

**BEFORE THE  
FLORIDA  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**ORIGINAL  
FILE COPY**

**Resolution of Petition(s) to establish )  
nondiscriminatory rates, terms, and ) Docket No. 950985-TP  
conditions for interconnection )  
involving local exchange companies and ) Date: January 22, 1996  
alternative local exchange companies )  
pursuant to Section 364.162, Florida )  
Statutes )**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIMOTHY T. DEVINE  
ON BEHALF OF  
METROPOLITAN FIBER SYSTEMS OF FLORIDA, INC.  
Docket No. 950985-TP**

**DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
00782 JAN 23 86  
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIMOTHY T. DEVINE  
ON BEHALF OF  
METROPOLITAN FIBER SYSTEMS OF FLORIDA, INC.  
Docket No. 950985-TP**

1       **Q.   PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2       **A.**   My name is Timothy T. Devine. My business address is MFS  
3           Communications Company, Inc. ("MFS"), Six Concourse Parkway, Suite  
4           2100, Atlanta, Georgia 30328.

5       **Q.   WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH MFS?**

6       **A.**   I am the Senior Director of External and Regulatory Affairs for the Southern  
7           Region for MFS Communications Company, Inc., the indirect parent company  
8           of Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida.

9                   I will collectively refer to MFSCC and its subsidiaries as "MFS."

10      **Q.   WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN THAT POSITION?**

11      **A.**   I am responsible for the regulatory oversight of commission dockets and other  
12           regulatory matters and serve as MFS's representative to various members of  
13           the industry. I am also responsible for coordinating co-carrier discussions  
14           with Local Exchange Carriers within the Southern Region.

15      **Q.   PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PREVIOUS PROFESSIONAL  
16           EXPERIENCE AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.**

17      **A.**   I have a B.S. in Political Science from Arizona State University and an M.A.  
18           in Telecommunications Policy from George Washington University. I began  
19           work in the telecommunications industry in April 1982 as a sales

1           representative for packet switching services for Graphnet, Inc., one of the first  
2           value-added common carriers in the United States. From 1983 until 1987, I  
3           was employed at Sprint Communications Co., in sales, as a tariff analyst, as a  
4           product manager, and as Manager of Product and Market Analysis. During  
5           1988, I worked at Contel Corporation, a local exchange carrier, in its  
6           telephone operations group, as the Manager of Network Marketing. I have  
7           been working for MFS and its affiliates since January 1989. During this time  
8           period, I have worked in product marketing and development, corporate  
9           planning, regulatory support, and regulatory affairs. Most recently, from  
10          August 1994 until August 1995, I have been representing MFS on regulatory  
11          matters before the New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut state  
12          commissions and was responsible for the MFS Interim Co-Carrier Agreements  
13          with NYNEX in New York and Massachusetts, as well as the execution of a  
14          co-carrier Joint Stipulation in Connecticut.

1       **Q.     PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OPERATIONS OF MFS**  
2           **COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC. AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES.**

3       **A.     MFS Communications Company, Inc. ("MFSCC") is a diversified**  
4           **telecommunications holding company with operations throughout the country,**  
5           **as well as in Europe. MFS Telecom, Inc., an MFSCC subsidiary, through its**  
6           **operating affiliates, is the largest competitive access provider in the United**  
7           **States. MFS Telecom, Inc.'s subsidiaries, including MFS/McCourt, Inc.,**  
8           **provide non-switched, dedicated private line and special access services.**

9                   **MFS Intelenet, Inc. ("MFSI") is another wholly owned subsidiary of**  
10           **MFSCC. It causes operating subsidiaries to be incorporated on a state-by-**  
11           **state basis. MFSI's operating subsidiaries collectively are authorized to**  
12           **provide switched interexchange telecommunications services in 48 states and**  
13           **have applications to offer such service pending in the remaining states. Where**  
14           **so authorized, MFSI's operating subsidiaries offer end users a single source**  
15           **for local and long distance telecommunications services with quality and**  
16           **pricing levels comparable to those achieved by larger communications users.**  
17           **Apart from Florida, MFSI subsidiaries have been authorized to provide**  
18           **competitive local exchange service in twelve states. Since July 1993, MFS**  
19           **Intelenet of New York, Inc. has offered local exchange services in competition**

1 with New York Telephone Company. MFS Intelenet of Maryland, Inc. was  
2 authorized to provide local exchange services in competition with Bell  
3 Atlantic-Maryland, Inc. in April 1994 and recently has commenced  
4 operations. On June 22, 1994, MFS Intelenet of Washington, Inc. was  
5 authorized to provide local exchange services in competition with US West  
6 Communications, Inc. On July 20, 1994, MFS Intelenet of Illinois, Inc. was  
7 certificated to provide local exchange services in competition with Illinois  
8 Bell Telephone Company and Central Telephone Company of Illinois. MFS  
9 Intelenet of Ohio was certificated to provide competitive local exchange  
10 service in competition with Ohio Bell on August 3, 1995. MFS Intelenet of  
11 Michigan, on May 9, 1995, was certificated to provide competitive local  
12 exchange service in competition with Ameritech-Michigan. MFS Intelenet of  
13 Connecticut was certificated to provide local exchange service in competition  
14 with Southern New England Telephone Company on June 28, 1995. MFS  
15 Intelenet of Georgia was authorized to provide competitive local exchange  
16 service on October 27, 1995. MFS Intelenet of Pennsylvania was authorized  
17 to provide competitive local exchange services on October 5, 1995. MFS  
18 Intelenet of Texas was authorized to provide competitive local exchange  
19 service on October 25, 1995. MFS Intelenet of California, Inc. was

1           certificated to provide competitive local exchange services in California by  
2           Order of the California Public Utilities Commission on December 20, 1995.  
3           Finally, MFS Intelenet of Massachusetts was certificated on March 9, 1994 to  
4           operate as a reseller of both interexchange and local exchange services in the  
5           Boston Metropolitan Area in competition with New England Telephone and is  
6           authorized to provide competitive local exchange services in Massachusetts.

7           **Q.   HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS**  
8           **COMMISSION?**

9           **A.**   Yes. The principal proceedings in which I have testified are as follows: on  
10          August 14, 1995 and September 8, 1995, respectively, I filed direct and  
11          rebuttal testimony in the universal service docket. *In re: Determination of*  
12          *funding for universal service and carrier of last resort responsibilities*, Docket  
13          No. 950696-TP. On September 1, 1995 and September 29, 1995, respectively,  
14          I filed direct and rebuttal testimony in the temporary number portability  
15          docket. *In re: Investigation into temporary local telephone portability*  
16          *solution to implement competition in local exchange telephone markets*,  
17          Docket No. 950737-TP. On September 5, 1995 and September 29, 1995,  
18          respectively, I filed direct and rebuttal testimony in the TCG Interconnection  
19          Petition docket. *Resolution of Petition(s) to establish nondiscriminatory*

1           *rates, terms, and conditions for interconnection involving local exchange*  
2           *companies and alternative local exchange companies pursuant to Section*  
3           *364.162, Florida Statutes, Docket No. 950985-TP. On November 13, 1995*  
4           *and December 11, 1995, respectively, I filed direct and rebuttal testimony in*  
5           *the Continental and MFS Interconnection Petition docket. Resolution of*  
6           *Petition(s) to establish nondiscriminatory rates, terms, and conditions for*  
7           *interconnection involving local exchange companies and alternative local*  
8           *exchange companies pursuant to Section 364.162, Florida Statutes, Docket*  
9           *No. 950985A-TP. On November 13, 1995 and December 11, 1995,*  
10          *respectively, I filed direct and rebuttal testimony in the unbundling docket.*  
11          *Resolution of Petition(s) to Establish Unbundled Services, Network Features,*  
12          *Functions or Capabilities, and Local Loops Pursuant to Section 364.161,*  
13          *Florida Statutes, Docket No. 950984-TP. On November 27, 1995 and*  
14          *December 12, 1995, respectively, I filed direct and rebuttal testimony in the*  
15          *MCI Unbundling Petition docket. Resolution of Petition(s) to Establish*  
16          *Unbundled Services, Network Features, Functions or Capabilities, and Local*  
17          *Loops Pursuant to Section 364.161, Florida Statutes, Docket No. 950984B-*  
18          *TP.*

1       **Q.     ARE ANY OF THE PARTIES UPON WHOSE BEHALF YOU ARE**  
2           **TESTIFYING CURRENTLY CERTIFICATED TO PROVIDE**  
3           **SERVICE IN FLORIDA?**

4       **A.**    Yes. Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc., a certificated Alternative  
5           Access Vendor ("AAV"), by letter dated July 5, 1995, notified the  
6           Commission of its intent to provide switched local exchange service in  
7           Florida. The Commission acknowledged this notification on September 12,  
8           1995, and later granted authority to MFS of Florida, Inc. to provide such  
9           services effective January 1, 1996.

10       **I.     PURPOSE AND SUMMARY**

11       **Q.     WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS**  
12           **PROCEEDING?**

13           MFS-FL has filed its interconnection petition in this docket, as well as a  
14           parallel petition in the unbundling docket, because its attempts at negotiations  
15           with Sprint-United Telephone Company of Florida and Sprint-Central  
16           Telephone Company of Florida ("Sprint-United/Centel" collectively) have  
17           failed to yield acceptable co-carrier arrangements, including an agreement on  
18           the pricing of interconnection. MFS-FL therefore is petitioning the  
19           Commission, in accordance with Florida Statute Section 364.162, to establish



1 nondiscriminatory rates, terms, and conditions for interconnection. This  
2 testimony supplements the information contained in the Petition with respect  
3 to the co-carrier arrangements required by MFS-FL to provide economically  
4 viable competitive local exchange service in Florida. Principally, MFS-FL  
5 could not come to an agreement with Sprint-United/Centel because Sprint-  
6 United/Centel delayed consideration of private negotiations for nearly half a  
7 year.

8 **Q. AS A THRESHOLD MATTER, WHAT IS "INTERCONNECTION"?**

9 **A.** The term "interconnection" is very broad and, for purposes of this proceeding,  
10 it will be helpful to distinguish among several types of interconnection. As a  
11 general matter, "interconnection" encompasses any arrangement involving a  
12 connection among different carriers' facilities, regardless of the form or  
13 purpose. For example, if one carrier resells a second carrier's transmission or  
14 switching services instead of constructing its own facilities to provide this  
15 service to the end user, the two carriers are "interconnected." Except where  
16 the second carrier controls a bottleneck facility, however, this form of  
17 interconnection of facilities is an optional and voluntary business  
18 arrangement, since the first carrier could perform the same function by adding  
19 facilities to its own network.

1                   When two or more carriers are providing local exchange service,  
2                   however, a different type of interconnection becomes essential. In that case,  
3                   competing networks must be able to exchange traffic (including the exchange  
4                   of signalling and billing information, and access to other service platforms  
5                   that support local exchange service), because of the overriding public interest  
6                   in preserving universal connectivity. In short, every telephone user in Florida  
7                   must be able to call (and receive calls from) every other user, regardless of  
8                   which carrier provides each user with local exchange service.

9           **Q.   WHY IS INTERCONNECTION AN IMPORTANT ISSUE?**

10          **A.**   It is important because today many Florida businesses and residences have a  
11                  telephone that is connected to Sprint-United/Centel's network. If MFS-FL  
12                  customers cannot place calls to, and receive calls from, customers of Sprint-  
13                  United/Centel, then MFS-FL will be unable, as a practical matter, to engage in  
14                  business in Florida, even if it is authorized to do so as a matter of law. No one  
15                  will buy a telephone service that does not permit calling to all other numbers.  
16                  Moreover, even if MFS-FL customers can place calls to Sprint-United/Centel  
17                  customers located in the same community, but only at excessive cost or with  
18                  inconvenient dialing patterns, poor transmission quality, or lengthy call set-up  
19                  delays, then MFS-FL will not be able to offer a service that customers would

1           be interested in using. Equitable co-carrier arrangements are necessary before  
2           new entrants can compete in the provision of local exchange service.

3           **Q.    WHAT IS MEANT BY THE TERM "CO-CARRIER**  
4           **ARRANGEMENTS"?**

5           **A.    By "co-carrier" arrangements, I refer to a variety of arrangements that will**  
6           **have to be established to allow ALECs and Sprint-United/Centel to deal with**  
7           **each other on a reciprocal, non-discriminatory, and equitable basis. Once the**  
8           **basic principles for such arrangements are established by the Commission, the**  
9           **affected carriers should be directed to implement specific arrangements in**  
10          **conformance with the principles. The term "co-carrier" signifies both that the**  
11          **two carriers are providing local exchange service within the same territory,**  
12          **and that the relationship between them is intended to be equal and recipro-**  
13          **cal—that is, neither carrier would be treated as subordinate or inferior.**

14          **Q.    SPECIFICALLY WHAT CO-CARRIER ARRANGEMENTS ARE**  
15          **REQUIRED FOR MFS-FL TO PROVIDE VIABLE COMPETITIVE**  
16          **LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE?**

17          **A.    MFS-FL believes that certain co-carrier requirements should apply equally**  
18          **and reciprocally to all local exchange carriers, LECs and ALECs alike. The**  
19          **Florida statutes have recognized the necessity for such arrangements by**

1           requiring LECs to negotiate both interconnection and unbundling  
2           arrangements. Fla. Stat. §§ 364.161, 364.162. The following are the co-  
3           carrier arrangements required by MFS-FL: 1) Number Resources; 2) Tandem  
4           Subtending/Meet-point Billing; 3) Reciprocal Traffic Exchange and  
5           Reciprocal Compensation; 4) Shared Platform Arrangements; 5) Unbundling  
6           the Local Loop; and 6) Interim Number Portability. All of these issues will be  
7           addressed herein, with the exception of unbundling which will be addressed in  
8           a separate parallel petition and testimony, and number resources, which the  
9           Commission has addressed in other proceedings.

10       **Q.    WAS THERE AGREEMENT ON ANY OF THESE CO-CARRIER**  
11       **ISSUES WITH SPRINT-UNITED/CENTEL?**

12       **A.    No.** On July 19, 1995, MFS-FL attempted to begin negotiations with  
13       Sprint-United/Centel for interconnection arrangements via a three-page letter  
14       outlining the proposed interconnection arrangements. Nearly four months  
15       later on November 9, 1995, MFS-FL sent Sprint-United/Centel a letter and  
16       a detailed 31-page proposed co-carrier agreement in an attempt to simplify  
17       the negotiations process for Sprint-United/Centel. MFS-FL still received no  
18       formal counterproposal from Sprint-United/Centel. On January 3, 1996,  
19       MFS-FL mailed another letter to Sprint-United/Centel in one last attempt at

1 receiving a response and beginning private negotiations. On January 5,  
2 1996, Sprint-United/Centel sent correspondence to MFS-FL disputing our  
3 status of negotiations. On January 18, 1996, Sprint-United/Centel formally  
4 replied to the MFS-FL proposal with a stipulation. However, upon a  
5 detailed review by MFS-FL, it became apparent that MFS-FL and Sprint-  
6 United/Centel significantly disagree on compensation issues and the  
7 stipulation itself lacks details to appropriately address the other issues. On  
8 January 19, 1996, MFS-FL sent Sprint-United/Centel a letter to indicate that  
9 it was going ahead with its Petition because both companies disagree on the  
10 primary issue of compensation as well as other fundamental issues. MFS-  
11 FL indicated its desire to continue discussions to reach an agreement on all  
12 or as many issues as possible before the hearings commence in March.

13 **II. TANDEM SUBTENDING AND MEET-POINT BILLING**

14 **Q. WHAT IS MEANT BY TANDEM SUBTENDING?**

15 **A.** MFS-FL proposes that if Sprint-United/Centel operates an access tandem  
16 serving a LATA in which MFS-FL operates, it should be required, upon  
17 request, to provide tandem switching service to any other carrier's tandem or  
18 end office switch serving customers within that LATA, thereby allowing  
19 MFS-FL's switch to "subtend" the tandem. This arrangement is necessary to

1 permit IXCs to originate and terminate interLATA calls on an ALEC's  
2 network without undue expense or inefficiency. Similar arrangements already  
3 exist today among LECs serving adjoining territories -- there are many  
4 instances in which an end office switch operated by one LEC subtends an  
5 access tandem operated by a different LEC in the same LATA.

6 **Q. HOW SHOULD INTERCARRIER BILLING BE HANDLED**  
7 **WHEN TANDEM SUBTENDING ARRANGEMENTS ARE**  
8 **USED?**

9 **A.** Where tandem subtending arrangements exist, LECs divide the local transport  
10 revenues under a standard "meet-point billing" formula established by the  
11 OBF and set forth in FCC and state tariffs. The same meet-point billing  
12 procedures should apply where the tandem or end office subtending the  
13 tandem is operated by an ALEC as in the case of an adjoining LEC.

14 MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel should establish meet-point billing  
15 arrangements to enable the new entrants to provide switched access services<sup>1/</sup>  
16 to third parties via a Sprint-United/Centel access tandem switch, in accordance  
17 with the Meet-Point Billing and Provisioning guidelines adopted by the OBF.

---

<sup>1/</sup> E.g., Feature Group B, Feature Group D, 800 access, and 900 access.

1                   Except in instances of capacity limitations, Sprint-United/Centel  
2                   should enable MFS to subtend the Sprint-United/Centel access tandem  
3                   switch(es) nearest to the MFS Rating Point associated with the NPA-NXX(s)  
4                   to or from which the switched access services are homed. In instances of  
5                   capacity limitation at a given access tandem switch, MFS-FL shall be allowed  
6                   to subtend the next-nearest Sprint-United/Centel access tandem switch in  
7                   which sufficient capacity is available.

8                   As I will discuss later in my testimony, interconnection for the meet-  
9                   point arrangement will occur at the Designated Network Interconnection Point  
10                  ("D-NIP") at which point MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel will interconnect  
11                  their respective networks for inter-operability within that LATA. Common  
12                  channel signalling ("CCS") will be utilized in conjunction with meet-point  
13                  billing arrangements to the extent such signaling is resident in the Sprint-  
14                  United/Centel access tandem switch. ALECs and Sprint-United/Centel  
15                  should, individually and collectively, maintain provisions in their respective  
16                  federal and state access tariffs sufficient to reflect this meet-point billing  
17                  arrangement.

18                  **Q.    WHAT PROVISIONS SHOULD APPLY FOR THE EXCHANGE OF**  
19                  **BILLING INFORMATION?**

1       A.     MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel will in a timely fashion exchange all  
2             information necessary to accurately, reliably and promptly bill third parties for  
3             switched access services traffic jointly handled by MFS-FL and Sprint-  
4             United/Centel via the meet-point arrangement. Information will be exchanged  
5             in Electronic Message Record ("EMR") format, on magnetic tape or via a  
6             mutually acceptable electronic file transfer protocol. Furthermore, MFS and  
7             Sprint-United/Centel should employ the calendar month billing period for  
8             meet-point billing, and should provide each other, at no charge, the  
9             appropriate usage data.

10       **Q.     HOW SHOULD BILLING TO THIRD PARTIES BE**  
11             **ACCOMPLISHED?**

12       A.     Initially, billing to third parties for the switched access services jointly  
13             provided by MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel via the meet-point billing  
14             arrangement should be according to the single-bill/multiple tariff method.  
15             Subsequently, billing to third parties for the switched access services jointly  
16             provided by MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel via the meet-point  
17             arrangement shall be, at MFS-FL's preference, according to the single-  
18             bill/single tariff method, single-bill/multiple-tariff method, multiple-  
19             bill/single-tariff method, or multiple-bill/multiple-tariff method. Should



1 MFS-FL prefer to change among these billing methods, MFS-FL would be  
2 required to notify Sprint-United/Centel of such change in writing, 90 days in  
3 advance of the date on which such change was to be implemented.

4 **Q. HOW WOULD SWITCHED ACCESS CHARGES TO THIRD**  
5 **PARTIES BE CALCULATED?**

6 **A.** Switched access charges to third parties would be calculated utilizing  
7 the rates specified in MFS-FL's and Sprint-United/Centel's respective federal  
8 and state access tariffs, in conjunction with the appropriate meet-point billing  
9 factors specified for each meet-point arrangement either in those tariffs or in  
10 the NECA No. 4 tariff. MFS-FL shall be entitled to the balance of the  
11 switched access charge revenues associated with the jointly handled switched  
12 access traffic, less the amount of transport element charge revenues to which  
13 Sprint-United/Centel is entitled pursuant to the above-referenced tariff  
14 provisions. Significantly, this does not include the interconnection charge,  
15 which is to be remitted to the end office provider, which in this case would be  
16 MFS-FL.

17 Where MFS-FL specifies one of the single-bill methods, Sprint-  
18 United/Centel shall bill and collect from third parties, promptly remitting to  
19 MFS-FL the total collected switched access charge revenues associated with

1 the jointly-handled switched access traffic, less only the amount of transport  
2 element charge revenues to which Sprint-United/Centel is otherwise entitled.

3 Meet-point billing will apply for all traffic bearing the 800, 888, or any  
4 other non-geographic NPA which may be likewise designated for such traffic  
5 in the future, where the responsible party is an IXC. In those situations where  
6 the responsible party for such traffic is a LEC, full switched access rates will  
7 apply.

8 **III. RECIPROCAL TRAFFIC EXCHANGE AND RECIPROCAL**  
9 **COMPENSATION**

10 **A. Traffic Exchange Arrangements**

11 **Q. WHAT TRAFFIC EXCHANGE ARRANGEMENTS MUST BE**  
12 **ESTABLISHED FOR THE EXCHANGE OF LOCAL TRAFFIC?**

13 **A.** To effectuate the exchange of traffic, MFS-FL proposes that interconnection  
14 be accomplished through meet-points, with each carrier responsible for  
15 providing trunking to the meet-point for the hand off of combined local and  
16 toll traffic and each carrier responsible for completing calls to all end users on  
17 their networks at the appropriate interconnection rate. In order to establish  
18 meet-points, carriers would pass both local and toll traffic over a single trunk  
19 group, utilizing a percent local utilization ("PLU") factor (similar to the

1           currently utilized percent interexchange utilization ("PIU") factor) to provide  
2           the proper jurisdictional call types, and subject to audit.

3                       MFS-FL proposes that, within each LATA served, MFS-FL and  
4           Sprint-United/Centel would identify a wire center to serve as the Designated  
5           Network Interconnection Point ("D-NIP") at which point MFS-FL and Sprint-  
6           United/Centel would interconnect their respective networks for inter-  
7           operability within that LATA. Where MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel  
8           interconnect at a D-NIP, MFS-FL would have the right to specify any of the  
9           following interconnection methods: a) a mid-fiber meet at the D-NIP or other  
10          appropriate point near to the D-NIP; b) a digital cross-connection hand-off,  
11          DSX panel to DSX panel, where both MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel  
12          maintain such facilities at the D-NIP; or c) a collocation facility maintained by  
13          MFS-FL, Sprint-United/Centel, or by a third party. In extending network  
14          interconnection facilities to the D-NIP, MFS-FL would have the right to  
15          extend its own facilities or to lease dark fiber facilities or digital transport  
16          facilities from Sprint-United/Centel or a third party. Such leased facilities  
17          would extend from any point designated by MFS-FL on its own network  
18          (including a co-location facility maintained by MFS at a Sprint-United/Centel  
19          wire center) to the D-NIP or associated manhole or other appropriate junction

1 point. MFS-FL would also have the right to lease such facilities from Sprint-  
2 United/Centel under the most favorable tariff or contract terms Sprint-  
3 United/Centel offers.

4 Where an interconnection occurs via a collocation facility, no  
5 incremental cross-connection charges would apply for the circuits. Upon  
6 reasonable notice, MFS-FL would be permitted to change from one  
7 interconnection method to another with no penalty, conversion, or rollover  
8 charges.

9 Although one meet-point is the minimum necessary for connectivity,  
10 more than one meet-point could be established if mutually acceptable, but  
11 should not be mandated. Moreover, if an additional mutually acceptable  
12 meet-point is established, the cost of terminating a call to that meet-point  
13 should be identical to the cost of terminating a call to the D-NIP. Any two  
14 carriers could establish specialized meet-points to guarantee redundancy. To  
15 ensure network integrity and reliability to all public switched network  
16 customers, it is desirable to have at least two meet-points. In this way, if one  
17 set of trunks is put out of service for any reason, such as a failure of electronic  
18 components or an accidental line cut, traffic could continue to pass over the  
19 other set of trunks and the impact upon users would be minimized. Each

1 carrier should be responsible for establishing the necessary trunk groups from  
2 its switch or switches to the D-NIP(s).

3 At a minimum, each carrier should be required to establish facilities  
4 between its switch(es) and the D-NIP in each LATA in sufficient quantity and  
5 capacity to deliver traffic to and receive traffic from other carriers.

6 **Q. HOW DOES MFS-FL'S D-NIP PROPOSAL MAXIMIZE THE**  
7 **EFFICIENCY OF THE NETWORK?**

8 **A.** MFS-FL's proposal permits the interconnecting parties—who understand their  
9 networks best and have the greatest incentive to achieve efficiencies—to  
10 determine where interconnection should take place. At the same time,  
11 minimum interconnection requirements are established to ensure that  
12 interconnection will take place between all carriers. MFS-FL opposes any  
13 interconnection plan that mandates too specifically where interconnection  
14 should take place. If carriers are not given flexibility as to where they can  
15 interconnect, inefficiencies will result. MFS-FL would therefore oppose any  
16 proposal that does not permit carriers to maximize the efficiency of their  
17 networks.

1           **Q.     WHAT DOES MFS-FL PROPOSE WITH RESPECT TO TRUNKING,**  
2                   **SIGNALLING, AND OTHER IMPORTANT INTERCONNECTION**  
3                   **ARRANGEMENTS?**

4           **A.     Sprint-United/Centel should exchange traffic between its network and the**  
5                   **networks of competing carriers using reasonably efficient routing, trunking,**  
6                   **and signalling arrangements. ALECs and Sprint-United/Centel should**  
7                   **reciprocally terminate LATA-wide traffic<sup>2/</sup> originating on each other's**  
8                   **network, via two-way trunking arrangements. These arrangements should be**  
9                   **jointly provisioned and engineered.**

10                         Moreover, each local carrier should be required to engineer its portion  
11                   of the transmission facilities terminating at a D-NIP to provide the same grade  
12                   and quality of service between its switch and the other carrier's network as it  
13                   provides in its own network. At a minimum, transmission facilities should be  
14                   arranged in a sufficient quantity to each D-NIP to provide a P.01 grade of  
15                   service. MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel should use their best collective  
16                   efforts to develop and agree upon a Joint Inteconnection Grooming Plan

---

<sup>2/</sup>     The term "LATA-wide traffic" refers to calls between a user of local exchange service where the new entrant provides the dial tone to that user, and a user of a Sprint-provided local exchange service where Sprint provides the dial tone to that user and where both local exchange services bear NPA-NXX designations associated with the same LATA.

1           prescribing standards to ensure that trunk groups are maintained at this grade  
2           of service. Carriers should provide each other the same form and quality of  
3           interoffice signalling (*e.g.*, in-band, CCS, etc.) that they use within their own  
4           networks, and SS7 signalling should be provided where the carrier's own  
5           network is so equipped. (A more detailed description of these proposed  
6           arrangements is described in the Proposed MFS-FL Co-Carrier Agreement,  
7           dated November 9, 1995, attached hereto as Exhibit TTD-2, at 13-14).

8                         ALECs should provide LEC-to-LEC CCS to one another, where  
9           available, in conjunction with LATA-wide traffic, in order to enable full inter-  
10          operability of CLASS features and functions. All CCS signalling parameters  
11          should be provided, including automatic number identification, originating  
12          line information, calling party category, charge number, etc. Sprint-  
13          United/Centel and MFS-FL should cooperate on the exchange of  
14          Transactional Capabilities Application Part ("TCAP") messages to facilitate  
15          full inter-operability of CCS-based features between their respective networks.  
16          CCS should be provided by Signal Transfer Point-to-Signal Transfer Point  
17          connections. Given that CCS will be used cooperatively for the mutual  
18          handling of traffic, link facility and link termination charges should be  
19          prorated 50% between the parties. For traffic for which CCS is not available,

1 in-band multi-frequency, wink start, and E&M channel-associated signalling  
2 will be forwarded. The Feature Group D-like ("FGD-like") trunking  
3 arrangements used by either party to terminate LATA-wide traffic may also be  
4 employed to terminate any other FGD traffic to that party, subject to payment  
5 of the applicable tariffed charges for such other traffic, e.g., interLATA traffic.

6 In addition to transmitting the calling party's number via SS7  
7 signalling, the originating carrier should also be required to transmit the  
8 privacy indicator where it applies. The privacy indicator is a signal that is sent  
9 when the calling party has blocked release of its number, either by per-line or  
10 per-call blocking. The terminating carrier should be required to observe the  
11 privacy indicator on calls received through traffic exchange arrangements in  
12 the same manner that it does for calls originated on its own network.

13 Each carrier should be required to provide the same standard of  
14 maintenance and repair service for its trunks terminating at the D-NIP as it  
15 does for interoffice trunks within its own network. Each carrier should be  
16 required to complete calls originating from another carrier's switch in the same  
17 manner and with comparable routing to calls originating from its own  
18 switches. In particular, callers should not be subject to diminished service



1           quality, noticeable call set-up delays, or requirements to dial access codes or  
2           additional digits in order to complete a call to a customer of a different carrier.

3       **Q.   HOW SHOULD MFS-FL COMPENSATE SPRINT-UNITED/CENTEL**  
4       **FOR TRANSITING TRAFFIC?**

5       **A.**   MFS-FL should only be required to pay for the Sprint-United/Centel  
6       intermediary function of transiting traffic in the limited circumstances in  
7       which two ALECs that are not cross-connected and do not have direct trunks  
8       utilize Sprint-United/Centel trunks to transit traffic. In all cases, ALECs  
9       should have an opportunity to cross-connect. In those instances in which  
10      MFS-FL must pay for this intermediary function, it should pay the lesser of:  
11      1) Sprint-United/Centel's interstate or intrastate switched access per minute  
12      tandem switching element; or 2) a per minute rate of \$0.002.

13      **Q.   WHY SHOULD CARRIERS BE REQUIRED TO USE TWO-WAY**  
14      **TRUNKING ARRANGEMENTS?**

15      **A.**   Carriers should be required to interconnect using two-way trunk groups  
16      wherever technically feasible. Use of two-way trunking arrangements to  
17      connect the networks of incumbent LECs is standard in the industry. Two-  
18      way trunk groups represent the most efficient means of interconnection

1           because they minimize the number of ports each carrier will have to utilize to  
2           interconnect with all other carriers.

3           **Q.    SHOULD INCUMBENT CARRIERS AND NEW ENTRANTS BE**  
4           **REQUIRED TO PROVIDE BLV/I TRUNKS TO ONE ANOTHER?**

5           **A.    MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel should provide LEC-to-LEC Busy Line**  
6           **Verification and Interrupt ("BLV/I") trunks to one another to enable each**  
7           **carrier to support this functionality. MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel should**  
8           **compensate one another for the use of BLV/I according to the effective rates**  
9           **listed in Sprint-United/Centel's federal and state access tariffs, as applicable.**

10          **B.    Reciprocal Compensation**

11          **Q.    WHY IS RECIPROCAL COMPENSATION CRITICAL TO THE**  
12          **DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL EXCHANGE COMPETITION IN**  
13          **FLORIDA?**

14          **A.    Reciprocal compensation arrangements for exchange of local traffic, including**  
15          **traffic traditionally known as intraLATA toll traffic, will be critical to the**  
16          **success or failure of local competition. The level of these charges will have a**  
17          **considerably more dramatic impact on ALECs than on Sprint-United/Centel.**  
18          **While virtually all of the traffic originated by ALEC customers will terminate**  
19          **on Sprint-United/Centel's network, only a small percentage of calls placed by**

1           Sprint-United/Centel customers will terminate on an ALEC's network. If "bill  
2           and keep" is not adopted, ALECs will be affected much more seriously than  
3           Sprint-United/Centel. The compensation scheme for interconnection that is  
4           established in this proceeding can determine a significant portion of an  
5           ALEC's cost of doing business and is therefore critical to ensuring that the  
6           business of providing competitive local exchange service in Florida is a viable  
7           one.

8           **Q.    WHY DOES MFS-FL ADVOCATE THAT COMPETITORS UTILIZE**  
9           **A "BILL AND KEEP" SYSTEM OF RECIPROCAL**  
10           **COMPENSATION?**

11           **A.**    The "bill and keep" method of reciprocal compensation is administratively  
12           simple, avoids complex economic analysis which is at best subject to further  
13           questioning, and is fair. What is more, bill and keep is already the most  
14           commonly used method of reciprocal compensation between LECs throughout  
15           the country. Bill and keep is the ideal interim arrangement until rates can be  
16           set at the Long Run Incremental Cost of Sprint-United/Centel interconnection  
17           once cost studies have been filed that will provide such cost information.

18           **Q.    HOW DOES "BILL AND KEEP" WORK?**

1       A.     Under the "bill and keep" method of reciprocal compensation for  
2             interconnection, each carrier would be compensated in two ways for  
3             terminating local calls originated by customers of other carriers. First, each  
4             carrier would receive the reciprocal right to receive termination of local calls  
5             made by its own customers to subscribers on the other carrier's network  
6             without cash payment, often referred to as payment "in kind." In addition, the  
7             terminating carrier is compensated for call termination by its own customer,  
8             who pays the terminating carrier a monthly fee for service, including the right  
9             to receive calls without separate charge.

10       **Q.     WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OF "BILL AND KEEP"?**

11       A.     One of the principal advantages of bill and keep, as compared with per-minute  
12             switched access charges, is that it economizes on costs of measurement and  
13             billing. With present technology, carriers are unable to measure the number of  
14             local calls that they terminate for any other given carrier. Measurement and  
15             billing costs could significantly increase the TSLRIC of the switching  
16             function for terminating traffic and could result in higher prices for  
17             consumers.

1       **Q.    WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THIS INCREASED COST STEMMING**  
2       **FROM MEASUREMENT AND BILLING OF PER-MINUTE**  
3       **TERMINATION FEES?**

4       **A.**    The overall impact on the cost of providing local exchange service could be  
5       devastating for both business and residential consumers. In order for this  
6       significantly increased cost of providing local exchange service to be justified,  
7       there would have to be a very large imbalance in traffic to make such  
8       measurement worthwhile for society. Moreover, the costs of measurement  
9       would create entry barriers and operate to deter competition, since they would  
10      be added to entrants' costs for nearly all calls (those terminated on the Sprint-  
11      United/Centel network), while being added only to a small fraction of Sprint-  
12      United/Centel calls (those terminated on an ALEC's network).

13      **Q.    WHAT OTHER ADVANTAGES TO "BILL AND KEEP" DO YOU**  
14      **PERCEIVE?**

15      **A.**    The bill and keep method of compensation also provides incentives to carriers  
16      to adopt an efficient network architecture, one that will enable the termination  
17      of calls in the manner that utilizes the fewest resources. A compensation  
18      scheme in which the terminating carrier is able to transfer termination costs to

1           the originating carrier reduces the incentive of the terminating carrier to utilize  
2           an efficient call termination design.

3           **Q.   HAS BILL AND KEEP BEEN ADOPTED IN OTHER STATES?**

4           **A.**   The use of the bill and keep method of compensation as long as traffic is close  
5           to being in balance (within 5%) has been adopted by the Michigan Public  
6           Service Commission. Likewise, the Iowa Utilities Board ordered use of the  
7           bill and keep method of compensation on an interim basis, pending the filing  
8           of cost studies. Both the Connecticut Department of Utility Control and the  
9           Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission also adopted bill and  
10          keep in orders recently adopted. Finally, the California Public Utilities  
11          Commission recently endorsed bill and keep on an interim basis:

12                        "In the interim, local traffic shall be terminated by the LEC for the  
13                        CLC and by the CLC for the LEC over the interconnecting facilities  
14                        described in this Section on the basis of mutual traffic exchange.

15                        Mutual traffic exchange means the exchange of terminating local  
16                        traffic between or among CLCs and LECs, whereby LECs and CLCs  
17                        terminate local exchange traffic originating from end users served by  
18                        the networks of other LECs or CLCs without explicit charging among  
19                        or between said carriers for such traffic exchange."

1            *Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion into*  
2            *Competition for Local Exchange Service, R.95-04-043, I.95-04-044,*  
3            *Decision 95-07-054 (Cal. P.U.C., July 25, 1995).*

4            **Q. HAS "BILL AND KEEP" BEEN SUCCESSFULLY INSTITUTED BY**  
5            **INCUMBENT LECS?**

6            **A.** Incumbent LECs throughout the United States have endorsed this  
7            compensation method by employing it with other LECs. "Bill and keep"  
8            arrangements and similar arrangements that approximate "bill and keep" are  
9            common throughout the United States between non-competing LECs in  
10            exchanging extended area service calls.

11           **Q. DOES MFS HAVE GOOD REASON TO BELIEVE THAT TRAFFIC**  
12           **WILL BE IN BALANCE BETWEEN SPRINT AND ALECS?**

13           **A.** Yes. Although incumbents often argue that, if traffic is not in balance  
14           between two carriers, "bill and keep" is an imperfect method of compensation,  
15           this theory is discredited by the experience of an MFS-FL affiliate in New  
16           York, where MFS is terminating more calls from NYNEX customers than  
17           NYNEX is terminating from MFS customers. In the face of evidence that it is  
18           terminating more minutes of intercarrier traffic in New York than the  
19           incumbent LEC, and hence would profit from a compensation system that

1           measures usage, MFS-FL's support for the bill and keep method of compensa-  
2           tion is all the more credible.

3           **Q.   WHY WOULD BASING TERMINATING ACCESS ON SWITCHED**  
4           **ACCESS MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR ALECS TO COMPETE?**

5           **A.**   Given the flat-rated local exchange rates of Sprint-United/Centel, payment of  
6           switched access would not permit economically viable local exchange  
7           competition. If MFS-FL must pay switched access rates and compete with  
8           Sprint-United/Centel retail rates, the resulting price squeeze would render it  
9           impossible for ALECs such as MFS-FL to compete in the Florida local  
10          exchange market. Accordingly, any efforts by Sprint-United/Centel to impose  
11          additional costs on ALECs through the imposition of a number of additional  
12          charges — switched access interconnection charges, universal service  
13          surcharges, additional trunking costs, and interim number portability charges,  
14          etc. — must not be permitted in the co-carrier arrangements mandated by the  
15          Commission.

16          **Q.   CAN YOU DEMONSTRATE THAT SWITCHED ACCESS RATES**  
17          **ARE UNACCEPTABLE?**

18          **A.**   Yes. A comparison of flat rates charged by BellSouth to residential customers  
19          with usage-based rates charged by BellSouth to competitors for terminating



1 access demonstrates a classic price squeeze. It is this simple price squeeze  
2 that will ensure that competition does not take root in Florida. Significantly,  
3 particularly in a flat-rate environment, the price squeeze is most acute for  
4 larger customers. Thus, ALECs will have an even more difficult time  
5 competing for customers with 800 monthly minutes of use than for customers  
6 with 600 or 460 minutes of use. This makes the price squeeze a particularly  
7 effective means of crippling competitors.

8 **Q. COULD YOU ELABORATE ON THE CONCEPT OF A PRICE**  
9 **SQUEEZE?**

10 **A.** A price squeeze occurs where a firm with a monopoly over an essential input  
11 needed by other firms to compete with the first firm in providing services to  
12 end users sells the input to its competitor at a price that prevents the end user  
13 competitor from meeting the end user price of the first firm, despite the fact  
14 that the competitor is just as efficient as the first firm. A price squeeze is  
15 anticompetitive and deters entry into the market because, by raising entrants'  
16 costs, it forces an entrant who wishes to match the incumbent's prices to  
17 absorb losses as a price of entry. Because of their anticompetitive nature,  
18 price squeezes are condemned as contrary to the public policy and prohibited  
19 by the antitrust laws. *See, e.g., United States v. Aluminum Co. of America,*

1           148 F.2d 416, 437-38 (2d Cir. 1945); *Illinois Cities of Bethany v. F.E.R.C.*,  
2           670 F.2d 187 (D.C.Cir. 1981); *Ray v. Indiana & Michigan Elect. Co.*, 606  
3           F.Supp. 757 (N.D. Ind. 1984). The Commission can ensure that a price  
4           squeeze will not be implemented by applying imputation principles.

5           **Q.    WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE FOR ALEC'S TO USE LOCAL**  
6           **EXCHANGE SERVICE AS A LOSS-LEADER, BUT RECOUP THE**  
7           **LOSS AND MAKE A PROFIT THROUGH OTHER SERVICES, SUCH**  
8           **AS INTRALATA TOLL AND INTERLATA SERVICES?**

9           **A.**    As has been recognized in other jurisdictions, if local exchange competition is  
10           to succeed, competition must be possible in all segments of the local exchange  
11           market, without cross-subsidization from other services. As the Illinois  
12           Commerce Commission recently observed:

13                   "The issue is not whether a new LEC ultimately can scrape  
14                   together revenues from enough sources to be able to afford  
15                   Illinois Bell's switched access charge. The crucial issue is the  
16                   effect of a given reciprocal compensation proposal on  
17                   competition. . . . [A]doption of Illinois Bell's [switched access  
18                   based] proposal and rationale would force new LECs to adopt

1                   either a premium pricing strategy or use local calling as a 'loss-  
2                   leader'. That is not just or reasonable."

3                   *Illinois Bell Telephone Proposed Introduction of a Trial of Ameritech's Customers*  
4                   *First Plan in Illinois*, Docket No. 94-0096, at 98 (Ill. Comm. Comm'n., April 7,  
5                   1995). The Commission must ensure that inflated pricing for interconnection does  
6                   not preclude ALECs from achieving operating efficiency by developing their own  
7                   mixture of competitive products over time, including if a LEC so opts, the provision  
8                   of local exchange service alone.

9                   **Q.     WHY IS A USAGE-BASED SWITCHED ACCESS RATE FOR ALECS**  
10                  **PARTICULARLY INAPPROPRIATE IN AN ENVIRONMENT IN**  
11                  **WHICH SPRINT-UNITED/CENTEL CHARGES ITS END-USER**  
12                  **CUSTOMERS ON A FLAT-RATE BASIS?**

1       A.     As discussed above, usage-based switched access rates can result in a price  
2             squeeze, a result which is exacerbated at higher calling volumes. Unless  
3             usage-based terminating access rates are set at considerably low levels,  
4             ALECs are forced to charge usage-based rates to end-user customers to  
5             recover their costs. This precludes ALECs from offering customers a choice  
6             of flat-rate or measured service, as Florida LECs currently offer. Not only  
7             would ALECs be limited to measured usage services but, as discussed above,  
8             even charging usage-based rates, ALECs cannot begin to compete when  
9             paying switched access.

10       **IV.    SHARED NETWORK PLATFORM ARRANGEMENTS**

11       **Q.    WHAT ARE THE "SHARED PLATFORM" ARRANGEMENTS TO**  
12       **WHICH YOU REFERRED EARLIER?**

13       A.     There are a number of systems in place today that support the local  
14             exchange network and provide customers with services that facilitate use of  
15             the network. Some of these service platforms must be shared by competing  
16             carriers in order to permit customers to receive seamless service. These  
17             platforms include the following:

18             a.     Interconnection Between MFS-FL and Other  
19                     Collocated Entities;

- 1                   b.     911 and E-911 systems;
- 2                   c.     Information Services Billing and Collection;
- 3                   d.     Directory Listings and Distribution;
- 4                   e.     Directory Assistance Service;
- 5                   f.     Yellow Page Maintenance;
- 6                   g.     Transfer of Service Announcements;
- 7                   h.     Coordinated Repair Calls;
- 8                   i.     Busy Line Verification and Interrupt;
- 9                   j.     Information Pages; and
- 10                  k.     Operator Reference Database.

11           **Q.    WHAT ARE MFS-FL'S VIEWS ON THE PROPOSED SHARED**  
12           **PLATFORM ARRANGEMENTS IN THE STIPULATION**  
13           **AGREEMENT BETWEEN BELL SOUTH AND OTHER**  
14           **PARTIES?**

15           **A.    With the exception of compensation issues, MFS-FL would be**  
16           **amenable to entering into similar shared platform arrangements with**  
17           **Sprint-United/Centel. Specifically, MFS-FL agrees in principal with**  
18           **the Stipulation proposals made on the following shared platform**  
19           **arrangements: (1) 911/E911 Access; (2) Directory Listings and**

1           Directory Distributions; (3) Busy Line Verification/Emergency  
2           Interrupt Services; (4) Number Resource Arrangements; (5) CLASS  
3           Interoperability; (6) Network Design and Management; (7) Network  
4           Expansion; and (8) Signaling. However, as I discussed at greater  
5           length later in my testimony, MFS-FL does not agree with the  
6           pricing of many of these arrangements.

7                       The Stipulation also does not address a number of shared  
8           platform arrangements necessary to provide customers with seamless  
9           local exchange services including: (1) interconnection between MFS-  
10          FL and other collocated entities; (2) information services billing and  
11          collection; (3) directory assistance; (4) Yellow Page maintenance; (5)  
12          transfer of service announcements; (6) coordinated repair calls; (7)  
13          information pages; and (8) operator reference database.

14                      I will address all of these shared platform arrangements in  
15          further detail below.

16          **Q.   WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD BE ADOPTED FOR**  
17          **INTERCONNECTION BETWEEN MFS-FL AND OTHER**  
18          **COLLOCATED FACILITIES?**

1       A.     Sprint-United/Centel should enable MFS-FL to directly interconnect  
2             to any other entity which maintains a collocation facility at the same  
3             Sprint-United/Centel wire center at which MFS-FL maintains a  
4             collocation facility, by effecting a cross-connection between those  
5             collocation facilities, as jointly directed by MFS-FL and the other  
6             entity. For each such cross-connection, Sprint-United/Centel should  
7             charge both MFS-FL and the other entity one-half the standard  
8             tariffed special access cross-connect rate. Any proposal that normal  
9             tariff rates apply for each interconnector that utilizes a collocation  
10            arrangement would be a barrier to competition because ALECs  
11            would be required to pay excessive rates for collocation  
12            arrangements.

13       **Q.     WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD BE ADOPTED FOR THE**  
14            **PROVISION OF 911/E911 SERVICES?**

15       A.     MFS-FL will need Sprint-United/Centel to provide trunk connections to its  
16             911/E-911 selective routers/911 tandems for the provision of 911/E911  
17             services and for access to all sub-tending Public Safety Answering Points  
18             ("PSAP"). Interconnection should be made at the Designated Network

1           Interconnection Point.<sup>2/</sup> Sprint-United/Centel must also provide MFS-FL  
2           with the appropriate common language location identifier (“CLLI”) code  
3           and specifications of the tandem serving area.

4                     Sprint-United/Centel should arrange for MFS-FL’s automated  
5           input and daily updating of 911/E911 database information related to  
6           MFS-FL end users. Sprint-United/Centel must provide MFS-FL  
7           with the Master Street Address Guide (“MSAG”) so that MFS-FL  
8           can ensure the accuracy of the data transfer. Additionally, Sprint-  
9           United/Centel should provide to MFS-FL the ten-digit POTS number  
10          of each PSAP which sub-tends each Sprint-United/Centel selective  
11          router/9-1-1 tandem to which MFS-FL is interconnected. Finally,  
12          Sprint-United/Centel should use its best efforts to facilitate the  
13          prompt, robust, reliable and efficient interconnection of MFS-FL  
14          systems to the 911/E911 platforms.

15          **Q.     WHAT ARRANGEMENTS SHOULD BE MANDATED FOR**  
16          **INFORMATION SERVICES BILLING AND COLLECTION?**

---

<sup>2/</sup> As discussed, the D-NIP is the correspondingly identified wire center at which point MFS-FL and BellSouth will interconnect their respective networks for inter-  
operability within that LATA.



1           A.     Where a LEC chooses to offer caller-paid information services, such as 976-  
2                 XXXX services, customers of competing LECs in the same service territory  
3                 should have the ability to call these numbers. In this case, either the LEC  
4                 providing the audiotext service or its customer, the information provider,  
5                 rather than the carrier serving the caller, determines the price of the service.  
6                 Therefore, a co-carrier arrangement should provide that the originating  
7                 carrier will collect the information service charge as agent for the service  
8                 provider, and will remit that charge (less a reasonable billing and collection  
9                 fee) to the carrier offering the audiotext service. To the extent that any  
10                charges apply for the reciprocal termination of local traffic, the originating  
11                carrier should also be entitled to assess a charge for the use of its network in  
12                this situation. This issue should be addressed in the context of the reciprocal  
13                billing and collection arrangements.

14                         MFS-FL will deliver information services traffic originated  
15                         over its Exchange Services to information services provided over  
16                         Sprint-United/Centel's information services platform (*e.g.*, 976) over  
17                         the appropriate trunks. Sprint-United/Centel should at MFS-FL's  
18                         option provide a direct real-time electronic feed or a daily or  
19                         monthly magnetic tape in a mutually-specified format, listing the

1           appropriate billing listing and effective daily rate for each  
2           information service by telephone number. To the extent MFS-FL  
3           determines to provide a competitive information services platform,  
4           Sprint-United/Centel should cooperate with MFS-FL to develop a  
5           LATA-wide NXX code(s) which MFS-FL may use in conjunction  
6           with such platform. Additionally, Sprint-United/Centel should route  
7           calls to such platform over the appropriate trunks, and MFS-FL will  
8           provide billing listing/daily rate information on terms reciprocal to  
9           those specified above.

10                   With respect to compensation issues, MFS-FL will bill and  
11           collect from its end users the specific end user calling rates Sprint-  
12           United/Centel bills its own end users for such services, unless MFS-  
13           FL obtains tariff approval from the Commission specifically  
14           permitting MFS-FL to charge its end users a rate different than the  
15           rate set forth in Sprint-United/Centel's tariff for such services. MFS-  
16           FL will remit the full specified charges for such traffic each month to  
17           Sprint-United/Centel, less \$0.05 per minute, and less uncollectibles.  
18           In the event MFS-FL provides an information service platform,

1           Sprint-United/Centel should bill its end users and remit funds to  
2           MFS-FL on terms reciprocal to those specified above.

3           **Q.   WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD APPLY TO DIRECTORY LISTINGS**  
4           **AND DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE SERVICE?**

5           **A.   The public interest requires that persons be able to obtain telephone listing**  
6           **information for a given locality by consulting only one printed directory or**  
7           **one directory assistance operator. No useful purpose would be served by**  
8           **publishing a separate directory of MFS-FL's customers. MFS-FL therefore**  
9           **proposes that Sprint-United/Centel include MFS-FL's customers' telephone**  
10          **numbers in all its "White Pages" and "Yellow Pages" directory listings and**  
11          **directory assistance databases associated with the areas in which MFS-FL**  
12          **provides services to such customers, and will distribute such directories to**  
13          **such customers, in the identical and transparent manner in which it provides**  
14          **those functions for its own customers' telephone numbers. MFS-FL should**  
15          **be provided the same rates, terms and conditions for enhanced listings (i.e.,**  
16          **bolding, indention, etc.) as are provided to Sprint-United/Centel customers.**

17                   Under MFS-FL's proposal, MFS-FL will provide Sprint-  
18                   United/Centel with its directory listings and daily updates to those  
19                   listings in an industry-accepted format; Sprint-United/Centel will

1           provide MFS-FL a magnetic tape or computer disk containing the  
2           proper format. MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel will accord MFS-  
3           FL's directory listing information the same level of confidentiality  
4           which Sprint-United/Centel accords its own directory listing  
5           information, and Sprint-United/Centel will ensure that access to  
6           MFS-FL's customer proprietary confidential directory information  
7           will be limited solely to those Sprint-United/Centel employees who  
8           are directly involved in the preparation of listings.

9           **Q.   WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD BE ADOPTED FOR BUSY**  
10           **LINE VERIFICATION AND INTERRUPT?**

11           **A.   MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel should establish procedures**  
12           **whereby their operator bureaus will coordinate with each other in**  
13           **order to provide Busy Line Verification ("BLV") and Busy Line**  
14           **Verification and Interrupt ("BLVI") services on calls between their**  
15           **respective end users. BLV and BLVI inquiries between operator**  
16           **bureaus should be routed over the appropriate trunks.**

1       **Q.    WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD BE ADOPTED FOR DIRECTORY**  
2       **ASSISTANCE?**

3       **A.    At MFS-FL's request, Sprint-United/Centel should: (1) provide to MFS-FL**  
4       **operators or to an MFS-FL-designated operator bureau on-line access to**  
5       **Sprint-United/Centel's directory assistance database, where such access is**  
6       **identical to the type of access Sprint-United/Centel's own directory**  
7       **assistance operators utilize in order to provide directory assistance services**  
8       **to Sprint-United/Centel end users; (2) provide to MFS-FL unbranded**  
9       **directory assistance service which is comparable in every way to the**  
10      **directory assistance service Sprint-United/Centel makes available to its own**  
11      **end users; (3) provide to MFS-FL directory assistance service under MFS-**  
12      **FL's brand which is comparable in every way to the directory assistance**  
13      **service Sprint-United/Centel makes available to its own end users; (4) allow**  
14      **MFS-FL or an MFS-FL-designated operator bureau to license Sprint-**  
15      **United/Centel's directory assistance database for use in providing**  
16      **competitive directory assistance services; and (5) in conjunction with (2) or**  
17      **(3), above, provide caller-optional directory assistance call completion**  
18      **service which is comparable in every way to the directory assistance call**  
19      **completion service Sprint-United/Centel makes available to its own end**

1 users. If call completion services were to be resold, Sprint-United/Centel  
2 should be required to provide calling detail in electronic format for MFS-FL  
3 to rebill the calling services.

4 **Q. WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD BE ADOPTED FOR YELLOW PAGE**  
5 **MAINTENANCE AND TRANSFER OF SERVICE**  
6 **ANNOUNCEMENTS?**

7 **A.** With regard to Yellow Page maintenance, Sprint-United/Centel  
8 should work cooperatively with MFS-FL to ensure that Yellow Page  
9 advertisements purchased by customers who switch their service to  
10 MFS-FL (including customers utilizing MFS-FL-assigned telephone  
11 numbers and MFS-FL customers utilizing co-carrier number  
12 forwarding) are maintained without interruption. Sprint-  
13 United/Centel should allow MFS-FL customers to purchase new  
14 yellow pages advertisements without discrimination, at non-  
15 discriminatory rates, terms and conditions. Sprint-United/Centel and  
16 MFS-FL should implement a commission program whereby MFS-FL  
17 may, at MFS-FL's discretion, act as a sales, billing and collection  
18 agent for Yellow Pages advertisements purchased by MFS-FL's  
19 exchange service customers.

1                   When an end user customer changes from Sprint-United/Centel to  
2                   MFS-FL, or from MFS-FL to Sprint-United/Centel, and does not retain its  
3                   original telephone number, the party formerly providing service to the end  
4                   user should provide a transfer of service announcement on the abandoned  
5                   telephone number. This announcement will provide details on the new  
6                   number to be dialed to reach this customer. These arrangements should be  
7                   provided reciprocally, free of charge to either the other carrier or the end  
8                   user customer.

9           **Q.   WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD BE ADOPTED FOR COORDINATED**  
10           **REPAIR CALLS, INFORMATION PAGES AND OPERATOR**  
11           **REFERENCE DATABASE?**

12           **A.   With respect to misdirected repair calls, MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel**  
13           **should educate their respective customers as to the correct telephone**  
14           **numbers to call in order to access their respective repair bureaus. To the**  
15           **extent the correct provider can be determined, misdirected repair calls**  
16           **should be referred to the proper provider of local exchange service in a**  
17           **courteous manner, at no charge, and the end user should be provided the**  
18           **correct contact telephone number. Extraneous communications beyond the**  
19           **direct referral to the correct repair telephone number should be strictly**

1 prohibited. In addition, MFS-FL and Sprint-United/Centel should provide  
2 their respective repair contact numbers to one another on a reciprocal basis.

3 Sprint-United/Centel should include in the "Information Pages" or  
4 comparable section of its White Pages Directories for areas served by MFS-  
5 FL, listings provided by MFS-FL for MFS-FL's calling areas, services  
6 installation, repair and customer service and other information. Such  
7 listings should appear in the manner and likenesses as such information  
8 appears for subscribers of the Sprint-United/Centel and other LECs.

9 Sprint-United/Centel should also be required to provide operator  
10 reference database ("ORDB") updates on a monthly basis at no charge in  
11 order to enable MFS-FL operators to respond in emergency situations.

12 **VI. LOCAL TELEPHONE NUMBER PORTABILITY ARRANGEMENTS**

13 **Q. WHAT ASPECTS OF NUMBER PORTABILITY WERE NOT**  
14 **ADDRESSED IN THE SEPARATE NUMBER PORTABILITY**  
15 **PROCEEDING?**

16 **A.** First, the operational issues that MFS-FL proposes are fully addressed in its  
17 Proposed Co-Carrier Agreement on pp. 26-28, attached hereto as Exhibit 2.  
18 Second, the Interim number portability stipulation explicitly delayed the  
19 issue of "compensation for termination of ported calls and the entitlement to



1           terminating network access charges on ported calls." Number Portability  
2           Stipulation at 3. To the extent that the majority of ALEC customers will  
3           initially be former LEC customers utilizing interim number portability, this  
4           is a critical issue for MFS-FL and other ALECs. Switched access and local  
5           compensation should apply regardless of whether a call is completed using  
6           interim number portability. MFS-FL believes that this is the only approach  
7           consistent with the Commission's goal of introducing competition in the  
8           local exchange market.

9           **Q.   WHICH CARRIER SHOULD COLLECT THE CHARGES FOR**  
10           **TERMINATION OF TRAFFIC ON ITS NETWORK WHEN A CALL**  
11           **IS RECEIVED VIA NUMBER RETENTION?**

12           **A.   Only if the customers' carrier collects these revenues will competition be**  
13           stimulated by interim number portability. Allowing the incumbent LEC to  
14           retain toll access charges for calls terminated to a retained number belonging  
15           to a customer of another carrier would have three adverse consequences.  
16           First, it would reward the incumbent LEC for the lack of true local number  
17           portability, and therefore provide a financial incentive to delay true number  
18           portability for as long as possible. Second, it would help reinforce the  
19           incumbent LEC bottleneck on termination of interexchange traffic, and

1           thereby stifle potential competition in this market. Third, it would impede  
2           local exchange competition by preventing new entrants from competing for  
3           one significant component of the revenues associated with that service,  
4           namely toll access charges.

5                       MFS does not subscribe to the LEC conventional wisdom that access  
6           charges "subsidize" local exchange service, since there is no evidence that  
7           the forward-looking economic cost of the basic local exchange service  
8           exceeds its price as a general matter (aside from special circumstances such  
9           as Lifeline, where a subsidy may exist). Nonetheless, access charges clearly  
10          provide a significant source of revenue -- along with subscriber access  
11          charges, local flat-rate or usage charges, intraLATA toll charges, vertical  
12          feature charges, and perhaps others -- that justify the total cost of  
13          constructing and operating a local exchange network, including shared and  
14          common costs. It is unrealistic to expect ALECs to make the substantial  
15          capital investment required to construct and operate competitive networks if  
16          they will not have the opportunity to compete for all of the services  
17          provided by the LECs and all of the revenues generated by those services.  
18          As long as true local number portability does not exist, the new entrants'  
19          opportunity to compete for access revenue would be severely restricted if

1           they had to forfeit access charges in order to use interim number portability  
2           arrangements.

3           **Q.    SHOULD COMPENSATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE**  
4           **EXCHANGE OF LOCAL OR TOLL TRAFFIC BETWEEN LECS**  
5           **VARY DEPENDING ON WHETHER INTERIM NUMBER**  
6           **PORTABILITY WAS IN PLACE ON A GIVEN CALL?**

7           **A.**    No. Temporary number portability is a technical arrangement that will  
8           permit competition to take root in Florida. The purpose of temporary  
9           number portability is to permit new entrants to market their services to  
10          customers by permitting customers to retain their phone numbers when  
11          switching to a new provider. Because it is necessary to bring to the public  
12          the benefits of competition at this time, temporary number portability  
13          benefits all callers, and has absolutely nothing to do with compensation.  
14          These issues should not be mixed, and compensation should not vary  
15          depending on whether temporary number portability is in place or not.

16          **Q.    WHAT COMPENSATION ARRANGEMENT SHOULD APPLY TO**  
17          **REDIRECTED CALLS UNDER TEMPORARY NUMBER**  
18          **PORTABILITY?**

1       A.     Sprint-United/Centel should compensate MFS-FL as if the traffic had been  
2             terminated directly to MFS-FL's network, except that certain transport  
3             elements should not be paid to MFS-FL to the extent that Sprint-  
4             United/Centel will be transporting the call on its own network. Thus, for  
5             LATA-wide calls originating on Sprint-United/Centel's network and  
6             terminating on MFS-FL's network, the effective inter-carrier compensation  
7             structure at the time the call is placed should apply. Traffic from IXCs  
8             forwarded to MFS-FL via temporary number portability should be  
9             compensated by Sprint-United/Centel at the appropriate intraLATA,  
10            interLATA-intrastate, or interstate terminating access rate less those  
11            transport elements corresponding to the use of the Sprint-United/Centel  
12            network to complete the call. In other words, Sprint-United/Centel should  
13            receive entrance fees, tandem switching, and part of the tandem transport  
14            charges. MFS-FL should receive local switching, the RIC, the CCL, and  
15            part of the transport charge. (The pro-rata billing share to be remitted to  
16            MFS-FL should be identical to the rates and rate levels as non-temporary  
17            number portability calls.) Sprint-United/Centel will bill and collect from the  
18            IXC and remit the appropriate portion to MFS-FL.

19       Q.     **HAS SPRINT-UNITED/CENDEL AGREED TO THIS POSITION?**

1       A.    No. As I stated in my earlier testimony, Sprint-United/Centel has been  
2            unwilling to engage in negotiations with MFS-FL.

3       **Q.    ARE THERE ANY OTHER INTERIM NUMBER PORTABILITY**  
4            **ISSUES THAT ARE UNLIKELY TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE**  
5            **SEPARATE PROCEEDING?**

6       A.    Yes. The details of how a request for interim number portability will be  
7            processed and billed were not addressed. MFS-FL believes that the  
8            Commission should address these issues in this proceeding to ensure that  
9            interim number portability is implemented efficiently and without dispute.

10      **Q.    DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

11      A.    Yes.

**MFS COMMUNICATIONS  
COMPANY, INC.**

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS OFFICE  
3000 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007  
TEL. (202) 424-7709  
FAX (202) 424-7645

July 19, 1995

Mr. John W. Clayton  
Director - National Carrier Accounts  
Sprint - Local Telecommunications Division  
2330 Shawnee Mission Parkway  
Westwood, KS 66205

Dear John:

In preparation for the upcoming Co-carrier meeting between MFS and Sprint , I have prepared the following outline of MFS's proposed arrangements for the co-provision of local exchange services.

I. Number Assignments - MFS will order its own NXX's through the established industry guidelines. MFS will establish rating points for these NXX's, and will list the numbers in the appropriate industry routing and rating guides.

II. Tandem Subtending/Meet-point Billing - Under established industry guidelines, MFS will interconnect with a Sprint access tandem for the provision of switched access services to interexchange carriers. MFS will negotiate the appropriate billing percentages for jointly provided transport services. MFS prefers a single-bill approach for the provision of these services. Included in this arrangement is the routing of 800 calls originated by an MFS end user.

III. Interconnection and Reciprocal Compensation - This defines the physical arrangements that MFS and Sprint will configure to exchange local and toll traffic, and the financial arrangements associated with such arrangements. Existing switched access charges are not appropriate for the termination of local traffic because these rates greatly exceed the long run incremental cost of terminating traffic, and in many cases exceed the retail rate of local calling services.

A. Interconnection of Networks - MFS proposes that interconnection of networks be accomplished through meet points. Each carrier will be responsible for providing trunking to the meet point for the hand off of combined local and toll traffic, and be responsible for completing calls to all end user on their networks at the appropriate interconnection rate.

B. Shared trunk groups - Carriers will pass both toll and local traffic over a single trunk group. A percent local utilization factor will be used to provide the proper local vs. toll percentage, subject to audit.

C. Pricing of interconnection arrangements - MFS proposes that a Bill and Keep, or mutual exchange, arrangement be utilized for the termination of local calls until the long run incremental cost of terminating calls is developed. Under this arrangement, the local portion of traffic completed by the other carrier is not billed. Toll traffic will be billed under the appropriate state or interstate access rates.

IV. Shared Platform Arrangements - The following shared platform arrangements are necessary to provide the full range of necessary local exchange services. MFS would like to explore, where possible, the ability to update appropriate databases by electronic means.

A. Interconnection to 911 systems - Provides for the establishment of trunking between MFS and established 911 hubs for the proper routing of calls.

B. 911 database access - Provides for the update of established ALI databases for the inclusion of new entrant customers.

C. Directory Listings - Provides that new entrants customers are provided the same free initial listing in the existing Bell white and yellow pages as they would receive as a Bell end user.

D. Directory Publishing and Delivery - Provides that new entrant customers are provided the same free service for the delivery of white pages as they would receive as a Bell end user.

E. Directory Assistance Database - Provides that new entrant customers are included in the existing Bell Directory Assistance Database.

F. Access to the Master Street Access Guide (MSAG) - This provides emergency service numbers and information for the correct routing of 911 calls.

G. Interconnection of Operator Service Platforms for the provision of Busy Line Verification and Interrupt Services.

H. Billing Arrangements for Mass Announcement Services

Mr. John W. Clayton  
July 19, 1995  
Page 3

V. Unbundling - Unbundling refers to the utilization of components of Sprint's presently tariffed services. MFS's initial unbundling proposal is to begin utilization of loop facilities between a Sprint central office and a customer premises. Unbundling will require the utilization of collocation for intrastate services, and the utilization of digital loop carrier systems within the collocation arrangements. Loop pricing should be appropriately discounted from the retail price for bundled dial tone line services.

VI. Interim Number Portability - MFS proposes that a remote call forwarding approach be utilized, with SS7 signalling to allow the utilization of certain Class features, until such a point where full number portability is made available. No charge should be applied, with the agreement that MFS would provide the same arrangement back to Sprint at no charge.

I look forward to discussing these issues with you at the meeting. Please call me at (212) 843-3056 if you would like to discuss any of these issues before hand.

Sincerely,



Gary J. Ball  
Director of Regulatory Affairs





Communications Company, Inc.

INFORUM, SUITE 2200  
250 WILLIAMS STREET  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-1034  
TEL. (404) 224-6000  
FAX (404) 224-6060

November 9, 1995

Mr. Jack Burge  
Carrier Account Manager  
Sprint United/Centel  
555 Lake Border Drive  
MC-5322  
Apopka, Florida 32703

**Via Facsimile & Overnite Mail**  
**@407 884 7020**

Dear Jack:

Attached please find a Co-carrier agreement which I am proposing for MFS and Sprint United/Centel to execute to address interconnection and unbundling between our companies in the state of Florida. I am requesting that Sprint United/Centel review the agreement and provide me written comments by the close of business Wednesday, November 22.

Also, I am proposing that we schedule a meeting the week of November 13 to discuss the proposed agreement. I am available to meet next week, any day, except Tuesday, November 14.

Please contact me at 404 224 6115 if you have any questions, and to schedule a meeting date.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Timothy T. Devine". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Timothy T. Devine



Communications Company, Inc.

INFORUM, SUITE 2200  
250 WILLIAMS STREET  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-1034  
TEL. (404) 224-6000  
FAX (404) 224-6060

November 9, 1995

Mr. Jack Burge  
Carrier Account Manager  
Sprint United/Centel  
555 Lake Border Drive  
MC-5322  
Apopka, Florida 32703

**Via Facsimile & Overnite Mail**  
**@407 884 7020**

Dear Jack:

Attached please find a Co-carrier agreement which I am proposing for MFS and Sprint United/Centel to execute to address Interconnection and Unbundling between our companies in the state of Florida. I am requesting that Sprint United/Centel review the agreement and provide me written comments by the close of business Wednesday, November 22.

Also, I am proposing that we schedule a meeting the week of November 13 to discuss the proposed agreement. I am available to meet next week, any day, except Tuesday, November 14.

Please contact me at 404 224 6115 if you have any questions, and to schedule a meeting date.

Sincerely,

Timothy T. Devine



Communications Company, Inc.

INFORUM, SUITE 2200  
250 WILLIAMS STREET  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-1034  
TEL. (404) 224-6000  
FAX (404) 224-6060

November 9, 1995

Mr. Jack Burge  
Carrier Account Manager  
Sprint United/Centel  
555 Lake Border Drive  
MC-5322  
Apopka, Florida 32703

**Via Facsimile & Overnight Mail**  
**@407 884 7020**

Dear Jack:

Attached please find a Co-carrier agreement which I am proposing for MFS and Sprint United/Centel to execute to address Interconnection and Unbundling between our companies in the state of Florida. I am requesting that Sprint United/Centel review the agreement and provide me written comments by the close of business Wednesday, November 22.

Also, I am proposing that we schedule a meeting the week of November 13 to discuss the proposed agreement. I am available to meet next week, any day, except Tuesday, November 14.

Please contact me at 404 224 6115 if you have any questions, and to schedule a meeting date.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Timothy T. Devine". The signature is fluid and cursive, written over a horizontal line.

Timothy T. Devine



INFORUM, SUITE 2200  
250 WILLIAMS STREET  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-1034  
TEL. (404) 224-6000  
FAX (404) 224-6060

November 9, 1995

Mr. Jack Burge  
Carrier Account Manager  
Sprint United/Centel  
555 Lake Border Drive  
MC-5322  
Apopka, Florida 32703

**Via Facsimile & Overnight Mail**  
**@407 884 7020**

Dear Jack:

Attached please find a Co-carrier agreement which I am proposing for MFS and Sprint United/Centel to execute to address Interconnection and Unbundling between our companies in the state of Florida. I am requesting that Sprint United/Centel review the agreement and provide me written comments by the close of business Wednesday, November 22.

Also, I am proposing that we schedule a meeting the week of November 13 to discuss the proposed agreement. I am available to meet next week, any day, except Tuesday, November 14.

Please contact me at 404 224 6115 if you have any questions, and to schedule a meeting date.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Timothy T. Devine". The signature is fluid and cursive, written over a horizontal line.

Timothy T. Devine

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

The Parties, each of which currently provides or intends to provide Exchange Services over their own respective switching networks in the State of Florida, agree pursuant to this Stipulation and Agreement to extend certain arrangements to one another as described and according to the terms, conditions and pricing specified hereunder. The Parties enter into this agreement without prejudice to any positions they have taken previously, or may take in the future in any legislative, regulatory, or other public forum.

**I. RECITALS & PRINCIPLES**

WHEREAS, universal connectivity between common carriers is the defining characteristic of the public switched telecommunications network in which all common carriers participate; and

WHEREAS, absent such connectivity the utility of communications services to individual consumers and to society as a whole would be severely and unnecessarily diminished; and

WHEREAS, encouraging fair, efficient and reasonable connectivity of networks has been identified as being in the public interest and as a guiding principle of U.S. telecommunications policy throughout this century<sup>1</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the events of the last three decades have made it abundantly clear that competition in communications markets has been highly beneficial to consumers and society as a whole; and

WHEREAS, it is now possible and eminently desirable to extend the benefits of competition to the local exchange services market; and

WHEREAS, the most basic prerequisite for the mere introduction of local exchange competition is the establishment of certain arrangements between and among incumbent and entrant local exchange carriers; and

WHEREAS, in order that the greatest possible benefits should accrue to consumers and society, such arrangements must: (1) allow the natural development of full, fair, efficient and effective local exchange competition; (2) allow each carrier to recognize and respond to competitive market incentives to configure robust, high quality, least-cost, efficient networks, to innovate, to optimize overall operations, to improve total customer service and customer responsiveness; and (3) ensure optimal inter-operability and service transparency to all end users, regardless of the carrier from which the end user chooses to receive service; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Beginning at least with the "Kingsbury Commitment of 1913", wherein the Bell System, in a bid to stave off anti-trust action, committed to the United States Attorney General to, among other things, connect its networks with those of independent telephone companies.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

WHEREAS, in order for efficiency and fairness to uphold in these arrangements, it is essential that each incumbent and entrant local exchange carrier be allowed the greatest possible flexibility and discretion to develop its own basic business strategies -- especially with respect to network design, technology and capital choice and deployment, management of operating expenses, product offerings and product packaging -- and should take sole responsibility for, and bear all risks associated with its own strategies and decisions in these areas; and

WHEREAS, no carrier should be in a position to shift any burdens arising from its own unilateral decisions and strategies in these areas onto its competitors, nor be able to confiscate from a competitor any benefits arising from that competitor's own unilateral decisions and strategies; and

WHEREAS, in the service of maximum inter-operability, each incumbent and entrant local exchange carrier should be able to efficiently, flexibly, and robustly exchange traffic and signaling with every other carrier operating in the same area at well-defined and standardized points of mutually agreed interconnection;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual provisions contained herein and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, ELEC and ILEC hereby covenant and agree as follows:

**II. DEFINITIONS**

- A. "Automatic Number Identification" or "ANI" refers to the number transmitted through the network identifying the calling party.
- B. "Central Office Switch", "Central Office" or "CO" means a switching entity within the public switched telecommunications network, including but not limited to:

"End Office Switches" which are Class 5 switches from which end user Exchange Services are directly connected and offered.

"Tandem Office Switches" which are Class 4 switches which are used to connect and switch trunk circuits between and among Central Office Switches.

Central Office Switches may be employed as combination End Office/Tandem Office switches (combination Class 5/Class 4).

- C. "CLASS Features" (also called "Vertical Features") include: Automatic Call Back; Automatic Recall; Call Forwarding Busy Line/Don't Answer; Call Forwarding Don't Answer; Call Forwarding Variable; Call Forwarding - Busy Line; Call Trace; Call Waiting; Call Number Delivery Blocking Per

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

Call; Calling Number Blocking Per Line; Cancel Call Waiting; Distinctive Ringing/Call Waiting; Incoming Call Line Identification Delivery; Selective Call Forward; Selective Call Rejection; Speed Calling; and Three Way Calling/Call Transfer.

- D. "Co-Location" or "Co-Location Arrangement" is an interconnection architecture method in which one carrier extends network transmission facilities to a wire center/aggregation point in the network of a second carrier, whereby the first carrier's facilities are terminated into equipment installed and maintained in that wire center by or on the behalf of the first carrier for the primary purpose of interconnecting the first carrier's facilities to the facilities of the second carrier.
- E. "Commission" means the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC).
- F. "Common Channel Signaling" or "CCS" means a method of digitally transmitting call set-up and network control data over a special network fully separate from the public switched network that carries the actual call.
- G. "Cross Connection" means an intra-wire center channel connecting separate pieces of telecommunications equipment including equipment between separate co-location facilities.
- H. "DID" means direct inward dialing.
- I. "DS-1" is a digital signal rate of 1.544 Mbps (Mega Bit Per Second).
- J. "DS-3" is a digital signal rate of 44.736 Mbps.
- K. "DSX panel" is a cross-connect bay/panel used for the termination of equipment and facilities operating at digital rates.
- L. "Electronic File Transfer" refers to any system/process which utilizes an electronic format and protocol to send/receive data files.
- M. "Entrant Local Exchange Carrier" or "ELEC" means a LEC which is not the current or former Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier in any geographic area.
- N. "Exchange Message Record" or "EMR" is the standard used for exchange of telecommunications message information among Local Exchange Carriers for billable, non-billable, sample, settlement and study data. EMR format is contained in BR-010-200-010 *CRIS Exchange Message*

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

*Record*, a Bellcore document which defines industry standards for exchange message records:

- O. "Exchange Service" refers to all basic access line, PBX trunk, Centrex/ESSX-like services, ISDN services, or any other services offered to end users which provide end users with a telephonic connection to, and a unique telephone number address on, the public switched telecommunications network, and which enable such end users to place or receive calls to all other stations on the public switched telecommunications network.
- P. "Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier" or "ILEC" means a LEC which is currently or was previously the exclusive LEC in a given geographic area.
- Q. "Interconnection" means the connection of separate pieces of equipment, transmission facilities, etc., within, between or among networks. The architecture of interconnection may include several methods including, but not limited to co-location arrangements and mid-fiber meet arrangements.
- R. "Interexchange Carrier" or "IXC" means a provider of stand-alone interexchange telecommunications services.
- S. "Interim Number Portability" or "INP" means the transparent delivery of Local Telephone Number Portability ("LTNP") capabilities, from a customer standpoint in terms of call completion, and from a carrier standpoint in terms of compensation, through the use of existing and available call routing, forwarding, and addressing capabilities.
- T. "ISDN" means Integrated Services Digital Network; a switched network service providing end-to-end digital connectivity for the simultaneous transmission of voice and data. Basic Rate Interface-ISDN (BRI-ISDN) provides for digital transmission of two 64 Kbps bearer channels and one 16 Kbps data channel (2B + D). Primary Rate Interface-ISDN (PRI-ISDN) provides for digital transmission of twenty-three (23) 64 Kbps bearer channels and one 16 Kbps data channel (23 B + D).
- U. "Line Side" refers to an end office switch connection that has been programmed to treat the circuit as a local line connected to a ordinary telephone station set. Line side connections offer only those transmission and signaling features appropriate for a connection between an end office and an ordinary telephone station set.
- V. "Link Element" or "Link" is a component of an Exchange Service; for purposes of general illustration, the "Link Element" is the transmission



**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

facility (or channel or group of channels on such facility) which extends from a Main Distribution Frame, DSX-panel, or functionally comparable piece of equipment in an ILEC end office wire center, to a demarcation or connector block in/at a customer's premises. Traditionally, links were provisioned as 2-wire or 4-wire copper pairs running from the end office distribution frame to the customer premise; however, a link may be provided via other media, including radio frequencies, as a channel on a high capacity feeder/distribution facility which may in turn be distributed from a node location to the customer premise via a copper or coax drop facility, etc. Links fall into the following categories:

"2-wire analog voice grade links" will support analog transmission of 300-3000 Hz, repeat loop start or ground start seizure and disconnect in one direction (toward the end office switch), and repeat ringing in the other direction (toward the end user). This link is commonly used for local dial tone service.

"2-wire ISDN digital grade links" will support digital transmission of two 64 Kbps bearer channels and one 16 Kbps data channel. This is a 2B+D basic rate interface Integrated Services Digital Network (BRI-ISDN) type of loop which will meet national ISDN standards.

"4-wire DS-1 digital grade links" will support full duplex transmission of isochronous serial data at 1.544 Mbps. This T-1/DS-1 type of loop provides the equivalent of 24 voice grade/DS0 channels.

- W. "Local Exchange Carrier" or "LEC" means any carrier that provides facility-based Exchange Services utilizing a switch it owns or substantially controls in conjunction with unique central office codes assigned directly to that carrier. This includes both Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers ("ILEC") and Entrant Local Exchange Carriers ("ELEC").
- X. "Local Telephone Number Portability" or "LTNP" means the technical ability to enable an end user customer to utilize its telephone number in conjunction with any exchange service provided by any Local Exchange Carrier operating within the geographic number plan area with which the customer's telephone number(s) is associated, regardless of whether the customer's Chosen Local Exchange Carrier is the carrier which originally assigned the number to the customer, without penalty to either the customer or its chosen local exchange carrier.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

- Y. "Main Distribution Frame" or "MDF" is the primary point at which outside ~~plant facilities terminate within a wire center, for interconnection to other~~ telecommunications facilities within the wire center.
- Z. "Meet-Point Billing" or "MPB" refers to an arrangement whereby two LECs jointly provide the transport element of a switched access service to one of the LEC's end office switches, with each LEC receiving an appropriate share of the transport element revenues as defined by their effective access tariffs.
- AA. "MECAB" refers to the *Multiple Exchange Carrier Access Billing (MECAB)* document prepared by the Billing Committee of the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF), which functions under the auspices of the Carrier Liaison Committee (CLC) of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS). The MECAB document, published by Bellcore as Special Report SR-BDS-000983, contains the recommended guidelines for the billing of an access service provided by two or more LECs, or by one LEC in two or more states within a single LATA.
- BB. "MECOD" refers to the *Multiple Exchange Carriers Ordering and Design (MECOD) Guidelines for Access Services - Industry Support Interface*, a document developed by the Ordering/Provisioning Committee under the auspices of the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF), which functions under the auspices of the Carrier Liaison Committee (CLC) of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS). The MECOD document, published by Bellcore as Special Report SR STS-002643, establish methods for processing orders for access service which is to be provided by two or more LECs.
- CC. "Mid-Fiber Meet" is an interconnection architecture method whereby two carriers meet at a fiber splice in a junction box.
- DD. "NANP" means the "North American Numbering Plan", the system of telephone numbering employed in the United States, Canada, and the Caribbean countries which employ NPA 809.
- EE. "Numbering Plan Area" or "NPA" is also sometimes referred to as an area code. This is the three digit indicator which is defined by the "A", "B", and "C" digits of each 10-digit telephone number within the North American Numbering Plan ("NANP"). Each NPA contains 800 possible NXX Codes. There are two general categories of NPA, "Geographic NPAs" and "Non-Geographic NPAs". A "Geographic NPA" is associated with a defined geographic area, and all telephone numbers bearing such NPA are associated with services provided within that geographic area. A "Non-Geographic NPA", also known as a "Service Access Code" or

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

"SAC Code" is typically associated with a specialized telecommunications service which may be provided across multiple geographic NPA areas; 800, 900, 700, and 888 are examples of Non-Geographic NPAs.

- FF. "NXX", "NXX Code", "Central Office Code" or "CO Code" is the three digit switch entity indicator which is defined by the "D", "E", and "F" digits of a 10-digit telephone number within the North American Numbering Plan ("NANP"). Each NXX Code contains 10,000 station numbers. Historically, entire NXX code blocks have been assigned to specific individual local exchange end office switches.
- GG. "On-Line Transfer" means the transferring of an incoming call to another telephone number without the call being disconnected.
- HH. "Permanent Number Portability" or "PNP" means the use of a database solution to provide fully transparent LTNP for all customers and all providers without limitation.
- II. "Plain Old Telephone Service Traffic" or "POTS traffic" refers to calls between two or more Exchange Service users, where both Exchange Services bear NPA-NXX designations associated with the same LATA or other authorized area (e.g., Extended Area Service Zones in adjacent LATAs). POTS traffic includes the traffic types that have been traditionally referred to as "local calling", as "extended area service (EAS)", and as "intraLATA toll".
- JJ. "Port Element" or "Port" is a component of an Exchange Service; for purposes of general illustration, the "Port" is a line card and associated peripheral equipment on an ILEC end office switch which serves as the hardware termination for the customer's exchange service on that switch and generates dial tone and provides the customer a pathway into the public switched telecommunications network. Each Port is typically associated with one (or more) telephone number(s) which serves as the customer's network address. Port categories include:

"2-wire analog line port" is a line side switch connection employed to provide basic residential and business type Exchange Services.

"2-wire ISDN digital line port" is a Basic Rate Interface (BRI) line side switch connection employed to provide ISDN Exchange Services.

"2-wire analog DID trunk port" is a direct inward dialing (DID) trunk side switch connection employed to provide incoming trunk type Exchange Services.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

"4-wire DS-1 digital DID trunk port" is a direct inward dialing (DID) trunk side switch connection employed to provide the equivalent of 24 analog incoming trunk type Exchange Services.

"4-wire ISDN digital DS-1 trunk port" is a Primary Rate Interface (PRI) trunk side switch connection employed to provide the ISDN Exchange Services.

- KK. "Rate Center" means the specific geographic point and corresponding geographic area which have been identified by a given LEC as being associated with a particular NPA-NXX code which has been assigned to the LEC for its provision of Exchange Services. The "rate center point" is the finite geographic point identified by a specific V&H coordinate, which is used to measure distance-sensitive enduser traffic to/from Exchange Services bearing the particular NPA-NXX designation associated with the specific Rate Center. The "rate center area" is the exclusive geographic area which the LEC has identified as the area within which it will provide Exchange Services bearing the particular NPA-NXX designation associated with the specific Rate Center. The Rate Center point must be located within the Rate Center area.
- LL. "Rating Point", sometimes also referred to as "Routing Point" means a location which a LEC has designated on its own network as the homing (routing) point for traffic inbound to Exchange Services provided by the LEC which bear a certain NPA-NXX designation. Pursuant to Bellcore Practice BR 795-100-100, the Rating Point may be an "End Office" location, or a "LEC Consortium Point of Interconnection". Pursuant to that same Bellcore Practice, examples of the latter shall be designated by a common language location identifier (CLLI) code with (x)KD in positions 9, 10, 11, where (x) may be any alphanumeric A-Z or 0-9. The Rating Point/Routing Point need not be the same as the Rate Center Point, nor must it be located within the Rate Center Area.
- MM. "Reference of Calls" refers to a process in which calls are routed to an announcement which states the new telephone number of an end user.
- NN. "Service Control Point" or "SCP" is the node in the signaling network to which informational requests for service handling, such as routing, are directed and processed. The SCP is a real time database system that, based on a query from the SSP, performs subscriber or application-specific service logic, and then sends instructions back to the SSP on how to continue call processing.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

- OO. "Signal Transfer Point" or "STP" performs a packet switching function that routes signaling messages among SSPs, SCPs and other STPs in order to set up calls and to query databases for advanced services.
- PP. "Synchronous Optical Network" or "SONET" means ...
- QQ. "Switched Access Service" means the offering of facilities for the purpose of the origination or termination of non-POTS traffic to or from Exchange Services offered in a given area. Switched Access Services include: Feature Group A, Feature Group B, Feature Group D, 800 access, and 900 access.
- RR. "Trunk Side" refers to a central office switch connection that is capable of, and has been programmed to treat the circuit as, connecting to another switching entity, for example a private branch exchange ("PBX") or another central office switch. Trunk side connections offer those transmission and signaling features appropriate for the connection of switching entities, and can not be used for the direct connection of ordinary telephone station sets.
- SS. "Wire Center" means a building or space within a building which serves as an aggregation point on a given carrier's network, where transmission facilities and circuits are connected or switched.

**III. DEFAULT NETWORK INTERCONNECTION ARCHITECTURE**

LECs shall interconnect their networks as necessary to effect the Co-Carrier Arrangements identified in Parts V., VI., VII., and IX. Any two or more LECs shall be free to employ whatever network interconnection architecture and at whatever points as the may mutually agree, provided that each LEC makes available the same arrangements to each other LEC operating within the same areas. Notwithstanding any mutual agreements which may be established between carriers regarding the architecture of network interconnection arrangements they may voluntarily establish between their networks, each LEC shall, upon request by any other LEC, minimally make available to that LEC interconnection arrangements conforming to the default network interconnection architecture defined below:

- A. In each LATA within which at least one ELEC provides Exchange Service, the ILEC wire center housing the ILEC tandem switch with the greatest traffic volume in the LATA shall be designated as the Default Network Interconnection Point ("D-NIP"). The D-NIP shall be the point at which all LECs providing Exchange Services within the LATA shall have the right to interconnect to all other LECs providing Exchange Services within the LATA.



**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

- B. Where an ELEC and an ILEC interconnect at a D-NIP, ELEC shall have the right to specify any of the following interconnection methods:
1. a mid-fiber meet at the D-NIP, or in a manhole or other appropriate junction point near to or just outside the D-NIP;
  2. a digital cross-connection hand-off, DSX panel to DSX panel, where both the ELEC and the ILEC maintain such facilities at the D-NIP;
  3. a co-location facility maintained by ELEC, or by a 3rd-party with whom ELEC has contracted for such purposes, at an ILEC wire center, where such wire center has been designated as the D-NIP; or
  4. a co-location facility maintained by ILEC, or by a 3rd-party with whom ILEC has contracted for such purposes, at an ELEC wire center, where such wire center has been designated as the D-NIP.
- C. In extending network interconnection facilities to the D-NIP, ELEC shall have the right to extend its own facilities or to lease dark fiber facilities or digital transport facilities from ILEC or from any 3rd-party, subject to the following terms:
1. Such leased facilities shall extend from any point designated by ELEC on its own network (including a co-location facility maintained by ELEC at an ILEC wire center) to the D-NIP or associated manhole or other appropriate junction point.
  2. Where ELEC leases such facilities from ILEC, ELEC shall have the right to lease under the most favorable tariff or contract terms ILEC offers.
- D. Where an interconnection occurs via a co-location facility, no incremental cross-connection charges shall apply for the circuits required by this agreement.
- E. Upon reasonable notice, ELEC may change from one of the interconnection methods specified above, to one of the other methods specified above, with no penalty, conversion, or rollover charges.

**IV. NUMBER RESOURCE ARRANGEMENTS**

- A. Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to in any manner limit or otherwise adversely impact any LEC's right to employ or to request and

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

be assigned any NANP number resources including, but not limited to, central office (NXX) codes pursuant to the Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines<sup>2</sup>.

- B. As contemplated by the Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines, each LEC shall designate within the geographic NPA with which each of its assigned NXX codes is associated, a Rate Center area within which it intends to offer Exchange Services bearing that NPA-NXX designation, and a Rate Center point to serve as the measurement point for distance-sensitive traffic to/from the Exchange Services bearing that NPA-NXX designation.
- C. Each LEC will also designate a Rating Point for each assigned NXX code. A LEC may designate one location within each Rate Center as the Rating Point for the NPA-NXXs associated with that Rate Center; alternatively, the LEC may designate a single location within one Rate Center to serve as the Rating Point for all the NPA-NXXs associated with that Rate Center and with one or more other Rate Centers served by the LEC within the same LATA.
- D. To the extent any ILEC serves as Central Office Code Administrator for a given region, the ILEC will support all other LEC requests related to central office (NXX) code administration and assignments in an effective and timely manner.
- E. All LECs will comply with code administration requirements as prescribed by the Federal Communications Commission, the Public Service Commission, and accepted industry guidelines.
- F. It shall be the responsibility of each LEC to program and update its own switches and network systems to recognize and route traffic to each other LEC's assigned NXX codes at all times. No LEC shall impose any fees or charges whatsoever on any other LEC for such activities.

**V. MEET-POINT BILLING ARRANGEMENTS**

A. Description

- 1. Each ELEC may at its sole option and discretion establish meet-point billing arrangements with an ILEC in order to provide Switched Access Services to third parties via an ILEC access tandem switch, in accordance with the Meet-Point Billing

---

<sup>2</sup> Last published by the Industry Numbering Committee ("INC") as INC 95-0407-008, Revision 4/7/95, formerly ICCF 93-0729-010.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

guidelines adopted by, and contained in the Ordering and Billing Forum's MECAB and MECOD documents, except as modified herein.

2. Except in instances of capacity limitations, ILEC shall permit and enable ELEC to sub-tend the ILEC access tandem switch(es) nearest to the ELEC Rating Point(s) associated with the NPA-NXX(s) to/from which the Switched Access Services are homed. In instances of capacity limitation at a given access tandem switch, ELEC shall be allowed to sub-tend the next-nearest ILEC access tandem switch in which sufficient capacity is available.
3. Except in those instances where ELEC and ILEC have negotiated mutually-agreeable alternative network interconnection arrangements, interconnection for the meet-point arrangement shall occur at the D-NIP.
4. Common channel signalling ("CCS") shall be utilized in conjunction with meet-point billing arrangements to the extent such signaling is resident in the ILEC access tandem switch.
5. ELEC and ILEC will use their best reasonable efforts, individually and collectively, to maintain provisions in their respective federal and state access tariffs, and/or provisions within the National Exchange Carrier Association ("NECA") Tariff No. 4, or any successor tariff, sufficient to reflect this meet-point billing arrangement, including meet-point billing percentages.
6. As detailed in the MECAB document, ELEC and ILEC will in a timely fashion exchange all information necessary to accurately, reliably and promptly bill third parties for Switched Access Services traffic jointly handled by ELEC and ILEC via the meet-point arrangement.<sup>3</sup> Information shall be exchanged in Electronic Message Record ("EMR") format, on magnetic tape or via a mutually acceptable electronic file transfer protocol.
7. ELEC and ILEC shall employ the calendar month billing period for meet-point billing, and shall provide each other, at no charge, the Usage Data.

---

<sup>3</sup> Including, as necessary, call detail records, interstate/intrastate/intraLATA percent of use factors, carrier name and billing address, carrier identification codes, serving wire center designation, etc., associated with such switched access traffic.



B. Compensation

1. At ELEC's option, billing to 3rd-parties<sup>4</sup> for the Switched Access Services jointly provided by ELEC and ILEC via the meet-point arrangement shall be according to the single-bill/single tariff method, single-bill/multiple-tariff method, multiple-bill/single-tariff method, or multiple-bill/multiple-tariff method.
2. Switched Access charges to 3rd-parties shall be calculated utilizing the rates specified in ELEC's and ILEC's respective federal and state access tariffs, in conjunction with the appropriate meet-point billing factors specified for each meet-point arrangement either in those tariffs or in the NECA No. 4 tariff.
3. ELEC shall be entitled to the balance of the switched access charge revenues associated with the jointly handled switched access traffic, less the amount of transport element charge revenues<sup>5</sup> to which ILEC is entitled pursuant to the above-referenced tariff provisions.
4. Where ELEC specifies one of the single-bill methods, ILEC shall bill and collect from 3rd parties, promptly remitting to ELEC the total collected switched access charge revenues associated with the jointly-handled switched access traffic, less only the amount of transport element charge revenues to which ILEC is otherwise entitled.
5. MPB will apply for all traffic bearing the 800, 888, or any other non-geographic NPA which may be likewise designated for such traffic in the future, where the responsible party is an IXC. In those situations where the responsible party for such traffic is a LEC, full switched access rates will apply.

VI. RECIPROCAL TRAFFIC EXCHANGE ARRANGEMENT

A. Description

LECs shall reciprocally terminate POTS calls originating on each others' networks. Except in those instances where two (or more) LECs have

---

<sup>4</sup> Including any future ILEC separate interexchange subsidiaries.

<sup>5</sup> For purposes of clarification, this does not include the interconnection charge, which is to be remitted to the end office provider, which in this case would be ELEC.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

negotiated mutually-agreeable alternative network interconnection arrangements, reciprocal traffic exchange shall occur as follows:

1. LECs shall make available to each other interconnection facilities for the reciprocal exchange of POTS traffic at the D-NIP. The POTS reciprocal traffic exchange facilities established between any two LECs shall be configured as two separate trunk groups, whereby the first LEC shall utilize the first trunk group to terminate traffic to the second LEC, and the second LEC shall utilize the second trunk group to terminate traffic to the first LEC.
2. The connections between the interconnection trunk groups shall be made at a DS-1 or multiple DS-1 level (including SONET) and shall be jointly-engineered to an objective P.01 grade of service.
3. Initial connections shall be made at an aggregate network level per D-NIP, such that a single trunk group shall be established in each direction between the two LEC networks, unless otherwise agreed to by the two LECs.

In those instances where the total traffic in either direction between the networks of two LECs (other than the ILEC with the greatest traffic in the LATA) is less than 2,000,000 per month for a sustained period of six (6) months, the ILEC which carries the greatest amount of traffic within the LATA shall allow those two LECs to route traffic between their respective networks via the aggregate traffic exchange trunk groups each LEC maintains with the ILEC for the exchange of traffic with the ILEC. In such instances, ILEC shall route traffic between the two LECs as if the originating LEC network was a single switching entity within the ILEC's own network.

4. Whenever the total traffic in either direction between discrete switching entities in two separate LEC networks exceeds 2,000,000, per month for a sustained period of three (3) months, disaggregated traffic exchange trunk group paths shall be established between those two switching entities at the option of either LEC. The interconnection architecture shall be the same as that which pertained for the aggregated connections.
5. Each party shall deliver to each other party POTS traffic at the D-NIP associated with the LATA in which the POTS traffic occurs.
6. LECs will provide Common Channel Signalling (CCS) to one another, where and as available, in conjunction with all traffic

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

exchanged at the D-NIP. LECs will cooperate on the exchange of **Transactional Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) messages to facilitate full inter-operability of CCS-based features between their respective networks, including all CLASS features and functions.** All CCS signalling parameters will be provided including automatic number identification (ANI), originating line information (OLI) calling party category, charge number, etc. All privacy indicators will be honored. Network signalling information such as Carrier Identification Parameter (CCS platform) and CIC/OZZ information (non-CCS environment) will be provided wherever such information is needed for call routing or billing. For traffic for which CCS is not available, in-band multi-frequency (MF), wink start, E&M channel-associated signalling with ANI will be forwarded.

7. LECs shall establish company-wide CCS interconnections STP-to-STP. Such interconnections shall be made at the D-NIP, as necessary.
8. Where any two LECs exchange traffic at the D-NIP, one LEC may request, and the second LEC shall provide within 60 days of receiving such request, a separated trunk group from the D-NIP to a specific end office or tandem switching entity in the network of the second LEC, in that the first LEC may utilize such separated trunk group in order to both terminate POTS traffic to points subtending that specific switch, and terminate and originate to such points non-POTS which would otherwise be terminated or originated to such switch via Feature Group ("FGD") Switched Access Services which the first LEC would otherwise purchase from the second LEC. All POTS traffic carried over such trunk group shall be subject solely to the compensation arrangements specified below for POTS traffic. All non-POTS traffic carried over such trunk group shall be subject solely to the applicable tariffed FGD Switched Access charges which would otherwise apply to such traffic, as described below.

**B. Compensation**

1. A POTS call handed-off at the D-NIP corresponding to the LATA in which the call occurs, shall be exchanged on an in-kind basis, with no charges, including CCS charges, applying in either direction.
2. A POTS call which is routed between two LECs via the aggregate traffic exchange trunk groups which each LEC maintains between its own network and the network of the largest ILEC operating in

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

the LATA, shall be exchanged on an in-kind basis, with no charges applying in either direction between the two LECs at either end of the call. However, the LEC on whose network the call originated shall pay the ILEC the lesser of : (1) ILEC's interstate Switched Access Service per minute tandem switching rate element; (2) ILEC's intrastate Switched Access Service per minute tandem switching rate element; or (3) a per minute rate of \$0.002. Should non-POTS traffic be exchanged over such arrangements, in either direction, such traffic will be subject to the standard meet-point billing compensation and procedures which would otherwise apply.

3. FGD charges for non-POTS traffic carried together with POTS traffic over a separated trunk group shall be calculated as follows:
  - a. FGD charges for non-POTS traffic shall be applied as if the D-NIP is the serving wire center for the FGD service.
  - b. Non-POTS traffic which would otherwise be subject to originating FGD charges will be rated and billed according to procedures which otherwise apply for the rating and billing of originating FGD traffic.
  - c. Non-POTS traffic which would otherwise be subject to terminating FGD charges will be rated and billed according to the procedures which otherwise apply for the rating and billing of terminating FGD traffic, with the following modifications:
    - (1) The initial written request for separated trunk groups to a specific switching entity shall include percentage of use factors for POTS traffic, intrastate non-POTS traffic, and interstate non-POTS traffic (the sum of which should equal 100%) the requesting (first) LEC expects to terminate over the separated trunk group.
    - (2) The initial estimated percentages shall be employed by the second LEC to rate and bill all traffic terminated over the separated trunk group, beginning on the date on which non-POTS traffic is initially terminated over over such trunk group, up to and including the last day of the calendar quarter following the quarter in which such terminations were initiated.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

- (3) Beginning with the calendar quarter immediately following the calendar quarter in which termination of non-POTS traffic was initiated, the first LEC shall by the 45th day of each new calendar quarter provide to the second LEC the actual terminating traffic percentages from the immediately preceding calendar quarter shall be provided for application in the next following calendar quarter. The second LEC shall utilize these percentages in calculating the terminating traffic exchange charges, terminating intrastate FGD charges, and terminating interstate FGD charges due from the first LEC.

**VII. SHARED NETWORK PLATFORM ARRANGEMENTS**

A. Interconnection Between ELECs Co-Located in an ILEC Wire Center

1. Description

ILEC will enable any two ELECs to directly interconnect their respective networks, where both ELECs maintain co-location facilities at the same ILEC wire center, by effecting a cross-connection between those co-location facilities, as jointly directed by the two ELECs.

2. Compensation

For cross-connections between two ELEC co-location facilities in the same ILEC wire center, ILEC will charge each ELEC one-half the standard tariffed special access cross-connect rate.

B. 9-1-1/E9-1-1

1. Description

- a. ELEC will interconnect to the ILEC 9-1-1/E-9-1-1 selective routers/911 tandems which serve the areas in which ELEC provides exchange services, for the provision of 9-1-1/E9-1-1 services and for access to all sub-tending Public Safety Answering Points ("PSAP"). ILEC will provide ELEC with the appropriate CLLI codes and specifications of the tandem serving area.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

- b. Except in those instances where ELEC and ILEC have negotiated mutually-agreeable alternative network interconnection arrangements, interconnection shall be made at the D-NIP.
- c. ILEC and ELEC will arrange for the automated input and daily updating of 9-1-1/E-9-1-1 database information related to ELEC end users. ILEC will provide ELEC with the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) so that ELEC can ensure the accuracy of the data transfer. Additionally, ILEC shall provide to ELEC the ten-digit POTS number for each PSAP that sub-tends each ILEC selective router/9-1-1 tandem to which ELEC is interconnected.
- d. ILEC will use its best efforts to facilitate the prompt, robust, reliable and efficient interconnection of ELEC systems to the 9-1-1/E-9-1-1 platforms.

2. Compensation

No charges shall apply for the provision of 911/E911 services between ILECs and ELECs.

C. Information Services Billing and Collection

1. Description

- a. Except in those instances where ELEC and ILEC have negotiated mutually-agreeable alternative network interconnection arrangements, ELEC shall deliver information services traffic originated over ELEC's Exchange Services to information services provided over ILEC's information services platform (*e.g.*, 976) over the reciprocal traffic exchange trunk groups interconnected at the D-NIP designated by the ILEC for receipt of such traffic.
- b. ILEC will at ELEC's option provide a direct real-time electronic feed or a daily or monthly magnetic tape in a mutually-specified format, listing the appropriate billing listing and effective daily rate for each information service by telephone number.
- c. To the extent ELEC determines to provide a competitive information services platform, ILEC will cooperate with ELEC to develop a LATA-wide NXX code(s) which ELEC

may use in conjunction with such platform. Additionally, ILEC shall route calls to such platform and ELEC will provide billing listing/daily rate information on terms reciprocal to those specified above.

2. Compensation

- a. ELEC will bill and collect from its end users the specific end user calling rates ILEC bills its own end users for such services, unless ELEC obtains tariff approval from the Public Service Commission ("PSC") specifically permitting ELEC to charge its end users a rate different than the rate set forth in ILEC's tariff for such services.
- b. ELEC will remit the full specified charges for such traffic each month to ILEC, less \$0.05 per minute, and less uncollectibles.
- c. In the event ELEC provides an information service platform, ILEC shall bill its end users and remit funds to ELEC on terms reciprocal to those specified above.

D. Directory Listings and Directory Distribution

1. Description

The directory listings and distribution terms and rate specified in this section shall apply to listings of ELEC customer numbers falling within NXX codes directly assigned to ELEC, and to listings of ELEC customer telephone numbers which are retained by ELEC pursuant to Local Telephone Number Portability Arrangements described below.

- a. ILEC will include ELEC's customers' telephone numbers in its "White Pages" and "Yellow Pages" directory listings and directory assistance databases associated with the areas in which ELEC provides services to such customers, and will distribute such directories to such customers, in the identical and transparent manner in which it provides those functions for its own customers' telephone numbers.
- b. ELEC will provide ILEC with its directory listings and daily updates to those listings in in an industry-accepted format; ILEC will provide ELEC a magnetic tape or computer disk containing the proper format.

- c. ELEC and ILEC will accord ELEC' directory listing information the same level of confidentiality which ILEC accords its own directory listing information, and ILEC shall ensure that access to ELEC's customer proprietary confidential directory information will be limited solely to those ILEC employees who are directly involved in the preparation of listings.

2. Compensation

- a. ILEC shall remit to ELEC a royalty payment for sales of any bulk directory lists to third parties, where such lists include ELEC customer listings.
- b. Such royalty payments shall be in proportion to the number of ELEC listings to ILEC listings contained in the list purchased by the third party, less 10% which ILEC may retain as sales commission.

E. Directory Assistance (DA)

1. Description

At ELEC' request, ILEC will:

- a. provide to ELEC operators or to an ELEC-designated operator bureau on-line access to ILEC's directory assistance database, where such access is identical to the type of access ILEC's own directory assistance operators utilize in order to provide directory assistance services to ILEC end users;
- b. provide to ELEC unbranded directory assistance service ELEC which is comparable in every way to the directory assistance service ILEC makes available to its own end users;
- c. provide to ELEC directory assistance service under ELEC's brand which is comparable in every way to the directory assistance service ILEC makes available to its own end users;
- d. allow ELEC or an ELEC-designated operator bureau to license ILEC's directory assistance database for use in providing competitive directory assistance services; and/or



**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

- e. in conjunction with VII.E.1.b. or VII.E.1.c., above, provide **caller-optional directory assistance call completion service** which is comparable in every way to the directory assistance call completion service ILEC makes available to its own end users.

2. Compensation

ILEC will charge ELEC Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC)--based rates for the following functionality:

- a. \$0.0\_\_ per directory assistance database query.
- b. \$0.0\_ per unbranded directory assistance call.
- c. \$0.0\_ per branded directory assistance call.
- d. \$ \_\_\_ for licensing of each directory assistance database.
- e. \$0.0\_ per use of caller-optional directory assistance call completion. (ILEC will provide calling and billing detail to ELEC in an acceptable format to ELEC for customer billing.

F. Yellow Page Maintenance

ILEC will work cooperatively with ELEC to ensure that Yellow Page advertisements purchased by customers who switch their service to ELEC (including customers utilizing ELEC-assigned telephone numbers and ELEC customers utilizing co-carrier number forwarding) are maintained without interruption. ILEC will allow ELEC customers to purchase new yellow pages advertisements without discrimination, at non-discriminatory rates, terms and conditions. ILEC and ELEC will implement a commission program whereby ELEC may, at ELEC's sole discretion, act as a sales, billing and collection agent for Yellow Pages advertisements purchased by ELEC's exchange service customers.

G. Transfer of Service Announcements

When an end user customer changes from ILEC to ELEC, or from ELEC to ILEC, and does not retain its original telephone number, the party formerly providing service to the end user will provide a transfer of service announcement on the abandoned telephone number. This announcement will provide details on the new number to be dialed to

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

reach this customer. These arrangements will be provided reciprocally, free of charge to either the other carrier or the end user customer.

H. Coordinated Repair Calls

ELEC and ILEC will employ the following procedures for handling misdirected repair calls:

1. ELEC and ILEC will educate their respective customers as to the correct telephone numbers to call in order to access their respective repair bureaus.
2. To the extent the correct provider can be determined, misdirected repair calls will be referred to the proper provider of local exchange service in a courteous manner, at no charge, and the end user will be provided the correct contact telephone number. Extraneous communications beyond the direct referral to the correct repair telephone number are strictly prohibited.
3. ELEC and ILEC will provide their respective repair contact numbers to one another on a reciprocal basis.

I. Busy Line Verification and Interrupt

1. Description

Each LEC shall establish procedures whereby its operator bureau will coordinate with the operator bureaus of each other LEC operating in the LATA in order to provide Busy Line Verification ("BLV") and Busy Line Verification and Interrupt ("BLVI") services on calls between their respective end users. BLV and BLVI inquiries between operator bureaus shall be routed over the Reciprocal Traffic Exchange Trunk groups.

2. Compensation

Each LEC shall equally and reciprocally compensate each other LEC for BLV and BLVI inquiries according to the following LRIC-based rates:

	<u>per inquiry</u>
BLV	\$0. __
BLVI	\$0. __

J. Information Pages

ILEC will include in the "Information Pages" or comparable section of its White Pages Directories for areas served by ELEC, listings provided by ELEC for ELEC's installation, repair and customer service and other information. Such listings shall appear in the manner and likenesses as such information appears for subscribers of the ILEC and other LECs.

K. Operator Reference Database (ORDB)

ILEC will provide the ELEC with monthly updates of the ILEC's Operator Reference Database (ORDB) in electronic format at no charge to enable ELECs to promptly respond to emergency agencies (i.e. fire, police, etc) in an timely fashion when emergencies occur.

**VIII. UNBUNDLED EXCHANGE SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS**

A. Description

ILEC shall immediately unbundle all its Exchange Services into two separate packages: (1) link element plus cross-connect element; and (2) port element plus cross-connect element. The following link and port categories shall be provided:

Link Categories

2-wire analog voice grade  
2 wire ISDN digital grade  
4-wire DS-1 digital grade

Port Categories

2-wire analog line  
2-wire ISDN digital line  
2-wire analog DID trunk  
4-wire DS-1 digital DID trunk  
4-wire ISDN DS-1 digital trunk

ILEC shall unbundle and separately price and offer these elements such that ELEC will be able to lease and interconnect to whichever of these unbundled elements ELEC requires, and to combine the ILEC-provided elements with any facilities and services that ELEC may itself provide, in order to efficiently offer telephone services to end users, pursuant to the following terms:

1. Interconnection shall be achieved via co-location arrangements ELEC shall maintain at the wire center at which the unbundled elements are resident.
2. At ELEC' discretion, each link or port element shall be delivered to the ELEC co-location arrangement over an individual 2-wire hand-

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

off, in multiples of 24 over a digital DS-1 hand-off in any combination or order ELEC may specify, or through other technically feasible and economically comparable hand-off arrangements requested by ELEC (e.g., SONET STS-1 hand-off).

3. All transport-based features, functions, service attributes, grades-of-service, install, maintenance and repair intervals which apply to the bundled service should apply to unbundled links.
4. All switch-based features, functions, service attributes, grades-of-service, and install, maintenance and repair intervals which apply to the bundled service should apply to unbundled ports.
5. ILEC will permit any customer to convert its bundled service to an unbundled service and assign such service to ELEC, with no penalties, rollover, termination or conversion charges to ELEC or the customer.
6. ILEC will bill all unbundled facilities purchased by ELEC (either directly or by previous assignment by a customer) on a single consolidated statement per wire center.
7. Where ILEC utilizes digital loop carrier ("DLC")<sup>6</sup> technology to provision the link element of an bundled Exchange Service to an end user customer who subsequently determines to assign the link element to ELEC and receive Exchange Service from ELEC via such link, ILEC shall deliver such link to ELEC on an unintegrated basis, pursuant to ELEC' chosen hand-off architecture, without a degradation of end user service or feature availability.
8. ILEC will permit ELEC to co-locate remote switching modules and associated equipment in conjunction with co-location arrangements ELEC maintains at an ILEC wire center, for the purpose of interconnecting to unbundled link elements.
9. ILEC shall provide ELEC with an appropriate on-line electronic file transfer arrangement by which ELEC may place, verify and receive confirmation on orders for unbundled elements, and issue and track trouble-ticket and repair requests associated with unbundled elements.

---

<sup>6</sup> See, Bellcore TR-TSY-000008, *Digital Interface Between the SLC-96 Digital Loop Carrier System and Local Digital Switch* and TR-TSY-000303, *Integrated Digital Loop Carrier (IDLC) Requirements, Objectives, and interface*.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

**B. Compensation**

Prices for unbundled elements should be based on long run service incremental cost, should depart from cost in equal proportions, and should be imputed into the bundled service rates, such that the following pricing formulae are satisfied:

$$P_B/C_B = P_L/C_L = P_P/C_P = P_C/C_C$$

and

$$P_B = P_L + P_P + P_C$$

**Where:**

- P<sub>B</sub>** = Price of the bundled service (including all applicable discounts).
- C<sub>B</sub>** = Long-run service incremental cost ("LRSIC") of the bundled service.
- P<sub>L</sub>** = Price of the unbundled link element.
- C<sub>L</sub>** = LRSIC of the unbundled link element.
- P<sub>P</sub>** = Price of the unbundled port element.
- C<sub>P</sub>** = LRSIC of the unbundled port element.
- P<sub>C</sub>** = Price of the unbundled cross-connect element.
- C<sub>C</sub>** = LRSIC of the unbundled cross-connect element.

ILEC shall provide links and ports to ELEC at the following monthly recurring rates:

	<u>Price, each when delivered over:</u>	
	<u>an individual</u>	<u>a digital</u>
	<u>2-wire hand-off</u>	<u>DS-1 hand-off</u>
2-wire analog voice grade link	\$ _____	\$ _____
2 wire ISDN digital grade link	\$ _____	\$ _____
4-wire DS-1 digital grade link	\$ <u>n/a</u>	\$ <u>7</u>

<sup>7</sup> To be provided as a Special Access or Private Line DS-1 Channel Termination/Local Distribution Channel, subject to the most favorable tariff or contract terms for which ELEC is eligible, except in those situations where:

- The ILEC offers its own end user customers a bundled DS-1 digital grade Exchange Service at a bundled rate which is less than the sum of the unbundled 4-wire DS-1 digital DID trunk port rate and the most favorable Channel Termination/Local Distribution Channel rate for which ELEC is eligible. In such instances, the ILEC shall provide 4-wire DS-1 digital grade links to ELEC at a rate less than or equal to the price of the bundled DS-1 digital grade Exchange Service less the unbundled 4-wire DS-1 digital DID trunk port rate, for ELEC's use in the provision of DS-1 digital grade Exchange Services.
- and/or
- The ILEC offers its own end user customers a bundled DS-1 digital grade Exchange Service (continued...)

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

2-wire analog line port	\$ _____	\$ _____
2-wire ISDN digital line port	\$ _____	\$ _____
2-wire analog DID trunk port	\$ _____	\$ _____
4-wire DS-1 digital DID trunk port	\$ n/a	\$ _____
4-wire ISDN-PRI digital trunk port	\$ n/a	\$ _____

C. Process for Requests for Further Essential Facilities

In the event that an ELEC identifies a new essential facility or function that would facilitate its provision of a competitive basic local exchange service offering, it shall submit a written request to the Commission and the appropriate ILEC for the provision of that essential facility or function. This request shall contain the name of the requesting entity, the date of the request, and the specific type of unbundling requested. The ILEC shall file a tariff providing the new essential facility or function service offering within 60 days, or within 30 days it should file a statement with the Commission indicating why it would not be technologically practicable to provide the component as a separate service offering. Any provider whose request for the provision of an essential facility or function is denied or not acted upon in a timely manner may file a complaint in accordance with current Commission rules.

**IX. LOCAL TELEPHONE NUMBER PORTABILITY ARRANGEMENTS**

A. Description

ILEC and ELEC will provide Local Telephone Number Portability ("LTNP") on a reciprocal basis between their networks to enable each of their end user customers to utilize telephone numbers associated with an Exchange Service provided by one carrier, in conjunction an Exchange Service provided by the other carrier, upon the coordinated or simultaneous termination of the first Exchange Service and activation of the second Exchange Service.

1. ELEC and ILEC will provide reciprocal LTNP immediately upon execution of this agreement via Interim Number Portability ("INP") measures. ILEC and ELEC will migrate from INP to a database-driven Permanent Number Portability ("PNP") arrangement as soon

---

<sup>7</sup> (...continued)

with performance specifications (including, but not limited to, installation intervals, service intervals, service priority, bit-error rates, interruption/availability rates, quality or conditioning) superior to that provided for Special Access or Private Line Channel Terminations/Local Distribution Channels. In such instances, the ILEC shall provide the same or better performance characteristics to ELEC for all DS-1 digital grade links ELEC purchases for use in the provision of DS-1 digital grade Exchange Services.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

as practically possible, without interruption of service to their respective customers.

2. INP shall operate as follows:

a. A customer of Carrier A elects to become a customer of Carrier B. The customer elects to utilize the original telephone number(s) corresponding to the Exchange Service(s) it previously received from Carrier A, in conjunction with the Exchange Service(s) it will now receive from Carrier B. Upon receipt of a signed letter of agency from the customer assigning the number to Carrier B, Carrier A will implement one of the following arrangements:

(1) For the portability of telephone numbers which are not part of a DID number block, Carrier A will implement an arrangement whereby all calls to the original telephone number(s) will be forwarded to a new telephone number(s) designated by Carrier B. Carrier A will route the forwarded traffic to Carrier B via the mutual traffic exchange arrangements, as if the call had originated from the original telephone number and terminated to the new telephone number.

(2) For the portability of telephone numbers which are part of a DID number block, Carrier A will provide Carrier B an aggregated, digital DS-1 or higher grade DID trunk group at each D-NIP (interface to be achieved in the same manner as the traffic exchange trunk groups at each D-NIP), such that all inbound traffic to ported DID numbers will be delivered to Carrier B over this digital DID trunk facility. In order for a customer to port its DID numbers from Carrier A to Carrier B, the customer will be required to assign entire 20-number DID blocks to Carrier B.

b. Carrier B will become the customer of record for the original Carrier A telephone numbers subject to the INP arrangements. Carrier A will provide Carrier B a single consolidated master billing statement for all collect, calling card, and 3rd-number billed calls associated with those numbers, with sub-account detail by retained number. At Carrier B's sole discretion, such billing statement shall be

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

delivered in real time via an agreed-upon electronic data transfer, or via daily or monthly magnetic tape.

- c. Carrier A will update its Line Information Database ("LIDB") listings for retained numbers, and restrict or cancel calling cards associated with those forwarded numbers, as directed by Carrier B.
  - d. Within two (2) business days of receiving notification from the customer, Carrier B shall notify Carrier A of the customer's termination of service with Carrier B, and shall further notify Carrier A as to the Customer's instructions regarding its telephone number(s). Carrier A will cancel the INP arrangements for the customer's telephone number(s). If the Customer has chosen to retain its telephone number(s) for use in conjunction with Exchange Services provided by Carrier A or by another LEC which participates in INP arrangements with Carrier A, Carrier A will simultaneously transition the number(s) to the customer's preferred carrier.
3. Under either an INP or PNP arrangement, ELEC and ILEC will implement a process to coordinate LTNP cut-overs with Unbundled Link conversions (as described in Paragraph VIII., above). ELEC and ILEC pledge to use their best efforts to ensure that LTNP arrangements will not be utilized in instances where a customer changes locations and would otherwise be unable to retain its number without subscribing to foreign exchange service.

**B. Compensation**

1. ELEC and ILEC shall provide LTNP (either INP or PNP) arrangements to one another at no charge, except for authorized collect, calling card and 3rd-number billed calls billed to the retained numbers. However, for all traffic forwarded between ELEC and ILEC in the manner described above, reciprocal compensation charges (pursuant to paragraph VI., above) and Switched Access charges (pursuant to each carrier's respective access tariffs), for POTS traffic and non-POTS traffic, respectively, shall be passed through as if the caller had directly dialed the new telephone number.
2. In INP arrangements, in order to effect this pass-through of reciprocal compensation and Switched Access charges to which each carrier would otherwise have been entitled if the ported



**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

traffic had been directly dialed to the new number, each carrier will be required to classify and include ported traffic in its quarterly percentage of use reports as POTS, intrastate non-POTS, or interstate non-POTS.

**X. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES**

- A. ILEC and ELEC agree to treat each other fairly, non-discriminatorily, and equally for all items included in this agreement, or related to the support of items included in this agreement.
- B. ELEC and ILEC will work cooperatively to minimize fraud associated with 3rd-number billed calls, calling card calls, or any other services related to this agreement.
- C. ELEC and ILEC agree to promptly exchange all necessary records for the proper billing of all traffic.
- D. For network expansion, ELEC and ILEC will review engineering requirements on a quarterly basis and establish forecasts for trunk utilization. New trunk groups will be implemented as dictated by engineering requirements for both ILEC and ELEC. ILEC and ELEC are required to provide each other the proper call information (e.g., originated call party number and destination call party number, CIC, OZZ, etc.) to enable each company to bill in a complete and timely fashion.
- E. There will be no re-arrangement, reconfiguration, disconnect, or other non-recurring fees associated with the initial reconfiguration of each carrier's traffic exchange arrangements upon execution of this agreement, other than the cost of establishing a new co-location arrangement where one does not already exist.
- F. ILEC shall assess no cross-connect fee on ELEC where ELEC establishes a meet-point billing connection, a D-NIP interconnection, or accesses a 911 or E911 port through a co-location arrangement at a ILEC wire center.

**XI. TERM**

ELEC and ILEC agree to provide service to each other on the terms defined in this agreement until superseded by another agreement or until standard arrangements are approved by the Public Service Commission, whichever occurs first. By mutual agreement, ELEC and ILEC may amend this agreement to extend the term of this agreement. Also by mutual agreement, ILEC and ELEC may jointly petition the appropriate regulatory bodies for permission to have

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

this agreement supersede any future standardized agreements or rules such regulators might adopt or approve.

**XII. INSTALLATION**

ILEC and ELEC shall effectuate all the terms of this agreement by within 90 days upon execution of this agreement.

**XIII. NETWORK MAINTENANCE AND MANAGEMENT**

ELEC and ILEC will work cooperatively to install and maintain a reliable network. ELEC and ILEC will exchange appropriate information (e.g., maintenance contact numbers, network information, information required to comply with law enforcement and other security agencies of the Government, etc.) to achieve this desired reliability.

ELEC and ILEC will work cooperatively to apply sound network management principles by invoking network management controls to alleviate or to prevent congestion.

**XIV. OPTION TO ELECT OTHER TERMS**

If, at any time, while this agreement is in effect, either of the parties to this agreement provides arrangements similar to those described herein to a third party operating within the same LATAs (including associated Extended Area Service Zones in adjacent LATAs) as for which this agreement applies, on terms different from those available under this agreement (provided that the third party is authorized to provide local exchange services), then the other party to this agreement may opt to adopt the rates, terms, and conditions offered to the third party for its own reciprocal arrangements with the first party. This option may be exercised by delivering written notice to the first party. The party exercising its option under this paragraph must continue to provide services to the first party as required by this agreement, subject either to the rates, terms, and conditions applicable to the third party or to the rates, terms, and conditions of this agreement, whichever is more favorable to the first party.

**XV. CANCELLATION, CONVERSION, NON-RECURRING OR ROLL-OVER CHARGES**

Neither ELEC nor ILEC shall impose cancellation charges upon each other.

**XVI. FORCE MAJEURE**

[to be inserted]

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION  
AND AGREEMENT**

---

**XVII. LIMITATION OF LIABILITY**

[to be inserted]

\* \* \* \* \*

Each of the signatories below agree to abide by the terms of this stipulation and agreement.

---

Sprint United/Centel	Date
----------------------	------

---

Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc.	Date
---	------



INFORUM, SUITE 2200  
250 WILLIAMS STREET  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-1034  
TEL. (404) 224-6000  
FAX (404) 224-6060

January 3, 1996

Mr. Jack Burge  
Carrier Account Manager  
Sprint United/Centel  
555 Lake Border Drive  
MC-5322  
Apopka, Florida 32703

**Via Facsimile & Overnite Mail**  
**@407 884 7020**

Dear Jack:

On July 19, 1995 MFS initiated Interconnection and Unbundling negotiations with Sprint United/Centel Florida by detailing MFS' request in a letter to your colleague Mr. John Clayton, subsequently on November 9, 1995, MFS further defined its request to Sprint United/Centel when I sent a 30 page proposed agreement to your attention. In my November 9 letter I specifically requested that Sprint United/Centel respond to MFS' proposed agreement in writing by November 22.

While we have had a couple of conference calls, Sprint United/Centel has not provided MFS with a comprehensive detailed written response to MFS' request for Interconnection and Unbundling, therefore I am planning to file a petition against Sprint United/Centel for Interconnection and Unbundling with the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) as early as next week.

Even though I am planning to initiate a petition at the PSC next week, I would like Sprint United/Centel to become more forthright with MFS in an attempt to reach agreement on our request and thus avoid litigation before the PSC.

Please contact me immediately at my new office location listed on the attached so we may discuss this issue in more detail.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Timothy T. Devine". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Timothy T. Devine

**Tim Devine New Contact Information:**

Timothy T. Devine  
Senior Director, External & Regulatory Affairs  
MFS Communications Company, Inc.  
Six Concourse Parkway, Suite 2100  
Atlanta, Georgia 30328-5351

Voice: 770 399 8378

Fax: 770 399 8398

Pager: 800 306 1459



Box 165000, MC 5322  
Altamonte Springs, Florida 32716-5000  
Telephone: 407-889-6747  
Fax: 407-884-7020

Jack K. Burge  
Account Executive

January 5, 1996

Mr. Timothy T. Devine  
Senior Director, External &  
Regulatory Affairs  
MFS Communications Company, Inc.  
Six Concourse Parkway, Suite 2100  
Atlanta, GA 30328-5351

Dear Tim:

The purpose of this letter is to respond to your letter dated January 3, 1996. I was a little surprised to read your depiction of the status of interconnection discussions between our two companies.

I would like to respond with my view of interconnection discussions between our two companies and then offer to meet with you either in person or via a conference call any time after January 10, 1996.

My recollection of the course of events on our discussions is as follows:


MFS sent a letter to Mr. John Clayton, Sprint/Local Telephone Division, on about July 19, 1995. Mr. John Clayton responded to that letter and asked for a response from MFS. No response was provided by MFS.

MFS overnighted a 31-page document to S/UTF that was received on Friday, November 10, 1995. In the document, MFS requested to meet and discuss the document the week of November 13, 1995. Numerous calls were made by me to you over the next couple of weeks asking to clarify some language in the document and the calls were not returned for a couple of weeks. Therefore, it was impossible to meet your request of a written response by November 22, 1995. Our two companies did participate on a conference call on November 28, 1995 and one of the action items of that conference call was that MFS was to provide S/UTF with a Bilateral Agreement within a couple of days. I never received anything further from MFS.

S/UTF is ready and willing to continue discussions with MFS. I am requesting that you provide me some dates that MFS would be available to resume interconnection discussions. I feel that it is premature to ask the FPSC to arbitrate until meaningful negotiations have taken place.

I am in the process of moving my office to Kansas City. You may leave a message at my existing number, (407) 889-6747 or I will contact you from Kansas City during the week of January 8, 1996 with my new contact number.

Sincerely,

  
Jack K. Burge

Tim Davine  
Received From  
Sprint 1-18-96

## STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT

This Stipulation and Agreement is entered into by and between the undersigned parties to settle outstanding issues in Docket No. 950985-TP, addressing the establishment, on an interim basis, of nondiscriminatory rates, terms and conditions for local interconnection pursuant to Section 364.162, Florida Statutes, issues associated with Docket No. 950737-TP, addressing a temporary telephone number portability solution, e.g., Remote Call Forwarding pursuant to Section 364.16(4), Florida Statutes, and Docket No. 950984-TP, addressing unbundling and resale of local exchange telecommunications company network features, functions and capabilities pursuant to Section 364.161, Florida Statutes, to the extent identified herein.

The undersigned parties are entering into this comprehensive Stipulation and Agreement for the purpose of facilitating the introduction of local exchange competition on an expedited basis and avoiding the uncertainty and expense of litigation. It is the intention of the undersigned parties that this comprehensive Stipulation and Agreement become effective on the date of signature and remain in effect until December 31, 1997. The undersigned parties understand that as experience is gained in the marketplace it may become apparent that prices, terms and conditions other than those set forth in this agreement for purposes of introducing competition may be more appropriate to support the continued development of competition upon the expiration of this agreement. The parties intend for this Stipulation and Agreement to establish the interim prices, terms, conditions and mechanisms necessary to facilitate the introduction of local exchange competition, as required by the above-referenced section of Florida Chapter Law 95-403. This Stipulation and Agreement will dispose of all known outstanding issues in the aforementioned dockets. Thereafter, to the extent permitted by law, the parties intend to renegotiate these provisions based upon experience gained in the marketplace.

The undersigned parties agree that the issues addressed in the aforementioned proceedings, which have been framed in response to the requirements of the above-referenced sections of Florida Chapter Law 95-403, shall be resolved during the two year term of this agreement as follows:

**A. Local Interconnection - Docket No. 950985-TP**

Section 364.16, Florida Statutes, requires, among other things, that each incumbent local exchange telecommunications company (LEC) provide access to and interconnection with its telecommunications facilities to any other provider of local exchange telecommunications services requesting such access and interconnection at non-discriminatory prices, rates, terms, and conditions established by the procedures set forth in Section 364.162, Florida Statutes. Section 364.162, Florida Statutes, provides that an alternative local exchange telecommunications company (ALEC) shall have until August 31, 1995, or sixty (60) days, to negotiate with the LEC mutually acceptable prices, terms and conditions of interconnection and for the resale of LEC services and facilities. The statute also provides that if the parties are not able to negotiate a price by August 31, 1995, or within sixty days, either party may petition the Commission to establish non-discriminatory rates, terms and conditions of interconnection and for the resale of LEC services and facilities. Whether set by negotiation or by the Commission, interconnection and resale prices, rates, terms and conditions shall be filed with the Commission before their effective date.

The parties were unable to negotiate mutually acceptable prices, terms and conditions of interconnection by August 31, 1995, or within sixty days. After further negotiations, however, the undersigned parties now agree to the following interim prices, terms, and conditions for interconnection and the exchange of traffic with Sprint United-Florida/Centel-Florida (hereinafter referred to as S-UTF/CF) through December 31, 1997:

1. "Local interconnection" as defined as including the delivery of local traffic to be terminated on each company's local network, the LEC unbundled network features, functions and capabilities contained in Attachment D, and temporary telephone number portability to be implemented pursuant to Section 364.16(4), Florida Statutes. While the parties have endeavored in good faith to resolve the issues relating to local interconnection, the parties recognize that they are unable to foresee and account for every issue that may arise as this Stipulation and Agreement is implemented. Thus, to



the extent that the prices, terms and conditions for local interconnection are not specifically established herein, the additional prices, terms and conditions shall be established pursuant to negotiation or set by the Commission, upon request, as required by to Section 364.161(6), Florida Statutes. If the Commission does not render its vote within 120 days, then the parties agree that the Commission's decision will be retroactive to the 120th day after a petition is filed.

2. The delivery of local traffic between the undersigned ALEC and S-UTF/CF shall be reciprocal and compensation will be mutual. S-UTF/CF makes available two forms of interconnection: a flat-rated port charge arrangement (hereinafter referred to as Option A) or a per minute of use charge (hereinafter referred to as Option B). The Option chosen by the ALEC will remain in effect for the duration of the agreement.
  - a. If Option A is elected, the ALEC purchases the capacity of a DS1 for terminating traffic to S-UTF/CF. Similarly, S-UTF/CF would purchase the capacity of a DS1 from the ALEC. Depending on the ALEC's network requirements and traffic patterns, the ALEC could purchase the DS1 capacity at S-UTF/CF's access tandem, local tandem or at an end office. The flat-rated port charge, Option A, is based on a fixed monthly charge for a DS1 interconnection at the access tandem or the individual end office. Both the tandem and the end office port charges are developed based on the access charge rate elements. The tandem port rates, include the additional switching and transport functions associated with a tandem. Also, recognizing that trunking efficiencies increase with the number of ports, a price reduction to the first tandem port of 50% of the difference between the end office and tandem charges is provided. This price reduction is only applicable at the first tandem in each LATA. The rates for end office and tandem connection are shown in Attachment A.
  - b. If Option B is elected, the parties will compensate each other using S-UTF/CF's terminating local switched access rates as provided in Attachment B for terminating

local traffic on each other's network. Any rate reductions to S-UTF/CF's interexchange switched access rates for these rate elements will be flowed through to the local Option A and B rates. If it is mutually agreed that the administrative costs associated with Option B are greater than the net monies exchanged, the parties will exchange local traffic on an in kind basis, foregoing compensation in the form of cash or cash equivalent.

3. When Option B is chosen, in order to mitigate the potential adverse impact on a local exchange provider which might occur because of an imbalance of terminating local traffic between the local exchange providers, and to reflect the fact that terminating costs are associated with peak period demand, a local exchange provider shall not be required to compensate another local exchange provider for more than up to one-hundred-ten percent (110%) of the total minutes of use of the local exchange provider with the lower minutes of use in the same month. This cap shall apply to the total local minutes of use calculated on a company-wide basis in the State of Florida. For example, if in a given month S-UTF/CF has 10,000 minutes of local traffic terminated on an ALEC's local exchange network and the ALEC has 15,000 minutes of local traffic terminated on S-UTF/CF's local exchange network, the ALEC would be required to compensate S-UTF/CF for local interconnection on the basis of 11,000 terminating minutes (10,000 mins. X 110% = 11,000 mins.) and S-UTF/CF would compensate the ALEC for 10,000 terminating minutes. Seven additional examples are contained on Attachment C which is incorporated herein by reference. If each local provider does not have the appropriate software to measure terminating traffic then each local provider will report to the other provider the amount of local traffic terminated. Interconnecting facilities shall conform, at the minimum, to the telecommunications industry standard of DS1 (Bellcore Standard No. TR-NWT-00499). STP (signal transfer point) SS7 (Signalling System 7) connectivity is also required.

The parties recognize that various aspects of the interconnection process including physical interconnection arrangements (i.e., collocation, midspan meet) technical requirements, trouble reporting and resolution, billing processes, resolution of operating issues, provisioning, ordering, deadlines, performance standards, recording of traffic, including start and stop time, reporting and payment, dispute resolutions, rounding measurements, financial penalties for late payments, and the provision of inter-carrier clearinghouse functions are not resolved in this document, and the parties agree to cooperatively work toward resolution of these issues. Either party may petition the PSC for resolution should unresolved issues remain 90 days from the effective date of this agreement. If the Commission does not render its vote within 120 days of the petition, then the parties agree that the Commission's decision will be retroactive to the 120th day after a petition is filed.

4. The parties stipulate and agree that the exchange of traffic on S-UTF/CF's Extended Area Service, Extended Calling Service and other local calling routes shall be considered local traffic. The parties will therefore compensate each other for such traffic pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 above.
5. S-UTF/CF shall work with the numbering administrator and the ALEC to the extent possible to see that the ALECs have a sufficient quantity of numbering resources so that S-UTF/CF can tell whether a call from S-UTF/CF customer to an ALEC's customer is local or toll. Whenever S-UTF/CF delivers traffic to an ALEC for termination on the ALEC's network, if S-UTF/CF cannot determine whether the traffic will be local or toll because of the manner in which the ALEC uses NXX codes, S-UTF/CF will not compensate the ALEC for local interconnection but will, instead, charge the ALEC originating intrastate network access service charges unless the ALEC can provide S-UTF/CF with sufficient information to make a determination as to whether the traffic is local or toll. In the event that the ALEC cannot determine whether traffic delivered to S-UTF/CF is local or toll, then the same provision shall apply.

6. **Either S-UTF/CF or an ALEC will provide intermediary tandem switching and transport to connect the end user of a local exchange provider to the end user of another ALEC, a LEC other than S-UTF/CF, another telecommunications company (e.g., pay telephone provider, operator services provider) or a wireless telecommunications service provider for the purpose of making a local call. The local exchange provider performing this intermediary function, will bill tandem switching and transport as shown on Attachment B.**
7. **When S-UTF/CF or an ALEC provides intermediary functions for network access, i.e., between an IXC and an ALEC, the ALEC and S-UTF/CF will each provide their own network access service elements on a meet-point basis. Each carrier will bill its own access service rate elements to the IXC. S-UTF/CF or the ALEC may bill the residual interconnection charge ("RIC") to the IXC when either provides the intermediary tandem function.**
8. **The delivery of intrastate toll traffic between the undersigned ALEC and S-UTF/CF shall also be reciprocal and compensation will be mutual. The undersigned ALEC and S-UTF/CF shall pay each other identical rates for terminating the same type of traffic on each other's network. The parties will pay each other S-UTF/CF's intrastate switched network access service rate elements on a per minute of use basis for originating and terminating intrastate toll traffic as appropriate. For example, when an ALEC customer places a toll call to a S-UTF/CF customer and the ALEC serves as the toll carrier, S-UTF/CF will charge the ALEC terminating network access charges, the price of which will vary depending upon whether the call goes through a S-UTF/CF tandem or is directly routed to the S-UTF/CF end office. If the ALEC is serving as the S-UTF/CF customer's presubscribed IXC, or the S-UTF/CF customer uses the ALEC on a 10XXX basis, the S-UTF/CF will charge the ALEC the appropriate originating network access charges. Likewise, if S-UTF/CF is serving as the ALEC customer's presubscribed IXC, or the ALEC customer uses S-UTF/CF on a 10XXX basis, the ALEC will bill S-UTF/CF**

the appropriate originating network access charges. Examples of these network access rate elements and prices are identified on Attachment D which is incorporated herein by reference.

Because the undersigned parties lack sufficient data with respect to the volumes of local terminating traffic being delivered to each LEC and ALEC, the prices, terms and conditions of local interconnection agreed to herein are deemed transitional in nature. The parties deem them acceptable only in the interests of compromise to enable the introduction of local exchange competition to Florida's consumers.

The undersigned parties stipulate and agree that because the local interconnection and traffic arrangements agreed to herein are considered transitional, the agreements shall be renegotiated with the new provisions becoming effective after January 1, 1998. Accordingly, by no later than June 1, 1997, the undersigned parties shall commence negotiations with regard to their terms, conditions and prices of interconnection arrangements to be effective beginning January 1, 1998. If the parties are unable to satisfactorily negotiate new interconnection terms, conditions and prices within 90 days of commencing negotiations, any party may petition the Commission to establish appropriate interconnection arrangements. The parties will encourage the Commission to issue its order by no later than December 31, 1997. In the event the Commission does not issue its order prior to January 1, 1998, or if the parties continue to negotiate the interconnection arrangements beyond January 1, 1998, the parties stipulate and agree that the terms, conditions and prices ultimately ordered by the Commission, or negotiated by the parties, will be effective retroactive to January 1, 1998. Until the revised interconnection arrangements become effective, the parties shall continue to exchange traffic on a reciprocal basis pursuant to the terms of this Stipulation and Agreement.

B. **Unbundling and Resale of Local Exchange Telecommunications Company Network Features, Functions and Capabilities Docket No. 950984-TP**

Section 364.161, Florida Statutes, requires each LEC, upon request, to unbundle each of its network features, functions and capabilities, including access to signaling data bases, systems and routing process, and offer them to any other telecommunications provider requesting such features, functions or

capabilities for resale to the extent technically and economically feasible and at prices that are not below cost. The statute also requires that the parties first negotiate the terms, conditions and prices of any feasible unbundling request. If the parties cannot reach a satisfactory resolution within 60 days, either party may petition the Commission to arbitrate the dispute and the Commission shall make a determination within 120 days.

The undersigned parties have now satisfactorily resolved the terms, conditions and prices of these network features, functions and capabilities that are technically and economically feasible of unbundling as set forth in Attachment E, which is incorporated herein by reference. It is understood by the parties that the list of network features, functions and capabilities is not exhaustive and the parties commit to cooperate in the negotiation of additional network features, functions and capabilities as the parties' future needs require.

The parties acknowledge that the provisions of Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, relating to the unbundling and resale of facilities and services, reflect a thoughtfully crafted and well-balanced approach to the introduction of local exchange competition, and the parties therefore commit that these provisions will be fairly and equitably implemented and adhered to in order to effectuate and remain consistent with legislative intent. The parties recognize that the application of current tariffed prices and resale purposes will not be inconsistent with this commitment. The parties agree that the issue of imputation of LEC unbundled service prices into its retail rates is not addressed by the Stipulation and Agreement, and that the ALECs reserve their right to further address imputation for these services, including unbundled local loops.

C. Temporary Number Portability - Docket No. 950797-TP

For purposes of number portability the parties recognize the recurring and nonrecurring rates and conditions set forth by the Florida Public Service Commission in Docket No. 957037-TP. For that terminating toll traffic ported to the ALEC, S-UTF/CF will bill the DXC tandem switching, the residual interconnection charge and a portion of the transport, and the ALEC will bill the DXC local switching, the carrier common line and a portion of the transport. If S-UTF/CF is unable to provide the necessary access

records to permit the ALECs to bill the IXCs directly for terminating access to ported numbers, then the parties agree to work cooperatively to develop a surrogate method to approximate the access minutes and revenues, and a settlement process based on the above distribution. If intraLATA calls are delivered to the other party via a ported number, the originating party will pay the terminating party.

**D. Resolution of Disputes**

The undersigned parties agree that if any dispute arises as to the interpretation of any provision of this Stipulation and Agreement or as to the proper implementation of any of the matters agreed to in this Stipulation and Agreement the parties will petition the Commission for a resolution of the dispute. However, each undersigned party reserves any rights it may have to seek judicial review of any ruling made by the Commission concerning this Stipulation and Agreement.

**E. Duration**

This Stipulation and Agreement takes effect when signed by the parties and remains in effect until each of the matters and issues addressed herein has been implemented or resolved as contemplated by the undersigned parties or as modified by mutual consent of the parties but will terminate December 31, 1997.

**F. Representations**

Each person signing this Stipulation and Agreement represents that he or she has the requisite authority to bind the party on whose behalf the person is signing. By signing this Stipulation and Agreement, each undersigned party represents that it agrees to each of the stipulations and agreements set forth herein. In the event there are parties to the aforementioned dockets that do not sign this Stipulation and Agreement, the comprehensive resolution of the issues set forth in this Stipulation and Agreement shall, nonetheless, be binding upon the undersigned parties. Each undersigned party commits to use its best efforts to persuade the Commission, prior to and during the hearings scheduled in the aforementioned dockets, to accept the stipulations agreed to by the undersigned parties.

**G. Limitation of Use**

The undersigned parties understand and agree that this Stipulation and Agreement was entered into to resolve issues and matters which are unique to the State of Florida because of regulatory precedent and legislative requirements. The undersigned parties therefore agree that none of the agreements and stipulations contained herein shall be proffered by an undersigned party in another jurisdiction as evidence of any concession or as a waiver of any position taken by another undersigned party in that jurisdiction or for any other purpose.

**H. Waivers**

Any failure by any undersigned party to insist upon the *strict performance* by any other entity of any of the provisions of this Stipulation and Agreement shall not be deemed a waiver of any of the provisions of this Stipulation and Agreement, and each undersigned party, notwithstanding such failure, shall have the right thereafter to insist upon the specific performance of any and all of the provisions of this Stipulation and Agreement.

**I. Billing**

To the extent either party is unable to implement the exact terms of this agreement as a result of technical difficulties, a reasonable surrogate will be developed for billing until such time as an actual bill can be implemented or the parties agree that the billing is sufficient for the term of this agreement.

**J. Governing Law**

This Stipulation and Agreement shall be governed by, and construed and enforced in accordance with, the laws of the State of Florida, without regard to its conflict of laws principles.

**K. Purposes**



The undersigned parties acknowledge that this Stipulation and Agreement is being entered into for the purposes of facilitating the introduction of local exchange competition; complying with the requirements of Florida Chapter Law 95-403 with respect to negotiating the matters at issue in Docket Nos. 950737-TP and 950985-TP. Neither this Stipulation and Agreement nor any action taken to reach, effectuate or further this Stipulation and Agreement may be construed as, or may be used as an admission by or against any party.

**L. Arm's Length Negotiations**

This Stipulation and Agreement was executed after arm's length negotiations between the undersigned parties and reflects the conclusion of the undersigned that this Stipulation and Agreement is in the best interests of all the undersigned parties.

**M. Joint Drafting**

The undersigned parties participated jointly in the drafting of this Stipulation and Agreement, and therefore the terms of this Stipulation and Agreement are not intended to be construed against any undersigned party by virtue of draftsmanship.

**N. Single Instrument**

This Stipulation and Agreement may be executed in several counterparts, each of which, when executed, shall constitute an original, and all of which shall constitute but one and the same instrument.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**OPTION A**

**SPRINT UNITED TELEPHONE-FLORIDA/CENTEL-FLORIDA**

**LOCAL INTERCONNECTION PORT CHARGES**

**RATE ELEMENTS AND RATE LEVELS**

<b>Access Tandem - First</b>	<b>\$4,528</b>
<b>Each Additional</b>	<b>\$5,024</b>
<b>End Office</b>	<b>\$4,032</b>

## ATTACHMENT B

## OPTION B

## SPRINT UNITED TELEPHONE-FLORIDA/CENTEL-FLORIDA

## LOCAL INTERCONNECTION

## RATE ELEMENTS AND RATE LEVELS

Rate Elements	Rate Levels as of <sup>2</sup> February 6, 1996	
	Tandem	End Office
Transport <sup>1</sup>		
DS1 Local Channel - Entrance Facility	0.00097	0.00097
Switched Common Transport per minute of use (10 miles)	0.00040	
Facilities Termination per MOU	0.00020	
Tandem Switching	0.00399	
Local Switching	0.00980	0.00980
Line Termination	<u>0.00790</u>	<u>0.00790</u>
	0.02326	0.01867

<sup>1</sup> Assumptions:

- Tandem Connection with Common Transport
- No Collocation
- DS1 local channel @ 9000 minutes per month and 24 voice grade equivalents

<sup>2</sup> S-UTF/CF's switched access rates, reflecting local transport restructure, have been approved with a February 6, 1996 effective date.

ATTACHMENT C

OPTION B

EXAMPLE OF "10% CAP"

Case 1:

S-UTF/CF terminates 10,000 min. to ALEC X

ALEC X bills S-UTF/CF for 10,000 min.

ALEC X terminates 15,000 min. to S-UTF/CF

S-UTF/CF bills ALEC X for 11,000 min. (10,000 + 10%)

Case 2:

S-UTF/CF terminates 15,000 min. to ALEC X

ALEC X bill S-UTF/CF for 11,000 min. (10,000 + 10%)

ALEC X terminates 10,000 min. to S-UTF/CF

S-UTF/CF bills ALEC X for 10,000 min.

Case 3:

S-UTF/CF terminates zero min. to ALEC X

ALEC X bills S-UTF/CF zero

ALEC X terminates 10,000 min. to S-UTF/CF

S-UTF/CF bills ALEC X zero

Case 4:

S-UTF/CF terminates 10,000 min. to ALEC X

ALEC X bills S-UTF/CF zero

ALEC X terminates zero min. to S-UTF/CF

S-UTF/CF bills ALEC X zero

Case 5:

S-UTF/CF terminates 10,000 min. to ALEC X

ALEC X bills S-UTF/CF for 10,000 min.

ALEC X terminates 10,200 min. to S-UTF/CF

S-UTF/CF bills ALEC X for 10,200 min. (difference is less than cap)

Case 6:

S-UTF/CF terminates 10,200 min. to ALEC X

ALEC X bills S-UTF/CF for 10,200 min. (Difference is less than cap)

ALEC X terminates 10,000 min. to S-UTF/CF

S-UTF/CF bills ALEC X for 10,000 min.

Case 7:

S-UTF/CF and ALEC X both terminate 10,000 min. to each other

ALEC X and S-UTF/CF both bill each other 10,000 min.

<sup>1</sup> For Case 1 and Case 2 in recognition that the composition of terminating minutes could include minutes charged at an end office rate and minutes charged a tandem differential the local exchange provider who utilizes the formula for purposes of the amount of minutes to base this payment on shall calculate their payment based on the same proportion of end office minutes and tandem minutes for their total minutes in that month. For example (using Case 1):

S-UTF/CF terminates 10,000 min. to ALEC X at the end office

ALEC X bills S-UTF/CF for 10,000 min.

ALEC X terminates 15,000 min. to S-UTF/CF, 9,000 (60%) at end office rate and 6,000 (40%) at tandem rate

S-UTF/CF bills ALEC X for 11,000 min. (10,000 + 10%), 6,600 (60%) at end office rate and 4,400 (40%) at tandem rate

## ATTACHMENT D

## SPRINT UNITED TELEPHONE-FLORIDA/CENTEL-FLORIDA

INTRASTATE SWITCHED ACCESS  
RATE ELEMENTS AND RATE LEVELS

Rate Elements	Rate Levels as of <sup>2</sup> February 6, 1996	
	UTF	CF
Carrier Common Line		
Originating	\$0.02580	\$0.030400
Terminating	\$0.33600	\$0.038200
Transport <sup>1</sup>		
DS1 Local Channel - Entrance Facility	\$0.000970	\$0.000970
Residual Interconnection	\$0.013997	\$0.021037
Switched Common Transport per minute of use per mile	\$0.00004	\$0.000040
Facilities Termination per MOU	\$0.000200	\$0.000200
Access Tandem Switching		
Premium	\$0.000880	\$0.000880
Transitional	\$0.000877	\$0.000877
Local Switching 2	\$0.009800	\$0.009800
Line Termination	\$0.007900	\$0.007900

<sup>1</sup> Assumptions:

- Tandem Connection with Common Transport
- No Collocation
- DS1 local channel @ 9000 minutes per month and 24 voice grade equivalents

<sup>2</sup>S-UTF/CF's switched access rates, reflecting local transport restructure, have been approved with a February 6, 1996 effective date.

**ATTACHMENT E****UNBUNDLED NETWORK FEATURES, FUNCTIONS AND CAPABILITIES**

The parties to the Stipulation and Agreement have negotiated the following additional terms, conditions and prices relating to unbundled network features, functions and capabilities:

(1) **Access to 911/E911 Emergency Network.**

For basic 911 service, S-UTF/CF will provide a list consisting of each municipality in Florida that subscribes to Basic 911 service. The list will also provide the E911 conversion date and for network routing purposes a ten-digit directory number representing the appropriate emergency answering position for each municipality subscribing to 911 service. Each ALEC will arrange to accept 911 calls from its customers in municipalities that subscribe to Basic 911 service and translate the 911 call to the appropriate 10-digit directory number as stated on the list provided by S-UTF/CF and route that call to S-UTF/CF at the appropriate tandem or end office. When a municipality converts to E911 service, the ALEC shall discontinue the Basic 911 procedures and begin the E911 procedures.

For E911 service, the ALEC will connect the necessary trunks to the appropriate E911 tandem, including the designated secondary tandem. If a municipality has converted to E911 service, the ALEC will forward 911 calls to the appropriate E911 primary tandem, along with ANI, based upon the current E911 end office to tandem homing arrangement as provided by S-UTF/CF. If the primary tandem trunks are not available, the ALEC will alternate route the call to the designated secondary E911 tandem. If the secondary tandem trunk are not available, the ALEC will alternate route the call to the appropriate Traffic Operator Position System (TOPS) tandem.

In order to ensure the proper working of the system, along with accurate customer data, the ALEC will provide daily updates to the E911 data-base. S-UTF/CF will work cooperatively with the ALEC to define record layouts, media requirements, and procedures for this process.

In some instances S-UTF/CF is responsible for maintenance of the E911 data-base and is compensated for performing these functions by either the municipality or the ALEC - for maintaining the ALEC's information. In no event, however, shall S-UTF/CF be entitled to compensation from both parties for the same function.

(2) **Directory Listings and Directory Distribution.**

S-UTF/CF will arrange for ALECs' customers' primary listings to be included in the white page (residence and business listings) and yellow page (business listings) directories as long as the ALEC provides information to S-UTF/CF in a manner compatible with S-UTF/CF's operational system. S-UTF/CF will coordinate the printing of all customers' information in the white and yellow pages directories on the same terms and conditions and at the same compensation level as S-UTF/CF pays its publisher(s) to have its directories compiled, printed and distributed. S-UTF/CF will work cooperatively with the ALEC on issues concerning lead time, timeliness, format, and the content of listing information.

(3) **Directory Assistance Services**

S-UTF/CF will arrange for ALECs to have three options for the provision of directory assistance service. First, S-UTF/CF will provide a resale option, where the ALEC would utilize S-UTF/CF's directory assistance service for the ALEC's customers. Second, S-



UTF/CF will provide a database purchase option. Third, S-UTF/CF will provide ALECs with a database access option, when it is technically feasible for S-UTF/CF.

(4) **IntraLATA 800 Traffic**

S-UTF/CF will compensate ALECs for the origination of 800 traffic terminated to S-UTF/CF pursuant to the ALEC's originating switched access charges, including the data-base query. The ALEC will provide to S-UTF/CF the appropriate records necessary for S-UTF/CF to bill its customers. The records will be provided in a standard ASR/EMR format. S-UTF/CF will compensate the ALEC based on tariffed rates for this function. At such time as an ALEC elects to provide 800 services, the ALEC will reciprocate this arrangement.

(5) **Busy Line Verification/Emergency Interrupt Services.**

S-UTF/CF and the ALECs shall mutually provide each other busy line verification and emergency interrupt services pursuant to tariff.

(6) **Network Design and Management**

S-UTF/CF and the ALECs will work cooperatively to install and maintain reliable interconnected telecommunications networks. A cooperative effort will include, but not be limited to, the exchange of appropriate information concerning network changes that impact services to the local service provider, maintenance contact numbers and escalation procedures. The interconnection of all networks will be based upon accepted industry/national guidelines for transmission standards and traffic blocking criteria. S-UTF/CF and the ALECs will work cooperatively to apply sound network management principles by invoking appropriate network management controls, i.e., call gapping, to alleviate or prevent network congestion. It is S-UTF/CF's intention not to charge rearrangement, reconfiguration, disconnect, or other non-recurring fees associated with

the initial reconfiguration of each carrier's interconnection arrangements. However, each ALEC's interconnection reconfigurations will have to be considered individually as to the application of a charge.

(7) **CLASS Interoperability.**

S-UTF/CF and the ALECs will provide LEC-to-LEC Common Channel Signalling (CCS) to one another, where available, in conjunction with all traffic in order to enable full interoperability of CLASS features and functions. All CCS signalling parameters will be provided including automatic number identification (ANI), originating line information (OLI) calling party category, charge number, etc. All privacy indicators will be honored, and S-UTF/CF and the ALECs will cooperate on the exchange of Transactional Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) messages to facilitate full interoperability of CCS-based features between their respective networks.

(8) **Network Expansion.**

For network expansion, S-UTF/CF and the ALECs will review engineering requirements on a quarterly basis and establish forecasts for trunk utilization. New trunk groups will be implemented as dictated by engineering requirements for both S-UTF/CF and the ALEC. S-UTF/CF and the ALEC are required to provide each other the proper call information (i.e., originated call party number and destination call party number, CIC, OZZ, etc.) to enable each company to bill accordingly.

(9) **Signaling.**

In addition to CLASS interoperability, as discussed above, S-UTF/CF will offer use of its signaling network on an unbundled basis at tariffed rates. Signaling functionality will be available with both A-link and B-link connectivity.

**(10) Local Loop.**

**The price of S-UTF/CF unbundled local loop will be the price set forth in S-UTF/CF's  
Special Access Tariff.**



Communications Company, Inc.

INFORUM, SUITE 2200  
250 WILLIAMS STREET  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-1034  
TEL (404) 224-6000  
FAX (404) 224-6060

January 19, 1996

Mr. Jack Burge  
Carrier Account Manager  
Sprint United/Centel  
555 Lake Border Drive  
MC-5322  
Apopka, Florida 32703

Via Facsimile & Overnight Mail  
@407 884 7020

Dear Jack:

Thank you for providing me your proposed Stipulation and Agreement that I received via overnight mail on January 18, 1996.

After a detailed review of the Stipulation it is apparent that we significantly disagree regarding several issues. Specifically, and most importantly, while MFS has proposed bill and keep, in-kind compensation, Sprint has proposed an unequal rate of compensation up to 2.3 cents per minute of use.

In addition, there are other areas of disagreement, including, meet-point billing compensation, switched access compensation for interim number portability calls, and the lack of details and rates Sprint has neglected to provide for other unbundled platform arrangements.

Also, Sprints proposal to provide Special Access service and rates as a substitute for unbundled dial-tone loops is unacceptable.

Therefore, MFS will immediately be filing a petition at the Florida Public Service Commission exercising our right to ask for the Commission's intervention. Although, in an attempt to avoid hearings in March, MFS would like to continue to attempt to reach agreement on all or any issues in an effort to avoid unnecessary litigation.

Please contact me at 770 399 8378 if you have any questions and to schedule a meeting date. I am available any day the week of January 22, in either Atlanta or Orlando to continue our discussions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Timothy T. Devine". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Timothy T. Devine