

SWIDLER
&
BERLIN
CHARTERED

DAVID M. HALLEY
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

DIRECTOR
(202) 424-7838

January 23, 1996

ORIGINAL
FILE COPY

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo
Director, Division of Records & Reporting
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850


Re: Docket No. 950984-TP

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Please find enclosed for filing in connection with the above-referenced docket the original and 15 copies of the Direct Testimony of Timothy T. Devine on Behalf of Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc. which accompanies the Petition of Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc. for GTE Florida, Inc. to Unbundle the Local Loop.

Also enclosed is an additional copy of the Direct Testimony. Please date stamp and return this copy in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. Thank you, in advance, for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above telephone number.

Very truly yours,


David M. Halley

- ACK
- AFA
- APP
- CAF Enclosures
- CMU Chase
- CTR
- EAG
- LEG 1
- LIN 5 orig
- OPC
- RCH
- SEC 1
- WAS
- OTH

3000 K STREET, N.W. ■ SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007-5116
(202) 424-7500 ■ FACSIMILE (202) 424-7643

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
00850 JAN 24 88
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

**BEFORE THE
FLORIDA
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**In re: Resolution of petition(s) to establish
unbundled services, network features, functions
or capabilities, and local loops pursuant to
Section 364.161, Florida Statutes**

)
) **Docket No. 950984-TP**
)
) **Filed: January 24, 1996**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIMOTHY T. DEVINE
ON BEHALF OF
METROPOLITAN FIBER SYSTEMS OF FLORIDA, INC.
Docket No. 950984-TP**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIMOTHY T. DEVINE
ON BEHALF OF
METROPOLITAN FIBER SYSTEMS OF FLORIDA, INC.
Docket No. 950984-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. ("MFSCC"), Six Concourse Parkway, Suite
4 2100, Atlanta, Georgia 30328-5351.

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 MFSCC, the indirect parent company of Metropolitan Fiber
8 Systems of Florida, Inc.

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

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

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

16 **A.**I have a B.S. in Political Science from Arizona State University and an M.A.
17 in Telecommunications Policy from George Washington University. I began
18 work in the telecommunications industry in April 1982 as a sales
19 representative for packet switching services for Graphnet, Inc., one of the first

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

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

16 **A.** MFSCC is a diversified telecommunications holding company with operations
17 throughout the country, as well as in Europe. MFS Telecom, Inc., an MFSCC
18 subsidiary, through its operating affiliates, is the largest competitive access
19 provider in the United States. MFS Telecom, Inc.'s subsidiaries, including

1 MFS/McCourt, Inc., provide non-switched, dedicated private line and special
2 access services.

3 MFS Intelenet, Inc. ("MFSI") is another wholly owned subsidiary of
4 MFSCC. It causes operating subsidiaries to be incorporated on a state-by-
5 state basis. MFSI's operating subsidiaries collectively are authorized to
6 provide switched interexchange telecommunications services in 48 states and
7 have applications to offer such service pending in the remaining states. Where
8 so authorized, MFSI's operating subsidiaries offer end users a single source
9 for local and long distance telecommunications services with quality and
10 pricing levels comparable to those achieved by larger communications users.
11 Apart from Florida, MFSI subsidiaries have been authorized to provide
12 competitive local exchange service in twelve states. Since July 1993, MFS
13 Intelenet of New York, Inc. has offered local exchange services in competition
14 with New York Telephone Company. MFS Intelenet of Maryland, Inc. was
15 authorized to provide local exchange services in competition with Bell
16 Atlantic-Maryland, Inc. in April 1994 and recently has commenced
17 operations. On June 22, 1994, MFS Intelenet of Washington, Inc. was
18 authorized to provide local exchange services in competition with US West
19 Communications, Inc. On July 20, 1994, MFS Intelenet of Illinois, Inc. was

1 certificated to provide local exchange services in competition with Illinois
2 Bell Telephone Company and Central Telephone Company of Illinois. MFS
3 Intelenet of Ohio was certificated to provide competitive local exchange
4 service in competition with Ohio Bell on August 3, 1995. MFS Intelenet of
5 Michigan, on May 9, 1995, was certificated to provide competitive local
6 exchange service in competition with Ameritech-Michigan. MFS Intelenet of
7 Connecticut was certificated to provide local exchange service in competition
8 with Southern New England Telephone Company on June 28, 1995. MFS
9 Intelenet of Texas, Inc. was authorized to provide local exchange service in
10 Texas in competition with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company by Order
11 signed on October 25, 1995. MFS Intelenet of Georgia, Inc. was certificated
12 to provide local exchange service in the Atlanta and Smyrna Exchanges in
13 competition with BellSouth and GTE on October 27, 1995. MFS Intelenet of
14 Pennsylvania, Inc. was authorized to provide local exchange service in
15 Pennsylvania by Order entered October 4, 1995. MFS Intelenet of California,
16 Inc. was authorized to provide competitive local exchange services in
17 California by Order of the California Public Utilities Commission on
18 December 20, 1995. MFS Intelenet of Massachusetts was certificated on
19 March 9, 1994 to operate as a reseller of both interexchange and local

1 exchange services in the Boston Metropolitan Area in competition with New
2 England Telephone and is authorized to provide competitive local exchange
3 services in Massachusetts. Finally, on January 12, 1996, MFS Intelenet of
4 Oregon was certificated to offer local exchange services in competition with
5 US West and GTE in Oregon.

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

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

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

17 **Q. ARE ANY OF THE PARTIES UPON WHOSE BEHALF YOU ARE**
18 **TESTIFYING CURRENTLY CERTIFICATED TO PROVIDE**
19 **SERVICE IN FLORIDA?**

1 A. Yes. Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc., a certificated Alternative
2 Access Vendor ("AAV"), by letter dated July 5, 1995, notified the
3 Commission of its intent to provide switched local exchange service in
4 Florida. The Commission acknowledged this notification on September 12,
5 1995, and later granted the requested authority.

6 I. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

7 Q. **WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS**
8 **PROCEEDING?**

9 A. MFS-FL has filed its unbundling petition in this docket, as well as a
10 parallel petition in the interconnection docket, because its attempts at
11 negotiations with GTE have failed to yield acceptable co-carrier
12 arrangements. MFS-FL therefore is petitioning the Commission, in
13 accordance with Florida Statute Section 364.161, for GTE to provide
14 unbundled services, network features, functions or capabilities, and
15 specifically the unbundled local loop and the concentration of
16 unbundled loops.

17 Q. **AS A THRESHOLD MATTER, WHAT IS MEANT BY THE TERM**
18 **"CO-CARRIER ARRANGEMENTS"?**

1 A. By "co-carrier" arrangements, I refer to a variety of arrangements that will
2 have to be established to allow alternative local exchange carriers ("ALECs")
3 and GTE to deal with each other on a reciprocal, non-discriminatory, and
4 equitable basis. Once the basic principles for such arrangements are
5 established by the Commission, the affected carriers should be directed to
6 implement specific arrangements in conformance with these principles. The
7 term "co-carrier" signifies both that the two carriers are providing local
8 exchange service within the same territory, and that the relationship between
9 them is intended to be equal and reciprocal—that is, neither carrier would be
10 treated as subordinate or inferior. The arrangements needed to implement this
11 co-carrier relationship will encompass, among other things, physical
12 connections between networks; signaling and routing arrangements for the
13 exchange of traffic between networks; and arrangements for joint access to
14 essential service platforms, such as operator and directory assistance services,
15 that must serve all telephone users within a geographic area.

16 MFS-FL believes that customers of all carriers must be assured that
17 they can call each other without the caller having to worry about which carrier
18 serves the other party. To achieve this, not only must carriers physically
19 connect their networks, but they must terminate calls for each other on a

1 reciprocal basis that is both technically and economically reasonable. Traffic
2 exchange arrangements should be seamless and transparent from the
3 viewpoint of the caller. There should be no difference in how a call is dialed,
4 how long it takes to be completed, or how it is billed depending solely upon
5 the identity of the carrier serving the dialed number. In addition, customers
6 should have access to essential ancillary functions of the network (such as
7 directory listings, directory assistance, inward operator assistance, and CLASS
8 features, to name a few) without regard to which carrier provides their dial
9 tone or originates their call.

10 **Q. SPECIFICALLY WHAT CO-CARRIER ARRANGEMENTS ARE**
11 **REQUIRED FOR MFS-FL TO PROVIDE VIABLE COMPETITIVE**
12 **LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE?**

13 **A.** MFS-FL believes that certain co-carrier requirements should apply equally
14 and reciprocally to all local exchange carriers, LECs and ALECs alike. The
15 Florida statute have recognized the necessity for such arrangements by
16 requiring LECs to negotiate both interconnection and unbundling
17 arrangements. Fla. Stat. §§ 364.161 and 364.162. The following are the co-
18 carrier arrangements required by MFS-FL: 1) Number Resources; 2) Tandem
19 Subtending/Meet-point Billing; 3) Reciprocal Traffic Exchange and

1 Reciprocal Compensation; 4) Shared Platform Arrangements; 5) Unbundling
2 the Local Loop; and 6) Interim Number Portability. Unbundling the local
3 loop will be addressed herein. The remaining arrangements will be addressed
4 in a separate parallel petition and testimony.

5 **Q. WAS THERE AGREEMENT ON ANY OF THESE CO-CARRIER**
6 **ISSUES WITH GTE?**

7 **A.** No. GTE and MFS-FL have been unable to reach an agreement. Beginning
8 on July 19, 1995, MFS-FL attempted to begin negotiations with GTE for
9 interconnection arrangements via a three-page letter outlining the MFS-FL
10 proposed interconnection arrangements. *See Exhibit TTD-1*, attached to this
11 testimony. Nearly four months later on November 9, 1995, having received
12 no formal written response from GTE to its initial letter, MFS-FL sent GTE
13 a letter and a detailed 31-page proposed co-carrier agreement in an attempt
14 to simplify the negotiations process for GTE. *See Exhibit TTD-2*, attached
15 to this testimony. On December 7, 1995, MFS-FL received from GTE a
16 three-page facsimile of a listing of GTE's switched access rates. *See Exhibit*
17 *TTD-3*, attached to this testimony. On January 3, 1996, following receipt
18 of the facsimile, MFS-FL mailed another letter to GTE in one last attempt at
19 receiving a response and beginning private negotiations. *See Exhibit TTD-4*,

1 attached to this testimony. On January 19, 1996, MFS-FL received from
2 GTE a counterproposal, the terms of which were unacceptable to MFS-FL.
3 See Exhibit TTD-5, attached to this testimony. MFS-FL indicated the
4 unacceptability of GTE's counterproposal in a letter to GTE dated January
5 22, 1996. See Exhibit TTD-6, attached to this testimony. In its January 22,
6 1996 letter to GTE, MFS-FL indicated its desire to continue discussions to
7 reach an agreement on all or as many issues as possible before Commission
8 hearings commence. As a result, the benefits of local competition have not
9 reached Florida consumers in GTE's territory as the Commission intended.

10 **II. UNBUNDLING OF LOCAL LOOP FACILITIES**

11 **Q. YOU STATED ABOVE THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD**
12 **FACILITATE COMPETITION IN THE LOCAL EXCHANGE**
13 **MARKET BY REQUIRING GTE TO OFFER ITS LOCAL LOOP**
14 **FACILITIES ON AN UNBUNDLED BASIS. WHY IS THIS**
15 **NECESSARY?**

16 **A.** The importance of local loop unbundling to the development of actual
17 competition derives directly from GTE's continued control of significant
18 monopoly elements. Unbundled links will provide access to an essential
19 bottleneck facility controlled by GTE. MFS-FL would strongly urge the

1 Commission to require GTE to unbundle its services so that each element of
2 the local loop bottleneck is priced separately from other service elements. This
3 will allow competitors and users to pay for only those portions of the loop
4 services that they want or need. Line side interconnection will allow
5 competing carriers to directly reach end user customers who are currently
6 reachable efficiently only through the GTE bottleneck network.

7 GTE continues to have monopoly control over the "last mile" of the
8 telecommunications network. Service between most GTE customers and the
9 GTE central offices remains, and for some time to come will apparently
10 continue to remain, nearly the exclusive province of GTE. This monopoly
11 results from the fact that this loop network consists mostly of transmission
12 facilities carrying small volumes of traffic, spread over wide geographic areas.
13 Presently, it is economically more efficient for competitors to utilize GTE
14 loops at cost-based rates rather than to construct ubiquitous competing
15 transmission and switching facilities. The "last mile" loop network, therefore,
16 is an essential bottleneck facility for any potential provider of competitive
17 local exchange service.

18 Given the protection of its former monopoly status, GTE has
19 constructed virtually ubiquitous loop networks that provide access to

Direct Testimony of Timothy T. Devine
MFS Communications Company, Inc.
January 24, 1996
Page 13

1 every interexchange carrier and virtually all residential and business
2 premises in its territory. In building these networks, GTE had the
3 singular advantage of favorable governmental franchises, access to
4 rights-of-way, unique tax treatment, access to buildings on an unpaid
5 basis, and protection against competition. Companies such as MFS-
6 FL that now seek to compete in the provision of local exchange service
7 do not share these advantages, and it would be both infeasible and
8 economically inefficient in most cases for them to seek to construct
9 duplicate loop facilities. Replication of the existing LEC loop network
10 (using either facilities similar to the incumbent LECs' or alternative
11 technologies such as wireless loops or cable television plant) would be
12 cost-prohibitive; moreover, competitors cannot obtain public and
13 private rights-of-way, franchises, or building access on the same terms
14 as incumbent LECs enjoy.

15 **Q. WHAT SPECIFIC UNBUNDLED ELEMENTS SHOULD BE MADE**
16 **AVAILABLE?**

17 **A.** The network access line portion of local exchange service can be represented
18 as being comprised of two key components: the loop, or "link," which
19 provides the transmission path between the customer and the local exchange

1 central office, and the "port," which represents the interface to the switch, and
2 the capability to originate and terminate calls. Unbundling the local loop
3 consists of physically unbundling the link and port elements, and pricing them
4 individually on an economically viable basis.

5 Specifically, GTE should immediately unbundle all of its
6 exchange services into two separate packages: the link element plus
7 cross-connect element and the port element plus cross-connect
8 element. MFS-FL seeks unbundled access and interconnection to the
9 following forms of unbundled links: (1) 2-wire and 4-wire analog
10 voice grade, also known as a "simple" link, which is simply a path for
11 voice-grade service from an end user's premises to the central office;
12 (2) 2-wire ISDN digital grade; and (3) 4-wire DS-1 digital grade.
13 MFS-FL also requests that the following forms of unbundled ports be
14 made available: (1) 2-wire and 4-wire analog line; (2) 2-wire ISDN
15 digital line; (3) 2-wire analog DID trunk; (4) 4-wire DS-1 digital DID
16 trunk; and (5) 4-wire ISDN DS-1 digital trunk. A diagram of the
17 unbundled elements requested by MFS-FL is attached to this
18 testimony as Exhibit TTD-7.

1 In order for MFS-FL to efficiently offer telephone services to
2 end users, GTE should unbundle and separately price and offer these
3 elements such that MFS-FL will be able to lease and interconnect to
4 whichever of these unbundled elements MFS-FL requires and to
5 combine the GTE-provided elements with facilities and services that
6 MFS-FL may provide itself.

7 **Q. WHAT IS THE UNBUNDLED LINK TECHNOLOGY REFERRED TO**
8 **AS DIGITAL LOOP CARRIER SYSTEMS?**

9 **A.** MFS-FL seeks unbundled access and interconnection to the link
10 subelements that are resident in the modern digital loop carrier
11 ("DLC") systems (which provide concentration) that LECs have begun
12 to deploy in lieu of copper pair links. These DLC systems typically
13 involve three main sub-elements: (1) a digital transport distribution
14 facility operating at 1.544 Mbps ("DS1"), or multiples thereof,
15 extending from the LEC end office wire center to a point somewhere
16 in the LEC network (this point could be a manhole, pedestal, or even a
17 telephone closet in a large building); (2) digital loop carrier terminal
18 equipment housed in the manhole, pedestal, telephone closet, etc., at
19 which the DS1 terminates and which derives from the DS1 facility 24

1 or more voice grade telephonic channels; and (3) copper pair
2 feeder/drop facilities (lines) extending from the DLC terminal to a
3 demarcation/connector block at various customers' premises.

4 To the extent these or similar systems are employed in GTE's
5 network, MFS-FL should be allowed to interconnect to the unbundled
6 subelements of these systems, where technically feasible and where capacity
7 allows. This further unbundling of the links into digital distribution and voice-
8 grade feeder/drop sub-elements is necessary in order to ensure that the quality
9 of links MFS-FL leases from the GTE is equal to the quality of links that GTE
10 provide directly to end users.

11 Essentially, MFS-FL would seek to lease as one element, the DS1-rate
12 digital distribution facility and DLC terminal, and to lease as discrete
13 incremental elements individual channels on voice-grade feeder/drop
14 facilities. MFS-FL would expect to interconnect to the DS1 distribution
15 facility at the GTE end office (via expanded interconnection arrangements
16 offered pursuant to Substantive Rule § 23.92), but would also consider
17 arrangements pursuant to which it could interconnect at other points. The
18 generic interface for the DLC-type arrangements is described in Bellcore TR-
19 TSY-000008, Digital Interface Between the SLC-96 Digital Loop Carrier

1 System and Local Digital Switch, and TR-TSY-000303, Integrated Digital
2 Loop Carrier ("IDLC") Requirements, Objectives and Interface and MFS-FL's
3 Ericsson switch is compatible with these standards.

4 **Q. IS LINK UNBUNDLING TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE?**

5 **A.** Yes. Competitors can interconnect to the unbundled loops at the LEC central
6 office using the same physical collocation arrangements already in place for
7 special access and private line circuits.

8 **Q. HAVE OTHER STATES REQUIRED LOOP UNBUNDLING?**

9 **A.** Yes. Several state public utility commissions have already determined that
10 unbundling of the local loop is essential for the development of local
11 exchange competition and in the public interest. The New York Public
12 Service Commission has found that the unbundling of local loops is in the best
13 interest of consumers because it would allow competitive carriers to expand
14 the market for their services, increase the utility of competitive networks and
15 offer all local exchange customers an alternative to the monopoly local service
16 provider.^{1/}

^{1/} *Proceeding on Motion of the Commission Regarding Comparably Efficient
Interconnection Arrangements for Residential and Business Links*, 152 PUR4th 193, 194 (NY
PSC 1994).

1 The Illinois and Michigan Commissions have determined that
2 unbundling of the local loop is necessary to remove a significant barrier to
3 competition. The Michigan Public Service Commission found that
4 "unbundled loops are vital to local exchange competition and in the public
5 interest" and are necessary to allow a competitive local exchange carrier to
6 provide service to every customer within its exchange areas.^{2/} In an Order
7 issued April 7, 1995, the Illinois Commerce Commission concluded that
8 "unbundling LEC networks is essential to permit the development of local
9 exchange competition and is in the public interest."^{3/}

10 On March 31, 1995, the Iowa Utilities Board declared that unbundling
11 of U S West's local loop "is necessary for competition in the local exchange"

^{2/} *In the matter of the application of CITY SIGNAL, INC. for an order establishing and approving interconnection arrangements with Michigan Bell Telephone Company, Case No. U-10647, Opinion and Order at 56, 57 (MI PSC, February 23, 1995).*

^{3/} *See Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Proposed Introduction of a Trial of Ameritech's Customers First Plan in Illinois, Docket Nos. 94-0096, et al., at 48 (Ill. Commerce Comm'n, April 7, 1995).*

1 because new entrants "are not going to be able to provide loops to all
2 customers. Resale of unbundled facilities is the appropriate answer."^{4/}

3 The Maryland Public Service Commission recently adopted an interim
4 pricing arrangement for unbundled links which requires rates for the links to
5 be set at levels that, when totalled, would equal (or be less than) the price of
6 bundled local dial tone line service. Further, the ratio between the prices for
7 unbundled links and ports must mirror the ratio between the direct costs of
8 these components.^{5/}

9 **Q. SHOULD GTE BE REQUIRED TO OFFER COLLOCATION FOR**
10 **INTERCONNECTION TO UNBUNDLED LINKS?**

11 **A.** Yes. Economic development and expanded competition in the provision of
12 local exchange services will be promoted only if MFS-FL can interconnect to
13 unbundled elements of the local loop. Interconnection should be achieved via
14 collocation arrangements MFS-FL will maintain at the wire center at which
15 the unbundled elements are resident. At MFS-FL's discretion, each link or

^{4/} *In re: McLeod Telemanagement, Inc.*, TCU-94-4 (Iowa Utilities Board, March 31, 1995).

^{5/} *In Re: Application of MFS Intelenet of Maryland, Inc.*, Case No. 8584, Phase II, Order No. 72348 at pp. 37-39, *mimeo* (issued December 28, 1995).

1 port element should be delivered to the MFS-FL collocation arrangement over
2 an individual 2-wire hand-off, in multiples of 24 over a digital DS-1 (or, if
3 technically feasible, higher transmission levels) hand-off in any combination
4 or order MFS-FL may specify, or through other technically feasible and
5 economically comparable hand-off arrangements requested by MFS-FL (e.g.,
6 SONET STS-1 hand-off). In addition, GTE should permit MFS-FL to
7 collocate digital loop carrier systems and associated equipment in conjunction
8 with collocation arrangements MFS-FL maintains at GTE's wire center, for
9 the purpose of interconnecting to unbundled link elements.

10 **Q. ON WHAT ADDITIONAL TERMS SHOULD GTE'S**
11 **UNBUNDLED ELEMENTS BE MADE AVAILABLE TO MFS-**
12 **FL IN ORDER FOR MFS-FL TO EFFICIENTLY OFFER**
13 **SERVICES?**

14 **A.** *GTE should be required to apply all transport-based features,*
15 *functions, service attributes, grades-of-service, and install,*
16 *maintenance and repair intervals which apply to bundled service to*
17 *unbundled links. Likewise, GTE should be required to apply all*
18 *switch-based features, functions, service attributes, grades-of-service,*

1 and install, maintenance and repair intervals which apply to bundled
2 service to unbundled ports.

3 GTE should permit any customer to convert its bundled service
4 to an unbundled service and assign such service to MFS-FL, with no
5 penalties, rollover, termination or conversion charges to MFS-FL or
6 the customer. GTE should also bill all unbundled facilities purchased
7 by MFS-FL (either directly or by previous assignment by a customer)
8 on a single consolidated statement per wire center. Finally, GTE
9 should provide MFS-FL with an appropriate on-line electronic file
10 transfer arrangement by which MFS-FL may place, verify and receive
11 confirmation on orders for unbundled elements, and issue and track
12 trouble-ticket and repair requests associated with unbundled elements.

13 **Q. WHAT IS MFS-FL'S POSITION WITH REGARD TO GTE'S**
14 **UNBUNDLING PROPOSAL?**

15 **A.** Unfortunately, MFS-FL cannot accept GTE's recommendation of
16 special access rates in lieu of unbundled loops. Hence, MFS-FL and
17 GTE have not yet reached an agreement.

1 **Q. IS IT IMPORTANT THAT UNBUNDLED ELEMENTS OF THE**
2 **LOCAL LOOP BE AVAILABLE TO NEW ENTRANTS AT A**
3 **REASONABLE PRICE?**

4 **A.** Yes. The availability of loops on an unbundled basis is only half the equation.
5 The loops must be priced in a manner that allows carriers to offer end users a
6 competitively priced service. In order to discourage GTE from implementing
7 anticompetitive pricing policies that would artificially depress the demand for
8 a competitor's service, the Commission should adopt pricing guidelines for
9 unbundled loops that are premised on GTE's' cost in providing the service and
10 that reflect this functional equivalency.

11 Absent any mitigating circumstances that might justify lower rates,
12 GTE's Long Run Incremental Costs ("LRIC") should serve as the target price
13 and cap for unbundled loops where such loops must be employed by
14 competitive carriers to compete realistically and practically with the
15 entrenched monopoly service provider, GTE. LRIC is the direct economic
16 cost of a given facility, including cost of capital, and represents the cost that
17 the LEC would otherwise have avoided if it had not installed the relevant
18 increment of plant -- *i.e.*, local loops in a given region. Thus, by leasing a
19 loop to a competitor, an incumbent LEC would be allowed to recover no less

1 than the full cost it would otherwise have avoided had it not built the
2 increment of plant that it has made available, through loop unbundling, for use
3 by a competitor in serving the customer to whose premises the loop extends.
4 For purposes of calculating LRIC-capped rates for unbundled loops, the LEC
5 would be required to perform long-run incremental cost studies for each
6 component of the local exchange access line, including the link, port, cross-
7 connect element and local usage elements. In addition, the volume and term
8 discounts that are offered to end users should be made available to competitive
9 local exchange carriers.

10 There is, however, an important qualification to this general
11 principle. LRIC is the appropriate pricing methodology *only* if it is
12 applied consistently in setting the price both for the unbundled services
13 provided to co-carriers and the bundled services offered by GTE to its
14 own end users. New entrants should not be subject to discriminatory
15 charges that GTE does not apply to its own end users. Therefore, the
16 Commission should adopt two additional pricing guidelines to prevent
17 such discrimination:

- 1 • First, the sum of the prices of the unbundled rate elements (link, port,
2 and cross-connect) must be no greater than the price of the bundled
3 dial tone line.
- 4 • Second, the ratio of price to LRIC for each element and for the
5 bundled dial tone line must be the same.

6 These two guidelines would require that the prices for the unbundled
7 dial tone line components be derived from the existing access line rates
8 established in GTE's effective tariffs. As long as those rates cover
9 LRIC, the unbundled component prices determined by these guidelines
10 would also cover LRIC.

11 **Q. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT A NEW ENTRANT SIMPLY**
12 **PURCHASING A PRIVATE LINE OR SPECIAL ACCESS CHANNEL**
13 **FROM GTE'S EXISTING TARIFF?**

14 **A.** It would not be economical and would not be practical from a time of
15 installation perspective. While there is not much physical difference between
16 an unbundled link and a private line or special access channel, there are
17 differences in technical standards as well as engineering and operational
18 practices. The voice-grade channels offered under the private line and special
19 access tariffs provide a dedicated transmission path between an end user's

1 premises and a LEC wire center, just as unbundled simple links would. The
2 major differences between these existing services and unbundled simple links
3 are the additional performance parameters required for private line and special
4 access services, beyond what is necessary to provide "POTS" (plain old
5 telephone service); and the methods used by LECs to install and provision the
6 services. Currently, installation of a private line or special access channel
7 typically requires special engineering by the LEC and therefore takes longer
8 and costs more than installation of a "POTS" line. This special engineering
9 begins with a line that would be suitable for "POTS," but then adapts it to
10 conform to specialized performance parameters. Therefore, no single private
11 line service offering provided by GTE is likely to represent the basic co-
12 carrier unbundled loop facility. Private line and special access services also
13 include additional performance standards that are not necessary for the
14 delivery of "POTS" service. MFS-FL's major concern is that, in the future,
15 when a customer decides to replace its existing GTE dial tone service with
16 MFS-FL dial tone service, MFS-FL should be able to have the customer's
17 existing link facility rolled over from the GTE switch to an MFS-FL expanded
18 interconnection node in the same central office, without having the entire link
19 re-provisioned or engineered over different facilities. This roll-over, including

1 the seamless roll-over to MFS-FL when the customer is taking advantage of
2 number retention, should occur within the same ordering provision interval as
3 GTE provides for bundled local exchange service to end users and with
4 minimal service interruption to those customers.

5 In addition, it has been MFS-FL's experience that, in most
6 cases, the tariffed rate of a private line service exceeds the tariffed rate
7 of a bundled dial tone business or residence line. In fact, private lines
8 or special access channels are typically priced at substantial premiums
9 today. LECs have set prices for these existing services at premium
10 prices, on the basis that these services require additional performance
11 parameters beyond what is necessary to provide POTS. As such,
12 applying the tariffed rate of a private line or special access channel for
13 unbundled loops will place MFS-FL in a "price squeeze," in that it
14 would be paying more for the unbundled loops than it would be
15 allowed to recover through end user retail rates. Left to its own
16 devices, a dominant incumbent LEC such as GTE, would not tariff the
17 unbundled loop facility at the appropriate LRIC price. Instead, it
18 would likely choose to continue to apply the premium rate to an

Direct Testimony of Timothy T. Devine
MFS Communications Company, Inc.
January 24, 1996
Page 27

1 entrant like MFS-FL in order to raise an additional barrier to
2 competition.

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

4 **A. Yes, it does.**

**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. Mike Marczak
GTE South
Post Office Box 110, MC7
Tampa, FL 33601

Dear Mike:

In preparation for the upcoming Co-carrier meeting between MFS and GTE, 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 GTE 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 GTE 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. Mike Marczak
July 19, 1995
Page 3

V. Unbundling - Unbundling refers to the utilization of components of GTE's presently tariffed services. MFS's initial unbundling proposal is to begin utilization of loop facilities between a BellSouth 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 BellSouth 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. Mike Marczyk
Senior Account Manager
GTE Telephone Operations
One Tampa City Center
Post Office Box 110 MC FLTC0009
Tampa, Florida 33601-0110

Via Facsimile & Overnight Mail
@813 228 5326

Dear Mike:

Attached please find a Co-carrier agreement which I am proposing for MFS and GTE to execute to address Interconnection and Unbundling between our companies in the state of Florida. I am requesting that GTE 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 prominent loop at the end.

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 century¹; 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

¹ 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 Guidelines².

- 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

² 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.³ 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.

³ 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.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION
AND AGREEMENT**

B. Compensation

1. At ELEC's option, billing to 3rd-parties⁴ 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 revenues⁵ 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

⁴ Including any future ILEC separate interexchange subsidiaries.

⁵ 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.

- (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

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION
AND AGREEMENT**

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 an industry-accepted format; ILEC will provide ELEC a magnetic tape or computer disk containing the proper format.

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION
AND AGREEMENT**

- 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. __

**FLORIDA CO-CARRIER STIPULATION
AND AGREEMENT**

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")⁶ 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.

⁶ 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:

- PB** = Price of the bundled service (including all applicable discounts).
- CB** = Long-run service incremental cost ("LRSIC") of the bundled service.
- PL** = Price of the unbundled link element.
- CL** = LRSIC of the unbundled link element.
- PP** = Price of the unbundled port element.
- CP** = LRSIC of the unbundled port element.
- PC** = Price of the unbundled cross-connect element.
- Cc** = 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>	
	an individual	a digital
	<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>

⁷ 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

⁷ (...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.

GTE of Florida Date

Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc. Date



**FACSIMILE
TRANSMITTAL
COVER SHEET**

**REGULATORY AND
INDUSTRY AFFAIRS (FL)**

DATE: DECEMBER 7, 1995

TO: TIM DEVINE

LOCATION: _____

TEL. NO.: 770-399-8378

FAX. NO.: 770-399-8398

FROM: Beverly Y. Menard

LOCATION: Tampa, FL -- MC FLTC0616

TEL. NO.: 813/224-4825

FAX.: 813/223-4888

MESSAGE: PER OUR CONVERSATION

Bew

NUMBER OF PAGES
INCLUDING THIS PAGE: 3

Updated Local Interconnection Rates

End Office Switching	0.0089000
Tandem Switching	0.0007500
Tandem Switched Termination	0.0002688
Tandem Sw. Transport Facility	
Zone 1	0.0000135
Zone 2	0.0000141
Zone 3	0.0000149
Total Tandem Switching (1 Mile)	
Zone 1	0.0010323
Zone 2	0.0010329
Zone 3	0.0010337
Total Interconnection (1 Mile)	
Zone 1	0.0099323
Zone 2	0.0099329
Zone 3	0.0099337
Total Tandem Switching (60 Miles)	
Zone 1	0.0018288
Zone 2	0.0018648
Zone 3	0.0019128
Total Interconnection (60 Miles)	
Zone 1	0.0107288
Zone 2	0.0107648
Zone 3	0.0108128

END

Local Interconnection Rates

End Office Switching	0.0089000
Tandem Switching	0.0009512
Tandem Switched Termination	0.0003584
Tandem Sw. Transport Facility	
Zone 1	0.0000155
Zone 2	0.0000163
Zone 3	0.0000172
Total Tandem Switching (1 Mile)	
Zone 1	0.0013251
Zone 2	0.0013259
Zone 3	0.0013268
Total Interconnection (1 Mile)	
Zone 1	0.0102251
Zone 2	0.0102259
Zone 3	0.0102268
Total Tandem Switching (60 Miles)	
Zone 1	0.0022396
Zone 2	0.0022876
Zone 3	0.0023416
Total Interconnection (60 Miles)	
Zone 1	0.0111396
Zone 2	0.0111876
Zone 3	0.0112416



Communications Company, Inc.

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

January 3, 1996

Mr. Mike Marczyk
Senior Account Manager
GTE Telephone Operations
One Tampa City Center
Post Office Box 110 MC FLTC0009
Tampa, Florida 33601-0110

Via Facsimile & Overnight Mail
@813 228 5326

Dear Mike:

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

In addition, while we have had a couple of conference calls, the only formal correspondence that MFS has received from GTE was a three page facsimile from Ms. Beverly Menard December 7, 1995 listing GTE's switched access-based local interconnection rates. I appreciate your position on local interconnection rates but switched access is neither currently used between local exchange carriers in Florida for the exchange of traffic nor is an appropriate structure to be used between incumbent and new entrant local exchange carriers for the exchange of traffic in Florida.

Therefore, since GTE has not provided MFS with a comprehensive detailed written response to MFS' request for Interconnection and Unbundling and we disagree over the key issue of compensation for the exchange of traffic, I am planning to file a petition against GTE 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 GTE to become more forthright with MFS in an attempt to reach agreement on our request and thus avoid litigation before the PSC.

Mr. Mike Marczyk
January 3, 1996
Page Two

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

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



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



GTE Telephone Operations
Florida Operation

January 19, 1996

One Tampa City Center
201 N. Franklin Street
P.O. Box 110 **FLTC0009**
Tampa, FL 33601-0110

Mr. Timothy T. Devine
Senior Director, External & Regulatory Affairs
Southern Region
MFS Communications Company, Inc.
Six Concourse Parkway, Suite 2100
Atlanta, GA 30328-8351

Dear Tim:

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with GTE Florida's written response to the terms and conditions of interconnection which have been proposed by MFS. As you know, MFS and GTE have discussed the companies' respective positions in several conference calls during the last few months of negotiations. However, in your letter of January 3, 1996, you requested a written response to each issue previously raised by MFS. Pursuant to that request, GTE Florida is responding in writing, as set forth in the Attachment to this letter.

After you review the responses, I would like to establish a conference call so we can discuss these items further. Except for some of the language which says that everything is at your option, I feel we are very close to agreement on many of the issues raised in the document. However, there are some items we need to discuss further so we can determine if we are in agreement or not and whether GTE Florida's responses need to be modified.

This response is strictly limited to GTE Florida. Due to the network arrangements in Florida and language contained in Chapter 364, these responses are not intended to serve as precedents for other states where MFS wishes to interconnect with GTE.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Marczyk
Senior Account Manager - Carrier Markets

Attachment

c: B. Menard
G. Adair
A. Gillman

I. Recital & Principles

The provisions in this section are unnecessary and were not all contained in the PacBell agreement. GTEFL wants this section replaced with general recitals more consistent with Chapter 364.

II. Definitions

GTEFL suggests that the definitions conform to Chapter 364 in Florida. As such, ELEC should be changed to ALEC, Alternative Local Exchange Carrier (Item M). In addition, POTS (Item II) definition does not include IntraLATA toll traffic in Florida.

III. Default Network Interconnection Architecture

- A.** In GTE Florida's network, there is only one access tandem with all GTEFL end offices subtending the access tandem. There are no other LECs subtending the GTEFL access tandem. MFS is currently collocated at Tampa Main which is the location for the access tandem. Therefore, it would appear that the D-NIP will be the access tandem.
- B.** GTEFL supports the language that interconnection points must be mutually agreed upon between the two parties. GTEFL cannot agree that the options should be strictly at the ELEC's option.
- C.** GTEFL does not lease dark fiber facilities. Since MFS is already collocated at Tampa Main, it would appear that most of the language in sections A, B and C should be modified to reflect the actual arrangement in place.
- D.** GTEFL will charge for cross-connection charges in conformance with the collocation tariffs.
- E.** Depending on the type of conversion required, GTEFL cannot universally waive all penalty, conversion or rollover charges.

IV. Number Resource Arrangements

These positions are consistent with GTEFL's position in previous negotiation meetings.

V. Meet-Point Billing Arrangements

A. Description

- 1.** GTEFL assumes this section applies for IXC access. If so, the meet point billing arrangements must be mutually agreed between the LECs. Moreover, such arrangements are not at the sole discretion of the LECs; they also involve the IXC who is the customer who orders access.

2. Since MFS is colocated at the access tandem (D-NIP), GTEFL has no problems with permitting MFS to subtenant the access tandem and assume this will be the most-point arrangement utilized.
5. Since GTEFL currently has no other LECs in the LATA, GTEFL has not worked with NECA No. 4 for most-point billing arrangements. However, GTEFL will use its best efforts to work with MFS on this issue.
7. GTEFL does not know what MFS means relative to the calendar month billing period. GTEFL issues bills on a monthly basis to IXCs; however, the data is not necessarily for a calendar month as GTEFL has 10 billing cycles in a month. There could be a charge for usage data.

B. Compensation

1. The compensation arrangements cannot be strictly at the ELEC's option. GTEFL does not know what the multiple-bill/single-tariff method is.
3. GTEFL does not understand why MFS will have an interconnection charge. It is our understanding that the interconnection charge was established as a residual revenue requirement associated with tandem switching. However, since GTEFL has not seen MFS' proposed access rates, GTEFL is not sure what rate elements MFS intends to apply.
4. GTEFL supports the industry guidelines and will not vary from the industry guidelines. As such, per MECOB guidelines, with the single bill option, the end office company bills the IXCs. If MFS subtenants the access tandem, they will be responsible for the billing.

VI. Reciprocal Traffic Exchange Arrangement

A. Description

1. GTEFL prefers two way trunks as we believe this is more efficient; however, if MFS wants one-way trunks, we are willing to accommodate this.
7. For CCS interconnections, it may not be the most efficient arrangement for all interconnections to be made at the D-NIP (have 2 STPs in the LATA).

B. Compensation

1. As GTEFL understands MFS' definition, POTS calls includes both local and intrastate toll traffic. GTEFL believes that intrastate switched access charges must apply for any intrastate toll traffic or this will be discriminatory with the treatment for IXCs. In addition, GTEFL is proposing to use the same access rates (excluding the interconnection charge and carrier common line) for local POTS traffic. The interconnections for

Common Channel Signalling will be furnished in accordance with the FCC GTOC Access Tariff.

2. **If GTEFL's access tandem is used for traffic transiting the tandem, GTEFL will charge tandem switching in accordance with its access tariffs. In addition, GTEFL supports the use of an additional rate element to compensate for ALEC to ALEC traffic transiting GTEFL's access tandem.**

VII. Shared Network Platform Arrangements

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

1. **The current colocation tariffs state that all facilities must terminate in Telephone Company equipment and no connections will be made between the partitioned space of collocated customers within the central office or access tandem. GTEFL will not permit cross connection to other collocated entities.**

B. 911/E911

- c. **The Master Street Address Guide is not the property of GTEFL but is actually provided by the counties. GTEFL is willing to make available to MFS the same arrangement that is currently utilized with United which will allow for the verification of MFS' data against the MSAG. Separate trunk groups to the 911 tandem are required.**

C. Information Services Billing and Collection

1. **GTEFL cannot agree to this arrangement being at the ELEC's option. The 976 tariff which GTEFL has in place does not reflect the type offering which will allow this type arrangement. It will be up to MFS whether they choose to have a 976 type arrangement or not.**

D. Directory Listings and Directory Distribution

1. **GTE Telephone Operations has developed a separate contract for this service and it will serve as the basis for negotiations. GTEFL agrees to include MFS' customers in the white page and yellow page directory listings and directory assistance databases. In addition, GTEFL agrees that the initial distribution of directories when they are published will be provided to MFS customers in the same manner as GTEFL customers (MFS will be required to provide the appropriate information to the Directory company for this to occur).**
2. **GTE will not sell MFS listings to third parties unless authorized by MFS. GTE will not function as a sales agent. MFS will establish their own listing price. GTE will be compensated for all administrative functions associated with the furnishing of listings to third parties.**

E. Directory Assistance (DA)

GTEFL agrees to charge for directory assistance calls using GTEFL's access tariffs which represent GTEFL's LRIC-based rates. The rates are \$0.25 for intrastate calls and \$0.28 for interstate calls. GTEFL does not currently have tariffed, and currently has no plans to tariff, licensing of the directory assistance database or a process where other parties have access to GTEFL's database for a database query service. Since GTEFL currently has no other LECs in the LATA, GTEFL has not tariffed an offering for LECs to use directory assistance call completion service. However, GTEFL is willing to pursue this further with MFS if MFS desires this service. In Florida, carriers are required to install separate trunk groups to the directory assistance switch.

F. Yellow Page Maintenance

GTEFL cannot agree to a commission program being implemented at the ELEC's sole discretion. GTEFL does not currently act as a sales agent for Yellow Pages advertisements.

G. Transfer of Service Announcements

Under the current FPSC rules for intercept, this is the type recording a customer would currently receive from GTEFL if they change numbers. Assuming the proper process is in place to insure the records get updated correctly, this should not be a problem.

H. Coordinated Repair Calls

GTEFL is still working on their position on this issue. Since GTEFL utilizes an 800 number for repair calls, we would expect that the misdirected calls should be minimal. GTEFL does not use 611 service for repair.

I. Busy Line Verification and Interrupt

GTEFL is willing to pursue this type arrangement; however, it may require different trunk groups to provide this service. GTEFL proposes that the rates charged will be the same rates currently charged to IXCs which are LRIC-based rates. The rates are \$0.65 for inward operator assistance service and apply on a per call basis. Each call may include any combination of functions for the same telephone number.

J. Information Pages

This subject is covered by the directory contact discussed above. GTEFL agrees that the Directory Company will include critical information in the front of the directory which MFS requests. It will be the Directory Company's responsibility to determine the placement of the information.

K. Operator Reference Database (ORDB)

Since GTEFL has 911 in all counties in its territory, GTEFL has no such database as emergency calls are routed to 911.

VIII. Unbundled Exchange Service Arrangements

- A. 2. GTEFL cannot agree that it is at the ALEC's discretion on hand-offs. GTEFL's current practices for exchange service is to hand-off at a 2-wire level. However, GTEFL is willing to consider other tariffed arrangements.
 - 5. GTEFL cannot agree to waive all penalties for conversion of service.
 - 6. At this point, the billing procedures have not been developed, but it doubtful that wire center billing can be accomplished easily.
 - 7. For digital loop carrier, GTEFL plans to use standard arrangements but require additional explanation on what MFS desires.
 - 8. Colocation of equipment will be done in conformance with the colocation tariffs which do not allow colocation of remote switching modules.
 - 9. An electronic system is not in place today and further discussion will have to occur on this request.
- B. GTEFL's prices are based on tariffed rates. Since some of the services requested are not currently tariffed, the development of prices has not been completed. Further discussion is also required on the differences between a 2-wire and DS-1 hand-off. The tariffed prices for the services requested by MFS are as follows:

	Prices, each when delivered over:	
	an individual 2-wire hand-off	a digital DS-1 hand-off
2-wire analog voice grade link	23.00	---
2-wire ISDN digital grade link	23.00(1)	---
4-wire DS-1 digital grade link	n/a	---
2-wire analog line part	180(2)	---
2-wire ISDN digital line part	20.00(2)	---
2-wire analog DID trunk part	180(2)	---
4-wire DS-1 digital DID trunk part	n/a	330.00(2)(3)
4-wire ISDN-PRI digital trunk part	n/a	330.00(2)

Note 1: Additional conditioning, signaling arrangements or items such as B-voice/CSD may be applicable

Note 2: Including usage (GTEFL would be charging same usage rates used for STS service)

Note 3: The applicable rates and charges for the DID accessible service are as specified in Section A13 of the tariff. The appropriate charges are the NAR as specified in Section A3 for voice only, or monthly usage rates for voice and data.

- C. GTEFL recommends following the approach outlined in Chapter 364; i.e., the parties will first negotiate, and if the parties are unable to reach satisfactory resolution, then either party may go to the Commission.

IX. Local Telephone Number Portability Arrangements

GTEFL believes this section must be updated to be consistent with decisions that have already been reflected in Florida Public Service Commission orders. GTEFL does not currently have available a digital DID offering. If MFS wants this type arrangement, we will need to discuss the technical parameters for this service so that GTEFL can determine whether the service can be offered and the price for the service (since to have no charge would be in violation of Chapter 364). GTEFL currently has no way to identify the access charges associated with remote call forwarded calls as they appear as two calls in GTEFL's systems and there is currently no billing and/or other mechanism in place to develop this data. GTEFL plans to compensate MFS for all local terminated calls using the same type arrangement which GTEFL uses to charge MFS for local calls and these type calls will look like local calls. GTEFL is willing to pursue development of a mutually agreeable surrogate to accommodate the differential between access charges and local compensation for ported calls as GTEFL cannot support making massive modifications to their billing system at this time to try to identify these type calls.

X. Responsibilities of the Parties

GTEFL agrees in principle with sections A-D. GTEFL does not agree with Sections E and F.

XI. Term

GTEFL agrees with MFS' position.

XII. Installation

GTEFL agrees with MFS' position.

XIII. Network Maintenance and Management

GTEFL agrees with MFS' position.

XIV. Option to Elect Other Terms

At this time, GTEFL is not in a position to address this section with MFS. We will undertake efforts to develop a position on this issue and submit a response to MFS.

****END****

XV. Cancellation, Conversion, Non-Recurring or Roll-Over Charges

GTEFL cannot agree to unilaterally waive all charges. This must be determined on a case by case basis.

XVI. Force Majeure

GTEFL awaits your terms and conditions before formulating a response.

XVII. Limitation of Liability

GTEFL awaits your terms and conditions before formulating a response.



INFORUM, SUITE 2200
250 WILLIAMS STREET
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-1034
TEL (404) 224-6000
FAX (404) 224-6080
January 22, 1996

Mr. Michael Marczyk
Sr. Account Manager
GTE Telephone Operations
One Tampa City Center
Tampa, Florida 33601-0110

Via Facsimile & Overnight Mail
@813 228 5326

Dear Mike:

Thank you for providing me your facsimile I received Friday January 19 in response to MFS' proposed Co-carrier Agreement dated November 8, 1995.

After a detailed review of the your response it is apparent that we significantly disagree regarding several issues. Specifically, and most importantly, while MFS has proposed bill and keep, in-kind compensation, GTE has proposed an unequal rate of compensation based upon a Switched Access per minute of use scheme. While MFS could possibly entertain a per minute of use (MOU) rate after an initial 18 month period of bill and keep, any per MOU rate must be based upon long run incremental costs (LRIC).

In addition, there are other areas of disagreement, including, meet-point billing compensation (Residual Interconnection Charge (RIC) item), switched access compensation for interim number portability calls, cross-connection between two local service providers at a GTE serving wire center, and some other Shared Platform (unbundled) arrangements.

Also, GTE's proposed rates for unbundled dial-tone loops are in excess of LRIC as proposed by MFS.

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. Indeed, it appears that we are in agreement on several other issues and most certainly should work diligently to stipulate on all items we are able to.

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 Tampa to continue our discussions.

Sincerely,

Timothy T. Devine

LEGEND OF TERMS

DLC = DIGITAL LOOP CARRIER

FOT = FIBER OPTIC TERMINAL

MDF = MAIN DISTRIBUTION FRAME

LOOP = UNBUNDLED DIAL-TONE LINE

PORT = UNBUNDLED DIAL-TONE PORT

2W = 2 WIRE

4W = 4 WIRE

DSX = DS-1 DIGITAL SIGNAL CROSS-CONNECT

DEMARCATON POINT = DIVIDING LINE BETWEEN BELL
AND MFS SERVICE


COLLOCATION SITE = SITE WHERE MFS HAS ITS OWN
DEDICATED EQUIPMENT



= TELEPHONE SET OR PRIVATE BRANCH EXCHANGE

A


DIGITAL LOOP CARRIER AT COLLOCATION SITE CONNECTED TO 2W OR 4W ANALOG OR DIGITAL ISDN GRADE LOOP



MFS-FL Response to
Staff 1st Set
Item #8
12-12-95/950984

B


DIGITAL LOOP CARRIER AT BELLSOUTH EQUIPMENT LOCATION CONNECTED TO 2W OR 4W ANALOG OR DIGITAL ISDN GRADE LOOP



MFS-FL Response to
Staff 1st Set
Item #8
12-12-95/950984

C


4W DS-1 DIGITAL GRADE LOOP CONNECTED TO COLLOCATION SITE



MFS-FL Response to
Staff 1st Set
Item #8
12-12-95/950984

D


2W OR 4W ANALOG OR DIGITAL, DID
AND ISDN PORT CONNECTED TO
COLLOCATED DIGITAL LOOP CARRIER



MFS-FL Response to
Staff 1st Set
Item #8
12-12-95/950984

E


4W DS-1 DIGITAL, DID OR ISDN DIGITAL PORT CONNECTED TO COLLOCATION SITE



MFS-FL Response to
Staff 1st Set
Item #8
12-12-95/950984

F


LOOPS AND PORTS COMBINED CONNECTED TO COLLOCATION SITE



MFS-FL Response to
Staff 1st Set
Item #8
12-12-95/950984

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, David M. Halley, hereby certify that on this 24th day of January, 1996, copies of the foregoing Direct Testimony of Timothy T. Devine on Behalf of Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc. which accompanies the Petition of Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc. for GTE Florida, Inc. to Unbundle the Local Loop, Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 950984-TP were sent via Federal Express to the parties on the attached official service list in this docket.



David M. Halley

Mr. Michael Tye
AT&T Communications
of the Southern States, Inc. (T1741)
101 North Monroe Street, Ste. 700
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-7733

Mr. Timothy Devine
Metropolitan Fiber Systems
of Florida, Inc.
Six Concourse Parkway, Ste. 1200
Atlanta, Georgia 30328

Laura L. Wilson, Esq.
Florida Cable Telecommunications Associates, Inc.
310 North Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Peter Dunbar, Esq.
Charles W. Murphy, Esq.
Pennington Law Firm
215 South Monroe Street, Ste. 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Richard Melson, Esq.
Hopping Law Firm
123 South Calhoun Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Jodie Donovan-May, Esq.
Teleport Communication Group - Washington, D.C.
2 LaFayette Center
1133 Twenty-First Street, N.W., Ste. 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esq.
Rutledge, Ecenia, Underwood, Purnell & Hoffman
215 South Monroe Street, Ste. 420
Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Ms. Jill Butler
Time Warner Communications
2773 Red Maple Ridge, Ste. 301
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Mr. Michael J. Henry
MCI Telecommunications Corporation (T1731)
780 Johnson Ferry Road, Ste. 700
Atlanta, Georgia 30342

Patrick Wiggins, Esq.
Wiggins Law Firm
501 East Tennessee Street, Ste. B
Tallahassee, Florida 32308

Floyd Self, Esq.
Messer Law Firm
215 South Monroe Street, Ste. 701
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Lee L. Willis, Esq.
J. Jeffrey Wahlen, Esq.
McFarlane, Ausley, et al.
227 South Calhoun Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Anthony P. Gillman, Esq.
Kimberly Caswell, Esq.
GTE Florida Incorporated, FLTC0007
201 North Franklin Street
Tampa, Florida 33602

Charles Beck, Esq.
Deputy Public Counsel
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

Patricia Kurlin
Intermedia Communications of Florida, Inc.
9280 Bay Plaza Blvd., Ste. 720
Tampa, Florida 33619-4453

Clay Phillips
Utilities & Telecommunications
House Office Building, Room 410
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

David Erwin, Esq.
Young Law Firm
225 South Adams Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1833

Nels Roseland
Executive Office of the Governor
Office of Planning and Budget
The Capital, Room 1502
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001

Graham A. Taylor
TCG South Florida
1001 West Cypress Creek Road, Suite 209
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33309-1949

Greg Krasovsky
Commerce & Economic Opportunities
Senate Office Building, Room 426
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

John Murray
Payphone Consultants, Inc.
3431 N.W. 55th Street
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33309-6308

H.W. Goodall
Continental Fiber Technologies, Inc.
4455 BayMeadows Road
Jacksonville, Florida 32217-4716

Richard A. Gerstemeier
Time Warner AxS of Florida, L.P.
2251 Lucien Way, Ste. 320
Maitland, Florida 32751-7023

Steven D. Shannon
MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc.
2250 Lakeside Boulevard
Richardson, Texas 75082

Gary T. Lawrence
City of Lakeland
501 East Lemon Street
Lakeland, Florida 33801-5079

Marsha Rule, Esq.
Wiggins & Willacorta
501 East Tennessee
Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Kimberly Caswell, Esq.
c/o Richard M. Fletcher
GTE Florida Incorporated
106 East College Avenue, Ste. 1440
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-7704

F. Ben Poag
Sprint/United-Florida
Sprint/Centel-Florida
555 Lake Border Drive
Apopka, Florida 32703

J. Phillip Carver, Esq.
c/o Nancy H. Sims
Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company
150 South Monroe Street, Ste. 400
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Robin Dunsan, Esq.
AT&T Communications
1200 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Promenade I, Room 4038
Atlanta, Florida 30309

Donald L. Crosby, Esq.
Continental CableVision, Inc.
7800 Belfort Parkway, Suite 270
Jacksonville, Florida 32256-6925

Bill Tabor
Utilities & Telecommunications
Houst Office Building, Room 410
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Brian Sulmonetti
LDDS Communications, Inc.
1515 South Federal Highway, #400
Boca Raton, Florida 33432-7404

Sue E. Weiske, Esq.
Senior Counsel
Law Department
Time Warner Communications
160 Inverness Drive West
Englewood, Colorado 80112

C. Everett Boyd, Jr., Esq.
Ervin, Varn, Jacobs, Odom & Ervin
305 South Gadsden
Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Benjamin Fincher, Esq.
Sprint Communications Company
Limited Partnership
3065 Cumberland Circle
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

Donna Canzano, Esq.
Staff Attorney
Legal Department
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850