asserts witness Tipton, then BellSouth should be authorized to disconnect or convert such services, after a 30-day written notice and absent a CLEC disconnection or conversion order. If CLECs do not submit the requisite orders during the 30-day period, witness Tipton opines that BellSouth should be allowed to transition such circuits to equivalent BellSouth tariffed services and impose full nonrecurring charges as set forth in BellSouth tariffs and UNE disconnect charges.

BellSouth witness Tipton asserts that although the language proposed by BellSouth and CompSouth is similar, CompSouth's proposed language gives more time to transition the TRO de-listed UNEs. Furthermore, CompSouth's proposal puts the onus on BellSouth to absorb the nonrecurring charges associated with converting these services to equivalent BellSouth tariffed services in the event that BellSouth has to initiate the conversion process.

The Joint CLECs acknowledge that there are certain UNEs that were de-listed by the TRO for which the FCC provided no specific transition plan or the transition plan has expired, and which would not be governed by the transition plan addressed in Section II. The Joint CLECs believe that BellSouth should provide at least 30 days' notice to CLECs before it disconnects any of the service arrangements or services identified in its notice. In any event, assert the Joint CLECs, BellSouth should not be permitted to disconnect the service arrangements or services if the CLEC has notified BellSouth of a dispute regarding the identification of a specific service arrangement or service that BellSouth claims it is not required to provide pursuant to §251. Additionally, the Joint CLECs believe there should be no service order, labor, disconnection, project management or other nonrecurring charges associated with a conversion of the TRO de-listed elements.

Subsequent Transition Period

BellSouth witness Tipton asserts that to the extent additional wire centers are found to meet the FCC's non-impairment criteria for de-listing a high-capacity loop or transport UNE, BellSouth's proposed standard contract language provides that CLECs will be notified of the "Subsequent Wire Center List" via a Carrier Notification Letter (CNL). Ten business days (which equates to 14 calendar days) after posting the CNL to its website, BellSouth should be permitted to cease offering new unbundled high-capacity loops and dedicated transport in the affected wire centers, except in a wire center where CLECs have "self-certified" they are entitled to unbundled access.

BellSouth's proposed language requires that a CLEC undertake a reasonably diligent inquiry to determine whether the CLEC is entitled to unbundled access to the affected network element, prior to submitting an order for high-capacity loops or dedicated transport in a wire center on the Subsequent Wire Center List. By submitting an order, contends BellSouth, the CLEC self-certifies that to the best of its knowledge, it is entitled to the UNE. BellSouth will process the CLEC request and if it believes the request does not comply with the TRRO provisions, it will pursue the dispute resolution process provided in the ICA. If the Commission resolves the dispute in BellSouth's favor, BellSouth proposes that the CLEC be billed the difference between the applicable UNE rates and the nonrecurring and recurring charges for the

equivalent tariffed service from the date the ordered circuit is installed to the date the circuit is transitioned to the equivalent tariffed service. Further, within 30 days following our decision, the CLEC is required to submit a spreadsheet identifying those non-compliant circuits to be transitioned to tariffed services or disconnected.

Witness Tipton explains that the Subsequent Transition Period for high-capacity loops and transport UNEs in service when the subsequent wire center determination is made will begin ten business days following posting of the CNL. The Subsequent Transition Period will last 90 days, during which the same transition rates as the TRRO established for the Initial Transition Period will apply.³² BellSouth believes that 90 days is sufficient for CLECs to transition de-listed UNEs in subsequent non-impaired wire centers because the number of wire centers will be fewer than those identified during the original transition period. Also, CLECs should have already performed some of the tasks necessary to transition de-listed UNEs to alternative arrangements, for example, modifying their customer contracts to anticipate such de-listing, and modifying ICAs in anticipation of the non-impairment determination. However, asserts witness Tipton, CLECs will be obligated to submit spreadsheets identifying the embedded base of UNEs to be converted or disconnected no later than 40 days after the date of the CNL. A project conversion timeline will then be negotiated, with completion of the transition activities by the end of the subsequent transition period. Absent a mutually agreeable compromise, witness Tipton opines that BellSouth's proposed standard terms should apply.

CompSouth is not opposed to a web-based notification of wire centers for the Subsequent Wire Center List assuming its proposed annual process for approving future non-impaired wire centers is adopted. However, CompSouth asserts that it is critical for CLECs to have the opportunity to efficiently review and challenge BellSouth's classifications. CompSouth witness Gillan proposes a standard procedure whereby BellSouth's Subsequent Wire Center List would be filed with the Commission on April 1 of each year, and CLECs would have until May 1 to file a challenge to any new wire center on that list. We would issue a decision regarding any disputed non-impaired wire center by June 15; the effective date of the Subsequent Wire Center List would be July 1.

XO witness Shulman believes that the Subsequent Transition Period needs to give CLECs sufficient time to change their business processes to adjust from unbundling in a subsequently affected wire center; BellSouth's proposed ten business days is not sufficient. Recognizing that CLECs would have less advance notice of de-listing in the future than they did for the initial de-listing, witness Shulman believes it is arguable that the length of Subsequent Transition Periods should be at least as long as the 12 and 18-month initial transition periods adopted in the TRRO. The witness also believes that the transition rates for the Subsequent Transition Period should apply from the beginning to the end of the transition period, regardless of when conversion orders are placed or completed. Finally, the witness opines that the only rates BellSouth should assess CLECs for converting the de-listed arrangements are Commission-approved switch-as-is conversion charges.

³² The transition rates for DS1 and DS3 loops and dedicated transport are equal to the higher of 115 percent of the rate paid for that element on June 15, 2004, or 115 percent of the rate this Commission established, if any, between June 16, 2004, and March 11, 2005.

As a compromise between the initial transition period and BellSouth's proposal, SEECA witness Montano proposes a Subsequent Transition Period of 180 days. The witness contends that CLECs would likely be unable to ensure an orderly transition of any affected circuits in less than 180 days. The witness asserts that many CLECs don't have the resources to continue business provisioning and also provision future unknown transition orders in 40 days following the CNL. Additionally, asserts witness Montano, CLECs need to review BellSouth's wire center information during the transition period; conduct a reasonable due diligence to determine whether or not the wire center is non-impaired; and inventory the circuits required to be transitioned and determine the appropriate alternative services to which to transition the circuits. Moreover, opines the witness, 180 days gives CLECs needed time to coordinate the conversions to alternative services, and allows CLECs to use competitive providers rather than BellSouth's special access pricing.

Sprint witness Maples believes that the transition process for future declassification events should mirror the one adopted in the TRRO for the initial transition, absent new findings or evidence. The witness asserts that BellSouth should notify each CLEC directly, not simply via a CNL posted to its website. Also, there should be a minimum of 30 days from the receipt of the notification from BellSouth for the CLEC to determine if it will self-certify and if not, modify its process to stop ordering the impacted UNE. During the 30-day period, opines the witness, the CLEC should be permitted to continue ordering the affected UNE at TELRIC rates. If a CLEC disputes BellSouth's non-impaired wire center claim, it should be allowed to continue ordering the impacted UNE during the dispute process, with no increase in price; the CLEC should not be required to transition off the affected UNE until resolution of the dispute. If a CLEC does not self-certify, the same transition period applies; the rate during the transition period should increase consistent with the TRRO transition procedure, absent any new finding.

Sprint witness Maples contends that BellSouth's proposal to cease providing de-listed high-capacity loop and transport UNEs in subsequent non-impaired wire centers ten days following issuance of the CNL does not provide sufficient time to review the BellSouth wire center claim and to determine whether or not to self-certify or stop placing orders. The witness asserts that CLECs will need to request the detailed data from BellSouth to review its claim of non-impairment. Moreover, opines the witness, the fact that a CLEC knows that BellSouth could change the status of a wire center in the future does not provide the type of advance notice that a CLEC needs to be ready to transition to alternate ILEC services, alternative providers, or self-provided services. With only a notice via a CNL and an abbreviated period of ten days for filing disputes, witness Maples asserts that CLECs may end up filing needless disputes based on incomplete information in an effort to preserve their rights.

Rather than requiring CLECs to provide a list of impacted UNEs within 40 days of receiving notice regarding the status of a wire center, Sprint witness Maples proposes that the timeline be modified to nine months for DS1 and DS3 loops and dedicated transport and 15 months for dark fiber dedicated transport. The witness asserts that the nine months is consistent with the December date requested by BellSouth for the embedded base of DS1 and DS3 loops identified in the initial transition period, and the longer period for dark fiber dedicated transport recognizes the FCC's 18-month transition period.

The Joint CLECs believe that BellSouth's proposed 90-day Subsequent Transition Period is inadequate and propose in their brief a Subsequent Transition Period of a maximum of 12 months and no less than 180 days. The Joint CLECs submit that since the FCC did not impose the TRRO transitional rates to the Subsequent Transition Period, existing UNE rates should apply until the conversion of the affected de-listed UNEs is completed. The Joint CLECs also argue in their brief that the notice provision of the parties' ICAs be used to ensure that the CLECs are aware of the potential loss of UNEs in a wire center, rather than a website CNL posting. The Joint CLECs assert that posting a notice on the website is insufficient and contrary to the general terms and conditions of the ICA.

B. ANALYSIS

(a) Transition of UNEs de-listed in the TRO

In comparing the positions of BellSouth and the Joint CLECs for this issue, we observe some distinct differences and areas of dispute. If BellSouth determines that a CLEC has any arrangements de-listed by the TRO, with the exception of entrance facilities, it proposes to provide a 30-day written notice to CLECs for them to submit disconnect or conversion orders. On the other hand, CompSouth would have BellSouth identify, by circuit identification number, the specific CLEC arrangements that need to be disconnected or converted. Additionally, CompSouth's proposed language provides that CLECs could dispute the BellSouth identified de-listed arrangements within 30 days. We note that the TRO was released August 21, 2003; the Order became effective on October 2, 2003. Thus, CLECs have known of the TRO de-listings for more than two years, while continuing to receive the de-listed UNEs during the subsequent litigation proceedings and change-of-law proceedings. We therefore find that if BellSouth determines, after the effective date of the change-of-law amendment, it is provisioning TRO de-listed UNEs, it is sufficient that it provide CLECs with a 30-day written notice in which to submit disconnection or conversion orders for such arrangements.

CompSouth proposes that absent a CLEC disconnection or conversion order, BellSouth should transition such circuits to the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service (or §271 equivalent service). BellSouth disagrees with the §271 reference. Based on our finding that the Commission does not have authority to require §271 checklist items that are not required by §251 to be included in §252 ICAs, we find that the CompSouth proposed language is not appropriate.

Under BellSouth's proposed language, whether the CLEC submits conversion or disconnection orders within the 30-day notice period or BellSouth identifies and transitions the affected de-listed arrangements, the CLEC will be charged applicable UNE disconnect charges and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of the equivalent BellSouth service. Unlike the proposed language for the TRRO de-listings, BellSouth is not proposing switch-as-is conversion charges for the TRO-related de-listed arrangements if the CLEC submits conversion orders within the specified 30-day period. Moreover, the applicable recurring charges will apply to each circuit retroactive to the effective date of the ICA amendment. The Joint CLECs recommend that the parties absorb their own costs associated with transitioning the circuits de-listed by the TRO, and that CLECs should not be charged any service order, labor,

disconnection, project management or other nonrecurring charges associated with the transition of UNEs to other services or arrangements. We observe that BellSouth offers no explanation why switch-as-is charges should not apply if the CLEC submits its conversion and disconnection orders within the 30-day notice period and it seems reasonable to treat TRO and TRRO delistings the same in this regard. Accordingly, we find that Commission-approved switch-as-is charges shall apply if the CLEC submits its orders within the designated period. However, if CLECs do not submit their orders within the 30-day notice period, then they shall be charged applicable UNE disconnect charges and the full nonrecurring charges for installation. CLECs can avoid these charges if they submit their orders within 30 days of the BellSouth CNL.

Finally, CompSouth witness Gillan proposes language to apply to bulk migrations of lines from one service platform to another associated with the transition off certain §251(c)(3) UNEs. The CompSouth proposed language requires that BellSouth provide a bulk migration process in which a CLEC may request to migrate BellSouth retail customers to the CLEC using UNE-L or EELs and migrate another CLEC's customer base to the CLEC using UNE-L. We observe that Docket No. 041338-TP is a generic docket addressing bulk migration and hot cut issues for BellSouth. We also observe that in response to our staff's discovery, CompSouth affirmatively states that it does not oppose addressing bulk migration and hot cut performance issues in the generic docket rather than in this instant proceeding. Nevertheless, the parties' positions regarding bulk migrations are very similar, and BellSouth has no objection to the CompSouth proposed bulk migration language with the slight modification that a CLEC may request to migrate another CLEC's embedded base of port/loop combinations or UNE-L to the CLEC using UNE-L and that the CLEC's customer base is the CLEC's embedded base. However, BellSouth believes that since hot cut performance is not an issue in this proceeding, the CompSouth language should not be adopted. We agree.

(b) Subsequent Transition Period

The issue of modifications and updates to the initial non-impaired list of wire centers and subsequent transition periods involves the following:

- how CLECs should be notified of subsequent wire centers that meet the non-impairment criteria set forth in the TRRO;
- how long CLECs should continue to be able to order de-listed high-capacity loops or transport or dark fiber transport in subsequent non-impaired wire centers;
- the period for transitioning the embedded de-listed elements to alternative arrangements;
- the rates to apply during the subsequent transition period;
- when orders should be submitted to transition the embedded de-listed elements;
- applicable rates for converting the de-listed elements identified by the specified deadline; and,
- applicable rates for converting de-listed elements for which orders are not submitted by a specified deadline.

BellSouth proposes that subsequent wire centers it determines meets the TRRO non-impairment criteria be posted in a CNL on its website. CompSouth does not oppose the website

posting of a Subsequent Wire Center List as long as its proposed annual procedure for determining new non-impaired wire centers is adopted. We note that CompSouth's procedure is addressed in Section V. Consistent with our earlier findings, we find a CNL website posting of a Subsequent Wire Center List is sufficient.

We agree with XO witness Shulman and Sprint witness Maples that CLECs should be allowed sufficient time to change their business processes to adjust from unbundling in a wire center that becomes non-impaired. We observe that BellSouth and the Joint CLECs believe that CLECs should be allowed to self-certify in wire centers on the Subsequent Wire Center List. Under BellSouth's proposed language, CLECs have ten days following the CNL to self-certify. When a CLEC submits an order for a UNE in a subsequent non-impaired wire center, BellSouth contends it is self-certifying that it is entitled to the UNE based on a reasonably diligent inquiry. On the other hand, CompSouth proposes that a CLEC's identification of disputed circuits constitutes self-certification and that a CLEC be given the entire transition period to dispute a BellSouth non-impaired wire center claim. We are concerned that BellSouth's proposed ten business days may not provide CLECs sufficient time to obtain and review the BellSouth wire center claim and determine whether or not to dispute the claim or stop placing orders. Additionally, we note that CLECs will become aware of a wire center status change when the CNL is posted; there is no advance notice. We find this makes it difficult for CLECs to be ready to transition to alternate ILEC services, alternative providers, or self-provided services as fast as BellSouth proposes.

BellSouth proposes a shorter Subsequent Transition Period of 90 calendar days for Subsequent Embedded Bases of de-listed arrangements than the 12- and 18-month transition periods established in the TRRO. The 90-day transition period begins 10 business days following the website posting of the CNL. In contrast, CompSouth, SEECA, and the Joint CLECs assert that the uncertainty of when a wire center may become non-impaired necessitates the Subsequent Transition Period be the same 12- and 18-month timelines as set forth for the initial transition period in the TRRO, or a minimum of no less than 180 days.

While we agree with BellSouth that Subsequent Transition Periods need not necessitate ICA amendments because the non-impaired wire center list will be incorporated by reference in the ICAs, we observe that BellSouth provided no evidence supporting its contention that significant increases in the number of future unimpaired wire centers are not expected. We observe that the TRRO did not establish a default transition process for UNEs in wire centers that are subsequently determined to meet the non-impairment criteria. Rather, the FCC expected parties to negotiate the appropriate transition mechanisms for such facilities through the §252 process. (TRRO ¶142, fn 399, ¶196, fn 519) That said, we find that if the FCC had intended Subsequent Transition Periods to exceed those initially established in the TRRO, it would have said so explicitly. We therefore find that, at a maximum, the Subsequent Transition Period shall be 12 months (18 months for dark fiber transport) from the time CLECs are notified that the given wire center is non-impaired. We find that a Subsequent Transition Period of 180 days for the de-listed high-capacity loops or transport UNEs (270 days for the de-listed dark fiber transport UNEs) in wire centers on the Subsequent Wire Center List is a reasonable compromise between BellSouth's and other parties' proposals.

BellSouth proposes that the rates to apply to the de-listed UNEs in the Subsequent Wire Center List should be the same transition rates set forth by the FCC in the TRRO for the Initial Transition Period -- the higher of 115 percent of the rate paid for that element on June 15, 2004, or 115 percent of the rate we established, if any, between June 16, 2004, and March 11, 2005. As with the initial transition period, BellSouth proposes that the transition rates for the Subsequent Transition Period should apply until the earlier of when the Subsequent Embedded Base circuits are converted to other arrangements or the end of the Subsequent Transition Period. The Joint CLECs assert in their brief that applicable transition rates should be existing UNE rates and should apply until the conversion of the UNEs is completed. We find that neither the BellSouth proposed transition rates nor the Joint CLECs' proposed rates are appropriate. We find that the transition rates for the Subsequent Transition Period shall be those applicable UNE rates existing at the time the Subsequent Wire Center List is posted, plus a 15 percent additive. We find that such transition rates are consistent with the FCC-established rates for the initial transition period and simply reflect an update to those rates to recognize changes in existing UNE rates that could occur prior to a Subsequent Wire Center List. Regarding the application of transition rates during the Subsequent Transition Period, we find that consistent with our finding in Section II of this Order, the transition rates shall apply throughout the Subsequent Transition Period.

BellSouth proposes that CLECs submit spreadsheets identifying the Subsequent Embedded Base of circuits to be disconnected or converted to other services no later than 40 days from the CNL posting. CompSouth and the Joint CLECs propose that CLECs submit spreadsheets by the end of the applicable Subsequent Transition Period. We find that, consistent with our finding in Section II regarding the similar dispute for the initial transition period, CLECs shall be required to submit spreadsheets identifying the Subsequent Embedded Base of circuits to be disconnected or converted to other services no later than the end of the Subsequent Transition Period.

Unlike BellSouth's proposal for the initial transition period, we observe that BellSouth does not propose to charge CLECs "switch-as-is" conversion rates and forego disconnect charges if CLEC orders and spreadsheets are submitted by the BellSouth proposed deadline. BellSouth offers no explanation why the subsequent transition period should be different than the initial transition period in this respect. CompSouth proposes that no nonrecurring charges should apply when converting the subsequent embedded base circuits to alternative arrangements. As discussed in more detail in Section II, BellSouth shall assess CLECs Commission-approved switch-as-is nonrecurring conversion charges and forego disconnect charges if CLECs submit orders and spreadsheets no later than the end of the Subsequent Transition Period. However, if CLECs do not submit orders and spreadsheets accordingly, we find that full UNE disconnect charges and tariffed installation charges shall apply.

Concerns with possible service disruptions to customers, as well as to CLECs' business plans if unbundled access were eliminated on a flash-cut basis, remain when additional wire centers meet the non-impairment criteria of the TRRO in the future. If the FCC no longer considered this a concern, it would not have expected parties to negotiate the appropriate transition mechanisms for such facilities through the §252 process. Accordingly, we find a

Subsequent Transition Period that represents a mix of the proposals proffered by the parties and follows similar transition pricing requirements and conversion requirements of the initial transition period is appropriate. A summary of the approved time-line is shown below.

Subsequent Transition Period for Future Non-Impaired Wire Centers

- Day 0
 - BellSouth Carrier Notification Letter (CNL) of Subsequent Wire Centers

- Day 30
 - Embedded Base Established for Subsequent Wire Centers
 - Subsequent Transition Period/Rates* Begin for Embedded Base
 - Further Unbundling Ends for Subsequent Wire Centers Unless CLEC Has Self-Certified

- Day 210
 - Subsequent Transition Period/Rates End for Embedded Base (Excludes Dark Fiber)
 - Disconnection/Conversion Spreadsheets Due from CLECs for Embedded Base (Excludes Dark Fiber)

- Day 211
 - CLEC-Identified Embedded Base (excludes dark fiber) Priced at Applicable Recurring Tariff Charges
 - BellSouth May Identify and Transition Any Remaining Embedded Base (Excludes Dark Fiber), Subject to Full Disconnection/Installation Charges

- Day 300
 - Subsequent Transition Period/Rates End for Embedded Dark Fiber
 - Disconnection/Conversion Spreadsheets Due from CLECs for Embedded Dark Fiber

- Day 301
 - CLEC-Identified Embedded Dark Fiber Priced at Applicable Recurring Tariff Charges
 - BellSouth May Identify and Transition Any Remaining Embedded Dark Fiber, Subject to Full Disconnection/Installation Charges

* Rates for the Subsequent Transition Period are the Commission-approved UNE rates existing at the time of the CNL, plus the 15 percent additive.

C. DECISION

Transition of UNEs de-listed in the TRO

If a CLEC has any de-listed TRO elements or arrangements in place after the effective date of the change-of-law amendment, we find that BellSouth shall be authorized to disconnect or convert such services, after a 30-day written notice and absent a CLEC disconnection or conversion order. If CLECs submit the requisite orders during the 30-day period, we find that conversions shall be subject to Commission-approved switch-as-is rates. If CLECs do not submit the requisite orders during the 30-day period, BellSouth shall be allowed to transition such circuits to equivalent BellSouth tariffed services and impose full nonrecurring charges as set forth in BellSouth tariffs and UNE disconnect charges.

We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth nor CompSouth is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that the language proposed by BellSouth, with the modifications discussed in our analysis, is appropriate. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

Subsequent Transition Period

- BellSouth shall identify and post on its website subsequent wire centers meeting the non-impairment criteria set forth in the TRRO (Subsequent Wire Center List) in a Carrier Notification Letter (CNL).
- CLECs have 30 calendar days following the CNL to dispute a non-impaired wire center claim. During the 30 days, rates for de-listed UNEs (DS1 and DS3 loops and transport and dark fiber transport) do not change.
- 30 calendar days after the CNL, BellSouth no longer has an obligation to provide unbundling of new de-listed UNEs, as applicable, in the wire centers listed on the Subsequent Wire Center List. If a CLEC disputes a specific non-impaired wire center claim with a UNE order within 30 calendar days following the CNL, BellSouth will provision the CLEC's ordered UNE. BellSouth will review the CLEC claim and will seek dispute resolution if needed. During the dispute resolution period, the applicable UNE rates will not change unless ordered by the Commission. Upon our resolution of the dispute, the rates will be trued-up, if necessary, to the time BellSouth provisioned the CLEC's order.
- The Subsequent Transition Period for DS1 and DS3 loops and transport in a wire center identified on the Subsequent Wire Center List is 180 calendar days and begins on day 30 following issuance of the CNL; the Subsequent Transition Period for dark fiber transport is 270 calendar days beginning on day 30 following issuance of the CNL.
- The Subsequent Transition Period applies to the Subsequent Embedded Base (all de-listed UNE arrangements in service in a wire center identified on the Subsequent Wire Center List on the thirtieth day following issuance of the CNL).
- The transition rates to apply to the Subsequent Embedded Base throughout the Subsequent Transition Period shall be the rate paid for that element at the time of the CNL posting, plus 15 percent.

- The CLECs shall be required to submit spreadsheets identifying the Subsequent Embedded Base of circuits to be disconnected or converted to other BellSouth services no later than the end of the Subsequent Transition Period (210 days following the CNL for DS1 and DS3 loops and transport and 300 days following the CNL for dark fiber transport). A project schedule for the conversion of these affected circuits will be negotiated between the parties.
- For the Subsequent Embedded Base circuits identified by the end of 210 days for DS1 and DS3 high-capacity loops and transport (300 days for dark fiber transport) following the CNL, BellSouth shall convert the applicable circuits at Commission-approved switch-as-is rates and UNE disconnect charges do not apply. The applicable recurring tariff charges will apply beginning on the first day following the end of the Subsequent Transition Period.
- If CLECs do not submit the spreadsheets for all of their Subsequent Embedded Base by the end of the Subsequent Transition Period, BellSouth shall be permitted to identify the remaining Subsequent Embedded Base and transition the circuits to the equivalent BellSouth tariffed services. Additionally, the circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth shall be subject to the applicable UNE disconnect charges and the full non-recurring charges for installation of the BellSouth equivalent tariffed service.
- For the Subsequent Embedded Base circuits, the applicable recurring tariff charges shall apply beginning on the first day following the end of the Subsequent Transition Period, whether or not the circuits have been converted.

We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth nor CompSouth is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that the language proposed by BellSouth, with the modifications discussed in our analysis, shall be adopted. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

IX. BELLSOUTH'S SQM/PMAP/SEEM

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth requests to cease reporting performance measurement data and making SEEM payments in accordance with a change-of-law that relieves BellSouth of its obligations to provide any UNE or UNE combinations pursuant to §251. BellSouth asserts that the PAP is not required by any portion of the Telecommunications Act, although it acknowledges that it is a mechanism that can be used to ensure that BellSouth is meeting its obligations under §251, after granting of §271 authority. BellSouth witness Blake explains that the purpose of establishing and maintaining BellSouth's PAP is to ensure that BellSouth provides nondiscriminatory access to elements required to be unbundled under §251(c)(3). If BellSouth fails to meet such measurements, it must pay the CLEC or the state a monetary penalty. Accordingly, BellSouth believes that de-listed elements should not be subject to the measurements of BellSouth's PAP

plan.³³ Witness Blake further contends that the issue of enforcement and prevention of backsliding relative to §271 obligations is a matter for the FCC to assess, determine, and monitor.

BellSouth witness Blake further observes that BellSouth has entered into over 150 commercial agreements that provide for non-251(c) replacement service arrangements similar to UNE-P. These commercial agreements provide for consequences if BellSouth fails to perform in accordance with its contractual obligations. Penalties are made available in these agreements. Because BellSouth provides these non-251(c) UNE replacements under a commercial agreement, performance data associated with these services are removed from the PAP. Witness Blake states that all such executed commercial agreements with BellSouth have a provision to exempt BellSouth from having to pay SEEM penalties, should BellSouth not perform in accordance with the parties' agreement. For those CLECs that have not entered into commercial agreements and continue to buy services (de-listed elements) from BellSouth, the performance data for these services (de-listed elements) currently remain in BellSouth's PAP.

Joint CLECs

According to CompSouth witness Gillan, BellSouth's PAP should be enforced with regard to BellSouth's §271 obligations. In other words, BellSouth should not be allowed to unilaterally cease reporting data or making SEEM payments simply because there is a change-of-law that may relieve BellSouth of any of its obligations to provide UNEs or UNE combinations pursuant to §251. Separate from its obligations under §251, witness Gillan asserts that BellSouth should continue to be obligated by §271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Florida statutes.

Witness Gillan further contends that the "purpose" of establishing and maintaining BellSouth's PAP is to ensure that BellSouth will continue to meet its §271 obligations, which includes BellSouth's obligation under §251. Witness Gillan claims that BellSouth's requirements to comply with the existing PAP should be unaffected by any de-listing of §251 UNEs. In support of his position, witness Gillan references the FCC's Memorandum Opinion and Order of December 19, 2002 where it states:

In prior orders, the Commission has explained that one factor it may consider as part of its public interest analysis is whether a BOC would have adequate incentives to continue to satisfy the requirements of section 271 after entering the long distance market. Although it is not a requirement for section 271 authority that a BOC be subject to such performance assurance mechanisms, the Commission previously has found that the existence of a satisfactory performance monitoring and enforcement mechanism is probative evidence that the BOC will continue to meet its section 271 obligations after a grant of such authority. (emphasis by witness)

³³ BellSouth did not propose specific revisions to the current language in the interconnection agreement.

Witness Gillan notes that the above is probative evidence that BellSouth must continue to meet its §271 obligations after a grant of authority.

B. ANALYSIS

Modifications to BellSouth's PAP are usually limited to the review process outlined in this Commission's Orders adopting changes to the PAP. The FCC's decision in the TRRO constitutes a change-of-law that BellSouth believes places certain network elements outside the framework of the PAP. The authority to enforce §271 obligations resides with the FCC, and thus it is inappropriate to extend the PAP's scope to encompass §271 obligations. We agree with BellSouth that the issue of enforcement and prevention of backsliding relative to BellSouth §271 obligations is a matter for the FCC to address.

This conclusion is also consistent with our May 19, 2004 Order on BellSouth's Amended Motion to modify its SEEM plan to remove Line Sharing.³⁴ In its Amended Motion, BellSouth requested to remove penalties relating to line sharing because the TRO removed the obligation of ILECs to provide line sharing as a UNE, pursuant to Section 251. Although we found that it was premature to answer the argument over obligations under §§251 and 271 of the Telecommunications Act, we did order BellSouth to report and pay line sharing penalties for specific measurement categories in BellSouth's PAP until the transitional period specified in the TRO ends in October 2006. In sum, we decided that line sharing would remain in the Plan consistent with the transitional plan outlined in the TRO regarding the phasing out of line sharing under §251:

In conclusion, we find that BellSouth shall continue to report and pay all line sharing penalties in the SEEM plan through October 2004 for the four ordering performance measurements In addition, we find that BellSouth shall continue to report and pay line sharing penalties for the five maintenance and repair performance categories until the three-year transitional period outlined by the FCC and the TRO end in October 2006. We note that these findings reflect the current status of the law and we recognize that the current law may change during the time frames outlined above.³⁵

Since the FCC has ruled that certain network elements no longer meet the impairment test, and since BellSouth is relieved from its obligations to provide line sharing as a UNE, subject to a transitional period, we find that these de-listed elements shall not be subject to the measurements of BellSouth's PAP.

We note that according to section 4.6.1 of BellSouth's SEEM Administrative Plan within BellSouth's Performance Assessment Plan, "If a change of law occurs which may relieve BellSouth's provisioning of a UNE or UNE combination, BellSouth shall petition the

³⁴ Order No. PSC-04-0511-PAA-TP, issued May 19, 2004, in Docket No. 000121A.

³⁵ Ibid, p. 13.

Commission within 30 days if it seeks to cease reporting data or paying remedies in accordance with the change of law.”

In sum, we find that the language proposed by CompSouth is inappropriate because it refers to network elements provided pursuant to §§251 or 271. We find that BellSouth's proposed language, with the phrase "pursuant to §251" added for clarity is appropriate.

C. DECISION

Performance data for services (de-listed elements) no longer under Section 251(c)(3) shall be removed from BellSouth's SQM/PMAP/SEEM. We find that the language proposed by BellSouth, with the modification discussed in our analysis, shall be adopted. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

X. CONVERSION OF SPECIAL ACCESS CIRCUITS TO UNE PRICING

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Tipton agrees that BellSouth “is required to convert special access services to UNE pricing, subject to the FCC’s limitations on high-capacity EELs, and to convert UNE circuits to special access services, provided that the requesting CLEC’s contract has these terms incorporated in its contract.” BellSouth proposes the following rates for these conversions.

BellSouth's Proposed Rates for Switch-As-Is Conversions

	<u>First Single</u>	<u>Additional Per Loop</u>
DS1 (less than 15 circuits)	\$24.97	\$3.52
DS1 Projects (15+ circuits on LSR)	\$26.46	\$5.01
DS3 (less than 15 circuits)	\$40.28	\$13.52
DS3 Projects (15+ circuits on LSR)	\$64.09	\$25.64

The witness admits that these rates are higher than those previously ordered in the BellSouth UNE docket (DN 990649A-TP). The Commission-ordered rate for EEL conversions is \$8.98. However, witness Tipton contends that the lower rate was determined prior to experience with performing the conversions and now that BellSouth has more knowledge of the actual work involved, it has determined that the rates proposed are more appropriate. Finally, witness Tipton testifies that if physical changes to the circuit are required, the “switch-as-is” rate should not apply; rather, full non-recurring charges for disconnection and installation would be appropriate. For purposes of any applicable volume and term discount plan or grandfathered arrangements, conversions are still considered disconnections. “BellSouth is generally in agreement with

CompSouth's proposed language and has made minor modifications to it as reflected in Exhibit PAT-5."

Joint CLECs

CompSouth witness Gillan's proposed contract language tracks almost identically with BellSouth's proposed language regarding this issue. Neither he nor any other CLEC witness offers testimony on this issue. The Joint CLECs oppose BellSouth's proposed new "switch-as-is" rates. They claim, "BellSouth and the Joint CLECs agree that, to avoid the 'wasteful and unnecessary charges' prohibited by the FCC, conversions should be priced based on a 'switch-as-is' basis." However, since BellSouth proposes rates that are much more than that which was approved by the Commission previously, the Joint CLECs assert, "The Commission should not approve any new conversion rate until the parties have had an opportunity to review and question BellSouth cost studies supporting such rates and present their arguments regarding those studies to the Commission."

B. ANALYSIS

We note that no CLEC addressed this issue in testimony. Other than the rates, the parties are generally in agreement. BellSouth witness Tipton indicates, "BellSouth is generally in agreement with CompSouth's proposed language and has made minor modifications to it as reflected in Exhibit PAT-5." The modification includes the additional phrase "pursuant to Section 251 of the Act" in two places in the paragraph on conversions. The entire sentence reads as follows:

Upon request, BellSouth shall convert a wholesale service, or group of wholesale services, to the equivalent Network Element or Combination that is available to CLEC pursuant to Section 251 of the Act and under this Agreement, or convert a Network Element or Combination that is available to CLEC pursuant to Section 251 of the Act and under this Agreement to an equivalent wholesale service or group of wholesale services offered by BellSouth (collectively "Conversion").

We note that this sentence tracks closely with the applicable rule which requires an ILEC to "convert a wholesale service, or group of wholesale services, to the equivalent unbundled network element, or combination of unbundled network elements, that is available to the requesting telecommunications carrier under section 251(c)(3) of the Act and this part [51]." (47 CFR 51.316(a)) Clearly, the FCC was requiring the ILEC to convert wholesale services to or from §251 elements; therefore, including the phrase: "pursuant to Section 251 of the Act" is appropriate.

BellSouth witness Tipton also comments that CompSouth's proposed language includes a reference to "rates found in 'Exhibit A.'" She notes that this exhibit is "not attached to CompSouth's proposed language." The witness maintains that the "switch-as-is" rates that she proposes should be adopted. We observe that BellSouth also included the language referencing

Exhibit A in its proposed language regarding conversions. Finally, we note that Section II addresses the rates to be adopted for the interconnection agreement, including “switch-as-is” rates for conversions and our approved language incorporating such rates into the interconnection agreement.

C. DECISION

We find that BellSouth is obligated to provide conversions of special access to UNE pricing. We find that the language proposed by BellSouth best implements our decision and shall be adopted. The approved language is found in Appendix A.

XI. CONVERSIONS TO STAND-ALONE UNES PENDING ON THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE TRO

A. PARTIES’ ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Tipton testifies that the “terms of interconnection agreements in effect on the effective date of the TRO are the appropriate rates, terms, conditions, and effective dates for EEL conversion requests that were pending on that date.” The TRO was the first time that the FCC held that ILECs had an obligation to convert special access to stand-alone UNEs at TELRIC rates. (TRO ¶¶586-587) Witness Tipton claims that because the FCC used the word “establish” in ¶585 and “conclude” in ¶586 of the TRO, it “makes clear that this was a new requirement, and not a modification of any previous requirement.” In contrast, the witness also notes that the FCC uses “reaffirm,” “reiterate,” and “currently require” in referring to conversions of combinations. (TRO ¶¶573-575)

Witness Tipton argues that although the CLECs often point to ¶589 of the TRO, nothing in that paragraph “addresses the conversion or requested conversion of individual elements.” Moreover, the “FCC expressly stated that the change in law procedures set forth in the interconnection agreements were the appropriate means to implement the obligations set forth in the TRO.” (TRO ¶701)

BellSouth witness Tipton contends, “any conversions pending on the effective date of the TRO should be guided by whether the CLEC had the appropriate conversion language in its interconnection agreement at the time the TRO became effective.” She claims that the FCC’s rules do not “indicate that these conversion provisions should be applied retroactively.”

Joint CLECs

CompSouth witness Gillan suggests that conversions that were “pending on the effective date of the TRO should be handled using conversion provisions set forth in the amended ICAs.” The Joint CLECs argue, “The FCC tied pricing provisions regarding conversions to the effective

date of the TRO. CLECs have been waiting for over two years for BellSouth to implement the portions of the TRO that improved pricing, terms, and conditions for conversions.” They contend that all conversion requests that were pending on the effective date of the TRO should be retroactively priced back to that effective date as explained by ¶589 in the TRO:

As a final matter, we decline to require retroactive billing to any time before the effective date of this Order. The eligibility criteria we adopt in this Order supersede the safe harbors that applied to EEL conversions in the past. To the extent pending requests have not been converted, however, competitive LECs are entitled to the appropriate pricing up to the effective date of this Order. (TRO ¶589)

B. ANALYSIS

We note that no CLEC offered testimony on this issue; likewise, neither party specifies language that should be included or excluded as part of this issue. In fact, BellSouth is “generally in agreement” with CompSouth’s position, but only if pending conversions are effective with the effective date of the agreement being arbitrated here. However, the Joint CLECs claim that “rates, terms and conditions for conversions pending on the effective date of the TRO should be those that reflect the FCC’s decisions in the TRO.”

Since the parties do appear to disagree on the effective date of pending conversions, we refer to the TRO ¶701, which states, “to the extent our decision in this Order changes carriers’ obligations under section 251, we decline . . . [to] override the section 252 process and unilaterally change all interconnection agreements to avoid any delay associated with renegotiation of contract provisions.” (TRO ¶701) We note that ¶589 of the TRO does conclude that CLECs “are entitled to the appropriate pricing up to the effective date of this Order.” (TRO ¶589) However, we find that this sentence refers to EEL conversions, not all conversions, as the entire paragraph discusses EELs and the previous “safe harbor” requirements instituted by the Supplemental Order Clarification. Thus, we find that conversions to stand-alone UNEs shall be effective with the effective date of an amendment or interconnection agreement that incorporates the language regarding such conversions.

C. CONCLUSION

We find that any conversions to stand-alone UNEs pending on the effective date of the TRO shall be effective with the date of an amendment or interconnection agreement that incorporates conversions. Since neither party proposed or contested language as part of this issue, we adopt our own language to cover this issue.

XII. CALL RELATED DATABASES

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Tipton lists the six specific call related databases the FCC identified in the TRO: 1) Line Information Data Base ("LIDB"); 2) Calling Name and Number (CNAM"); 3) Toll Free Calling; 4) Local Number Portability ("LNP"); 5) Advanced Intelligent Network ("AIN"); and 6) E911. The witness asserts that BellSouth's call related databases are presently available on an unbundled basis, although the TRO relieved BellSouth and other ILECs of their obligation to continue to do so indefinitely. In its brief, BellSouth asserts that unbundled access to call-related databases is tied to BellSouth's limited obligation (until March 10, 2006) to provide unbundled access to local switching.

In addition to the TRO, witness Tipton states that the TRRO went further to remove the ILEC's obligation to provide DS0 level switching as well, which further reduces BellSouth's obligations. The TRRO also set forth the parameters for the 12-month transition period, which began on March 11, 2005, and will end on March 10, 2006. Witness Tipton acknowledges that call related databases as an unbundled offering will be available through the end of the 12-month transition period, although most of these databases will no longer be available on an unbundled basis pursuant to §251 after the transition period. The noted exception is for 911 and E911 databases; BellSouth cites to ¶ 551 of the TRO for support: "[w]e find that competitive carriers that deploy their own switches are not impaired in any market without access to incumbent LEC call-related databases, with the exception of 911 and E911 databases . . ." This point is reflected in both of BellSouth's language offerings as well.³⁶

BellSouth's proposed language addresses its obligation to CLECs that have existing agreements with BellSouth as of the effective date of the TRO, March 11, 2005, and for those that do not. For CLECs that have an existing agreement, the language for call related databases is contained in Sections 7 and 8 of Attachment 2 of their draft agreement. The bulk of all argument concerns the language for CLECs that have existing agreements with BellSouth as of March 11, 2005.

For CLECs that do not have existing agreements with BellSouth as of the effective date of the TRO, the so-called "new" CLECs, BellSouth's language provides unbundled access only to the 911 and E911 call related databases.

BellSouth witness Tipton states that BellSouth and CompSouth are reasonably close to reaching agreement on language to address call-related databases. However, in its brief, BellSouth firmly contends that this Commission has no §271 authority, and thus rebuffs the language from CompSouth that refers to this section, or any obligation there under. There is general agreement about BellSouth's obligations during the transition period, although in a red-

³⁶ Hearing Exhibit 17 is a draft of BellSouth's Attachment 2 for CLECs that had existing agreements with BellSouth as of March 10, 2005. Hearing Exhibit 18 is a similar document for CLECs that did not have existing agreements as of that date.

line version of the proposed language offered by CompSouth, witness Tipton rejects two main components of the CompSouth language proposal.³⁷

First, witness Tipton rejects a proposal that could be interpreted as obligating BellSouth to offer a post-transition period product. Witness Tipton emphasizes that BellSouth will only offer call related databases on an unbundled basis during the transition period, and that BellSouth's proposed language does not address the time period following the transition period. The specific text of the CompSouth language that witness Tipton rejects suggests that BellSouth will offer an "equivalent Section 271 offering" when the transition period ends. Nothing in witness Tipton's testimony or exhibits addresses a post-transition offering. In its brief, BellSouth states that after March 10, 2006, CLECs may purchase access to call related databases pursuant to BellSouth's tariffs, or via a commercially negotiated agreement.

Second, witness Tipton rejects a multi-page proposal from CompSouth member MCI that addresses a directory assistance database, and BellSouth's obligation under "Sections 251(b)(3) of the Act and any other applicable laws." In its brief, BellSouth notes only one exception requiring access to incumbent LEC call-related databases, and that exception is for the provision of 911 and E911 databases. Witness Tipton states that "the FCC rejected MCI's proposal in paragraph 558 of the TRO."

Joint CLECs

Not all of the CLECs who are parties to this proceeding are disputing this issue with BellSouth.³⁸ CompSouth witness Gillan does not directly testify on the limited subject of access to call-related databases per se, although he repeatedly submits that this and several other issues have §§251, 252, and 271 overtones. In discovery responses, Covad, MCI and Supra make similar assertions. CompSouth's proposed language for call-related databases is:

4.4.3.1 BellSouth shall also make available the following elements relating to Local Switching, as such elements are defined at 47 C.F.R. §51.319(d)(4)(i), during the Transition Period: signaling networks, call-related databases, and shared transport. After the completion of the Transition Period, such elements may be transitioned to the equivalent BellSouth Section 271 offering, pursuant to the transition provisions herein applicable to Local Switching arrangements.

The language proposed by MCI includes a two-and-a-half page supplement to the CompSouth proposal that concerns access to a daily update of Directory Assistance Data. In part, the supplement from MCI "requires BellSouth . . . to provide nondiscriminatory access to call-related databases under Sections 251(b)(3) of the Act and any other applicable law."

B. ANALYSIS

³⁷CompSouth's original proposed language, JPG-1, was not entered into the record of this proceeding. A revised version was entered as Hearing Exhibit 23, although there were no changes to the applicable sections BellSouth witness Tipton previously evaluated. The version that witness Tipton red-lined was entered as Hearing Exhibit 21.

³⁸ In its brief at page 2, Sprint asserts that it has no dispute with BellSouth. Although it withdrew from active participation, US LEC expresses a similar stance in a discovery response.

BellSouth and other parties refer to this issue as a “271 issue,” which is a reference to BellSouth’s obligations with respect to 47 U.S.C. § 271 of the Act. Although BellSouth states that “the [Florida] Commission has no Section 271 authority,” the Joint CLECs contend that BellSouth’s legal obligations under 47 U.S.C. § 271 of the Act remain despite the TRO, because call related databases are a “checklist” item.

In part, ¶551 of the TRO states that “competitive carriers that deploy their own switches are not impaired in any market without access to incumbent LEC call-related databases, with the exception of the 911 and E911 databases as discussed below.” (TRO ¶551) Commenting parties to the TRO also point out two important considerations: the emergence of alternative suppliers, and evidence that some carriers are self-provisioning call-related databases. (TRO ¶553-554) Regarding alternatives to ILEC offerings, certain CLECs argue for impairment, claiming the alternative offerings are inferior to the ILECs’ databases. (TRO ¶554) The FCC rejects this notion. (Id.)

Availability

The Joint CLECs did not specifically address “availability” in a direct manner, though we find the topic is broached indirectly. Even though the FCC found that a number of alternative suppliers of call-related databases “are actively providing such services to competitive LECs on a commercial basis,” the Joint CLECs appear to present their case as though BellSouth was the sole supplier of call-related databases. (footnote omitted)(TRO ¶553) Although BellSouth witness Tipton stops short of stating that call-related databases will be unavailable after the transition period, the witness emphasizes that BellSouth’s §251 unbundling obligation for all databases only lasts through the transition period, and thereafter only remains for the 911 and E911 offerings. We note that BellSouth’s brief touches on what options will be available post-transition. Importantly, we find that the TRO is clear in carving out the exception that applies to the 911 and E911 call-related databases. (TRO ¶557) In part, ¶557 of the TRO states:

[B]ecause of the unique nature of 911 and E911 services and the public safety issues inherent in ensuring nondiscriminatory access to such databases, we conclude that without evidence of alternative providers or the ability to self-deploy, competitive carriers must continue to obtain unbundled access to those databases to ensure that their customers have access to emergency services. (TRO ¶557)

Language Proposals

BellSouth witness Tipton thwarts the efforts of MCI to include for its own agreement with BellSouth language regarding a daily update of Directory Assistance Data. The witness states that the TRO is clear in addressing what MCI seeks, citing to ¶558, which states, in part:

We reject competitive LECs’ assertions that, we should require in this proceeding unbundled access to the incumbent LEC databases for bulk transfer of information for competitive carriers to maintain their own call-related databases . . . [and] there is persuasive evidence that competitive LECs have alternative

sources available to obtain access to call-related databases generally, and the CNAM database specifically. (TRO ¶558)

We find BellSouth appropriately rejects MCI's proposed language. In ¶558 of the TRO, the FCC states that this matter is more appropriately addressed under section 251(b)(3) of the Act, rather than under the impairment analysis under section 251(d)(2). (TRO ¶558)

In considering the implementing language to address access to call-related databases, the parties are primarily at odds over the §271 obligations under the Act. The Joint CLEC brief argues extensively that we should require BellSouth to offer an "equivalent BellSouth 271 offering." We disagree. The text of the TRO makes clear BellSouth's obligations, and these obligations do not include making an "equivalent 271 offering" available. We agree with BellSouth that the CompSouth language could be interpreted in a manner that requires BellSouth to offer products it is not obligated to offer. Consistent with our finding that only §251 obligations belong in §252 agreements, we find that any provisions relating to §271 shall not be included in the parties' ICAs or amendments. For this reason, we find the CompSouth language shall not be adopted.

For the most part, we find BellSouth's language correctly reflects its TRO obligations. BellSouth's language indicates that BellSouth will continue to offer unbundled access to its 911 and E911 call-related databases to all CLECs. For CLECs with existing agreements with BellSouth as of March 11, 2005, the other databases will only remain available on an unbundled basis pursuant to §251 throughout the transition period. Therefore, we find BellSouth's proposed language is the appropriate starting point, although we find that an additional sentence³⁹ shall be added that is only applicable for CLECs with existing agreements with BellSouth as of March 11, 2005. The additional sentence adds clarity that was otherwise not present. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

C. DECISION

BellSouth is obligated to offer all CLECs unbundled access to the 911 and E911 call-related databases. For CLECs with existing agreements with BellSouth as of March 11, 2005, BellSouth is obligated to offer unbundled access to all other call related databases through March 10, 2006.

We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth nor the Joint CLECs is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that the language proposed by BellSouth, with the modification discussed in our analysis, shall be adopted. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

³⁹ Our approved language for CLECs with existing agreements with BellSouth as of March 11, 2005, is based on BellSouth's proposed language, but adds the following sentence: "Such unbundled access is only available until March 10, 2006." (The sentence is not applicable or necessary for all other CLECs.)

XIII. MINIMUM POINT OF ENTRY (“MPOE”)

A. PARTIES’ ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

Definition of MPOE

BellSouth witness Fogle asserts that the FCC has defined the MPOE as “either the closest practicable point to where the wiring crosses a property line or the closest practicable point to where the wiring enters a multiunit building or buildings.” Thus, in instances where the property owner has chosen the use of a MPOE, the MPOE is effectively the demarcation point between the inside wiring facilities at the multiple dwelling unit and the loop facilities of the carrier. Florida PSC Rule 25-4.0345 requires that the demarcation point be located at the customer’s premises at a point easily accessed by the customer. If the property owner desires an MPOE arrangement, the incumbent LEC must obtain our approval before establishing the demarcation point at any location other than the end user’s premise. No party has filed testimony disputing this definition. The proposed contact language does not specify a definition for a MPOE.

Joint CLECs

Definition of MPOE

The testimony of CompSouth witness Gillan does not specifically address the definition of MPOE. We note that the contract language proposed by CompSouth contains the same language regarding its use of MPOE as BellSouth.

Sprint

Definition of MPOE

The testimony of Sprint witness Maples does not address the definition of MPOE.

B. ANALYSIS

Definition of MPOE

We find that the definition of MPOE stated by BellSouth witness Fogle in his testimony is consistent with Federal and State law. However, the proposed contact language does not specify a definition for a MPOE. No party has filed contradicting testimony regarding this sub-issue. We do not believe that a specific definition for MPOE is necessary within the contract.

C. DECISION

Since no party has proposed language for a definition of MPOE within the contract, we conclude that no language is required.

XIV. HYBRID LOOPS

A. PARTIES ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Fogle contends, “The basis for the FCC requirements for access to loop types is to ensure that CLECs continue to have access to currently existing last mile copper facilities, as long as those facilities continue to exist.” He provides the definition of a hybrid loop from §2.1.3 of BellSouth’s proposed language:

A hybrid Loop is a local Loop, composed of both fiber optic cable, usually in the feeder plant, and copper twisted wire or cable, usually in the distribution plant.

He references footnote 832 of the TRO and claims, “As is the case with all loops, the definition includes any of the associated electronics, such as DLC systems.” He quotes ¶288 of the TRO and maintains, “the FCC ruled that hybrid loops should not be unbundled since they are part of the next-generation network.” He asserts that access to hybrid loops is prohibited with one limited exception. “The sole exception is to provide access to the time division multiplexing features of a hybrid loop in an overbuild situation (where continued access to existing copper is required by the FCC).” The remaining language of §2.1.3 discusses the access obligations of BellSouth:

BellSouth shall provide [CLEC] with nondiscriminatory access to the time division multiplexing features, functions and capabilities of such hybrid Loop, on an unbundled basis to establish a complete transmission path between BellSouth’s central office and an End User’s premises.

BellSouth suggests that the parties “do not appear to contest . . . includ[ing] the language contained in [the federal rules] in interconnection agreements.” BellSouth objects to CompSouth’s proposed language as it includes hybrid loops as a §271 obligation.

Joint CLECs

CompSouth witness Gillan suggests that BellSouth’s obligations regarding hybrid loops for serving the mass market are different than for serving the enterprise market. He emphasizes that ¶288 of the TRO states: “We decline to require incumbent LECs to unbundle the next-generation network, packetized capabilities of their hybrid loops to enable requesting carriers to provide broadband services to the mass market.” (emphasis by witness) The witness claims that this distinction is defined by the services provided to the end-user customer: “whenever a CLEC requests a DS1 loop to serve a customer, that request itself means that the customer is (or is becoming) a member of the enterprise market . . .”

Witness Gillan also testifies that BellSouth’s relief of its hybrid loop unbundling obligations is only limited to the packet-based capability. He contends that this limitation

“should not affect CLECs ability to obtain access to DS1 (and DS3) loops in any meaningful way.”

First, the FCC made clear that BellSouth must still provide DS1 and DS3 loops on such facilities. . . Second, the FCC’s policies are premised on the understanding that, to the extent that an ILEC does deploy a packet-based architecture, the packet-architecture parallels its TDM-network, and would not isolate customers from access to CLEC DS1-based services.

Witness Gillan testifies that the FCC’s narrow exception to BellSouth’s hybrid loop unbundling obligations “should have little practical effect.” The Joint CLECs also claim, “This limitation, however, should not affect CLECs’ ability to obtain access to DS1 (and DS3) loops in any meaningful way.”

B. ANALYSIS

CompSouth witness Gillan argues in great detail about whether a customer is considered an enterprise customer or a mass market customer. However, we are unsure what specifically is in dispute. Therefore, we will focus on the language proposed by the parties to resolve any disagreements. We find the TRO and the rules are clear regarding unbundling of hybrid loops and, in fact, the parties appear to agree on most of these points.

The language shown below is CompSouth’s proposed language. We note that BellSouth’s proposed language tracks almost identically with CompSouth’s proposal, except for the underlined portion.

2.1.3

A hybrid Loop is a local Loop, composed of both fiber optic cable, usually in the feeder plant, and copper twisted wire or cable, usually in the distribution plant. BellSouth shall provide CLEC with nondiscriminatory access to the time division multiplexing features, functions and capabilities of such hybrid Loop, including DS1 and DS3 capacity under Section 251 where impairment exists, on an unbundled basis to establish a complete transmission path between BellSouth’s central office and an End User’s premises. Where impairment does not exist, BellSouth shall provide such hybrid loop at just and reasonable rates pursuant to Section 271 at the rates set forth in Exhibit B. This access shall include access to all features, functions, and capabilities of the hybrid loop that are not used to transmit packetized information.

2.1.3.1

BellSouth shall not engineer the transmission capabilities of its network in a manner, or engage in any policy, practice, or procedure, that disrupts or degrades access to a local loop or subloop, including the time division multiplexing-based features, functions, and capabilities of a hybrid loop, for which a requesting

telecommunications carrier may obtain or has obtained access pursuant to this Attachment.

We find that the disputed language relates to §271 and whether BellSouth's §271 obligations should be included in the agreement. Consistent with our earlier finding, the disputed language shall not be included.

C. DECISION

BellSouth shall be required to provide the CLEC with nondiscriminatory access to the time division multiplexing features, functions and capabilities of a hybrid loop, including DS1 and DS3 capacity under Section 251 where impairment exists, on an unbundled basis to establish a complete transmission path between BellSouth's central office and an end user's premises. We find that the language proposed by BellSouth best implements our decision and shall be adopted. The approved language is found in Appendix A.

XV. ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATIONS

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Fogle asserts that the FCC defines RNMs in ¶632 of the TRO, where it states that ILECs must perform those activities that they regularly undertake for their own customers. He explains that RNMs "are industry-recognized standard changes to outside plant infrastructure in order to provide standard services." He notes that BellSouth will routinely perform for CLECs those network modifications, including line conditioning, that it does for its own customers, including xDSL customers. He advises that BellSouth may also perform additional line conditioning functions pursuant to collaborative agreements with CLECs; however, he contends that line conditioning functions beyond those that BellSouth performs for its own customers are not required by the FCC.

Witness Fogle explains, by way of example, that if the industry standard for the provision of DS1 service requires repeaters to be installed, BellSouth will provide them. He contends that RNMs do not include non-standard changes, such as the removal of load coils that were placed to meet industry standards for the provision of voice service. He states that in 2004 BellSouth received a mere two requests from CLECs for removal of load coils on loops over 18,000 feet in length. He notes that BellSouth does not remove load coils on such loops to serve its own customers. He advises that BellSouth received only 55 requests from CLECs for removal of bridged taps during the same year.

Witness Fogle contends that the FCC considers line conditioning to be a subset of RNMs, as indicated by the language in the TRO. He agrees with CompSouth witness Gillan that the rules for RNMs and for line conditioning are in different subparts of the CFR. However, he

contends that both subparts are included within the FCC's Specific Unbundling Requirements at 47 CFR 51.319. He explains that ¶250 of the TRO indicates that line conditioning "constitutes a form" of RNM, while ¶643 states that it is "properly" seen as a network modification. He asserts that this language shows the FCC's intent that line conditioning should be treated as a subset of RNMs.

Witness Fogle disagrees with witness Gillan that BellSouth must condition loop facilities for CLECs whether BellSouth performs a particular modification for its own customers or not. He asserts that because line conditioning is a subset of RNMs, "BellSouth's line conditioning obligation is based entirely on what it would do for its own customers." He clarifies that "BellSouth is not asserting that it needs to offer advanced services to a specific customer to have a routine network modification obligation." He explains that it is necessary, however, for BellSouth to routinely perform a requested RNM to provide services itself in order to have an obligation to perform similar modifications for CLECs.

Witness Fogle contends that witness Gillan is incorrect in his claim that BellSouth has an advantage in its DSL offerings because they are provided from remote terminals, which are located closer to customers than CLEC offerings to customers that the CLECs serve using longer loops. He advises that there are many customers that neither BellSouth nor the CLECs can reach with DSL services. He explains that both BellSouth and CLECs may have to use Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexers (DSLAMs) in remote terminals to provide such services; thus, they are in the same situation.

Witness Fogle states that BellSouth can agree to some of CompSouth's proposed language.

Joint CLECs

CompSouth witness Gillan opines that BellSouth must perform RNMs where an UNE loop has already been constructed. He notes that the FCC has provided examples of RNMs which

include, but are not limited to, rearranging or splicing of cable; adding an equipment case; adding a doubler or repeater; adding a smart jack; installing a repeater shelf; adding a line card; deploying a new multiplexer or reconfiguring an existing multiplexer; and attaching electronic and other equipment that the incumbent LEC ordinarily attaches to a DS1 loop to activate such loop for its own customer. They also include activities needed to enable a requesting telecommunications carrier to obtain access to a dark fiber loop. Routine modifications may entail activities such as accessing manholes, deploying bucket trucks to reach aerial cable, and installing equipment casing.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ 47 CFR 51.319(a)(8)(ii)(local loops); §51.319(e)(5)(ii)(dedicated transport).

He adds that the FCC also provided examples of what was not a RNM:

Routine network modifications do not include the construction of a new loop, or the installation of new aerial or buried cable for a requesting telecommunications carrier.⁴¹

Witness Gillan states that the language in the agreements must closely track the FCC's language. He agrees with BellSouth that the key is to ensure that the provisions contain BellSouth's obligation to perform "the same routine network modifications for high capacity loop facilities used to serve CLEC customers as it does for itself."

Witness Gillan states that line conditioning is not the same as a Routine Network Modification. He asserts that RNMs are distinct from line conditioning as evidenced by the separate rules: 47 CFR 51.319(a)(8) for RNMs and 47 CFR 51.319(a)(1)(iii) for line conditioning. He states that the FCC rule provisions make it clear that BellSouth must condition facilities regardless of whether the ILEC offers advanced services to the end-user customer on that copper loop or subloop. He contends that BellSouth need not routinely condition loop facilities for its own customers in order to be obligated to do so for CLECs.

Witness Gillan explains that while BellSouth houses its DSL offerings in remote terminals located closer to customers, CLECs must use longer loops because the CLECs are collocated in the central office. He contends that this difference could lead BellSouth to claim it does not have to provide line conditioning, because it does not do so to provide DSL to its own customers. He asserts that "because the FCC has specifically established Line Conditioning as an obligation that BellSouth must honor *whether or not it would do so for its own customers*, BellSouth must still condition facilities at the request of the CLEC at the TELRIC-compliant rates already approved by this Commission." (emphasis by witness)

Sprint

Sprint witness Maples agrees that the FCC defined a RNM as "an activity that the incumbent LEC regularly undertakes for its own customer." (47 CFR 51.319(a)(7) and 51.319(e)(4)(ii)) He opines that "the FCC wanted to ensure non-discriminatory treatment and to prevent any undue restrictions for access to UNEs." He notes that the FCC established principles and provided examples in the rule, but did not provide a detailed list of electronic components. (TRO ¶634) As noted in its brief, Sprint has reached agreement on this issue.

⁴¹ 47 CFR 51.319(a)(8)(ii)(local loops); §51.319(e)(5)(ii)(dedicated transport).

B. ANALYSIS

We agree with BellSouth that line conditioning is specifically a subset of RNMs. The FCC stated in paragraph 635 of the TRO that

. . . the routine modifications that we require today are substantially similar activities to those that the incumbent LECs currently undertake under our line conditioning rules. Specifically, based on the record, high-capacity loop modifications and line conditioning require comparable personnel, can be provisioned within similar intervals; and do not require a geographic extension of the network. (TRO ¶635, fns omitted)

CompSouth witness Gillan correctly pointed out that the rules pertaining to each are separate and distinct. Nevertheless, as shown above, the FCC considers line conditioning to be substantially similar to RNMs. Further, the FCC treats line conditioning as a RNM, stating that

incumbent LECs must make the routine adjustments to unbundled loops to deliver services at parity with how incumbent LECs provision such facilities for themselves. Similarly, in order to provide xDSL services to their own customers, incumbent LECs condition the customer's local loop. Thus, line conditioning is a term or condition that incumbent LECs apply to their provision of loops for their own customers and must offer to requesting carriers pursuant to their section 251(c)(3) nondiscrimination obligations. (TRO ¶643)

While the FCC required that ILECs need only provide line conditioning at parity with what they provide for themselves, there is no requirement that they go beyond that standard in provisioning loops to competitors. As noted by BellSouth in its brief, this Commission also found in our Joint Petitioners' Order that RNMs and line conditioning are to be performed at parity.

The language to implement these provisions contains two sections: 1) Routine Network Modifications; and 2) Line Conditioning. In formulating the approved language, we began with BellSouth's redline of CompSouth's proposed language as contained in EXH 21. While Sprint has reached agreement with BellSouth on this issue, as indicated in its position above, we note the language it provided is useful for the remaining parties' agreements. We incorporated a modification proposed by Sprint to the section that addresses RNMs. We agree with Sprint that the use of the term "anticipated the request" is vague and not required by the FCC.

C. DECISION

BellSouth shall provide the same routine network modifications and line conditioning that it normally provides for its own customers. We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth, CompSouth nor Sprint is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that parts of the language proposed by BellSouth, CompSouth, and Sprint shall be combined and adopted. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

XVI. RATES FOR ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATIONS

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Fogle states that “this issue encompasses a basic disagreement between the parties on what functions constitute a routine network modification, since the source of the obligation leads to the process for establishing a rate.” He contends that the methodology to determine the rate is based upon whether BellSouth is required to perform the modification. He explains that if the answer is yes, the rate is based on Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost (TELRIC), but if no, then the applicable rate will be contained in either a commercial agreement between BellSouth and the CLEC, or a tariff.

Witness Fogle opines that BellSouth’s language is consistent with the language in the TRO. He advises that BellSouth has offered alternative solutions to the CLECs. He explains that special construction is required to make a non-standard loop, and then convert it back to industry and BellSouth standards if the CLEC no longer needs it. He avers that BellSouth will undertake such special construction upon request from a CLEC. He notes that certain functions, such as line conditioning on a loop longer than 18,000 feet, are “non-standard, non-routine.” He states that the “costs are appropriately recovered under BellSouth’s FCC No. 1 tariff.” He contends that no language or rate is appropriate to be included in the amendment, since there is no FCC requirement to provide a non-standard modification. He asserts that “non-standard changes to loops are not routine network modifications.”

Witness Fogle states that the language proposed by CompSouth would only allow BellSouth to receive TELRIC-based rates already approved by this Commission, even for requested changes that were not included in the calculation of the TELRIC rate. He explains that BellSouth will apply previously approved rates where appropriate. However, he advises that for RNMs that do not have previously approved TELRIC rates, such RNMs should be handled on an individual case basis until we approve a rate.

Joint CLECs

CompSouth witness Gillan asserts that “because the FCC has specifically established Line Conditioning as an obligation that BellSouth must honor *whether or not it would do so for its own customers*, BellSouth must still condition facilities at the request of the CLEC at the TELRIC-compliant rates already approved by this Commission.” (emphasis by witness) No further testimony was provided.

Sprint

Sprint witness Maples contends that ILECs must prove that additional charges for RNM are not already included in the UNE recurring and/or nonrecurring rates. He advises that the FCC warned against double recovery of such costs in the TRO. He asserts that any additional

charges should be reviewed to determine which costs have already been included in the existing rates. He avers that the terms proposed by BellSouth accurately reflect this position except that BellSouth defines a modification as routine only if it was “anticipated.” Witness Maples states that such a restriction is vague and that he could not find any mention of “anticipation” in the FCC’s rules or orders. He opines that such language could be interpreted or used to “justify rejecting an UNE order or demanding additional charges.” As noted in its brief, Sprint has reached agreement on this issue.

B. ANALYSIS

While we agree with BellSouth witness Fogle that the driving factor in the pricing of an RNM is whether or not the RNM is required, we note that does not completely address the issue. The question to be answered is what the process should be to establish a rate to allow for the cost of a routine network modification that is not already recovered in Commission-approved recurring or nonrecurring rates. Virtually no testimony was provided on this point.

We agree with witness Maples that BellSouth’s language “anticipated the request” is vague and not required by the FCC. Although we find witness Maples’ modification of BellSouth’s language is more reasonable, we find the use of the FCC’s actual language would better accomplish Sprint’s goal. BellSouth references “normal operations” which has been retained by Sprint. We find this is also subject to interpretation as to what constitutes a normal operation. Therefore, we find that the words “normally provides for its own customers” shall be substituted such that the sentence will read:

If BellSouth normally provides such RNM for its own customers and has recovered the costs for performing such modifications through the rates set forth in Exhibit A, then BellSouth will perform such RNM at no additional charge.

We find this approach is in keeping with the UNE rates established by this Commission, where a nonrecurring rate of zero was established for unbundled loop modification of loops under 18,000 feet in length.⁴² Rates were also established for other loop conditioning procedures, such as bridged tap removal and load coil removal from loops over 18,000 feet.⁴³

As pointed out by BellSouth witness Fogle, non-standard procedures are not “routine.” We agree. The issue is how to determine rates for those procedures that do fall under the category of routine network modifications, but which do not already have an established rate. If a procedure is routine, it appears that BellSouth could anticipate it. Thus, BellSouth should already have a TELRIC rate established by this Commission. We find it appropriate for BellSouth to continue to use such rates, which it appears willing to do, until additional rates, if needed, can be established in a proceeding before this Commission. We find this will not pose an undue hardship on either BellSouth or the parties. As testified to by BellSouth witness Fogle, requests from CLECs for certain modifications have been very limited.

⁴² Investigation into Pricing of Unbundled Network Elements, Order No. PSC-01-2051-FOF-TP, Docket No. 990649-TP, issued October 18, 2001, p. 49.

⁴³ Ibid.

The approved language we find is included under Section XV. As discussed there, BellSouth has agreed in part to the language provided by the Joint CLECs. The change discussed above tracks the language of the FCC rules. While Sprint has reached agreement with BellSouth on this issue, as indicated in its position above, we note the language it provided is useful for the remaining parties' agreements.

C. DECISION

BellSouth shall use the rates approved by this Commission in the UNE Order. If any additional rates are needed, BellSouth should petition this Commission to establish those rates. We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth, CompSouth nor Sprint is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that parts of the language proposed by BellSouth, CompSouth, and Sprint shall be combined and adopted as discussed in the analysis. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

XVII. OVERBUILD DEPLOYMENTS OF FIBER TO THE HOME AND FIBER TO THE CURB FACILITIES

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Fogle maintains that BellSouth has no obligation to unbundle FTTH loops in overbuild situations, except where the ILEC elects to retire existing copper loops. In this case, the ILEC has to provide unbundled access to a 64 Kbps transmission path over the FTTH loop. Where the copper loops have not been retired, the ILEC, at its option, may provide unbundled access to a spare copper loop. As part of its proposed contract language, witness Fogle notes in FTTH/FTTC overbuild areas where it has not yet retired copper facilities, BellSouth is not obligated to ensure that such copper loops are capable of transmitting signals prior to receiving a request for access. He maintains that if a request is received, BellSouth will restore the copper loop to serviceable condition if technically feasible. BellSouth witness Fogle maintains that the time it will take to provide the copper loop will need to be negotiated.

Joint CLECs

In response to our staff's third set of interrogatories, CompSouth agreed that in brownfield (i.e. overbuild) situations, BellSouth may either continue to offer access to copper loops that have not been retired, or unbundle a 64 Kbps channel on the fiber loop if the copper loop has been retired. CompSouth further notes, however, that this limitation would not exempt BellSouth from its obligations to continue to offer unbundled access to DS1 capacity loops. As part of CompSouth's suggested contract language in Exhibit 23, witness Gillan proposes adding the following sentence to BellSouth's language regarding copper loop retirement:

BellSouth's retirement of copper Loops must comply with Applicable Law.

Sprint

Sprint witness Maples agrees with BellSouth witness Fogle that an ILEC does not have to unbundle the FTTH/FTTC overbuild facilities as long as it maintains access to the existing copper loop facilities. Where Sprint witness Maples disagrees with BellSouth relates to the applicability of this obligation to enterprise customers. Sprint witness Maples argues that the overbuild exemption does not apply to enterprise customers for the same reasons greenfield restrictions do not apply.

To incorporate this interpretation, Sprint witness Maples has proposed amending section 2.1.2.2 of BellSouth's suggested contract language to include the following sentence: "FTTH/FTTC loops do not include local loops to enterprise customers or predominantly business MDUs."⁴⁴ BellSouth witness Fogle asserts, however, BellSouth and Sprint have now resolved their difference on this issue. The language he points to as being acceptable to both eliminates the phrase "enterprise customers or" from the language above.

B. ANALYSIS

The testimony filed in the record of this proceeding specifically addressing the issue of overbuilt deployment of fiber is limited.

In overbuild (or brownfield) deployments, an ILEC constructs fiber transmission facilities parallel to or in replacement of its existing copper plant. (TRO ¶ 276) The FCC concludes that in these brownfield areas, the ILEC must ensure continued access to unbundle a transmission path suitable for providing narrowband services to customers served by such FTTH loops. (TRO ¶ 277) In order to guarantee continued narrowband access, ILECs have the option either to:

- (1) Keep the existing copper loop connected to a particular customer premises after deploying FTTH;⁴⁵ or
- (2) In situations where the ILEC elects to retire the copper loop, it must provide unbundled access to a 64 Kbps transmission path over its FTTH loop.⁴⁶

The FCC declined to prohibit an ILEC from retiring copper loops they have replaced with FTTH loops. The FCC stressed that it was not preempting the ability of any state commission to evaluate an ILEC's retirement of its copper loops to ensure such retirement complies with any applicable state legal or regulatory requirements. However, the FCC was specific that it did not establish independent authority based on federal law for states to review ILEC copper loop retirement policies. (TRO ¶¶ 281-284)

⁴⁴ We note what appears to be a typographic error in the testimony of witness Maples. Witness Maples compares the unbundling requirements of brownfield to greenfield areas.

⁴⁵ TRO ¶ 277; 47 C.F.R. Part 51.319(a)(3)(ii)(A).

⁴⁶ TRO ¶ 277; 47 C.F.R. Part 51.319(a)(3)(ii)(C).

Sprint witness Maples testified that the overbuild exemptions do not apply and that the overbuild exclusions do not apply to enterprise customers. He proposes the same modifications with respect to his issue as he proposed in Section XIII. We do not believe that this language is supported by the TRO. The FCC notes that its market classifications are not intended to prohibit the use of UNE loops by customers not typically associated with a given customer market class. (TRO ¶210)

While the testimony of CompSouth witness Gillan does not directly address brownfield areas, we find that CompSouth's responses to our staff's interrogatories make it clear that CompSouth believes ILECs are required to unbundle DS1 loops irrespective of an area's brownfield or greenfield designation. We note the FCC's TRO Errata did not address brownfield areas. Further, Exhibit 37, the FCC's Opposition to Allegiance Telecom's Motion for Stay Pending Review, does not address brownfield deployment.

We find that BellSouth's proposed contract language is, for the most part, consistent with the FCC's rules.⁴⁷ Unlike the FCC's greenfield FTTH/FTTC rules, the overbuild FTTH/FTTC rule is quite clear as to the limited circumstances where an ILEC is still obligated to unbundle. The language in the parties' ICA should closely track the FCC's rule. We find it appropriate to add specific language that BellSouth's retirement of copper loops must comply with applicable law. We find that this is consistent with the TRO. (TRO ¶ 284) Furthermore, BellSouth witness Fogle indicated that he did not object to the inclusion of this language.

C. CONCLUSION

The unbundling requirements of an incumbent carrier with respect to overbuilt FTTH/FTTC loops are limited to either unbundled access to a copper loop or (if the ILEC elects to retire the copper loop) a 64 Kbps transmission path over the FTTH/FTTC loop. We find that the language proposed by BellSouth best implements our decision, with minor modifications as discussed in the analysis, and shall be adopted. The approved language is found in Appendix A.

XVIII. EEL AUDIT RIGHTS

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth

BellSouth contends that its language should be accepted because it most closely follows the TRO's requirements. BellSouth witness Tipton argues, "the FCC was clear in stating the parameters of an EELs audit. The language in the interconnection agreements should reflect these parameters and need not go further." That language can be found in Exhibit PAT-1 at §5.3.4.3 or in Exhibit PAT-2 at §4.3.4.3 and it reads as follows:

⁴⁷ 47 C.F.R. Part 51.319(a)(3)(ii).

BellSouth may, on an annual basis, audit [CLEC]'s records in order to verify compliance with the qualifying service eligibility criteria. The audit shall be conducted by a third party independent auditor, and the audit must be performed in accordance with the standards established by the American Institute for Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). To the extent the independent auditor's report concludes that [CLEC] failed to comply with the service eligibility criteria, [CLEC] must true-up any difference in payments, convert all noncompliant circuits to the appropriate service, and make the correct payments on a going-forward basis. In the event the auditor's report concludes that [CLEC] did not comply in any material respect with the service eligibility criteria, [CLEC] shall reimburse BellSouth for the cost of the independent auditor. To the extent the auditor's report concludes that [CLEC] did comply in all material respects with the service eligibility criteria, BellSouth will reimburse [CLEC] for its reasonable and demonstrable costs associated with the audit. [CLEC] will maintain appropriate documentation to support its certifications.

Witness Tipton explains the reimbursement procedures set forth in the TRO and how the language indicated above comports with the TRO. She quotes the TRO in ¶627 and ¶628:

[T]o the extent the independent auditor's report concludes that the competitive LEC failed to comply in all material respects with the service eligibility criteria, the competitive LEC must reimburse the incumbent LEC for the cost of the independent auditor.

...

[T]o the extent the independent auditor's report concludes that the requesting carrier complied in all material respects with the eligibility criteria, the incumbent LEC must reimburse the audited carrier for its costs associated with the audit.

BellSouth witness Tipton explains why BellSouth has not proposed to use the phrase "in all material respects" in both reimbursement scenarios: whether the CLEC should reimburse the ILEC for the cost of the audit and whether the ILEC should reimburse the CLEC for its costs incurred in complying with the audit. She claims that during the discussions and negotiations of this interconnection agreement, "[s]ome CLECs indicated that they would argue that they were not responsible for the cost of the auditor unless the auditor found that they did not comply in any respect with the service eligibility criteria." She testifies that the CLECs were arguing that "the sentence means 'failed in all material respects.'" In order to clarify, "BellSouth's proposal includes 'any material respect' in the provision that governs when the CLEC is responsible for the cost of the auditor."

Witness Tipton also testifies that including a list of acceptable auditors in the interconnection agreement is unnecessary. She states, "Because the TRO and the ICA language proposed by BellSouth include the requirement that the AICPA standards be followed, any auditor who can meet those standards should be acceptable." She claims that such a list would

lead to great expense to both parties and endless delays. She also claims that it would “provide a convenient means for CLECs to avoid an audit.” Further, BellSouth responds in discovery that “any dispute or concern should be vetted at the conclusion of an audit.”

Joint CLECs

CompSouth witness Gillan testifies, “Principles that the FCC established are that the ILEC should use an independent auditor and perform audits no more than once each year. To assure independence, the auditor should be mutually agreed upon by BellSouth and the CLEC.” Witness Gillan proposes that BellSouth should provide proper notification that includes the basis for BellSouth’s assertion that certain circuits are noncompliant. He suggests that the notification should identify the specific circuits that are noncompliant and include relevant documentation that will verify BellSouth’s assertions. “This approach is necessary to give ‘teeth’ to the FCC’s *for-cause* audit standard; undocumented cause is no cause at all.” (emphasis in original) CompSouth’s proposal “would identify potential issues quickly, thus avoiding unnecessary disputes over whether BellSouth may or may not proceed with an audit.” (Id.) The witness testifies that with this approach, “it is more likely that BellSouth and the target CLEC will be able to narrow and/or more quickly resolve disputes over whether or not BellSouth has the right to proceed with an EEL audit.” Quoting the TRO at ¶622, he asserts that “BellSouth has only a ‘limited right to audit,’ not an open invitation; in addition, the FCC’s intention was to grant CLECs ‘. . . unimpeded UNE access based upon self-certification, subject to later verification based upon cause.’” (emphasis by witness) While witness Gillan admits that the TRO does not specifically require such a notice, he maintains “this Commission may order such a requirement” referring to ¶625 in the TRO.

The Joint CLECs also point out, “Another disputed issue regarding EELs audits relates to which party selects the auditor.” CompSouth’s proposed language requires mutual agreement to the auditor prior to commencement of the audit. The Joint CLECs assert this is the “most simple and straightforward way to decide whether an auditor is truly independent.” They are “unwilling to agree to a ‘pre-approved’ list of entities . . . unless such list also includes a mechanism for identifying conflicts and disqualifying particular auditors based on conflicts.”

B. ANALYSIS

In the TRO, the FCC allows CLECs access to certain EELs. (TRO ¶586) All EELs must satisfy the revised EEL eligibility criteria contained in the TRO, which include 911/E911 capability, termination into a collocation arrangement and local number assignment. (TRO ¶593) Similar to the Supplemental Order Clarification, the TRO allows a CLEC to self-certify that it is in compliance with the EEL eligibility criteria, and the ILEC to verify compliance through the auditing process. (TRO ¶623)

Self-certification, simply stated, is a CLEC attesting that the EEL in question meets the service eligibility criteria. Upon receipt of the self-certification, the FCC requires the ILEC to provide the facility to the requesting CLEC. Details of the self-certification process are not

addressed by the FCC; in fact, it declined to specify the form of such certification, but found that a “letter sent to the incumbent LEC by a requesting carrier is a practical method.” (TRO ¶624) In footnote 1900, the FCC explained its reasoning: “The success of facilities-based competition depends on the ability of competitors to obtain the unbundled facilities for which they are eligible in a timely fashion. Thus, an incumbent LEC that questions the competitor’s certification may do so by initiating the audit procedures set forth below.” (TRO ¶624 fn 1900) The audit procedures explained in the TRO are similar to those contained in the Supplemental Order Clarification.

The Joint CLECs are asking this Commission to add steps to the auditing process which could hinder the process. One such step is the requirement that BellSouth identify the specific circuits that it wishes to audit and provide documentation to back up its claims. According to CompSouth witness Gillan, “This approach is necessary to give ‘teeth’ to the FCC’s *for-cause* audit standard; undocumented cause is no cause at all.” (emphasis in original) We understand the Joint CLECs’ concern of unwarranted audits; however, the FCC addressed those concerns:

[T]o the extent the independent auditor’s report concludes that the requesting carrier complied in all material respects with the eligibility criteria, the incumbent LEC must reimburse the audited carrier for its costs associated with the audit. We expect that this reimbursement requirement *will eliminate the potential for abusive or unfounded audits*, so that incumbent LEC[s] will only rely on the audit mechanism in appropriate circumstances. (emphasis added) (TRO ¶628)

If an ILEC were allowed to audit any CLEC at any time with no repercussions, the scale is unfairly tipped toward the ILEC. On the other hand, the FCC requires the CLEC to reimburse the ILEC for the cost of the audit if the auditor found material *noncompliance*; in this way, the FCC hoped to ensure a CLEC only ordered EEL circuits when it was entitled to them. (TRO ¶627) If a CLEC is able to delay that process, the scale is tipped toward the CLEC. We find the FCC’s rules set out in the TRO achieve a reasonable balance, and that adding additional conditions is not appropriate and may upset this balance.

We agree with BellSouth that requiring BellSouth to identify specific circuits and to provide documentation to support its belief of noncompliance, could unnecessarily delay the audit. BellSouth witness Tipton stresses, “BellSouth is under no obligation to provide the grounds to support its request for an audit. Doing so would serve no purpose other than to enable the audited CLEC to unreasonably dispute and, therefore, delay the audit.” In order to ensure that the audit process is not hindered by such delays, the notice need only include any information that BellSouth has agreed to provide. Moreover, BellSouth agrees that it will not audit without cause, since it must pay for the audit. We understand that an audit without cause would certainly be cost-prohibitive, as BellSouth is required to pay for the audit and reimburse the CLEC for its costs to comply with the audit, if the auditor finds the CLEC has materially complied. (TRO ¶628)

We note that CompSouth witness Gillan does not discuss in detail the need to mutually agree to the auditor prior to the audit commencing. Yet, the language submitted by witness

Gillan does indicate the desire on the part of the Joint CLECs to mutually agree to the auditor and the location prior to an audit taking place. Additionally, the Joint CLECs argue that mutual agreement is necessary to ensure true independence of the auditor. We note that the TRO does not offer specific guidance on who should conduct the audit, but states, “we recognize that the details surrounding the implementation of these audits may be specific to related provisions of interconnection agreements . . . the states are in a better position to address that implementation.” (TRO ¶625) The FCC even used the independent auditor as a specific example of a possible area of concern. (TRO ¶625)

The Joint CLECs’ request that an auditor be chosen and agreed to in advance is, on the surface, equitable. The Joint CLECs do have a substantial interest in the outcome of the audit and the importance of the independence of the auditor is clear. However, BellSouth makes a strong argument that allowing the Joint CLECs to veto the selection of the auditor could delay the audit significantly. In addition, BellSouth states that the Commission should make a finding in this docket consistent with that made in the Verizon Arbitration Order. Specifically, BellSouth requests that it be allowed to obtain the auditor.⁴⁸ (Verizon Arbitration Order pp. 115-119) As stated above, we find that disruption of the audit significantly undermines the FCC’s TRO rules regarding the self-certification process and the audit process. These processes should be strictly adhered to as set forth in the TRO in order to ensure the balance is maintained between the ILEC’s need for compliance and the CLEC’s need for unimpeded access. If the audit process is hindered by postponement of an audit, the CLEC could continue to improperly obtain access to nonconforming facilities at unbundled rates. As such, we find it appropriate that BellSouth choose the auditor. However, as agreed to by the parties, either BellSouth or the CLEC being audited may petition this Commission for resolution of any disputes arising out of an audit; we find this would include selection of the auditor. Therefore, we find that BellSouth shall attempt to find an appropriate independent auditor to perform the audit, in order to avoid legal disputes after the audit is completed.

Finally, we note that BellSouth has changed the word “any” to “all” in its language with regard to materiality. We find this change is significant. However, BellSouth has agreed that the auditor determines whether the CLEC has complied or failed to comply in all material respects. Also, if BellSouth believes the auditor incorrectly interprets the language, it may bring that dispute to this Commission for resolution. Therefore, we find this change is unnecessary.

C. DECISION

We find that BellSouth need not identify the specific circuits that are to be audited or provide additional detailed documentation prior to an audit of a CLEC’s EELs. The audit shall be performed by an independent, third-party auditor selected by BellSouth. The audit shall be performed according to the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants

⁴⁸ We note that this issue was also recently addressed in Docket No. 040130-TP, an arbitration between BellSouth and several CLECs. In that docket we concluded that “ . . . the audit shall be performed by an independent, third-party auditor selected by BellSouth from a list of at least four auditors included in the interconnection agreement.” (Joint Petitioners’ Order, p. 49) However, the parties in this docket have stated that a list of auditors would be inappropriate.

(AICPA). The CLEC may dispute any portion of the audit following the dispute resolution procedures contained in the interconnection agreement after the audit is complete. We find that neither the language proposed by BellSouth nor CompSouth is totally appropriate to implement our decision. Instead, we find that the language proposed by BellSouth, with the modifications discussed in our analysis, shall be adopted. Our approved language is found in Appendix A.

XIX. FCC'S ISP REMAND CORE FORBEARANCE ORDER

A. PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

BellSouth states that we should resolve this issue on a carrier-by-carrier basis depending on the specific facts. BellSouth contends that given the option for CLECs to choose different rate structures in the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order, a "one-size-fits-all" approach is inappropriate.

The Joint CLECs contend that the contractual changes to implement the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order may differ among various CLECs' ICAs, but the underlying principle is that all references to the "new markets" and "growth cap" restrictions should be deleted. The Joint CLECs argue that those restrictions no longer limit the CLECs' reciprocal compensation rights. As such, the Joint CLECs argue that ICAs should be amended to remove the "new markets" and "growth caps" provisions. The Joint CLECs further contend that the argument BellSouth makes to implement the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order on an ad hoc basis is flawed, because the Order's provisions only impact those CLECs who have chosen reciprocal compensation rate plans that include the restrictions. The Joint CLECs argue that the FCC ordered that those limitations should no longer be enforced and did not seek to limit CLEC or ILEC reciprocal compensation options. The Joint CLECs suggest that we implement the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order by ordering that ICAs that include the restrictions may be amended on the same timeline and processes that apply to amendments related to changes in either the TRO or TRRO.

B. ANALYSIS

In previous arbitration proceedings before this Commission, the parties file ICAs in which disputed language may be reviewed and considered. However, in this particular proceeding we do not have the benefit of any such language concerning intercarrier compensation provisions. Instead, this proceeding is a generic proceeding in which we are primarily setting language for parties and non-parties alike sufficient to implement the TRO and the TRRO. The parties in this proceeding have not proposed language for this issue for inclusion in existing and new ICAs; instead, BellSouth contends that implementation of the FCC's findings in the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order should be done on a carrier by carrier basis, while the Joint CLECs apparently want this Commission to order that references in existing ICAs to growth caps or the "new markets" rule be stricken. There appears to be no dispute that the FCC granted forbearance with regard to growth caps and the "new markets" rule. Parties are (and have been) entitled to invoke their contractual change-of-law provisions to amend their

ICAs as appropriate.⁴⁹ Moreover, we find that the FCC intended to lift the restrictions regarding “new markets” and “growth caps” and to apply its forbearance to “all telecommunications carriers.” ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order at ¶27.

However, we again note that no language is before the Commission on this issue. Further, there is no evidence in this record as to what give and take may have occurred in arriving at the multitude of ICAs containing reciprocal compensation provisions, as well as whether there are interrelated provisions that may differ somewhat from the details in the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order. For these reasons, we are hesitant to unilaterally order that an unknown number of ICAs be amended to strike all references to growth caps and the “new markets” rule. Rather, we find that all affected CLECs are entitled to amend their agreements to implement the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order; such amendments shall be handled on a carrier-by-carrier basis.

C. DECISION

We find that all affected CLECs are entitled to amend their agreements to implement the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order; such amendments shall be handled on a carrier-by-carrier basis. Accordingly, no language is necessary for this issue.

XX. EXISTING SECTION 252 INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENTS

A. PARTIES’ ARGUMENTS

BellSouth contends that we should approve specific contract language that resolves each disputed issue and can be promptly executed to meet the FCC’s transitional deadlines. BellSouth requests that we order that the parties execute amendments to their ICAs within a certain timeframe following issuance of the written order specifying the contract language. BellSouth further requests that we order that if an amendment is not executed within this certain timeframe, then the Commission-specified language will go into effect for all CLECs in the state of Florida, regardless of whether an amendment is signed.

The Joint CLECs take no position on whether the order stemming from this proceeding can or should bind non-parties. Rather, the Joint CLECs argue that we should take no action to affect existing agreements that address how such changes of law should be incorporated into existing and new §252 ICAs. The Joint CLECs contend that the proposed UNE contract language submitted by BellSouth includes language on many issues that are not in dispute in this proceeding, and should not be approved by this Commission. Furthermore, the Joint CLECs contend that they should not have to accept new contract language that is unrelated to the disputed issues in this proceeding. The Joint CLECs suggest that CompSouth’s contract

⁴⁹ We note that the ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order, granting Core’s petition with regard to the growth caps and “new markets” rule provisions, was released on October 18, 2004.

language proposal⁵⁰ and BellSouth's redline⁵¹ of the CompSouth proposal accurately set forth the disputed issues in this proceeding.

B. ANALYSIS

BellSouth and the Joint CLECs appear to agree that our decisions in this proceeding shall form the basis for amendments to the parties' ICAs, unless the parties have agreed otherwise. BellSouth argues that amendments should be binding on non-parties to this proceeding, whereas the Joint CLECs refrain from taking a position on whether non-parties should be bound. By Order No. PSC-05-0639-PCO-TP, issued June 14, 2005, we established the scope of this proceeding, ruling that "it is appropriate that all certificated CLECs operating in BellSouth's Florida territory be bound by the ultimate findings in this proceeding."⁵² Accordingly, we find that non-parties should be bound by the amendments arising from our determinations in this proceeding. We find that the resulting amendments be limited to the disputed issues in this proceeding and not affect language unrelated to the disputed issues in this proceeding.

BellSouth requests that we provide a timeframe in which amendments are to be executed, while the Joint Petitioners take the position that amendments should be executed within a reasonable time to allow for compliance with our decision in this proceeding. Our common practice in previous arbitrations has been to issue a final order to incorporate this Commission's arbitrated decisions.⁵³ Generally, a signed amendment or agreement is filed thereafter, and we subsequently issue an order to approve the signed amendment or agreement.⁵⁴ We note, however, that the agreement is deemed approved pursuant to §252 (e)(4) of the Act if we do not take action to approve or reject it within 30 days of filing.⁵⁵

In order to comply with the FCC's transitional deadline, and in light of the timing of the issuance of this order, we direct that the agreements and amendments that are filed to reflect our decisions herein shall contain an effective date of March 11, 2006, subject to ultimate approval of the agreements by the Commission. In addition, to effectuate such ultimate approval as quickly as possible, we grant staff administrative authority to approve any amendments and agreements filed in accordance with our decisions in this proceeding.

C. DECISION

In accordance with our ruling in Order No. PSC-05-0639-PCO-TP, issued in this docket, we find that parties and non-parties shall be bound to the amendments arising from our determinations in this proceeding. For non-parties, we find that the resulting amendments be

⁵⁰ Revised Exhibit No. JPG-1 to Mr. Gillan's testimony.

⁵¹ Exhibit No. PAT-5 to Ms. Tipton's rebuttal testimony.

⁵² *Petition to establish generic docket to consider amendments to interconnection agreements resulting from changes in law by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.*, Docket 041269-TP, FPSC Order No. PSC-05-0639-PCO-TP at 1.

⁵³ *Petition for arbitration of amendment to interconnection agreements with certain competitive local exchange carriers and commercial mobile radio service providers in Florida by Verizon Florida, Inc.*, Docket 040156-TP, FPSC Order No. PSC-05-1200-FOF-TP at 89, Issued December 5, 2005.

⁵⁴ Id.

⁵⁵ Id.

limited to the disputed issues in this proceeding and not affect language unrelated to the disputed issues in this proceeding.

In order to comply with the FCC's transitional deadline, and consistent with the Prehearing Officer's February 21, 2006 order, we direct that interconnection agreements and amendments reflecting our decisions set forth herein shall be filed by March 10, 2006. Such agreements and amendments shall specify an effective date of March 11, 2006, subject to ultimate approval of the agreements by the Commission. In addition, we grant our staff administrative authority to approve any such agreements and amendments filed in accordance with our decisions in this proceeding.

This docket shall remain open pending our approval of all final arbitration agreements and amendments in accordance with §252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the specific findings set forth in this Order are approved in every respect. It is further

ORDERED that the issues for arbitration identified in this docket are resolved as set forth within the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that the parties and non-parties shall be bound to the amendments arising from our determinations in this proceeding. For non-parties, the resulting amendments shall be limited to the disputed issues in this proceeding and not affect language unrelated to the disputed issues in this proceeding. It is further

ORDERED, that agreements and amendments reflecting our decisions in this proceeding shall be filed by March 10, 2006, and shall specify an effective date of March 11, 2006, subject to ultimate approval of the agreements by the Commission. It is further

ORDERED that we grant our staff administrative authority to approve any amendments and agreements filed in accordance with our decisions in this proceeding. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall remain open pending our approval of all final arbitration agreements and amendments in accordance with §252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 2nd day of March, 2006.

BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director
Division of the Commission Clerk
and Administrative Services

By: /s/ Kay Flynn
Kay Flynn, Chief
Bureau of Records

This is a facsimile copy. Go to the Commission's Web site,
<http://www.floridapsc.com> or fax a request to 1-850-413-
7118, for a copy of the order with signature.

(S E A L)

AJT/KS

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request:
1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

COMMISSIONER ARRIAGA dissents from the Commission's decision in Section VI of this Order:

The question posed to the Commission has yet to be answered by a controlling authority, although there have been several State Commissions and District Courts deciding the issue. Let us first begin with the premise that this Commission has controlling authority to approve or disapprove interconnection agreements independent of their formation (i.e. negotiation, arbitration, or mediation). 47 U.S.C. §252(e)(1) These agreements are within our purview and under our jurisdiction. Further, in §271 of the Act, competitive checklist items (i) and (ii) make explicit reference to acquiescence with §§251 and 252. The reference in §271 creates a vehicle for the BOC's to be able to demonstrate compliance with §271. It follows that if §252 agreements are vehicles for §271 compliance, then those obligations within §271 can be included in interconnection agreements. There have been several commissions and courts that have come to this same conclusion.

Further, it has been said that the FCC has preempted State Commissions because we do not have enforcement jurisdiction over §271 obligations. In this instance, the Commission would not be enforcing §271, nor would I argue that we have §271 enforcement authority. By including these obligations we would simply be preserving this Commission's jurisdiction and the right to set rates, not enforcing. The Act does not give the FCC sole ratemaking authority of §271 elements, which is the same conclusion reached by the United States District Court for the District of Maine.⁵⁶ The Act is clear on the actions the FCC may take in enforcing §271, delineated in subsections (d)(6)(A)(i), (ii) and (iii). We would not be acting within the FCC's enforcement mechanism or passing judgment on the actions of BellSouth. By setting rates, we are not interfering with the scope of the FCC or any action that they deem appropriate.

In conclusion, it does not appear that setting rates is encroaching on the FCC purview of enforcement; it is further clear that the Act unambiguously refers to §§251 and 252 in §271 in reference to compliance. Based on this, our jurisdiction is preserved by having §271 elements included in §252 agreements.

⁵⁶ *Verizon New England, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Maine v. Maine Public Utilities Commission*, Civil No. 05-53-B-C, Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (November 30, 2005)

Index of Our Approved Language

Issue (Page reference in Appendix)	BellSouth's Proposed Language		CompSouth's Proposed Language		Combination of BellSouth and CompSouth Language Proposals
	<u>With No Changes</u>	<u>With Changes</u>	<u>With No Changes</u>	<u>With Changes</u>	
Section II					X
Section III	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Section IV					X
Section V					X
Sections VI and VII	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Section VIII		X			
Section IX		X			
Section X	X				
Section XI		X			
Section XII		X			
Section XIII					X
Section XIV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Section XV					X
Section XVI					X
Section XVII		X			
Section XVIII		X			
Sections XIX and XX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Section II: Implementation of the FCC's Transition Plan for

- (1) Switching,**
- (2) High Capacity Loops and**
- (3) Dedicated Transport.**

Approved Language: The approved language below is applicable only to CLECs having existing ICAs with BellSouth.

Transition for DS1 and DS3 Loops

For purposes of this Section __, the Transition Period for the Embedded Base of DS1 and DS3 Loops and for the Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops is the twelve (12) month period beginning March 11, 2005 and ending March 10, 2006.

For purposes of this Section __, Embedded Base means DS1 and DS3 Loops that were in service for <<customer_short_name>> as of March 11, 2005, in those wire centers that, as of such date, met the criteria set forth in Section __. Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Embedded Base.

Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops are those <<customer_short_name>> DS1 and DS3 Loops in service as of March 11, 2005, in excess of the caps set forth in Sections __ and __ below, respectively. Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Agreement, and except as set forth in Section __, BellSouth shall make available DS1 and DS3 Loops only for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base during the Transition Period:

DS1 Loops to any Building served by a wire center containing 60,000 or more Business Lines and four (4) or more fiber-based collocators (DS1 Threshold).

DS3 Loops to any Building served by a wire center containing 38,000 or more Business Lines and four (4) or more fiber-based collocators (DS3 Threshold).

The initial list of wire centers (Initial Wire Center List) meeting the criteria set forth in Sections __ and __ above, is set forth in Exhibit __. As of the effective date of this Amendment, no self-certification in any wire center set forth in the Initial Wire Center List is permitted.

Transition Period Pricing. From March 11, 2005, through the completion of the Transition Period, BellSouth shall charge a rate for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base and <<customer_short_name>>'s Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops equal to the higher of:

115% of the rate paid for that element on June 15, 2004; or

115% of a new rate the Commission establishes, if any, between June 16, 2004 and March 11, 2005.

These rates shall be as set forth in Exhibit _.

The Transition Period shall apply only to (1) <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base and (2) <<customer_short_name>>'s Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops. <<customer_short_name>> shall not add new DS1 or DS3 loops pursuant to this Agreement.

<<customer_short_name>> shall provide spreadsheets to BellSouth no later than March 10, 2006, identifying the specific DS1 and DS3 Loops, including the Embedded Base and Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops to be either (1) disconnected and transitioned to wholesale facilities obtained from other carriers or self-provisioned facilities; or (2) converted to other available UNE Loops or other wholesale facilities provided by BellSouth, including special access. For Conversions as defined in Section _, such spreadsheets shall take the place of an LSR or ASR. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Embedded Base and Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops. If a <<customer_short_name>> chooses to convert the DS1 and DS3 UNE Loops to special access circuits, BellSouth will include such DS1 and DS3 Loops once converted within <<customer_short_name>>'s total special access circuits and apply any discounts to which <<customer_short_name>> is entitled.

If <<customer_short_name>> submits the spreadsheet(s) for its Embedded Base and Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops on or before March 10, 2006, those identified circuits shall be subject to the Commission-approved switch-as-is conversion nonrecurring charges and no UNE disconnect charges.

If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit the spreadsheet(s) for its Embedded Base and Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops on or before March 10, 2006, BellSouth will identify and transition such circuits to the equivalent wholesale services provided by BellSouth. Those circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth pursuant to this Section shall be subject to all applicable UNE disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service as set forth in BellSouth's tariffs.

For Embedded Base circuits and Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops converted, the applicable recurring tariff charge shall apply to each circuit as of March 11, 2006. The transition of the Embedded Base and Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops should be performed in a manner that avoids, or otherwise minimizes to the extent possible, disruption or degradation to <<customer_short_name>>'s customers' service.

Dark Fiber Loop

Dark Fiber Loop is an unused optical transmission facility, without attached signal regeneration, multiplexing, aggregation or other electronics, from the demarcation point at an End User's premises to the End User's serving wire center. Dark Fiber Loops may be strands of optical fiber existing in aerial or underground structure. BellSouth will not provide line terminating elements,

regeneration or other electronics necessary for <<customer_short_name>> to utilize Dark Fiber Loops.

Transition for Dark Fiber Loop

For purposes of this Section __, the Transition Period for Dark Fiber Loops is the eighteen (18) month period beginning March 11, 2005 and ending September 10, 2006.

For purposes of this Section __, Embedded Base means Dark Fiber Loops that were in service for <<customer_short_name>> as of March 11, 2005. Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Embedded Base.

During the Transition Period only, BellSouth shall make available for the Embedded Base Dark Fiber Loops for <<customer_short_name>> at the terms and conditions set forth in this Attachment.

Transition Period Pricing. From March 11, 2005, through the completion of the Transition Period, BellSouth shall charge a rate for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base of Dark Fiber Loops equal to the higher of:

115% of the rate paid for that element on June 15, 2004; or

115% of a new rate the Commission establishes, if any, between June 16, 2004 and March 11, 2005.

These rates shall be as set forth in Exhibit __.

The Transition Period shall apply only to <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base and <<customer_short_name>> shall not add new Dark Fiber Loops pursuant to this Agreement.

Effective September 11, 2006, Dark Fiber Loops will no longer be made available pursuant to this Agreement.

<<customer_short_name>> shall provide spreadsheets to BellSouth no later than September 10, 2006, identifying the specific Dark Fiber Loops, to be either disconnected or converted to other BellSouth services. <<customer_short_name>> may transition from Dark Fiber Loops to other available wholesale facilities provided by BellSouth, including special access, wholesale facilities obtained from other carriers, or self-provisioned facilities. For Conversions as defined in Section __, such spreadsheets shall take the place of an LSR or ASR. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Embedded Base Dark Fiber Loops. If a <<customer_short_name>> chooses to convert the Dark Fiber UNE Loops to special access circuits, BellSouth will include such Dark Fiber Loops once converted within <<customer_short_name>>'s total special access circuits and apply any discounts to which <<customer_short_name>> is entitled.

If <<customer_short_name>> submits the spreadsheets specified in Section _ above for all of its Embedded Base on or before September 10, 2006, Conversions shall be subject to Commission-approved switch-as-is charges and no UNE disconnect charges.

If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit the spreadsheet(s) specified in Section _ above for all of its Embedded Base on or before September 10, 2006, BellSouth will identify <<customer_short_name>>'s remaining Embedded Base, if any, and will transition such circuits to the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service(s). Those circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth pursuant to this Section _ shall be subject to all applicable disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service as set forth in BellSouth's tariffs.

For Embedded Base circuits converted or transitioned, the applicable recurring tariff charge shall apply to each circuit as of September 11, 2006. The transition of the Embedded Base circuits should be performed in a manner that avoids, or otherwise minimizes to the extent possible, disruption or degradation to <<customer_short_name>>'s customers' service.

Local Switching

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Agreement, the services offered pursuant to this Section _ are limited to DS0 level Local Switching and BellSouth is not required to provide Local Switching pursuant to this Agreement except as set forth in Section _ below.

BellSouth shall not be required to unbundle local circuit switching for <<customer_short_name>> for a particular End User when <<customer_short_name>>: (1) serves an End User with four (4) or more voice-grade (DS0) equivalents or lines served by BellSouth in Zone 1 of the following MSAs: Miami, FL; Orlando, FL; and Ft. Lauderdale, FL; or (2) serves an End User with a DS1 or higher capacity Loop in any service area covered by this Agreement. To the extent that <<customer_short_name>> is serving any End User as described above as of the Effective Date of this Agreement, such End User's arrangement may not remain in place and such Arrangement must be terminated by <<customer_short_name>> or transitioned by <<customer_short_name>>, or BellSouth shall disconnect such Arrangements upon thirty (30) days notice.

Transition for Local Switching

For purposes of this Section _, the Transition Period for the Embedded Base of Local Switching is the twelve (12) month period beginning March 11, 2005 and ending March 10, 2006.

For the purposes of this Section _, Embedded Base shall mean Local Switching and any additional elements that are required to be provided in conjunction therewith that were in service for <<customer_short_name>> as of March 11, 2005. Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Embedded Base.

During the Transition Period only, BellSouth shall make Local Switching available for the Embedded Base, in addition to all elements (signaling networks, call-related databases, and

shared transport) that are required to be provided in conjunction with Local Switching, as such elements are defined at 47 C.F.R. §51.319(d)(4)(i), at the rates, terms and conditions set forth in Section _ and Exhibit _. The Transition Period shall apply only to <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base and <<customer_short_name>> shall not place new orders for Local Switching pursuant to this Agreement.

Transition Period Pricing. From March 11, 2005, through the completion of the Transition Period, BellSouth shall charge a rate for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base of Local Switching equal to the higher of:

The rate at which during <<customer_short_name>> leased that combination of elements on June 15, 2004, plus one dollar; or

The rate the Commission established, if any, between June 16, 2004, and the effective date of the TRRO, plus one dollar.

These rates shall be as set forth in Exhibit _.

<<customer_short_name>> must submit orders, to disconnect or convert all of its Embedded Base of Local Switching to other BellSouth services as Conversions on or before March 10, 2006. <<customer_short_name>> may transition from these Local Switching elements to other available wholesale arrangements provided by BellSouth, wholesale facilities obtained from other carriers, or self-provisioned facilities. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Embedded Base of Local Switching.

If <<customer_short_name>> submits the spreadsheets specified in Section _ above for all of its Embedded Base on or before March 10, 2006, Conversions shall be subject to Commission-approved switch-as-is charges and no UNE disconnect charges.

If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit orders to disconnect or convert all of its Embedded Base of Local Switching on or before March 10, 2006, BellSouth will identify <<customer_short_name>>'s remaining Embedded Base of Local Switching and will disconnect such Local Switching. Those circuits identified and disconnected by BellSouth shall be subject to the applicable UNE disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement.

Effective March 11, 2006, Local Switching will no longer be made available pursuant to this Agreement.

The transition of the Embedded Base should be performed in a manner that avoids, or otherwise minimizes to the extent possible, disruption or degradation to <<customer_short_name>>'s customers' service.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, BellSouth will only provide unbundled access to Common (Shared) Transport to the extent BellSouth is required to provide and is providing Local Switching to <<customer_short_name>>.

UNE-P

DS0 Local Switching, in combination with a Loop and Common (Shared) Transport (UNE-P) provides local exchange service for the origination or termination of calls. UNE-P supports the same local calling and feature requirements as described in the Local Switching section of this Attachment and the ability to presubscribe to a primary carrier for intraLATA toll service and/or to presubscribe to a primary carrier for interLATA toll service.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Agreement, BellSouth is not required to provide UNE-P pursuant to this Agreement except as set forth in this Section.

Transition Period for UNE-P

For purposes of this Section __, the Transition Period for UNE-P is the twelve (12) month period beginning March 11, 2005 and ending March 10, 2006.

For purposes of this Section __, Embedded Base shall mean UNE-P and any additional elements that are required to be provided in conjunction with UNE-P (signaling networks, call-related databases, and shared transport), as such elements are defined at 47 C.F.R. §51.319(d)(4)(i), that were in service for <<customer_short_name>> as of March 11, 2005. Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Embedded Base.

During the Transition Period only, BellSouth shall make UNE-P available for the Embedded Base, in addition to all elements that are required to be provided in conjunction with UNE-P (signaling networks, call-related databases, and shared transport), as such elements are defined at 47 C.F.R. §51.319(d)(4)(i), at the rates, terms and conditions set forth in this Attachment. The Transition Period shall apply only to <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base and <<customer_short_name>> shall not place new orders for UNE-P pursuant to this Agreement.

Transition Period Pricing. From March 11, 2005, through the completion of the Transition Period, BellSouth shall charge a rate for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base of Local Switching equal to the higher of:

The rate at which during <<customer_short_name>> leased that combination of elements on June 15, 2004, plus one dollar; or

The rate the Commission established, if any, between June 16, 2004, and the effective date of the TRRO, plus one dollar.

These rates shall be as set forth in Exhibit __.

<<customer_short_name>> must submit orders, or spreadsheets if converting to UNE Loops through the Bulk Migration process, to either disconnect or convert all of its Embedded Base of UNE-P to other BellSouth services as Conversions on or before March 10, 2006. <<customer_short_name>> may transition from these UNE-P arrangements to other available wholesale arrangements provided by BellSouth, wholesale facilities obtained from other carriers,

or self-provisioned facilities. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Embedded Base of UNE-P.

If <<customer_short_name>> submits the spreadsheets specified in Section _ above for all of its Embedded Base on or before March 10, 2006, Conversions shall be subject to Commission-approved switch-as-is charges.

If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit orders or spreadsheets converting all of the Embedded Base of UNE-P on or before March 10, 2006, BellSouth will identify <<customer_short_name>>'s remaining Embedded Base of UNE-P and will transition such UNE-P to resold BellSouth telecommunication services, as set forth in Attachment _. Those circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth shall be subject to the applicable disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of such BellSouth services as set forth in BellSouth's tariffs.

For Embedded Base UNE-P converted or transitioned, the applicable recurring tariff charges shall apply as of March 11, 2006. The transition of the Embedded Base should be performed in a manner that avoids, or otherwise, minimizes to the extent possible, disruption or degradation to <<customer_short_name>>'s customers' service.

Effective March 11, 2006, UNE-P will no longer be made available pursuant to this Agreement.

BellSouth shall make 911 updates in the BellSouth 911 database for <<customer_short_name>>'s UNE-P. BellSouth will not bill <<customer_short_name>> for 911 surcharges. <<customer_short_name>> is responsible for paying all 911 surcharges to the applicable governmental agency.

Dedicated Transport and Dark Fiber Transport

Dedicated Transport. Dedicated Transport is defined as BellSouth's transmission facilities between wire centers or switches owned by BellSouth, or between wire centers or switches owned by BellSouth and switches owned by <<customer_short_name>>, including but not limited to DS1, DS3 and OCn level services, as well as dark fiber, dedicated to <<customer_short_name>>. BellSouth shall not be required to provide access to OCn level Dedicated Transport under any circumstances pursuant to this Agreement. In addition, except as set forth in Section _, BellSouth shall not be required to provide to <<customer_short_name>> unbundled access to interoffice transmission facilities that do not connect a pair of wire centers or switches owned by BellSouth ("Entrance Facilities").

Transition for DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport Including DS1 and DS3 Entrance Facilities

For purposes of this Section _, the Transition Period for the Embedded Base of DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport, Embedded Base Entrance Facilities and for Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport, is the twelve (12) month period beginning March 11, 2005 and ending March 10, 2006.

For purposes of this Section __, Embedded Base means DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport that were in service for <<customer_short_name>> as of March 11, 2005 in those wire centers that, as of such date, met the criteria set forth in Sections __ or __ below. Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Embedded Base.

For purposes of this Section __, Embedded Base Entrance Facilities means Entrance Facilities that were in service for <<customer_short_name>> as of March 11, 2005. Subsequent disconnects or loss of customers shall be removed from the Embedded Base.

For purposes of this Section __, Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport means those <<customer_short_name>> DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport facilities in service as of March 11, 2005, in excess of the caps set forth in Section __. Subsequent disconnects and loss of End Users shall be removed from Excess DS1 and DS3 Loops.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Agreement, BellSouth shall make available Dedicated Transport as described in this Section __ only for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base during the Transition Period:

DS1 Dedicated Transport where both wire centers at the end points of the route contain 38,000 or more Business Lines or four (4) or more fiber-based collocators. (Tier 1 Wire Center)

DS3 Dedicated Transport where both wire centers at the end points of the route contain 24,000 or more Business Lines or three (3) or more fiber-based collocators (Tier 2 Wire Center).

The initial list of wire centers (Initial Wire Center List) meeting the criteria set forth in Sections __ and __ above, is set forth in Exhibit __. As of the effective date of this Amendment, no self-certification in any wire center set forth in the Initial Wire Center List is permitted.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Agreement, BellSouth shall make available Entrance Facilities only for <<<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base Entrance Facilities and only during the Transition Period.

Transition Period Pricing. From March 11, 2005, through the completion of the Transition Period, BellSouth shall charge a rate for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base of DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport and for <<customer_short_name>>'s Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport, as described in this Section __, equal to the higher of:

115% of the rate paid for that element on June 15, 2004; or

115% of a new rate the Commission establishes, if any, between June 16, 2004 and March 11, 2005.

These rates shall be as set forth in Exhibit __.

From March 11, 2005, through the completion of the Transition Period, BellSouth shall charge a rate for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base Entrance Facilities as set forth in Exhibit __.

The Transition Period shall apply only to (1) <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base circuits and Embedded Base Entrance Facilities; and (2) <<customer_short_name>>'s Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport. <<customer_short_name>> shall not add new Entrance Facilities pursuant to this Agreement. Further, <<customer_short_name>> shall not add new DS1 or DS3 Dedicated Transport as described in this Section _ pursuant to this Agreement.

A wire center listed on the Initial Wire Center List exceeds either of the thresholds set forth in Sections _ or _. No further DS1 Dedicated Transport Unbundling will be required from that wire center to other Tier 1 wire centers.

A wire center listed on the Initial Wire Center List exceeds either of the thresholds set forth in Sections _ or _. No further DS3 Dedicated Transport unbundling will be required from that wire center to Tier 1 or Tier 2 wire centers.

No later than March 10, 2006 <<customer_short_name>> shall submit spreadsheet(s) identifying all of the Embedded Base circuits, Embedded Base Entrance Facilities, and Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport to be either disconnected or converted to other BellSouth services pursuant to Section _. <<customer_short_name>> may transition from these DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport, Entrance Facilities, and Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport arrangements to other available wholesale arrangements provided by BellSouth, wholesale facilities obtained from other carriers, or self-provisioned facilities. For Conversions as defined in Section _, such spreadsheet shall take the place of an LSR or ASR. If a <<customer_short_name>> chooses to convert the DS1 and DS3 UNE Dedicated Transport circuits or UNE Entrance Facilities to special access circuits, BellSouth will include such DS1 and DS3 UNE Dedicated Transport circuits and UNE Entrance Facilities once converted within <<customer_short_name>>'s total special access circuits and apply any discounts to which <<customer_short_name>> is entitled. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Embedded Base, Embedded Base Entrance Facilities, and Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport.

If <<customer_short_name>> submits the spreadsheets specified in Section _ above for all of its Embedded Base on or before March 10, 2006, Conversions shall be subject to Commission-approved switch-as-is charges.

If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit the spreadsheet(s) specified in Section _ above for all of its Embedded Base circuits, Embedded Base Entrance Facilities and Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport on or before March 10, 2006, BellSouth will identify <<customer_short_name>>'s remaining Embedded Base circuits, Embedded Base Entrance Facilities and Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport, if any, and will transition such circuits to the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service(s). Those circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth shall be subject to all applicable disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service as set forth in BellSouth's tariffs.

For Embedded Base circuits, Embedded Base Entrance Facilities and Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport converted or transitioned, the applicable recurring tariff charge shall apply to each circuit as of March 11, 2006. The transition of the Embedded Base, Embedded Base

Entrance Facilities and Excess DS1 and DS3 Dedicated Transport should be performed in a manner that avoids, or otherwise, minimizes to the extent possible, disruption or degradation to <<customer_short_name>>'s customers' service.

Dark Fiber Transport. Dark Fiber Transport is defined as Dedicated Transport that consists of unactivated optical interoffice transmission facilities without attached signal regeneration, multiplexing, aggregation or other electronics. Except as set forth in Section _ below, BellSouth shall not be required to provide access to Dark Fiber Transport Entrance Facilities pursuant to this Agreement.

Transition for Dark Fiber Transport and Dark Fiber Transport Entrance Facilities

For purposes of this Section _, the Transition Period for the Embedded Base Dark Fiber Transport and Embedded Base Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities is the eighteen (18) month period beginning March 11, 2005 and ending September 10, 2006.

For purposes of this Section _, Embedded Base means Dark Fiber Transport that was in service for <<customer_short_name>> as of March 11, 2005 in those wire centers that, as of such date, met the criteria set forth in _. Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Embedded Base.

For purposes of this Section _, Embedded Base Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities means Fiber Entrance Facilities that were in service for <<customer_short_name>> as of March 11, 2005 in those wire centers that, as of such date, met the criteria set forth in _. Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Embedded Base.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Agreement, BellSouth shall make available Dark Fiber Transport as described in this Section X only for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base during the Transition Period:

Dark Fiber Transport where both wire centers at the end points of the route contain twenty-four thousand (24,000) or more Business Lines or three (3) or more fiber-based collocators. (Tier 2 Wire Center)

The initial list of wire centers (Initial Wire Center List) meeting the criteria set forth in Sections _ and _ above, is set forth in Exhibit _. As of the effective date of this Amendment, no self-certification in any wire center set forth in the Initial Wire Center List is permitted.

Transition Period Pricing. From March 11, 2005, through the completion of the Transition Period, BellSouth shall charge a rate for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base and Embedded Base Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities shall be equal to the higher of:

115% of the rate paid for that element on June 15, 2004; or

115% of a new rate the Commission establishes, if any, between June 16, 2004 and March 11, 2005.

These rates shall be as set forth in Exhibit _.

From March 11, 2005, through the completion of the Transition Period, BellSouth shall charge a rate for <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base Entrance Facilities as set forth in Exhibit _.

The Transition Period shall apply only to <<customer_short_name>>'s Embedded Base of Dark Fiber Transport and Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities. <<customer_short_name>> shall not add new Dark Fiber Transport as described in this Section X. <<customer_short_name>> shall not add new Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities pursuant to this Agreement.

Wire Centers listed on the Initial List exceed the threshold set forth in Section _. BellSouth will not be required to provide <<customer_short_name>> future access to Dark Fiber Transport from those wire centers.

No later than September 10, 2006 <<customer_short_name>> shall submit spreadsheet(s) identifying all of the Embedded Base of Dark Fiber Transport and Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities to be either disconnected or converted to other BellSouth services as Conversions pursuant to Section _. <<customer_short_name>> may transition from these Dark Fiber Transport and Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities to other available wholesale arrangements provided by BellSouth, wholesale facilities obtained from other carriers, or self-provisioned facilities. For Conversions as defined in Section _, such spreadsheet shall take the place of an LSR or ASR. If a <<customer_short_name>> chooses to convert the Dark Fiber UNE Transport circuits and Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities to special access circuits, BellSouth will include such Dark Fiber UNE Transport circuits and Dark Fiber UNE Entrance Facilities once converted within <<customer_short_name>>'s total special access circuits and apply any discounts to which <<customer_short_name>> is entitled. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Embedded Base of Dark Fiber Transport and Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities.

If <<customer_short_name>> submits the spreadsheets specified in Section _ for all of its Embedded Base of Dark Fiber Transport and Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities on or before September 10, 2006, Conversions shall be subject to Commission-approved switch-as-is charges.

If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit the spreadsheet(s) for all of its Embedded Base of Dark Fiber Transport and Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities prior to September 10, 2006, BellSouth will identify <<customer_short_name>>'s remaining Embedded Base of Dark Fiber Transport and Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities, if any, and will transition such circuits to the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service(s). Those circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth shall be subject to all applicable UNE disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service as set forth in BellSouth's tariffs.

For Embedded Base Dark Fiber Transport and Embedded Base Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities converted or transitioned, the applicable recurring tariff charge shall apply to each circuit as of September 11, 2006. The transition of the Embedded Base Dark Fiber Transport and Embedded Base Dark Fiber Entrance Facilities should be performed in a manner that avoids, or otherwise,

minimizes to the extent possible, disruption or degradation to <<customer_short_name>>'s customers' service.

Conversion of Wholesale Services to Network Elements or Network Elements to Wholesale Services

Upon request, BellSouth shall convert a wholesale service, or group of wholesale services, to the equivalent Network Element or Combination that is available to <<customer_short_name>> pursuant to Section 251 of the Act and under this Agreement or convert a Network Element or Combination that is available to <<customer_short_name>> pursuant to Section 251 of the Act and under this Agreement to an equivalent wholesale service or group of wholesale services offered by BellSouth (collectively "Conversion"). BellSouth shall charge the applicable nonrecurring Commission-approved switch-as-is rates for Conversions to specific Network Elements or Combinations found in Exhibit __. BellSouth shall also charge the same nonrecurring switch-as-is rates when converting from Network Elements or Combinations. Any rate change resulting from the Conversion will be effective as of the next billing cycle following BellSouth's receipt of a complete and accurate Conversion request from <<customer_short_name>>. Any change from a wholesale service/group of wholesale services to a Network Element/Combination, or from a Network Element/Combination to a wholesale service/group of wholesale services, that requires a physical rearrangement will not be considered to be a Conversion for purposes of this Agreement. BellSouth will not require physical rearrangements if the Conversion can be completed through record changes only. Orders for Conversions will be handled in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Ordering Guidelines and Processes and CLEC Information Packages.

Section IV: BellSouth's obligation to provide Section 251 unbundled access to high capacity loops and dedicated transport and definition of the following terms:

- (i) **Business Line**
- (ii) **Fiber-Based Collocation**
- (iii) **Building**
- (iv) **Route**

Approved Language:

Loops/Transport

Language to implement BellSouth's obligation to provide § 251 unbundled access to high capacity loops and dedicated transport is included under Section II.

(i) Business Line

For purposes of this Attachment __, a “Business Line” is, as defined in 47 C.F.R. § 51.5, a BellSouth-owned switched access line used to serve a business customer, whether by BellSouth itself or by a CLEC that leases the line from BellSouth. The number of business lines in a wire center shall equal the sum of all BellSouth business switched access lines, plus the sum of all UNE loops connected to that wire center, including UNE loops provisioned in combination with other unbundled elements. Among these requirements, business line tallies (1) shall include only those access lines connecting end-user customers with BellSouth end-offices for switched services, (2) shall not include non-switched special access lines, (3) shall account for ISDN and other digital access lines by counting each 64 kbps-equivalent as one line. For example, a DS1 line corresponds to 24 64 kbps-equivalents, and therefore to 24 “business lines.”

(ii) Fiber-Based Collocation

For purposes of this Attachment __ a “Fiber-Based Collocator” is, as defined in 47 C.F.R. § 51.5, any carrier, unaffiliated with BellSouth, that maintains a collocation arrangement in a BellSouth wire center, with active electrical power supply, and operates a fiber-optic cable or comparable transmission facility that (1) terminates at a collocation arrangement within the wire center; (2) leaves the BellSouth wire center premises; and (3) is owned by a party other than BellSouth or any affiliate of BellSouth, except as set forth in this paragraph. Dark fiber obtained from an incumbent LEC on an indefeasible right of use basis shall be treated as non-incumbent LEC fiber-optic cable. Two or more affiliated fiber-based collocators in a single wire center shall collectively be counted as a single fiber-based collocator. For purposes of this paragraph, the term affiliate is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(1) and any relevant interpretation in this Title.

(iii) Building

For purposes of this Attachment __, a “Building” is a permanent physical structure including, but not limited to, a structure in which people reside, or conduct business or work on a daily basis and through which there is one centralized point of entry in the structure through which all telecommunications services must transit. As an example only, a high rise office building with a general telecommunications equipment room through which all telecommunications services to that building’s tenants must pass would be a single “building” for purposes of this Attachment __. Two or more physical areas served by individual points of entry through which telecommunications services must transit will be considered separate buildings. For instance, a strip mall with individual businesses obtaining telecommunication services from different access points on the building(s) will be considered individual buildings, even though they might share common walls.

(iv) Route

The definition of a route is included under Section II.

Section V: FCC's Section 251 Non-Impairment Criteria

Approved Language:

Procedures For Additional Designations Of "Non-Impaired" Wire Centers

If BellSouth seeks to designate additional wire centers as "non-impaired" for purposes of the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order (TRRO), BellSouth will post a Carrier Notification Letter (CNL) designating any new (additional) "non-impaired" wire centers ("subsequent wire centers"). The list of additional "non-impaired" wire centers as designated by BellSouth will reflect the number of Business Lines, as of December 31 of the previous year, and will also reflect the number of fiber-based collocators in each subsequent wire center on the list at the time of BellSouth's designation.

Designation by BellSouth of additional "non-impaired" wire centers will be based on the following criteria:

- a. The CLLI of the wire center.
- b. The number of switched business lines served by BellSouth in that wire center based upon data as reported in ARMIS 43-08 for the previous year.
- c. The sum of all UNE Loops connected to each wire center, including UNE Loops provisioned in combination with other elements.
- d. A completed worksheet that shows, in detail, any conversion of access lines to voice grade equivalents.
- e. The names of any carriers relied upon as fiber-based collocators.

BellSouth and CLEC agree to resolve disputes concerning BellSouth's additional wire center designations in dispute resolution proceedings before the Commission.

The initial wire center list is shown below.

WIRE CENTER	BUSINESS LINES	FIBER-BASED COLLOCATION	TRANSPORT TIER	LOOP UNBUNDLING
MIAMFLPL	86,923	>4	1	No DS1/3
MIAMFLGR	68,580	>4	1	No DS1/3
ORLDFLMA	57,966	>4	1	No DS3
FTLDFLMR	55,881	>4	1	No DS3
GSVLFLMA	55,681	4	1	No DS3
ORLDFLPC	45,792	>4	1	No DS3
MIAMFLHL	43,021	>4	1	No DS3
JCVLFLCL	42,452	>4	1	No DS3
MIAMFLAE	41,912	>4	1	No DS3
BCRTFLMA	40,746	>4	1	No DS3
PRRNFLMA	37,969	3	2	
HLWDFLPE	37,415	4	1	
WPBHFLHH	36,053	3	2	
HLWDFLWH	34,022	--	2	
PMBHFLMA	33,993	4	1	
WPBHFLAN	33,521	4	1	
ORLDFLPH	33,148	4	1	
MLBRFLMA	32,547	4	1	
DYBHFLMA	32,282	>4	1	
FTLDFLCY	31,487	4	1	
ORLDFLAP	31,234	3	2	
PNSCFLFP	30,863	--	2	
FTLDFLPL	29,469	>4	1	
FTLDFLJA	29,209	>4	1	
PNSCFLBL	28,685	4	1	
BCRTFLBT	26,601	--	2	
WPBHFLGR	26,527	3	2	
ORLDFLSA	26,126	>4	1	
PMBHFLFE	25,909	4	1	
STRNFLMA	25,577	--	2	
WPBHFLGA	24,885	--	2	
MIAMFLRR	24,740	3	2	
DRBHFLMA	24,695	1	2	
MIAMFLBR	24,482	--	2	
MIAMFLPB	24,380	4	1	
JCVLFLSJ	24,088	3	2	
MIAMFLSO	23,802	3	2	
MIAMFLWM	23,310	4	1	
FTLDFLOA	23,008	>4	1	
MIAMFLCA	22,645	3	2	
ORLDFLCL	20,828	>4	1	

WIRE CENTER	BUSINESS LINES	FIBER-BASED COLLOCATION	TRANSPORT TIER	LOOP UNBUNDLING
WPBHFLRB	20,393			
MNDRFLLO	20,180	3	2	
SNFRFLMA	20,140			
NDADFLGG	18,239	>4	1	
COCOFLMA	18,097	4	1	
JCVLFLSM	17,820	>4	1	
BYBHFLMA	17,675			
DLBHFLMA	17,230			
WPBHFLLE	13,622	3	2	
JCVLFLAR	13,101			
MIAMFLBA	11,560			

Section VIII: Transition of Existing Network Elements that BellSouth is No Longer Obligated to Provide as Section 251 UNEs

Approved Language:

(a) The following language is ordered only for CLECs with existing ICAs with BellSouth. Except to the extent expressly provided otherwise in this Attachment, <<customer_short_name>> may not maintain unbundled network elements or combinations of unbundled network elements, that are no longer offered pursuant to this Agreement (collectively "Arrangements"). In the event BellSouth determines that <<customer_short_name>> has in place any Arrangements after the Effective Date of this Agreement, BellSouth will provide <<customer_short_name>> with thirty (30) calendar days written notice to disconnect or convert such Arrangements. Those circuits identified by <<customer_short_name>> within such thirty (30) day period shall be subject to Commission-approved switch-as-is rates with no UNE disconnect charges. If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit orders to disconnect or convert such Arrangements within such thirty (30)-day period, BellSouth will transition such circuits to the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service(s). Those circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth shall be subject to all applicable UNE disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service as set forth in BellSouth's tariffs. The applicable recurring tariff charges shall apply to each circuit beginning the day following the thirty (30)-day notice period.

(b) Modifications and Updates to the Wire Center List and Subsequent Transition Periods

The language below is applicable both to existing and new ICAs.

Self-Certification. Prior to submitting an order pursuant to this Agreement for high capacity (DS1 or above) Dedicated Transport or high capacity Loops, <<customer_short_name>> shall undertake a reasonably diligent inquiry to determine whether <<customer_short_name>> is entitled to unbundled access to such Network Elements in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. By submitting any such order, <<customer_short_name>> self-certifies that to the best of <<customer_short_name>>'s knowledge, the high capacity Dedicated Transport or high capacity Loop requested is available as a Network Element pursuant to this Agreement. Upon

receiving such order, BellSouth shall process the request in reliance upon <<customer_short_name>>'s self-certification. To the extent BellSouth believes that such request does not comply with the terms of this Agreement, BellSouth shall seek dispute resolution in accordance with the General Terms and Conditions of this Agreement. In the event such dispute is resolved in BellSouth's favor, BellSouth shall bill <<customer_short_name>> the difference between the rates for such circuits pursuant to this Agreement and the applicable nonrecurring and recurring charges for the equivalent tariffed service from the date of installation to the date the circuit is transitioned to the equivalent tariffed service. Within thirty (30) calendar days following a decision finding in BellSouth's favor, <<customer_short_name>> shall submit a spreadsheet identifying those non-compliant circuits to be transitioned to tariffed services or disconnected.

DS1 or DS3 loops, or Dedicated Transport in Wire Centers that Meet the TRRO Non-Impaired Criteria in the Future

In the event BellSouth identifies additional wire centers that meet the criteria set forth in Section __, but that were not included in the Initial Wire Center List, BellSouth shall include such additional wire centers in a carrier notification letter (CNL). Each such list of additional wire centers shall be considered a "Subsequent Wire Center List."

Effective thirty (30) calendar days after the date of a BellSouth CNL providing a Subsequent Wire Center List, BellSouth shall not be required to unbundle new DS1 or DS3 Loops, or transport, as applicable, in such additional wire center(s), except pursuant to the self-certification process.

BellSouth shall make available de-listed DS1 and DS3 Loops and transport that were in service for <<customer_short_name>> in a de-listed wire center on the Subsequent Wire Center List as of the thirtieth (30th) calendar day after the date of BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List (Subsequent Embedded Base) until one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the thirtieth (30th) calendar day from the date of BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List (Subsequent Transition Period).

Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Subsequent Embedded Base.

The rates that shall apply to the Subsequent Embedded Base throughout the entire Subsequent Transition Period. The rates shall equal the rate paid for that element at the time of the CNL posting, plus 15%.

No later than one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days from BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List, <<customer_short_name>> shall submit a spreadsheet(s) identifying the Subsequent Embedded Base of circuits to be disconnected or converted to other BellSouth services. For Conversions as defined in Section __, such spreadsheets shall take the place of an LSR or ASR. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Subsequent Embedded Base of circuits. If a <<customer_short_name>> chooses to convert the de-listed DS1 and DS3 Loops and Transport to special access circuits, BellSouth will include such de-listed DS1 and DS3 Loops and Transport once converted within <<customer_short_name>>'s total special access circuits and apply any discounts to which

<<customer_short_name>> is entitled. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Subsequent Embedded Base.

If <<customer_short_name>> submits the spreadsheet(s) for its Subsequent Embedded Base by one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days from BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List, those identified circuits shall be subject to the Commission-approved switch-as-is conversion nonrecurring charges.

If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit the spreadsheet(s) for all of its Subsequent Embedded Base by one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the date of BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List, BellSouth will identify <<customer_short_name>>'s remaining Subsequent Embedded Base, if any, and will transition such circuits to the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service(s). Those circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth shall be subject to the applicable disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service as set forth in BellSouth's tariffs.

For Subsequent Embedded Base circuits converted or transitioned, the applicable recurring tariff charges shall apply on the first day after the end of the Subsequent Transition Period. The transition of the Subsequent Embedded Base circuits should be performed in a manner that avoids, or otherwise minimizes to the extent possible, disruption or degradation to <<customer_short_name>>'s customers' service.

Dark Fiber Transport in Wire Centers that Meet the TRRO Non-Impaired Criteria in the Future

In the event BellSouth identifies additional wire centers that meet the criteria set forth in Section __ above, but that were not included in the Initial Wire Center List, BellSouth shall include such additional wire centers in a CNL. Each such list of additional wire centers shall be considered a "Subsequent Wire Center List."

Effective thirty (30) calendar days after the date of a BellSouth CNL providing a Subsequent Wire Center List, BellSouth shall not be required to unbundle new Dark Fiber Transport, as applicable, in such additional wire center(s), except pursuant to the self-certification process as set forth in Section __ above.

For purposes of Section __, BellSouth shall make available dark fiber transport that was in service for <<customer_short_name>> in a wire center on the Subsequent Wire Center List as of the thirtieth (30th) calendar day after the date of BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List (Subsequent Embedded Base) until two hundred and seventy (270) calendar days after the thirtieth (30th) calendar day from the date of BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List (Subsequent Transition Period).

Subsequent disconnects or loss of End Users shall be removed from the Subsequent Embedded Base.

The rates that shall apply to the Subsequent Embedded Base throughout the entire Subsequent Transition Period. The rates shall equal the rate paid for that element at the time of the CNL posting, plus 15%.

No later than two hundred and seventy (270) calendar days from BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List <<customer_short_name>> shall submit a spreadsheet(s) identifying the Subsequent Embedded Base of circuits to be disconnected or converted to other BellSouth services. For Conversions as defined in Section __, such spreadsheets shall take the place of an LSR or ASR. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Subsequent Embedded Base of circuits. If a <<customer_short_name>> chooses to convert the Dark Fiber Transport to special access circuits, BellSouth will include such Dark Fiber Transport once converted within <<customer_short_name>>'s total special access circuits and apply any discounts to which <<customer_short_name>> is entitled. The Parties shall negotiate a project schedule for the Conversion of the Subsequent Embedded Base.

If <<customer_short_name>> submits the spreadsheet(s) for its Subsequent Embedded Base within two hundred and seventy (270) calendar days from BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List, those identified circuits shall be subject to the Commission-approved switch-as-is conversion nonrecurring charges are applicable

If <<customer_short_name>> fails to submit the spreadsheet(s) for all of its Subsequent Embedded Base within two hundred and seventy (270) calendar days after the date of BellSouth's CNL identifying the Subsequent Wire Center List, BellSouth will identify <<customer_short_name>>'s remaining Subsequent Embedded Base, if any, and will transition such circuits to the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service(s). Those circuits identified and transitioned by BellSouth shall be subject to the applicable disconnect charges as set forth in this Agreement and the full nonrecurring charges for installation of the equivalent tariffed BellSouth service as set forth in BellSouth's tariffs.

For Subsequent Embedded Base circuits converted or transitioned, the applicable recurring tariff charges shall apply on the first day after the end of the Subsequent Transition Period. The transition of the Subsequent Embedded Base circuits should be performed in a manner that avoids, or otherwise, minimizes to the extent possible, disruption or degradation to <<customer_short_name>>'s customers' service.

Section IX: BellSouth's SQM/PMAP/SEEM

Approved Language:

CLEC may purchase and use Network Elements and Other Services from BellSouth in accordance with 47 C.F.R §51.309. Performance Measurements associated with this Attachment 2 are contained in Attachment _____. The quality of the Network Elements provided pursuant to §251, as well as the quality of the access to said Network Elements that BellSouth provides to CLEC, shall be, to the extent technically feasible, at least equal to that which BellSouth provides to itself, and its affiliates.

The Parties shall comply with the requirements as set forth in the technical references within this Attachment 2. BellSouth shall comply with the requirements set forth in the technical reference TR73400, as well as any performance or other requirements identified in this Agreement, to the

extent that they are consistent with the greater of BellSouth's actual performance or applicable industry standards. If one or more of the requirements set forth in this Agreement are in conflict, the technical reference TR73600 requirements shall apply. If the parties cannot reach agreement, the dispute resolution process set forth in the General Terms and Conditions of this Agreement shall apply.

Section X: 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?

Approved Language:

Conversion of Wholesale Services to Network Elements or Network Elements to Wholesale Services

Upon request, BellSouth shall convert a wholesale service, or group of wholesale services, to the equivalent Network Element or Combination that is available to CLEC pursuant to Section 251 of the Act and under this Agreement, or convert a Network Element or Combination that is available to CLEC pursuant to Section 251 of the Act and under this Agreement to an equivalent wholesale service or group of wholesale services offered by BellSouth (collectively "Conversion"). BellSouth shall charge the applicable nonrecurring switch-as-is rates for Conversions to specific Network Elements or Combinations found in Exhibit A. BellSouth shall also charge the same nonrecurring switch-as-is rates when converting from Network Elements or Combinations. Any rate change resulting from the Conversion will be effective as of the next billing cycle following BellSouth's receipt of a complete and accurate Conversion request from CLEC. A Conversion shall be considered termination for purposes of any volume and/or term commitments and/or grandfathered status between CLEC and BellSouth. Any change from a wholesale service/group of wholesale services to a Network Element/Combination, or from a Network Element/Combination to a wholesale service/group of wholesale services that requires a physical rearrangement will not be considered to be a Conversion for purposes of this Agreement. BellSouth will not require physical rearrangements if the Conversion can be completed through record changes only. Orders for Conversions will be handled in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Ordering Guidelines and Processes and CLEC Information Packages as referenced in Sections ___ and ___ below.

Any outstanding conversions shall be effective on or after the effective date of this agreement.

Ordering Guidelines and Processes

For information regarding Ordering Guidelines and Processes for various Network Elements, Combinations and Other Services, CLEC should refer to the "Guides" section of the BellSouth Interconnection Web site.

Additional information may also be found in the individual CLEC Information Packages located at the "CLEC UNE Products" on BellSouth's Interconnection Web site at: www.interconnection.bellsouth.com/guides/html/unes.html.

The provisioning of Network Elements, Combinations and Other Services to CLEC's Collocation Space will require cross-connections within the central office to connect the Network Element, Combinations or Other Services to the demarcation point associated with CLEC's Collocation Space. These cross-connects are separate components that are not considered a part of the Network Element, Combinations or Other Services and, thus, have a separate charge pursuant to this Agreement.

Section XI: Conversions to Stand-Alone UNEs Pending on the Effective Date of the TRO

Approved Language:

Any pending conversions shall be effective on the effective date of this agreement.

Section XII: Call Related Databases

Approved Language:

Call Related Databases and Signaling

Call Related Databases are the databases other than OSS, that are used in signaling networks, for billing and collection, or the transmission, routing or other provision of a Telecommunication Service. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, BellSouth shall only provide unbundled access to call related databases and signaling including but not limited to, BellSouth Switched Access 8XX Toll Free Dialing Ten Digit Screening Service, LIDB, Signaling, Signaling Link Transport, STP, SS7 AIN Access, Service Control Point(SCP\Databases, Local Number Portability (LNP) Databases and Calling Name (CNAM) Database Service pursuant to this Agreement where BellSouth is required to provide and is providing Local Switching or UNE-P to <<customer_short_name>> pursuant to this Agreement. *(See NOTE #1)*

NOTE #1: For CLECs with existing agreements with BellSouth as of March 11, 2005, insert the following: Such unbundled access is only available until March 10, 2006. (The sentence is not applicable or necessary for all other CLECs.)

BellSouth Switched Access (SWA) 8XX Toll Free Dialing Ten Digit Screening Service

The BellSouth SWA 8XX Toll Free Dialing Ten Digit Screening Service database (8XX SCP Database) is a SCP that contains customer record information and the functionality to provide call-handling instructions for 8XX calls. The 8XX SCP IN software stores data downloaded from the national SMS/8XX database and provides the routing instructions in response to queries from the SSP or tandem. The BellSouth SWA 8XX Toll Free Dialing Ten Digit Screening

Service (8XX TFD Service) utilizes the 8XX SCP Database to provide identification and routing of the 8XX calls, based on the ten digits dialed. At <<customer_short_name>>'s option, 8XX TFD Service is provided with or without POTS number delivery, dialing number delivery, and other optional complex features as selected by <<customer_short_name>>.

The 8XX SCP Database is designated to receive and respond to queries using the ANSI Specification of SS7 protocol.

LIDB

LIDB is a transaction-oriented database accessible through Common Channel Signaling (CCS) networks. For access to LIDB, <<customer_short_name>> must purchase appropriate signaling links pursuant to Section X.4 below. LIDB contains records associated with End User Line Numbers and Special Billing Numbers. LIDB accepts queries from other Network Elements and provides appropriate responses. The query originator need not be the owner of LIDB data. LIDB queries include functions such as screening billed numbers that provides the ability to accept Collect or Third Number Billing calls and validation of Telephone Line Number based non-proprietary calling cards. The interface for the LIDB functionality is the interface between BellSouth's CCS network and other CCS networks. LIDB also interfaces to administrative systems.

Technical Requirements

BellSouth will offer to <<customer_short_name>> any additional capabilities that are developed for LIDB during the life of this Agreement.

BellSouth shall process <<customer_short_name>>'s customer records in LIDB at least at parity with BellSouth customer records, with respect to other LIDB functions. BellSouth shall indicate to <<customer_short_name>> what additional functions (if any) are performed by LIDB in the BellSouth network.

Within two (2) weeks after a request by <<customer_short_name>>, BellSouth shall provide <<customer_short_name>> with a list of the customer data items, which <<customer_short_name>> would have to provide in order to support each required LIDB function. The list shall indicate which data items are essential to LIDB function and which are required only to support certain services. For each data item, the list shall show the data formats, the acceptable values of the data item and the meaning of those values.

BellSouth shall provide LIDB systems for which operating deficiencies that would result in calls being blocked shall not exceed thirty (30) minutes per year.

BellSouth shall provide LIDB systems for which operating deficiencies that would not result in calls being blocked shall not exceed twelve (12) hours per year.

BellSouth shall provide LIDB systems for which the LIDB function shall be in overload no more than twelve (12) hours per year.

All additions, updates and deletions of <<customer_short_name>> data to the LIDB shall be solely at the direction of <<customer_short_name>>. Such direction from <<customer_short_name>> will not be required where the addition, update or deletion is necessary to perform standard fraud control measures (e.g., calling card auto-deactivation).

BellSouth shall provide priority updates to LIDB for <<customer_short_name>> data upon <<customer_short_name>>'s request (e.g., to support fraud detection), via password-protected telephone card, facsimile, or electronic mail within one hour of notice from the established BellSouth contact.

BellSouth shall provide LIDB systems such that no more than 0.01% of <<customer_short_name>> customer records will be missing from LIDB, as measured by <<customer_short_name>> audits. BellSouth will audit <<customer_short_name>> records in LIDB against Data Base Administration System (DBAS) to identify record mismatches and provide this data to a designated <<customer_short_name>> contact person to resolve the status of the records and BellSouth will update system appropriately. BellSouth will refer record of mismatches to <<customer_short_name>> within one (1) business day of audit. Once reconciled records are received back from <<customer_short_name>>, BellSouth will update LIDB the same business day if less than five hundred (500) records are received before 1:00 p.m. Central Time. If more than five hundred (500) records are received, BellSouth will contact <<customer_short_name>> to negotiate a time frame for the updates, not to exceed three (3) business days.

BellSouth shall perform backup and recovery of all of <<customer_short_name>>'s data in LIDB including sending to LIDB all changes made since the date of the most recent backup copy, in at least the same time frame BellSouth performs backup and recovery of BellSouth data in LIDB for itself. Currently, BellSouth performs backups of the LIDB for itself on a weekly basis; and when a new software release is scheduled, a backup is performed prior to loading the new release.

BellSouth shall provide <<customer_short_name>> with LIDB reports of data which are missing or contain errors, as well as any misrouted errors, within a reasonable time period as negotiated between <<customer_short_name>> and BellSouth.

BellSouth shall prevent any access to or use of <<customer_short_name>> data in LIDB by BellSouth personnel that are outside of established administrative and fraud control personnel, or by any other Party that is not authorized by <<customer_short_name>> in writing.

BellSouth shall provide <<customer_short_name>> performance of the LIDB Data Screening function, which allows a LIDB to completely or partially deny specific query originators access to LIDB data owned by specific data owners, for Customer Data that is part of an NPA-NXX or RAO-0/1XX wholly or partially owned by <<customer_short_name>> at least at parity with BellSouth Customer Data. BellSouth shall obtain from <<customer_short_name>> the screening information associated with LIDB Data Screening of <<customer_short_name>> data in

accordance with this requirement. BellSouth currently does not have LIDB Data Screening capabilities. When such capability is available, BellSouth shall offer it to <<customer_short_name>> under the BFR/NBR Process as set forth in Attachment ____.

BellSouth shall accept queries to LIDB associated with <<customer_short_name>> customer records and shall return responses in accordance with industry standards.

BellSouth shall provide mean processing time at the LIDB within 0.50 seconds under normal conditions as defined in industry standards.

BellSouth shall provide processing time at the LIDB within one (1) second for ninety-nine percent (99%) of all messages under normal conditions as defined in industry standards.

Interface Requirements

BellSouth shall offer LIDB in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

The interface to LIDB shall be in accordance with the technical references contained within.

The CCS interface to LIDB shall be the standard interface described herein.

The LIDB Data Base interpretation of the ANSI-TCAP messages shall comply with the technical reference herein. Global Title Translation (GTT) shall be maintained in the signaling network in order to support signaling network routing to the LIDB.

The application of the LIDB rates contained in Exhibit A will be based on a Percent CLEC LIDB Usage (PCLU) factor. <<customer_short_name>> shall provide BellSouth a PCLU. The PCLU will be applied to determine the percentage of total LIDB usage to be billed to the other Party at local rates. <<customer_short_name>> shall update its PCLU on the first of January, April, July and October and shall send it to BellSouth to be received no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the first of each such month based on local usage for the past three months ending the last day of December, March, June and September, respectively. Requirements associated with PCLU calculation and reporting shall be as set forth in BellSouth's Jurisdictional Factors Reporting Guide.

Signaling. BellSouth shall offer access to signaling and access to BellSouth's signaling databases subject to compatibility testing and at the rates set forth in this Attachment. BellSouth may provide mediated access to BellSouth signaling systems and databases. Available signaling elements include signaling links, STPs and SCPs. Signaling functionality will be available with both A-link and B-link connectivity.

Signaling Link Transport. Signaling Link Transport is a set of two (2) or four (4) dedicated 56 kbps transmission paths between <<customer_short_name>> designated SPOI that provide appropriate physical diversity.

Technical Requirements

Signaling Link Transport shall consist of full duplex mode 56 kbps transmission paths and shall perform in the following two ways:

As an "A-link" Signaling Link Transport is a connection between a switch or SCP and a home STP switch pair; and

As a "B-link" Signaling Link Transport is a connection between two (2) STP switch pairs in different company networks (e.g., between two (2) STP switch pairs for two (2) CLECs).

Signaling Link Transport shall consist of two (2) or more signaling link layers as follows:

An A-link layer shall consist of two (2) links; and

A B-link layer shall consist of four (4) links.

A signaling link layer shall satisfy interoffice and intraoffice diversity of facilities and equipment, such that:

No single failure of facilities or equipment causes the failure of both links in an A-link layer (i.e., the links should be provided on a minimum of two (2) separate physical paths end-to-end); and

No two (2) concurrent failures of facilities or equipment shall cause the failure of all four (4) links in a B-link layer (i.e., the links should be provided on a minimum of three (3) separate physical paths end-to-end).

Interface Requirements. There shall be a DS1 (1.544 Mbps) interface at <<customer_short_name>>'s designated SPOIs. Each 56 kbps transmission path shall appear as a DS0 channel within the DS1 interface.

STP. An STP is a signaling network function that includes all of the capabilities provided by the signaling transfer point switches and their associated signaling links that enables the exchange of SS7 messages among and between switching elements, database elements and signaling transfer point switches.

Technical Requirements

STPs shall provide access to BellSouth Local Switching or Tandem Switching and to BellSouth SCPs/Databases connected to BellSouth SS7 network. STPs also provide access to third party local or tandem switching and third party provided STPs.

The connectivity provided by STPs shall fully support the functions of all other Network Elements connected to the BellSouth SS7 network. This includes the use of the BellSouth SS7 network to convey messages that neither originate nor terminate at a signaling end point directly connected to the BellSouth SS7 network (i.e., transit messages). When the BellSouth SS7 network is used to convey transit messages, there shall be no alteration of the Integrated Services Digital Network User Part (ISDNUP) or Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) user

data that constitutes the content of the message. Rates for ISDNUP and TCAP messages are as set forth in Exhibit A.

If a BellSouth tandem switch routes traffic, based on dialed or translated digits, on SS7 trunks between a <<customer_short_name>> local switch and third party local switch, the BellSouth SS7 network shall convey the TCAP messages that are necessary to provide Call Management features (Automatic Callback, Automatic Recall, and Screening List Editing) between <<customer_short_name>> local STPs and the STPs that provide connectivity with the third party local switch, even if the third party local switch is not directly connected to BellSouth STPs.

STPs shall provide all functions of the SCCP necessary for Class 0 (basic connectionless) service as defined in Telcordia ANSI Interconnection Requirements. This includes GTT and SCCP Management procedures, as specified in ANSI T1.112.4. Where the destination signaling point is a <<customer_short_name>> or third party local or tandem switching system directly connected to BellSouth SS7 network, BellSouth shall perform final GTT of messages to the destination and SCCP Subsystem Management of the destination. In all other cases, BellSouth shall perform intermediate GTT of messages to a gateway pair of STPs in an SS7 network connected with BellSouth SS7 network and shall not perform SCCP Subsystem Management of the destination. If BellSouth performs final GTT to a <<customer_short_name>> database, then <<customer_short_name>> agrees to provide BellSouth with the Destination Point Code for <<customer_short_name>> database.

STPs shall provide all functions of the Operations, Maintenance and Administration Part (OMAP) as specified in applicable industry standard technical references, which may include, where available in BellSouth's network, MTP Routing Verification Test (MRVT) and SCCP Routing Verification Test (SRVT).

Where the destination signaling point is a BellSouth local or tandem switching system or database, or is a <<customer_short_name>> or third party local or tandem switching system directly connected to the BellSouth SS7 network, STPs shall perform MRVT and SRVT to the destination signaling point. In all other cases, STPs shall perform MRVT and SRVT to a gateway pair of STPs in an SS7 network connected with the BellSouth SS7 network. This requirement may be superseded by the specifications for Internetwork MRVT and SRVT when these become approved ANSI standards and available capabilities of BellSouth STPs.

SS7

When technically feasible and upon request by <<customer_short_name>>, SS7 AIN Access shall be made available in association with switching. SS7 AIN Access is the provisioning of AIN 0.1 triggers in an equipped BellSouth local switch and interconnection of the BellSouth SS7 network with <<customer_short_name>>'s SS7 network to exchange TCAP queries and responses with a <<customer_short_name>> SCP.

SS7 AIN Access shall provide <<customer_short_name>> SCP access to an equipped BellSouth local switch via interconnection of BellSouth's SS7 and <<customer_short_name>> SS7

Networks. BellSouth shall offer SS7 AIN Access through its STPs. If BellSouth requires a mediation device on any part of its network specific to this form of access, BellSouth must route its messages in the same manner. The interconnection arrangement shall result in the BellSouth local switch recognizing the <<customer_short_name>> SCP as at least at parity with BellSouth's SCPs in terms of interfaces, performance and capabilities.

Interface Requirements

BellSouth shall provide the following STP options to connect <<customer_short_name>> or <<customer_short_name>>-designated Local Switching systems to the BellSouth SS7 network:

An A-link interface from <<customer_short_name>> Local Switching systems; and

A B-link interface from <<customer_short_name>> local STPs.

Each type of interface shall be provided by one or more layers of signaling links.

The SPOI for each link shall be located at a cross-connect element in the CO where the BellSouth STP is located. There shall be a DS1 or higher rate transport interface at each of the SPOIs. Each signaling link shall appear as a DS0 channel within the DS1 or higher rate interface.

BellSouth shall provide intraoffice diversity between the SPOI and BellSouth STPs so that no single failure of intraoffice facilities or equipment shall cause the failure of both B-links in a layer connecting to a BellSouth STP.

STPs shall provide all functions of the MTP as defined in the applicable industry standard technical references.

Message Screening

BellSouth shall set message screening parameters so as to accept valid messages from <<customer_short_name>> local or tandem switching systems destined to any signaling point within BellSouth's SS7 network where the <<customer_short_name>> switching system has a valid signaling relationship.

BellSouth shall set message screening parameters so as to pass valid messages from <<customer_short_name>> local or tandem switching systems destined to any signaling point or network accessed through BellSouth's SS7 network where the <<customer_short_name>> switching system has a valid signaling relationship.

BellSouth shall set message screening parameters so as to accept and pass/send valid messages destined to and from <<customer_short_name>> from any signaling point or network interconnected through BellSouth's SS7 network where the <<customer_short_name>> SCP has a valid signaling relationship.

SCP/Databases

Call Related Databases provide the storage of, access to, and manipulation of information required to offer a particular service and/or capability. BellSouth shall provide access to the

following Databases: LNP, LIDB, Toll Free Number Database, ALI/DMS, and CNAM Database. BellSouth also provides access to SCE/SMS application databases and DA.

A SCP is deployed in a SS7 network that executes service application logic in response to SS7 queries sent to it by a switching system also connected to the SS7 network. SMS provides operational interfaces to allow for provisioning, administration and maintenance of subscriber data and service application data stored in SCPs.

Technical Requirements for SCPs/Databases

BellSouth shall provide physical access to SCPs through the SS7 network and protocols with TCAP as the application layer protocol.

BellSouth shall provide physical interconnection to databases via industry standard interfaces and protocols (e.g., SS7, ISDN and X.25).

The reliability of interconnection options shall be consistent with requirements for diversity and survivability.

LNP Database. The Permanent Number Portability (PNP) database supplies routing numbers for calls involving numbers that have been ported from one local service provider to another. BellSouth agrees to provide access to the PNP database at rates, terms and conditions as set forth by BellSouth and in accordance with an effective FCC or Commission directive.

CNAM Database Service

CNAM is the ability to associate a name with the calling party number, allowing the End User (to which a call is being terminated) to view the calling party's name before the call is answered. The calling party's information is accessed by queries launched to the CNAM database. This service also provides <<customer_short_name>> the opportunity to load and store its subscriber names in the BellSouth CNAM SCPs.

<<customer_short_name>> shall submit to BellSouth a notice of its intent to access and utilize BellSouth CNAM Database Services. Said notice shall be in writing no less than sixty (60) days prior to <<customer_short_name>>'s access to BellSouth's CNAM Database Services and shall be addressed to <<customer_short_name>>'s Local Contract Manager.

<<customer_short_name>>'s End Users' names and numbers related to UNE-P Services and shall be stored in the BellSouth CNAM database, and shall be available, on a per query basis only, to all entities that launch queries to the BellSouth CNAM database. BellSouth, at its sole discretion, may opt to interconnect with and query other calling name databases. In the event BellSouth does not query a third party calling name database that stores the calling party's information, BellSouth cannot deliver the calling party's information to a called End User. In addition, BellSouth cannot deliver the calling party's information where the calling party subscribes to any service that would block or otherwise cause the information to be unavailable.

For each <<customer_short_name>> End User that subscribes to a switch based vertical feature providing calling name information to that End User for calls received, BellSouth will launch a query on a per call basis to the BellSouth CNAM database, or, subject to Section X.6.2.1 above, to a third party calling name database, to provide calling name information, if available, to <<customer_short_name>>'s End User. <<customer_short_name>> shall pay the rates set forth in Exhibit A, on a per query basis, for each query to the BellSouth CNAM database made on behalf of an <<customer_short_name>> End User that subscribes to the appropriate vertical features that support Caller ID or a variation thereof. In addition, <<customer_short_name>> shall reimburse BellSouth for any charges BellSouth pays to third party calling name database providers for queries launched to such database providers for the benefit of <<customer_short_name>>'s End Users.

BellSouth currently does not have a billing mechanism for CNAM queries. Until a mechanized billing solution is available for CNAM queries, BellSouth shall bill <<customer_short_name>> at the applicable rates set forth in Exhibit A based on a surrogate of two hundred and fifty-six (256) database queries per month per <<customer_short_name>>'s End Users with the Caller ID feature.

SCE/SMS AIN Access

BellSouth's SCE/SMS AIN Access shall provide <<customer_short_name>> the capability to create service applications in a BellSouth SCE and deploy those applications in a BellSouth SMS to a BellSouth SCP.

BellSouth's SCE/SMS AIN Access shall provide access to SCE hardware, software, testing and technical support (e.g., help desk, system administrator) resources available to <<customer_short_name>>. Training, documentation, and technical support will address use of SCE and SMS access and administrative functions but will not include support for the creation of a specific service application.

BellSouth SCP shall partition and protect <<customer_short_name>> service logic and data from unauthorized access.

When <<customer_short_name>> selects SCE/SMS AIN Access, BellSouth shall provide training, documentation, and technical support to enable <<customer_short_name>> to use BellSouth's SCE/SMS AIN Access to create and administer applications. <<customer_short_name>> access will be provided via remote data connection (e.g., dial-in, ISDN).

BellSouth shall allow <<customer_short_name>> to download data forms and/or tables to BellSouth SCP via BellSouth SMS without intervention from BellSouth.

Automatic Location Identification/Data Management System

911 and E911 Databases

BellSouth shall provide <<customer_short_name>> with nondiscriminatory access to 911 and E911 databases on an unbundled basis, in accordance with 47 C.F.R. § 51.319 (f).

The ALI/DMS database contains End User information (including name, address, telephone information, and sometimes special information from the local service provider or End User) used to determine to which PSAP to route the call. The ALI/DMS database is used to provide enhanced routing flexibility for E911. <<customer_short_name>> will be required to provide the BellSouth 911 database vendor daily service order updates to E911 database in accordance with Section XX.2.1 below.

Technical Requirements

BellSouth's 911 database vendor shall provide <<customer_short_name>> the capability of providing updates to the ALI/DMS database through a specified electronic interface. <<customer_short_name>> shall contact BellSouth's 911 database vendor directly to request interface. <<customer_short_name>> shall provide updates directly to BellSouth's 911 database vendor on a daily basis. Updates shall be the responsibility of <<customer_short_name>> and BellSouth shall not be liable for the transactions between <<customer_short_name>> and BellSouth's 911 database vendor.

It is <<customer_short_name>>'s responsibility to retrieve and confirm statistical data and to correct errors obtained from BellSouth's 911 database vendor on a daily basis. All errors will be assigned a unique error code and the description of the error and the corrective action is described in the CLEC Users Guide for Facility Based Providers that is found on the BellSouth Interconnection Web site.

<<customer_short_name>> shall conform to the BellSouth standards as described in the CLEC Users Guide to E911 for Facilities Based Providers that is located on the BellSouth's Interconnection Web site: www.interconnection.bellsouth.com/guides.

Stranded Unlocks are defined as End User records in BellSouth's ALI/DMS database that have not been migrated for over ninety (90) days to <<customer_short_name>>, as a new provider of local service to the End User. Stranded Unlocks are those End User records that have been "unlocked" by the previous local exchange carrier that provided service to the End User and are open for <<customer_short_name>> to assume responsibility for such records.

Based upon End User record ownership information available in the NPAC database, BellSouth shall provide a Stranded Unlock annual report to <<customer_short_name>> that reflects all Stranded Unlocks that remain in the ALI/DMS database for over ninety (90) days. <<customer_short_name>> shall review the Stranded Unlock report, identify its End User records and request to either delete such records or migrate the records to

<<customer_short_name>> within two (2) months following the date of the Stranded Unlock report provided by BellSouth. <<customer_short_name>> shall reimburse BellSouth for any charges BellSouth's database vendor imposes on BellSouth for the deletion of <<customer_short_name>>'s records.

911 PBX Locate Service®. 911 PBX Locate Service is comprised of a database capability and a separate transport component.

Description of Product. The transport component provides a dedicated trunk path from a Private Branch Exchange (PBX) switch to the appropriate BellSouth 911 tandem.

The database capability allows <<customer_short_name>> to offer an E911 service to its PBX End Users that identifies to the PSAP the physical location of the <<customer_short_name>> PBX 911 End User station telephone number for the 911 call that is placed by the End User.

<<customer_short_name>> may order either the database capability or the transport component as desired or <<customer_short_name>> may order both components of the service.

911 PBX Locate Database Capability. <<customer_short_name>>'s End User or <<customer_short_name>>'s End User's database management agent (DMA) must provide the End User PBX station telephone numbers and corresponding address and location data to BellSouth's 911 database vendor. The data will be loaded and maintained in BellSouth's ALI database.

Ordering, provisioning, testing and maintenance shall be provided by <<customer_short_name>> pursuant to the 911 PBX Locate Marketing Service Description (MSD) that is located on the BellSouth Interconnection Web site.

<<customer_short_name>>'s End User, or <<customer_short_name>>'s End User database management agent must provide ongoing updates to BellSouth's 911 database vendor within a commercially reasonable timeframe of all PBX station telephone number adds, moves and deletions. It will be the responsibility of <<customer_short_name>> to ensure that the End User or DMA maintain the data pertaining to each End User's extension managed by the 911 PBX Locate Service product. <<customer_short_name>> should not submit telephone number updates for specific PBX station telephone numbers that are submitted by <<customer_short_name>>'s End User, or <<customer_short_name>>'s End User DMA under the terms of 911 PBX Locate product.

<<customer_short_name>> must provision all PBX station numbers in the same LATA as the E911 tandem.

<<customer_short_name>> agrees to release, indemnify, defend and hold harmless BellSouth from any and all loss, claims, demands, suits, or other action, or any liability whatsoever, whether suffered, made, instituted or asserted by <<customer_short_name>>'s End User or by any other party or person, for any personal injury to or death of any person or persons, or for any

loss, damage or destruction of any property, whether owned by <<customer_short_name>> or others, or for any infringement or invasion of the right of privacy of any person or persons, caused or claimed to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the installation, operation, failure to operate, maintenance, removal, presence, condition, location or use of PBX Locate Service features or by any services which are or may be furnished by BellSouth in connection therewith, including but not limited to the identification of the telephone number, address or name associated with the telephone used by the party or parties accessing 911 services using 911 PBX Locate Service hereunder, except to the extent caused by BellSouth's gross negligence or willful misconduct. <<customer_short_name>> is responsible for assuring that its authorized End Users comply with the provisions of these terms and that unauthorized persons do not gain access to or use the 911 PBX Locate Service through user names, passwords, or other identifiers assigned to <<customer_short_name>>'s End User or DMA pursuant to these terms. Specifically, <<customer_short_name>>'s End User or DMA must keep and protect from use by any unauthorized individual identifiers, passwords, and any other security token(s) and devices that are provided for access to this product.

<<customer_short_name>> may only use BellSouth PBX Locate Service solely for the purpose of validating and correcting 911 related data for <<customer_short_name>>'s End Users' telephone numbers for which it has direct management authority.

911 PBX Locate Transport Component. The 911 PBX Locate Service transport component requires <<customer_short_name>> to order a CAMA type dedicated trunk from <<customer_short_name>>'s End User premise to the appropriate BellSouth 911 tandem pursuant to the following provisions.

Except as otherwise set forth below, a minimum of two (2) End User specific, dedicated 911 trunks are required between the <<customer_short_name>>'s End User premise and the BellSouth 911 tandem as described in BellSouth's Technical Reference (TR) 73576 and in accordance with the 911 PBX Locate Marketing Service Description located on the BellSouth Interconnection Web site. <<customer_short_name>> is responsible for connectivity between the End User's PBX and <<customer_short_name>>'s switch or POP location. <<customer_short_name>> will then order 911 trunks from their switch or POP location to the BellSouth 911 tandem. The dedicated trunks shall be, at a minimum, DS0 level trunks configured as part of a digital interface (delivered over a <<customer_short_name>> purchased DS1 facility that hands off at a DS1 or higher level digital or optical interface). <<customer_short_name>> is responsible for ensuring that the PBX switch is capable of sending the calling station's Direct Inward Dial (DID) telephone number to the BellSouth 911 tandem in a specified Multi-frequency (MF) Address Signaling Protocol. If the PBX switch supports Primary Rate ISDN (PRI) and the calling stations are DID numbers, then the 911 call can be transmitted using PRI, and there will be no requirement for the PBX Locate Transport component.

Ordering and Provisioning. <<customer_short_name>> will submit an Access Service Request (ASR) to BellSouth to order a minimum of two (2) End User specific 911 trunks from its switch or POP location to the BellSouth 911 tandem.

Testing and maintenance shall be provided by <<customer_short_name>> pursuant to the 911 PBX Locate Marketing Service description that is located on the BellSouth Interconnection Web site.

Rates. Rates for the 911 PBX Locate Service database component are set forth in Exhibit ___. Trunks and facilities for 911 PBX Locate transport component may be ordered by <<customer_short_name>> pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in Attachment ___.

Section XIV: Hybrid Loops

Approved Language:

A hybrid loop is a local loop, composed of both fiber optic cable, usually in the feeder plant, and copper twisted wire or cable, usually in the distribution plant. BellSouth shall provide CLEC with nondiscriminatory access to the time division multiplexing features, functions and capabilities of such hybrid loop, including DS1 and DS3 capacity under Section 251 where impairment exists, on an unbundled basis to establish a complete transmission path between BellSouth's central office and an End User's premises.

BellSouth shall not engineer the transmission capabilities of its network in a manner, or engage in any policy, practice, or procedure, that disrupts or degrades access to a local loop or subloop, including the time division multiplexing-based features, functions, and capabilities of a hybrid loop, for which a requesting telecommunications carrier may obtain or has obtained access pursuant to this Attachment.

Section XV: Routine Network Modifications

Approved Language:

Routine Network Modifications

BellSouth will perform Routine Network Modifications (RNM) in accordance with FCC 47 CFR 51.319 (a)(7) and (e)(4) for Loops and Dedicated Transport provided under this Attachment. If BellSouth normally provides such RNM for its own customers and has recovered the costs for performing such modifications through the rates set forth in Exhibit ___, then BellSouth will perform such RNM at no additional charge. A routine network modification is an activity that BellSouth regularly undertakes for its own customers. Routine network modifications include, but are not limited to, rearranging or splicing of cable; adding an equipment case; adding a doubler or repeater; adding a smart jack; installing a repeater shelf; adding a line card; and deploying a new multiplexer or reconfiguring an existing multiplexer. Routine network modifications may entail activities such as accessing manholes, deploying bucket trucks to reach aerial cable, and installing equipment casings. Routine network modifications do not include the construction of a new loop, or the installation of new aerial or buried cable for a CLEC.

RNM will be performed within the intervals established for the Network Element and subject to the performance measurements and associated remedies set forth in Attachment ___ of this Agreement. If BellSouth does not normally provide such RNM for its own customers, and has not recovered the costs of such RNM in the rates set forth in Exhibit ___, then such request will be handled as a project on an individual case basis. BellSouth will provide a price quote for the request and, upon receipt of payment from CLEC, BellSouth will perform the RNM.

Line Conditioning

Line Conditioning is defined as routine network modification that BellSouth regularly undertakes to provide xDSL services to its own customers. This may include the removal of any device, from a copper Loop or copper Subloop that may diminish the capability of the Loop or Subloop to deliver high-speed switched wireline telecommunications capability, including xDSL service. Such devices include, load coils, excessive bridged taps, low pass filters, and range extenders. Excessive bridged taps are bridged taps that serve no network design purpose and that are beyond the limits set according to industry standards and/or the BellSouth's TR 73600 Unbundled Local Loop Technical Specification.

BellSouth will remove load coils only on copper Loops and Subloops that are less than eighteen thousand (18,000) feet in length.

Any copper loop being ordered by CLEC which has over 6,000 feet of combined bridged tap will be modified, upon request from CLEC, so that the loop will have a maximum of 6,000 feet of bridged tap. This modification will be performed at no additional charge to CLEC. Line conditioning orders that require the removal of other bridged tap that serves no network design purpose on a copper Loop that will result in a combined total of bridged tap between two thousand five hundred (2,500) and six thousand (6,000) feet will be performed at the rates set forth in Exhibit ___.

CLEC may request removal of any unnecessary and non excessive bridged tap (bridged tap between zero (0) and two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet which serves no network design purpose), at rates pursuant to BellSouth's SC Process as mutually agreed to by the Parties.

Rates for Unbundled Loop Modification (ULM) are as set forth in Exhibit ___.

BellSouth will not modify a Loop in such a way that it no longer meets the technical parameters of the original Loop type (e.g., voice grade, ADSL, etc.) being ordered.

If CLEC requests ULM on a reserved facility for a new Loop order, BellSouth may perform a pair change and provision a different Loop facility in lieu of the reserved facility with ULM if feasible. The Loop provisioned will meet or exceed specifications of the requested Loop facility as modified. CLEC will not be charged for ULM if a different Loop is provisioned. For Loops that require a DLR or its equivalent, BellSouth will provide LMU detail of the Loop provisioned.

CLEC will request Loop make up information pursuant to this Attachment prior to submitting a service inquiry and/or a LSR for the Loop type that CLEC desires BellSouth to condition.

When requesting ULM for a Loop that BellSouth has previously provisioned for CLEC, CLEC will submit a SI to BellSouth. If a spare Loop facility that meets the Loop modification specifications requested by CLEC is available at the location for which the ULM was requested, CLEC will have the option to change the Loop facility to the qualifying spare facility rather than to provide ULM. In the event that BellSouth changes the Loop facility in lieu of providing ULM, CLEC will not be charged for ULM but will only be charged the service order charges for submitting an order.

Section XVI: Rates for Routine Network Modifications

Approved Language:

The approved language is included under Section XV.

Section XVII: Overbuild Deployments of Fiber to the Home and Fiber to the Curb Facilities

Approved Language:

In FTTH/FTTC overbuild situations where BellSouth also has copper Loops, BellSouth may make those copper Loops available to <<customer_short_name>> on an unbundled basis, until such time as BellSouth chooses to retire those copper Loops using the FCC's network disclosure requirements. Alternatively, BellSouth will offer a 64 Kbps second voice grade channel over its FTTH/FTTC facilities. BellSouth's retirement of copper Loops must comply with applicable law.

Furthermore, in FTTH/FTTC overbuild areas where BellSouth has not yet retired copper facilities, BellSouth is not obligated to ensure that such copper Loops in that area are capable of transmitting signals prior to receiving a request for access to such Loops by <<customer_short_name>>. If a request is received by BellSouth for a copper Loop, and the copper facilities have not yet been retired, BellSouth will restore the copper Loop to serviceable condition if technically feasible. In these instances of Loop orders in a FTTH/FTTC overbuild area, BellSouth's standard Loop provisioning interval will not apply, and the order will be handled on a project basis by which the Parties will negotiate the applicable provisioning interval.

Section XVIII: EEL Audit Rights

Approved Language:

EELs Audit provisions

BellSouth may, on an annual basis audit CLEC's records in order to verify compliance with the high capacity EEL eligibility criteria. To invoke its limited right to audit, BellSouth will send a Notice of Audit to CLEC. Such Notice of Audit will be delivered to CLEC no less than thirty (30) calendar days prior to the date upon which BellSouth seeks to commence an audit.

The audit shall be conducted by a third party independent auditor, retained and paid for by BellSouth. The audit must be performed in accordance with the standards established by the American Institute for Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) which will require the auditor to perform an "examination engagement" and issue an opinion regarding CLEC's compliance with the high capacity EEL eligibility criteria. AICPA standards and other AICPA requirements will be used to determine the independence of an auditor. The independent auditor's report will conclude whether CLEC complied in all material respects with the applicable service eligibility criteria. Consistent with standard auditing practices, such audits require compliance testing designed by the independent auditor.

To the extent the independent auditor's report concludes that CLEC failed to comply with the service eligibility criteria, CLEC must true-up any difference in payments, convert all noncompliant circuits to the appropriate service, and make the correct payments on a going-forward basis.

To the extent the independent auditor's report concludes that CLEC failed to comply in all material respects with the service eligibility criteria, CLEC shall reimburse BellSouth for the cost of the independent auditor. To the extent the independent auditor's report concludes that CLEC did comply in all material respects with the service eligibility criteria, BellSouth will reimburse CLEC for its reasonable and demonstrable costs associated with the audit, CLEC will maintain appropriate documentation to support its certifications. The Parties shall provide such reimbursement within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of a statement of such costs.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 15, 2006, a copy of the foregoing document was served on the following, via the method indicated:

- ☐ Hand
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Facsimile
- ☐ Overnight
- ☒ Electronic

Henry Walker, Esquire
Boult, Cummings, et al.
1600 Division Street, #700
Nashville, TN 37219-8062
hwalker@boultcummings.com
bmagness@phonelaw.com

- ☐ Hand
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Facsimile
- ☐ Overnight
- ☒ Electronic

James Murphy, Esquire
Boult, Cummings, et al.
1600 Division Street, #700
Nashville, TN 37219-8062
jmurphy@boultcummings.com

- ☐ Hand
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Facsimile
- ☐ Overnight
- ☒ Electronic

Ed Phillips, Esq.
United Telephone - Southeast
14111 Capitol Blvd.
Wake Forest, NC 27587
Edward.phillips@mail.sprint.com

- ☐ Hand
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Facsimile
- ☐ Overnight
- ☒ Electronic

H. LaDon Baltimore, Esquire
Farrar & Bates
211 Seventh Ave. N, # 320
Nashville, TN 37219-1823
don.baltimore@farrar-bates.com
jheitmann@kelleydrye.com

- ☐ Hand
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Facsimile
- ☐ Overnight
- ☒ Electronic

Charles B. Welch, Esquire
Farris, Mathews, et al.
618 Church St., #300
Nashville, TN 37219
cwelch@farrismathews.com
kris.shulman@xo.com

