

SPECIAL COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

VOTE SHEET

DATE: February 21, 1997

RE: DOCKET NO. 96-2233-TP - Petition by AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. for arbitration of certain terms and conditions of a proposed agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. concerning interconnection and resale under the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve AT&T and BellSouth's arbitrated agreement?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve all sections of the AT&T and BellSouth agreement, except for the sections identified in Table A in the staff analysis. The agreement is consistent with Section 251 of the Act and this Commission's order issued in this proceeding.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: Full Commission

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

Susan F. Clark
[Signature]
J. Terry Dear
[Signature]
[Signature]

Susan F. Clark

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:
PSC/RAR33 (5/90)

Commissioner Clark dissented on Issue 4.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA PARTICIPATED IN THE VOTE VIA VIDEO TELECONFERENCING FROM MIAMI. IN HIS ORAL VOTE, HE: CONCURRED WITH THE MAJORITY / DISSENTED. COMMISSIONER GARCIA WILL SIGN THE ORIGINAL VOTE SHEET UPON HIS RETURN TO TALLAHASSEE.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02267 MAR-36

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Issue 2: Should the Commission establish language for the dispute associated with SS7 Network and AIN between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.?

Recommendation: No. The Commission should not establish language for this area of dispute.

APPROVED

Issue 3: Should the Commission address the pricing and language disputes for unbundled network elements between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission establish language for the pricing sections that are in dispute as discussed in the staff analysis. Staff recommends that the Commission should not establish language for Section 30.7 of the agreement. That language dispute concerns an issue not addressed in the arbitration proceeding.

APPROVED

Issue 4: Should the Commission establish language for the dispute associated with Local Services Resale between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve the staff proposed language identified in the staff analysis.

DENIED

*The language proposed by
BellSo was adopted.
Commissioner Clark dissented.*

Issue 5: Should the Commission establish language for the dispute associated with Performance Measurement between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve the staff proposed language identified in the staff analysis.

APPROVED

Issue 6: Should the Commission establish language for the dispute associated with access to poles, ducts, conduits and rights-of-way between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve the staff proposed language identified in the staff analysis.

APPROVED

Issue 7: Should the Commission approve the language, as identified in the February 11, 1997 letter, for electronic interfaces between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve the language contained in the February 11, 1997 letter.

APPROVED

Issue 8: Should the Commission establish language for the dispute associated with general contract terms and conditions between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.?

Recommendation: No. The Commission should not establish language for this area of dispute.

MODIFIED

*Approved with modification
made at the conference.*

Issue 9: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No, this docket should remain open until the parties have filed their signed arbitration agreement, and the Commission has completed its review of BST's cost studies that were required to be filed pursuant to the order in this proceeding.

MODIFIED

*The signed agreement incorporating
substance of today's decision is to be
filed by March 7, 1997.*