



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: February 25, 2002

TO: DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF THE COMMISSION CLERK &
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (BAYÓ)

FROM: DIVISION OF COMPETITIVE MARKETS & ENFORCEMENT (KING, *me*
BARRETT, *MOB* T. BROWN, *tb* J-E. BROWN, SCHULTZ, *TMS* TURNER) *AW*
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL (KNIGHT, CHRISTENSEN, *AW*
KEATING) *RIC*

RE: DOCKET NO. 001305-TP - PETITION BY BELLSOUTH
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN ISSUES
IN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH SUPRA TELECOMMUNICATIONS
AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC.

AGENDA: 03/05/02 - REGULAR AGENDA - POST HEARING DECISION; MOTION
FOR REHEARING, APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL MASTER, INDEFINITE
DEFERRAL; RENEWED MOTION FOR INDEFINITE STAY -
PARTICIPATION IS LIMITED TO COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF ON
POST HEARING ISSUES - ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED ON PENDING
MOTIONS

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: NONE

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\CMP\WP\001305r.RCM

LIST OF ACRONYMS - 7 -

CASE BACKGROUND - 9 -

ISSUE I: Should Supra's February 13, 2002, Motion for Oral
Argument be granted? (Keating) - 12 -

ISSUE II: Should Supra's February 18, 2002, Motion for Oral
Argument be granted? (Keating) - 13 -

ISSUE III: Should Supra's Motion for Rehearing, for Appointment of
a Special Master, and Indefinite Deferral be granted?
(Christensen, Keating, Knight) - 14 -

ISSUE IV: Should Supra's Renewed Motion for Indefinite Stay and In
the Alternative Renewed Motion for Oral Arguments be
granted? (Keating) - 27 -

ISSUE B: Which agreement template shall be used as the base
agreement into which the Commission's decision on the
disputed issues will be incorporated? (T. Brown)
. - 29 -

ISSUE 1: What are the appropriate fora for the submission of
disputes under the new agreement? (Knight) - 36 -

ISSUE 4: Should the Interconnection Agreement contain language to
the effect that it will not be filed with the Florida
Public Service Commission for approval prior to an ALEC
obtaining ALEC certification from the Florida Public
Service Commission? (Schultz) - 50 -

ISSUE 5: Should BellSouth be required to provide to Supra a
download of all of BellSouth's Customer Service Records
("CSRs")? (Schultz) - 54 -

ISSUE 10: Should the rate for a loop be reduced when the loop
utilizes Digitally Added Main Line (DAML) equipment?
(J-E. Brown) - 60 -

ISSUE 11A: Under what conditions, if any, should the Interconnection Agreement state that the parties may withhold payment of disputed charges? (Schultz) - 67 -

ISSUE 11B: Under what conditions, if any, should the Interconnection Agreement state that the parties may withhold payment of undisputed charges? (Schultz) - 74 -

ISSUE 12: Should BellSouth be required to provide transport to Supra Telecom if that transport crosses LATA boundaries? (Turner) - 75 -

ISSUE 15: What Performance Measurements should be included in the Interconnection Agreement? (T. Brown) - 80 -

ISSUE 16: Under what conditions, if any, may BellSouth refuse to provide service under the terms of the interconnection agreement? (Turner) - 85 -

ISSUE 18: What are the appropriate rates for the following services, items or elements set forth in the proposed Interconnection Agreement?

- (A) Resale
- (B) Network Elements
- (C) Interconnection
- (D) Collocation
- (E) LNP/INP
- (F) Billing Records
- (G) Other (J-E. Brown) - 93 -

ISSUE 19: Should calls to Internet Service Providers be treated as local traffic for the purposes of reciprocal compensation? (Barrett) - 97 -

ISSUE 20: Should the Interconnection Agreement include validation and audit requirements which will enable Supra Telecom to assure the accuracy and reliability of the performance data BellSouth provides to Supra Telecom? (T. Brown) - 102 -

ISSUE 21: What does "currently combines" mean as that phrase is used in 47 C.F.R. §51.315(b)? (Schultz) - 105 -

- ISSUE 22: Under what conditions, if any, may BellSouth charge Supra Telecom a "non-recurring charge" for combining network elements on behalf of Supra Telecom? (Schultz)
. - 119 -
- ISSUE 23: Should BellSouth be directed to perform, upon request, the functions necessary to combine unbundled network elements that are ordinarily combined in its network? If so, what charges, if any, should apply? (Schultz)
. - 120 -
- ISSUE 24: Should BellSouth be required to combine network elements that are not ordinarily combined in its network? If so, what charges, if any, should apply? (Schultz) . - 121 -
- ISSUE 28: What terms and conditions and what separate rates, if any, should apply for Supra Telecom to gain access to and use BellSouth's facilities to serve multi-tenant environments? (J-E. Brown) - 122 -
- ISSUE 29: Is BellSouth obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve the first three lines to a customer located in Density Zone 1? Is BellSouth obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve four or more lines provided to a customer located in Density Zone 1? (Barrett) . - 128 -
- ISSUE 32: (A) Under what criteria may Supra Telecom charge the tandem switching rate?
(B) Based on Supra Telecom's network configuration as of January 31, 2001, has Supra Telecom met these criteria? (T. Brown) - 136 -
- ISSUE 33: What are the appropriate means for BellSouth to provide unbundled local loops for provision of DSL service when such loops are provisioned on digital loop carrier facilities? (Barrett) - 140 -
- ISSUE 34: What coordinated cut-over process should be implemented to ensure accurate, reliable and timely cut-overs when a customer changes local service from BellSouth to Supra Telecom? (Turner) - 151 -

- ISSUE 38: Is BellSouth required to provide Supra Telecom with nondiscriminatory access to the same databases BellSouth uses to provision its customers? (Barrett) . . - 160 -
- ISSUE 40: Should Standard Message Desk Interface-Enhanced ("SMDI-E"), Inter-Switch Voice Messaging Service ("IVMS") and any other corresponding signaling associated with voice mail messaging be included within the cost of the UNE switching port? If not, what are the appropriate charges, if any? (King) - 165 -
- ISSUE 42: What is the proper time frame for either party to render bills? (T. Brown) - 174 -
- ISSUE 46: Is BellSouth required to provide Supra Telecom the capability to submit orders electronically for all wholesale services and elements? (Barrett) . . - 178 -
- ISSUE 47: When, if at all, should there be manual intervention on electronically submitted orders? (Barrett) . . - 183 -
- ISSUE 49: Should Supra Telecom be allowed to share with a third party the spectrum on a local loop for voice and data when Supra Telecom purchases a loop/port combination and if so, under what rates, terms and conditions? (King) - 187 -
- ISSUE 57: Should BellSouth be required to provide downloads of RSAG, LFACS, PSIMS and PIC databases without license agreements and without charge? (Turner) - 192 -
- ISSUE 59: Should Supra Telecom be required to pay for expedited service when BellSouth provides services after the offered expedited date, but prior to BellSouth's standard interval? (Schultz) - 196 -
- ISSUE 60: When BellSouth rejects or clarifies a Supra Telecom order, should BellSouth be required to identify all errors in the order that caused it to be rejected or clarified? (Barrett) - 201 -
- ISSUE 61: Should BellSouth be allowed to drop or "purge" orders? If so, under what circumstances may BellSouth be allowed

to drop or "purge" orders, and what notice should be given, if any? (Barrett) - 205 -

ISSUE 62: Should BellSouth be required to provide completion notices for manual orders for the purposes of the interconnection agreement? (Barrett) - 210 -

ISSUE 63: Under what circumstances, if any, would BellSouth be permitted to disconnect service to Supra for nonpayment? (Schultz) - 213 -

ISSUE 65: Should the parties be liable in damages, without a liability cap, to one another for their failure to honor in one or more material respects any one or more of the material provisions of the Agreement for purposes of this interconnection agreement? (Knight) - 214 -

ISSUE 66: Should Supra Telecom be able to obtain specific performance as a remedy for BellSouth's breach of contract for purposes of this interconnection agreement? (Knight) - 218 -

ISSUE 67: Should this docket be closed? (Knight) - 222 -

LIST OF ACRONYMS

1996 Act or the ACT	Telecommunications Act of 1996
ADSL	Asymmetric Digital Subscriber Line
ADUF	Access Daily Usage File
ALEC	Alternative Local Exchange Company
AT&T	AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.
BellSouth	BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc
BBR	BellSouth Business Rules
CCP	Change Control Process
CLEC	Competitive Local Exchange Company
CPNI	Customer Proprietary Network Information
CSOTS	CLEC Service Order Tracking System
CSR	Customer Service Record
DAML	Digitally Added Main Line
DLC	Digital Loop Carrier
DSL	Digital Subscriber Line
DSLAM	Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer
ECTA	Electronic Communications Trouble Administration
EDI	Electronic Data Interchange
EEL	Enhanced Extended Loop
EODUF	Enhanced Optional Daily Usage File
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FOC	Firm Order Commitment
FPSC	Florida Public Service Commission
ILEC	Incumbent Local Exchange Company
ISP	Internet Service Provider

IVMS	Inter-Switch Voice Messaging Service
IXC	Interexchange Company
LATA	Local Access and Transport Area
LENS	Local Exchange Navigation System
LFACS	Loop Facility Assignment Control System
LOA	Letter of Authorization
LSR	Local Service Request
MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area
NTW	Network Terminating Wire
ODUF	Optional Daily Usage File
OSS	Operational Support Systems
PIU	Percent Interstate Usage
PLU	Percent Local Usage
RSAG	Regional Service Address Guide
RT	Remote Terminal
SMDI-E	Standard Message Desk Interface-Enhanced
SOCS	Service Order Communications System
Supra	Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc.
TAFI	Trouble Analysis and Facilities Interface
TAG	Telecommunications Access Gateway
TELRIC	Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost
UNE	Unbundled Network Element
VMS	Voice Messaging Service

CASE BACKGROUND

On September 1, 2000, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth) filed a petition for arbitration of certain issues in a new interconnection agreement with Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc. (Supra). BellSouth's petition raised fifteen disputed issues. Supra filed its response, and this matter was set for hearing. In its response Supra raised an additional fifty-one issues. In an attempt to identify and clarify the issues in this docket, issue identification meetings were held on January 8, 2001, and January 23, 2001. At the conclusion of the January 23 meeting, the parties were asked by staff to prepare a list with the final wording of the issues as they understood them. BellSouth submitted such a list, but Supra did not, choosing instead to file on January 29, 2001, a motion to dismiss the arbitration proceedings. On February 6, 2001, BellSouth filed its response. In Order No. PSC-01-1180-FOF-TI, issued May 23, 2001, the Commission denied Supra's motion to dismiss, but on its own motion ordered the parties to comply with the terms of their prior agreement by holding an inter-company Review Board meeting. Such meeting was to be held within 14 days of the issuance of the Commission's order, and a report on the outcome of the meeting was to be filed with the Commission within 10 days after completion of the meeting. The parties were placed on notice that the meeting was to comply with Section 252(b)(5) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act).

Pursuant to the Commission's Order, the parties held meetings on May 29, 2001, June 4, 2001, and June 6, 2001. The parties then filed post-meeting reports with the Commission. Several of the original issues were withdrawn by the parties. These include Issues 2, 3, 6, 8, 30, 36, 37, 39, 43, 50, 54, 56, 58, and 64. Within its post-meeting report submitted June 18, 2001, Supra lodged a complaint alleging that BellSouth had failed to negotiate in good faith because BellSouth had not provided to Supra information necessary for the negotiations and had refused to negotiate from the parties' current agreement. BellSouth filed a Response and Motion to Dismiss on July 9, 2001, stating, among other matters, that the complaint as filed by Supra failed to set forth any basis upon which this Commission could find that BellSouth had acted in bad faith. On July 19, 2001, Supra filed its Response to BellSouth's Motion to Dismiss.

An additional twenty issues (A, 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 25A&B, 26, 27, 31, 35, 41, 44, 45, 48, 51-53, and 55) were withdrawn or resolved by the parties either during mediation or the hearing, or in subsequent meetings. Staff notes that although some additional issues were settled, thirty-seven disputed issues remain. Given the relatively straightforward nature of many of the issues in dispute, staff is troubled that the parties could not settle more of these issues.¹ There are instances where the evidence in the record is somewhat limited, which limits the depth of staff's analysis.

The Commission has jurisdiction pursuant to Section 252 of the Act to arbitrate interconnection agreements. Section 252 states that a State Commission shall resolve each issue set forth in the petition and response, if any, by imposing the appropriate conditions as required. Further, staff believes that while Section 252(e) of the Act reserves the state's authority to impose additional conditions and terms in an arbitration consistent with the Act and its interpretation by the FCC and the courts, the Commission should use discretion in the exercise of such authority.

The Commission heard this matter on September 26-27, 2001. On February 8, 2002, staff filed its post-hearing recommendation for consideration by the Commission at its February 19, 2002, Agenda Conference. Prior to the Agenda Conference, the item was deferred.

On February 13, 2002, Supra filed a Motion asking that the item not be considered until additional legal briefing could be had addressing the impact of the decision of the United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit (hereinafter "11th Circuit"), Cir. Order Nos. 00-12809 and 00-12810, the consolidated appeals of BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. v. MCIMETRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC., D.C. Docket No. 99-00248-CV-JOF-1 and BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. v. WORLDCOM TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND E.SPIRE COMMUNICATIONS, INC., D.C. Docket No. 99-00249-CV-JOF-1, respectively. In the alternative, Supra requested oral argument on the impact of that decision on Issue 1 of this recommendation. By Order No. PSC-02-0202-FCO-TP, issued February 15, 2002, the request for additional briefing was granted. Parties were directed to file their supplemental briefs by February 19, 2002. The additional

¹Staff would note that some of the issues that remain in dispute were previously addressed by this Commission in generic proceedings.

analysis of the 11th Circuit's decision is incorporated into the revised analysis of Issue 1 of this recommendation.

Also, on February 18, 2002, Supra filed a Motion for Rehearing, Motion for Appointment of a Special Master, Motion for Indefinite Deferral, and Motion for Oral Argument. BellSouth filed its response on February 21, 2002.

On February 21, 2002, Supra filed a Renewed Motion for Indefinite Stay of Docket No. 001305-TP, and an Alternative Renewed Motion for Oral Argument. On February 22, 2002, BellSouth filed its Response in opposition.

This recommendation will address the Motions for Rehearing, Appointment of a Special Master, and the Requests for Oral Argument. It also addresses the Renewed Motion for Indefinite Stay and Oral Argument, as well as the thirty-seven issues which remain unresolved. Additions and revisions are indicated by highlighted and underlined text, except as to the added Issues I, II, III, and IV in accordance with SOP 1607.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE I: Should Supra's February 13, 2002, Motion for Oral Argument be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Staff recommends that oral argument on Issue 1 be denied. (Keating)

STAFF ANALYSIS: In its February 13, 2002, Motion, Supra asked that it either be allowed to submit briefs on the impact of the decision of the United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit (hereinafter "11th Circuit"), Cir. Order Nos. 00-12809 and 00-12810, the consolidated appeals of BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. v. MCIMETRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC., D.C. Docket No. 99-00248-CV-JOF-1 and BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. v. WORLDCOM TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND E.SPIRE COMMUNICATIONS, INC., D.C. Docket No. 99-00249-CV-JOF-1, respectively, or that it be allowed to present oral argument regarding the impact of this decision on Issue 1 of Item 27 on the February 19, 2002, Agenda Conference. On February 15, 2002, BellSouth filed its response to the Motion. Therein, it argued that the Motion was a delay tactic by Supra and as such, should be denied. By Order No. PSC-02-0202-PCO-TP, issued February 15, 2002, the request for additional briefing was granted.

On February 19, 2002, the parties filed briefs addressing the impact of the 11th Circuit's decision. The analysis set forth in those briefs has been incorporated into the staff's analysis of Issue 1 of this recommendation. The briefs filed present a thorough and substantial analysis of the impact of the 11th Circuit's decision on the matter addressed in Issue 1. Supra has not explained how oral argument would lend further clarity to this matter, as is contemplated by Rule 25-22.058, Florida Administrative Code. Staff believes that the briefs sufficiently address the 11th Circuit's decision and that additional oral argument would not assist the Commission in rendering its decision. Therefore, staff recommends that the request for oral argument be denied.

ISSUE II: Should Supra's February 18, 2002, Motion for Oral Argument be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Staff recommends that Supra's request be denied. (Keating)

STAFF ANALYSIS: Supra asks that the Commission grant oral argument on its Motion for Rehearing pursuant to Rule 25-22.058, Florida Administrative Code. Supra states that oral argument would aid the Commission in rendering a decision in this matter.

BellSouth contends that Supra's motion is not timely and is a delay tactic.

Rule 25-22.058(1), Florida Administrative Code, states:

The Commission may grant oral argument upon request of any party to a section 120.57, F.S. formal hearing. A request for oral argument shall be contained on a separate document and must accompany the pleading upon which argument is requested. The request shall state with particularity why oral argument would aid the Commission in comprehending and evaluating the issues before it. Failure to file a timely request for oral argument shall constitute waiver thereof.

Supra did not file its request for oral argument in a separate document from its motion, and it did not explain in its request how oral argument would "aid the Commission in comprehending and evaluating the issues before it," as required by Rule 25-22.058, Florida Administrative Code. Staff does not believe that oral argument on Supra's motion would lend any clarity to the matters addressed, nor would it aid the Commission in its consideration of this matter. As such, staff recommends that the request for oral argument be denied.

ISSUE III: Should Supra's Motion for Rehearing, Appointment of a Special Master, and Indefinite Deferral be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: No. The Commission should deny Supra's Motion for Rehearing, Appointment of a Special Master, and Indefinite Deferral. (Christensen, Keating)

STAFF ANALYSIS: On February 18, 2002, Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems, Inc. (Supra) filed its Motion for Rehearing in Docket No. 001305-TP; Motion for the Appointment of a Special Master; Motion for an Indefinite Deferral; Motion for Oral Argument (Motion). On February 20, 2002, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. filed its Response (Response). Supra's Motion for Oral Argument is addressed in Issue II, above. The remainder of Supra's Motion is addressed in this issue.

A. Arguments of the Parties

1. **Supra's Motion**

Request for Rehearing

In support of its Motion for Rehearing, Supra states that pursuant to Rule 28-106.211, Florida Administrative Code, the presiding officer before whom a case is pending has the authority to grant a rehearing for appearance of impropriety. Supra notes that Order No. PSC-02-0143-PCO-TP, issued January 31, 2002, in Docket No. 001097-TP, addressed a situation in which a Commission staff member was found to have provided cross-examination questions to BellSouth before the hearing scheduled for that docket. Supra further notes that the Order states "in order to remove any possible appearance of prejudice, I find that this matter should be afforded a rehearing."

Supra states that in Docket No. 001097-TP, on the eve of the evidentiary hearing in that docket, the Commission staff member provided to a BellSouth employee a copy of draft cross-examination questions for BellSouth and Supra witnesses. Supra asserts that this staff member requested that the BellSouth employee advise the staff member as to which witnesses the draft cross-examination questions should be directed. Supra contends that it is likely that the BellSouth employee contacted this staff member because the draft questions were not forwarded to staff legal counsel until two hours later. Supra asserts that although the staff member

indicated that a copy was sent to Supra, that cannot be verified. Further, Supra asserts that it never received a copy of the draft cross-examination questions.

Supra notes that after an internal staff investigation regarding the situation, the Prehearing Officer issued Order No. PSC-02-0143-PCO-TP, which granted a rehearing in Docket No. 001097-TP. Supra cites the following findings from paragraph number 4 of the Order:

Prior to the scheduled Agenda Conference, a procedural irregularity was brought to my attention, which prompted a deferral of the item . . . I directed further inquiry, and have since reviewed the findings of that inquiry. Although the inquiry has failed to disclose any prejudice to either party, the Commission is sensitive to the mere appearance of impropriety. Accordingly, in order to remove any possible appearance of prejudice, I find that this matter should be afforded a rehearing. (Emphasis in Motion)

Supra contends that although the Order did not find any prejudice to either party, it believes that this is contrary to the evidence and the circumstances surrounding the incident. Supra states that the staff member's misconduct was not disclosed to Supra until five months after the incident. Furthermore, Supra argues that this staff member had no reason to refrain from such behavior, which indicates a bias in favor of BellSouth. Supra maintains that a rehearing was the proper remedy because of the creation of the appearance of impropriety, even though the staff inquiry failed to disclose any prejudice.

Supra alleges that the same impropriety exists in Docket No. 001305-TP, which is Supra's only other case pending before the Commission. Supra contends that it is undisputed that the same staff member who engaged in the aforementioned misconduct in Docket No. 001097-TP also participated in the instant docket, Docket No. 001305-TP, and was present at the two-day hearing in this docket. Supra contends that in this docket the staff member had a second opportunity to prejudice Supra, and that the Commission cannot affirmatively state that this staff member did not provide BellSouth with cross-examination questions, or any other untoward assistance, before the evidentiary hearing in this docket.

Supra asserts that the above situation raises serious questions about the conclusion of the Commission's internal investigation that Supra was not prejudiced as a result of the staff member's actions, as well as serious questions involving the conduct of BellSouth and its employees, and its failure to immediately disclose to the Commission the "illicit" relationship between its employee and the staff member. Citing Hernandez v. State, 750 So. 2d 50 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1999), Supra asserts that there are a long line of cases involving the appearance of impropriety which arises when an illicit relationship develops between adversarial parties.

Supra contends that while staff is not a party to the proceedings, it does engage in conduct which is adversarial, as evidenced by this staff member's preparation of draft cross-examination questions for BellSouth and Supra for use by staff legal counsel in preparation for the hearing. Supra asserts that whether or not questions were prepared by this staff member in this docket, the staff member had access to cross-examination questions, documents, and "other Commission Staff information" which could have been used to assist BellSouth in its litigation against Supra. Supra argues that "this access and [the staff member's] bias in favor of BellSouth by all standards of common sense creates an actual conflict of interest between two individuals and two entities, the Commission and BellSouth - with divided loyalties."

Citing People v. Singer, 226 Cal. App. 3d 23 (1990), Supra asserts that "[t]he validity of our adversarial system depends upon the guaranty of this 'undivided loyalty and effort'" Supra cites to Cuyler v. Sullivan, 466 U.S. 335, 349-351 (1980), for the proposition that the courts are clear that once "having found an actual conflict of interest, the Court must presume prejudice resulting therefrom." Supra further cites Cuyler, stating that "[a] defendant who shows that a conflict of interest actually affected the adequacy of representation need not demonstrate prejudice in order to obtain relief."

Supra argues that this legal conclusion by the courts raises serious and legitimate questions regarding the internal investigation's conclusion that the staff member's misconduct failed to disclose any prejudice in Docket No. 001097-TP. Supra further asserts that it need not demonstrate any prejudice in order to obtain relief but only that an actual conflict of interest exists. Supra contends that staff, in its recommendation to the

Prehearing Officer, articulated the wrong standard regarding whether a rehearing was warranted in Docket No. 001097-TP, although Supra agrees with the Prehearing Officer's decision to require rehearing.

Supra contends that the cited cases are instructive because it shows the analysis a court would undertake in determining whether a new trial should be granted in a criminal context. Supra argues that if the standard is appropriate for a criminal context, then the standard should be sufficient in a civil proceeding such as the one in the instant case.

Citing Reynolds v. Chapman at page 1343 (full citation not provided by Supra), Supra contends that once it is determined that an actual conflict exists, the Court then asks whether "a plausible alternative strategy" could have been pursued during any portion of the proceeding. Supra suggests that the Commission should ask whether it is plausible that the staff may have pursued an alternative strategy or course of action during the discovery phase of this proceeding or during the evidentiary hearing. Supra concludes that the Commission must conclude that "the plausible course of action was not followed because it conflicted with [this staff member's] external loyalties."

Supra cites to Zuck v. Alabama, 588 F.2d 436 (5th Cir. 1979), for the proposition that an actual conflict of interest occurs when an attorney places himself in a situation inherently conducive to divided loyalties. Supra asserts that an actual conflict of interest occurs when staff members in a supervisory capacity place themselves in a situation inherently conducive to divided loyalties. Supra contends that in the present circumstance, there was a secret relationship between the staff member and the BellSouth employee which benefitted BellSouth, as evidenced by the staff member sending BellSouth cross-examination questions in Docket No. 001097-TP. Supra further contends that it therefore follows that the same misconduct occurred in this docket, which presented BellSouth with the opportunity for pursuing a different strategy or course of action in this docket. Supra asserts that it need not prove that the same misconduct occurred in this docket to obtain the relief sought. Supra alleges that it is very reasonable to conclude that the staff member continued to have improper communications with BellSouth in this docket because so long as this staff member remained undetected, the staff member had no

reason to refrain from engaging in the same conduct engaged in before the evidentiary hearing in Docket No. 001097-TP.

Supra further contends that if Commission staff had learned of the misconduct before the end of the hearing and the time Supra was notified of the misconduct in Docket No. 001097-TP, this would further substantiate the institutional bias Supra believes is already evident. Supra asserts that it is irrelevant whether this staff member worked on writing the staff recommendation in this docket because the bias and/or prejudice occurred during the entire proceeding, which includes discovery, depositions, as well as the evidentiary hearing. Supra asserts that the Commission cannot state with certainty that this staff member "did not leave at night with documents that she later delivered to BellSouth employees" or "did not meet with BellSouth employees after work hours to inform them of information that would compromise Supra in its litigation before the Commission."

Supra concludes that this staff member engaged in misconduct in Docket No. 001097-TP, showed bias in favor of BellSouth, had the opportunity to continue to engage in misconduct in this docket, and that the misconduct was hidden from Supra until after the close of the evidentiary hearing in this docket. Supra asserts that based on these reasons, the Commission should conclude that the actual conflict affected the adequacy of the staff's representation and impartiality in this proceeding and that Supra need not demonstrate prejudice in order to obtain relief. Supra states that it disagrees with the characterization of the misconduct as a "procedural irregularity" as well as the conclusion that the inquiry failed to disclose any prejudice. Supra agrees that the Commission should be sensitive to the mere appearance of impropriety. Thus, Supra concludes that a rehearing is in order based on precedent established in Docket No. 001097-TP.

Over and above the alleged bias of the staff member, Supra also alleges that there is an institutional bias in favor of BellSouth. Supra contends that there was a recent incident which transpired with respect to Supra's Motion for Supplemental Authority filed on January 30, 2002, regarding the 11th Circuit's decision in MCIMetro published on January 10, 2002. Supra asserts that BellSouth filed its response stating that Supra was incorrect in stating that the 11th Circuit's decision is controlling. Supra states that in Order No. PSC-02-0159-TP, issued February 1, 2002, granting in part and denying in part its Motion to File

Supplemental Authority, the word "controlling" was struck from Supra's motion as improper argument. Supra further notes that the Order states that the 11th Circuit's decision shall be properly considered. Supra states that the Prehearing Officer "unfortunately" but "very likely" relied on staff's recommendation in rendering his decision on the Motion. Supra alleges that staff simply accepted BellSouth's assertion when drafting the recommendation regarding its Motion to File Supplemental Authority and its overall recommendation in this docket. Supra alleges that staff's legal conclusion regarding the precedential effect of the Eleventh Circuit's decision is "completely false as a matter of law" and thus indicative of the institutional bias in favor of BellSouth. Supra concludes that it must be granted a rehearing of the entire proceeding in this docket, lest it be prejudiced by the appearance of impropriety that exists in both dockets.

Finally, Supra contends that its Motion is timely filed because the Commission's General Counsel requested that it take no action until the investigation regarding the misconduct was complete. Supra states that the investigation was completed and the Order granting a rehearing in Docket No. 001097-TP was issued January 31, 2002. Supra asserts that it has only been fifteen days since the Order was issued directing a rehearing in Docket No. 001097-TP, and, as such, its Motion for Rehearing in this Docket is timely. Supra notes that its Motion for Rehearing was not filed in Docket No. 001097-TP because the Commission ordered a rehearing in that docket.

Request for Appointment of a Special Master

With regard to its request for a Special Master, Supra states that the presiding officer may fashion an order to promote the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of all aspects of a proceeding. Supra contends that ordering a rehearing is a two-part decision, with the first part requiring a determination of whether a rehearing should be granted and the second part requiring a determination as to whom will hear the case once rehearing is granted. Supra asserts that a fair, just, and inexpensive way to resolve this question is to order that a Special Master, consisting of a three member panel agreed to by both parties, be appointed to handle the entire rehearing.

Supra asserts that a good example of such a three member panel would be the arbitration panel presently hearing disputes between

the parties pursuant to the parties' current interconnection agreement. Supra states that if the parties are unable to agree on the panel members, a list of qualified candidates could be submitted for Commission approval. Supra suggests that the Special Master would handle the case and prepare a recommendation for final disposition by a majority vote of the Commission or a Commission Panel. Supra states that it has no objection to the matter ultimately being decided by the Commissioners themselves, after the completion of the hearing process before an independent body. Supra concludes that the answer is the appointment of a Special Master.

Request for Indefinite Deferral of Docket No. 001305-TP

In addition, Supra requests that Docket No. 001305-TP be indefinitely deferred from being considered at any Commission Agenda Conference until this Motion for Rehearing is ruled upon.

2. BellSouth's Response

In its Response, BellSouth contends that Supra's Motion is "replete with shrill and conclusory rhetoric" but "utterly devoid of any substance of legitimate analysis." BellSouth characterizes Supra's Motion as "nothing more than a desperate and baseless effort to postpone the Commission's vote on a Staff Recommendation with which Supra is apparently dissatisfied." BellSouth asks that the Commission reject the Motion in its entirety.

BellSouth asserts that the primary basis for Supra's Motion is an "ad nauseam recital" of actions that allegedly occurred in Docket No. 001097-TP. BellSouth states that it addressed those matters in that docket and will not repeat its entire position in its Response to Supra's Motion.

BellSouth asserts that Supra's Motion fails to allege any improper actions in this docket. BellSouth states that Supra's Motion offers no evidence that any improper activities took place in this docket and alleges no specific conduct by BellSouth or the Commission staff that affected either the hearing or the Staff Recommendation. Citing Supra's Motion, BellSouth states that Supra points to nothing more than an "opportunity to prejudice Supra." BellSouth asserts that such speculation is not grounds for rehearing. BellSouth asserts that there is no evidence that the staff member in question or any other staff member made any

improper contacts with BellSouth in this docket. Further, BellSouth asserts that a review of the Staff Recommendation reveals that the staff member in question did not participate in staff's evaluation of the disputed issues.

BellSouth also asserts that Supra's allegations of improper conduct are false and based on nothing more than conjecture. BellSouth offers a sworn affidavit of Nancy Sims as evidence that there is no merit to Supra's allegations of cooperation between BellSouth and the Commission staff in this docket. In her affidavit, Ms. Sims states, among other things, that she did not have any substantive discussions with the staff member in question concerning this docket, that the only documents she ever received from this staff member were the draft cross-examination questions in Docket No. 001097-TP, and that she neither met with this staff member after hours or outside of the Commission nor had anything but a professional relationship with this staff member. BellSouth contends that the Commission should not delay action in this docket based on "unsupported claims of possible irregularities in this docket."

BellSouth contends that Supra has filed its Motion solely for purposes of harassment and delay. Citing Order No. PSC-98-1467-FOF-TP, issued October 28, 1998, BellSouth states that the Commission has previously found that Supra made allegations of misconduct concerning a BellSouth employee without any factual or legal support. BellSouth notes that while the Commission denied BellSouth's request for sanctions in that case, the Commission stated at page 10 of that order that "further pursuit by Supra of such legally and factually deficient theories shall not be considered lightly." BellSouth contends that "Supra's flagrant disregard of the Commission's previous order should not be tolerated."

BellSouth also rebuts Supra's claim that there is institutional bias against Supra. BellSouth asserts that staff's disagreement with Supra's interpretation of the Eleventh Circuit decision cited by Supra is not proof of bias. BellSouth asserts that if disagreement with a party constitutes bias, then the staff would be considered biased against every party in every proceeding where the staff disagrees with that party. BellSouth contends that because Supra cannot demonstrate any institutional bias, Supra's request for appointment of a special master is unnecessary.

BellSouth asserts that Supra has not offered a legitimate reason for the Commission to depart from its normal practices and procedures by delegating its authority to third parties. BellSouth alleges that Supra has, throughout this proceeding, "attempted to manufacture disputes and delays that would postpone the parties' transition from their existing agreement to the follow-on agreement."

Finally, BellSouth argues that Supra's Motion is not timely. BellSouth states that Supra, by its own admission, was aware of the issues related to Docket No. 001097-TP no later than October 5, 2001. BellSouth further states that Supra was aware of the staff member's initial assignment to this docket because it was a matter of public record and could be readily observed that this staff member was present at the September 26-27, 2001, hearing in this docket. BellSouth asserts that despite this knowledge, "Supra deliberately waited until the very last minute to make its false and outrageous claims with the obvious intent to delay the vote in this case."

B. Analysis

In its Motion, Supra asks the Commission, on the eve of hearing its staff's post-hearing recommendation in this docket, to take the extraordinary step of appointing a special master to rehear this docket because of an event that took place, and was remedied by order of the Prehearing Officer, in a separate docket involving these parties. Without seeking reconsideration of the Prehearing Officer's finding that an internal investigation disclosed no prejudice to either party, Supra asks the Commission to ignore this finding and replace it with a finding that there was prejudice to Supra in that docket. After laying claim to prejudice which the prehearing officer in Docket No. 001097-TP expressly found to be absent, Supra bootstraps that "prejudice" across the divide between dockets into this arbitration docket. Absent evidence or even an allegation of any specific improper act by the Commission staff or BellSouth in this docket, Supra asks the Commission to find that Supra was prejudiced in this docket based on (1) its belief that it was prejudiced in the separate docket and (2) on speculation that the individuals involved in the event in the separate docket could have conspired against Supra in this docket. Supra's Motion is procedurally improper and substantively flawed.

Most importantly, Supra does not allege and does not show that any bias which they say arose in the distant complaint docket, and which it now says affects this docket, will survive presentation of the staff recommendation to the Commission itself at agenda conference. Assuming arguendo that the staff recommendation were flawed (and staff believes that it is not) the Commission itself is the decision-maker in this case, and it has not yet rendered a decision, or even considered the staff's recommendation. Put simply, because there is no agency action, Supra is not an aggrieved party. It is entirely improper to seek reconsideration of the staff recommendation because the Commission is free to accept staff's recommendations, to accept part of staff's recommendations, or to reject staff's recommendations entirely.

As noted above, Supra's Motion calls into question the results of the internal inquiry addressed by the Prehearing Officer's order setting Docket No. 001097-TP for rehearing. However, Supra has not asked for reconsideration of that Order. Further, Supra's Motion cannot be considered as a motion for reconsideration of that order for two reasons. First, Supra's Motion was not filed in the docket in which the order was issued. Second, Supra's Motion was filed eighteen days after issuance of the Prehearing Officer's order, well past the ten day deadline established in Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code, for reconsideration of a non-final order.

In addition, Supra's Motion is procedurally improper because it asks for rehearing based on staff's post-hearing recommendation, rather than rehearing of a Commission order. The rules governing administrative proceedings before the Commission do not provide for rehearing of staff recommendations prior to a Commission decision. In this instance, the Commission has not yet rendered a final decision in this docket.² Furthermore, although Supra questions portions of the Prehearing Officer's order in Docket No. 001097-TP and alleges "institutional bias" in its Motion, it does not imply any bias on behalf of the Commissioners and agrees that it would be

² The Commission addressed a somewhat similar situation in Order No. PSC-99-0582-FOF-TP, issued March 29, 1999, in Docket No. 980800-TP. In that case, the Commission struck Supra's Exceptions/Objections to staff's post-hearing recommendation as improper under the rules governing this Commission.

appropriate for the Commissioners to make the final determination in this matter.

Supra also argues that its Motion is timely because it was filed fifteen days after the Prehearing Officer ordered a rehearing in Docket No. 001097-TP. Notwithstanding the fact that Supra's Motion was actually filed eighteen days after the Prehearing Officer's order was issued, the timeliness of Supra's Motion cannot be established by reference to an event which took place in a separate and discrete docket. Further, given that Supra was informed of the events that occurred in Docket No. 001097-TP over four months before its Motion was filed, the timing of Supra's motion -- one day prior to the Commission's scheduled vote in this docket -- is at least questionable.

The substantive basis for Supra's Motion is also flawed. Absent evidence or even an allegation of any specific improper act by the Commission staff or BellSouth in this docket, Supra asks the Commission to find that Supra was prejudiced in this docket based on (1) its belief that it was prejudiced in Docket No. 001097-TP and (2) on speculation that the individuals involved in the event in Docket 001097-TP could have conspired against Supra in this docket. As to Supra's first point, the question of whether Supra was prejudiced in Docket No. 001097-TP was appropriately addressed in that docket through an internal investigation and an order of the Prehearing Officer. Supra did not seek reconsideration of the Prehearing Office's decision. As to Supra's second point, mere speculation of prejudice, absent any evidence or allegation of a specific improper act in this docket, is not a proper basis for the Commission to require a rehearing, particularly considering the timing of Supra's request. Supra has offered no proof or even allegations of any specific act that caused it to be prejudiced in this docket. The only evidence before the Commission is Ms. Sims' affidavit, which at least supports a finding that Ms. Sims was not involved with the staff member in question in any of the activities that Supra suggests *could* have happened. Further, staff can affirmatively state that the staff member in question played no role in preparing the recommendation in this docket. Supra asserts only that there was an opportunity for improper acts to take place and invites the commission to infer that they did indeed take place. Absent proof or specific allegations of wrongdoing, however, the Commission should not halt the processing of any of its dockets simply because those opportunities may exist.

Supra cites case law as support for its argument that the events in Docket No. 001097-TP necessarily taint the proceedings in this docket. As Supra notes in its Motion, the line of cases cited by Supra describe the analysis used in criminal cases to determine whether an attorney is ineffective due to a conflict of interest. Supra suggests that these cases are instructive. However, these cases are clearly not controlling in this administrative setting and are not on point with the facts before the Commission. Even stretching to apply the standard set forth in the cited cases to the situation before the Commission, Supra's Motion must fail. Reynolds v. Chapman, 253 F.3d 1337, 1342-43 (11th Cir. 2001) identifies the standard used by the courts as a two-part test under which the petitioner/defendant must demonstrate: (a) that his defense attorney had an actual conflict of interest; and (b) that this conflict adversely affected the attorney's performance. To satisfy the first part of the test, "a defendant must show something more than 'a possible, speculative, or merely hypothetical conflict.'" Id. Even if Supra could satisfy this part of the test using its strained analogy of staff to the defense attorney and Supra to the defendant, it has not demonstrated in any way that it can satisfy the second part of the test - that any conflict of interest adversely affected staff's performance in this docket. Advisory staff simply had no conflict of interest - none in the complaint docket and none in this docket.

Perhaps the weakest leg upon which Supra elects to stand is the notion that because staff does not embrace Supra's analysis of the 11th Circuit's decision in MCIMetro, there must be "institutional bias" against Supra. Staff's disagreement with Supra's interpretation of that decision is just that - disagreement. Neither Supra, nor BellSouth, nor the staff can advance an infallible legal argument. The affect of the 11th Circuit's decision is debatable as is evidenced by the prehearing officer's decision permitting briefs on that specific issue. Disagreement as to the interpretation and application of the case is not proof of bias.

Finally, although Supra seeks a rehearing before some entity other than staff, the hearing which has already been afforded the parties was before the Commission. It is the same Commission before which Supra says it is content submitting the results of a special master or the like for final decision. Again, it serves to note that the Commission before whom the hearing was had -- before

whom witnesses were sworn and before whom evidence was presented -- is the decision-maker in this case.

In summary, Supra has bootstrapped imagined bias into this record upon pure speculation devoid of any alleged overt or covert act; it has failed to associate that imagined bias in any way to the only decision-makers in this case - the Commission; and it has set upon this course prior to any decision affecting its substantial interests.

For the reasons stated above, the Commission should deny Supra's Motion.

ISSUE IV: Should Supra's Renewed Motion for Indefinite Stay and In the Alternative Renewed Motion for Oral Argument be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Staff recommends that Supra's motion is an improper, premature pleading not contemplated by Order No. PSC-02-0202-PCO-TP, Commission rules, or the Rules of Civil Procedure. (KEATING)

STAFF ANALYSIS: On February 21, 2002, Supra filed a Motion again requesting oral argument on staff's recommendation originally filed on February 7, 2002, in this Docket. Supra contends that it filed the request for oral argument pursuant to Rule 25-22.058, Florida Administrative Code.

In its Motion, Supra also responds to BellSouth's brief filed in accordance with Order No. PSC-02-0202-PCO-TP. Therein, Supra disputes BellSouth's contention that Section 364.162(1), Florida Statutes, is applicable to this case and, instead, contends that the Commission's proper role is merely that of a rate regulator.

In its response, BellSouth contends that Supra's February 21, 2002, Motion is, in its entirety, an improper pleading in that it is a response to BellSouth's brief filed in accordance with Order No. PSC-02-0202-PCO-TP. BellSouth contends that Order No. PSC-02-0202-PCO-TP did not contemplate reply briefs. Furthermore, BellSouth contends that even if the motion could possibly be considered proper, it is nevertheless untimely, because it was not submitted with the original pleadings upon which oral argument is now requested. Finally, BellSouth notes that it cannot understand how the motion can be "renewed," when the original motions have yet to be fully addressed by the Commission. For these reasons, BellSouth believes the motion should be rejected as an improper pleading designed "for the purposes of delay and harassment." Opposition at 3.

Staff recommends that Supra's Motion, including its alternative request for relief, be denied. The Motion is not only premature, in that the original requests for relief have not yet been ruled upon by the Commission, it is also an improper pleading not contemplated by Order No. PSC-02-0202-PCO-TP, Commission rules, or the Rules of Civil Procedure.

Even if the Commission were to accept the pleading, the arguments raised therein merely restate previous arguments

regarding the effect of the 11th Circuit's decision in MCIMetro, with the added claim that, contrary to BellSouth's assertions, Section 364.162(1), Florida Statutes, does not authorize the Commission to act with regard to disputes arising out of approved interconnection agreements. Staff, however, disagrees. The plain language of Section 364.162(1), Florida Statutes, states, in pertinent part, that:

The Commission shall have the authority to arbitrate any dispute regarding interpretation of interconnection or resale prices and terms and conditions.

The Legislature did not differentiate between disputes arising before an agreement has been approved and those arising out of an approved agreement. The specific language says "any" dispute. Furthermore, staff emphasizes the use of the term "interpretation" in this provision. Were the Commission constrained only to resolving disputes prior to the parties entering into an agreement, there would be little opportunity for "interpretation" of any rates, terms, and conditions; rather, the Commission would be charged with establishing and defining the initial rates, terms, and conditions. As set forth in Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary, the term "interpret" means to explain the meaning of something. In establishing a new agreement between carriers through arbitration, the Commission does not "explain" new terms for the parties--it sets them.³

³See Verizon v. Jacobs, Case No. SC01-323 (Fla. 2002) (*subject to motions for rehearing*), wherein the Court emphasized that under Florida rules of statutory construction, the language of the statute must be given its plain and ordinary meaning, and there is no need to resort to other rules of statutory construction when the language is clear and unambiguous.

ISSUE B: Which agreement template shall be used as the base agreement into which the Commission's decision on the disputed issues will be incorporated?

RECOMMENDATION: BellSouth's most current template agreement should be used as the base agreement into which the Commission's decision on disputed issues will be incorporated. (T. BROWN)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: The Commission should use BellSouth's proposed agreement as a template in this proceeding.

SUPRA: The current Agreement must be used as the base agreement for the Commission's decision on disputed issues, because not only have the parties redlined it, but the parties are also familiar with it and have ongoing matters which are rooted therein.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The issue before the Commission is to determine which agreement template shall be used as the base agreement into which the Commission's decisions on the disputed issues will be incorporated. The dispute is whether BellSouth's most current agreement template, or the parties' existing agreement, should be the basis for the follow-on agreement.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Hendrix asserts that the BellSouth standard template agreement is the proper place to start the parties' negotiations. (TR 75, 157) He states, "many ALECs, including AT&T, realized that their existing Interconnection Agreement was out of date and agreed to use the BellSouth standard template as a blue print for beginning negotiations for their new agreements." (Hendrix TR 69) Witness Hendrix also states that "BellSouth believed that using the AT&T Agreement as the base agreement or template would be difficult at best." (TR 40) He goes on to state that:

In general, the law has changed substantially since the passage of the 1996 Act. FCC and state Commission orders have clarified the rights and obligations of the parties. Based upon these changes and upon the experience

BellSouth has gained in implementing the 1996 Act over the last five years, BellSouth's internal processes have been modified substantially as well. Supra intends to require BellSouth to maintain the outdated processes simply to support Supra's agreement, when such processes have been updated for all other CLECs. While it is impossible to list all the changes that BellSouth has made to its agreement since the AT&T Agreement was negotiated, below are some of the more prominent changes. (Hendrix EXH 6, p.4)

Witness Hendrix speaks to some of these changes in the same exhibit. In that exhibit, witness Hendrix notes changes to the following sections or attachments to the agreement: General Terms and Conditions, Resale, UNEs, Collocation, Local Interconnection, Billing, Disaster Recovery Plan, and Number Portability. (EXH 6)

BellSouth witness Hendrix explains that BellSouth was aware that Supra wished to use the parties' existing agreement as a starting point for negotiations. (TR 108) However, witness Hendrix states, "... we explained to Supra that there were many changes that had taken place in the agreement, there were many rulings that had been issued." (TR 108) BellSouth asserts that the existing agreement does not reflect the changes that have taken place in the industry based on various arbitrations and rulings. (TR 109, 157) Witness Hendrix then states, "to go on and use an agreement that is outdated that is reflective of the time that the parties negotiated that agreement is, in BellSouth's mind, not appropriate." (TR 157)

BellSouth witness Hendrix believes that even though Supra witness Ramos identifies eight reasons to use the current agreement, "he fails to identify any reason not to use the two templates that BellSouth offered to Supra as the basis for beginning negotiations." (emphasis in original) (TR 64) Witness Hendrix contends that BellSouth offered to begin negotiations with Supra using either the standard interconnection agreement or the current working draft of the agreement BellSouth was using in negotiations with AT&T. (TR 69, 108, 141) Those agreement templates were offered to Supra in March 2000 and July 2000, respectively. Witness Hendrix states that the BellSouth/AT&T working draft is the agreement that was filed with BellSouth's Petition for Arbitration on September 1, 2000 in accordance with Section 252(b)(2)(A). (TR 69, 71) He also states that:

It was not until June 18, 2001, that Supra proposed any contract language to this Commission, and what Supra then proposed was simply a redline of the General Terms and Conditions of its existing Agreement. It has yet to propose language for the Commission to consider for the 14 attachments associated with its proposed agreement. (TR 74)

Furthermore, BellSouth witness Hendrix contends that "Supra has refused to specify what in the BellSouth proposed Interconnection Agreement it does not agree with, nor has Supra proposed an Interconnection Agreement to this Commission clearly showing the Parties' unresolved issues." (TR 72) He asserts that:

BellSouth is the only party to this proceeding that has filed an Interconnection Agreement for approval by the Commission. This was done when BellSouth filed its Petition for Arbitration. (Hendrix TR 70-71)

BellSouth witness Hendrix believes that by not identifying the specific terms of BellSouth's proposed Interconnection Agreement that it disputes, "Supra failed '...to cooperate with the State commission in carrying out its function as an arbitrator.'" (TR 73) Witness Hendrix contends that Supra has failed to provide information that is necessary for the Commission to resolve this issue. (TR 74) As such, he believes that BellSouth's proposed Interconnection Agreement should be approved as the baseline for the BellSouth/Supra Interconnection Agreement. (Hendrix TR 75)

Supra witness Ramos asserts that the parties' negotiations of a follow-on agreement should begin with the current agreement. (TR 515) As such, witness Ramos offers several reasons why the current agreement is the proper base for negotiation. (TR 515) Witness Ramos contends that "Supra has commenced the implementation of its Business Plan based on the Current Agreement, and should be entitled some continuity, particularly where the vast majority of the terms and conditions remain unchanged by any subsequent order or rule." (TR 514) In addition, witness Ramos argues that the follow-on agreement should promote continuity with regard to the types of service and cost of those services to Supra's customers. (TR 514, 700) Witness Ramos offers several additional reasons in support of this position which appear in a June 7, 2000, letter, in which Supra's counsel stated that:

As stated above, Supra Telecom wishes to execute an agreement which, except for expiration date, would retain the exact terms as our current interconnection Agreement. The time period for this new agreement can be three years. However, after negotiations between AT&T and BellSouth have concluded, Supra Telecom may then choose to opt into that agreement. We do not see why this request should create any problems for BellSouth since the current agreement was obviously acceptable to BellSouth when originally negotiated with BellSouth. Moreover, the current Agreement has already "passed muster" with the Florida Public Service Commission ("FPSC") and has been the subject of various FPSC rulings that clarify various provisions and memorialize current Florida law on the various subject.[sic] Moreover, incorporating the terms of the prior agreement into a new agreement will make negotiation of a new agreement quick and simple; thereby creating [a] "win-win" situation for everyone. Although Supra Telecom would prefer entering into the same agreement again, if you believe that there are some terms in the current agreement which require modification or updating to bring the agreement in line with recent regulatory and industry changes, we would be happy to consider any proposed revisions. In any event, to avoid any delay, we can agree to negotiate such revisions by way of an amendment at a later date. (emphasis added) (TR 515-516; EXH 18)

Supra witness Ramos believes that because BellSouth wants to begin from an entirely new agreement, Supra has been placed in an unfavorable bargaining position. (TR 515) Furthermore, witness Ramos contends that there have been other follow-on agreements in which the parties used the current agreement as a starting point or simply extended the term of the agreement. (TR 514, 516) He argues that BellSouth and MCI used their existing agreement as a starting point for negotiations when drafting the parties' follow-on agreement. (Ramos TR 514) Witness Ramos also suggests that "BellSouth's argument that 'practices have changed, the controlling law has changed, and the interconnection offerings, terms and conditions that are available have changed' is without merit." (TR 517) In support, witness Ramos asserts that "[t]he Act, which is the controlling law in this instance, has neither been changed nor amended since its passage in 1996." (TR 517, 614) Furthermore, witness Ramos asserts that BellSouth's reasoning is "flawed, and

disingenuous" as the parties existing Agreement has been amended to reflect changes in the law. (TR 515) He also argues that "it would simply be a matter of inserting or deleting provisions in that agreement to make it reflect the current state of the industry." (Ramos TR 515)

Staff's Analysis

Staff believes that the basis for the follow-on agreement should be BellSouth's most current template agreement. This is the same agreement filed with BellSouth's petition for arbitration on September 1, 2000 and is the only agreement produced in its entirety in this proceeding. The record in this docket does not support using the parties' existing agreement as a basis for the follow-on agreement.

Supra argues that the parties' existing agreement should be the basis for the follow-on agreement. However, Supra witness Ramos confirms that Supra did not attach a competing version of the existing agreement with modifications, or any other agreement, with its response to BellSouth's petition for arbitration. (TR 759) He also confirms that Supra has not filed a complete proposed agreement in the proceeding. (Ramos TR 760) All Supra has provided is an attachment containing a redlined version of the general terms and conditions. (TR 760)

Supra witness Ramos asserts that "Supra is eager to enter into a Follow-On Agreement" (TR 608) In fact, witness Ramos goes so far as to state, "Supra does not wish to continue operating under an agreement that has been the subject of a number of disputes between Supra and BellSouth" (TR 608, 765) He then states:

What Supra seeks in the follow-on agreement is clarity as well [as] parity and to be able to incorporate whatever new FCC rules that are out there that need to be filed in the agreement as well as FPSC orders that go to be [sic] with that agreement. Supra seeks to have all that there. (Ramos TR 765)

Staff believes that any agreement should represent the current state of the industry and reflect any changes in the law. This is especially true when the parties' existing agreement has expired and a follow-on agreement is being contemplated. Supra wants to use

the parties' existing agreement, but on the other hand, does not want to operate under an agreement that in the past has created disputes between these parties. (Ramos TR 608, 765) Supra witness Ramos contends that the Act "has neither been changed or amended since its passage . . ." (TR 517) However, throughout his testimony he clearly contemplates that change in one form or another has taken place since 1996. (Ramos TR 614, 765)

The record indicates that BellSouth presented Supra with several options as negotiations between the parties began. BellSouth offered to begin negotiations from the standard template or use the most recent version of the working draft of the BellSouth/AT&T agreement which was still being negotiated. (Hendrix TR 69) Based on the record, staff believes that BellSouth never intended to exclude the parties' existing agreement as an option. Instead, staff believes that given changes in the law and the difficulties created in other recent follow-on agreement negotiations, BellSouth offered what it did to alleviate some of the same problems when negotiating the Supra agreement. Moreover, it appears from the testimony that BellSouth believed that Supra would adopt the AT&T agreement once it was final. (Hendrix TR 143) This very possibility was alluded to in the June 7, 2000, letter from Supra's counsel to BellSouth. (Ramos TR 515)

Staff believes that the item of real importance here is that BellSouth is the only party that produced a complete agreement in this record -- in other words, an agreement which represents the current state of the industry and interpretation of the Act. The record reflects that BellSouth offered Supra several options as a starting point for negotiations and filed a complete, updated version with its petition. Apparently the options proposed by BellSouth were unacceptable to Supra. Even though Supra witness Ramos stated that Supra was "eager" to finalize a follow-on agreement and that his company did not want to operate under an agreement that had created many disputes between the parties, Supra did not produce an alternative agreement until after the hearing began. That agreement was the parties' existing agreement without any updates, the BellSouth/AT&T agreement, which was adopted by Supra on October 5, 1999.

Staff believes that the parties have been given ample opportunity to either reach a decision on which of the proposed agreements to use as the basis for the follow-on agreement or to make the necessary changes to the existing agreement. The parties

have been unable to accomplish either. Furthermore, staff believes that the parties are incapable of resolving this issue on their own. This belief is reinforced by BellSouth witness Hendrix when he states "I think it would be difficult to negotiate an agreement at this point." (TR 159)

Conclusion

BellSouth's most current template agreement, filed with their petition for arbitration, is the only interconnection agreement produced in its entirety as part of this arbitration. Supra has not produced a complete, competing interconnection agreement in this proceeding for the Commission's consideration. As such, staff recommends that BellSouth's most current template agreement should be used as the base agreement into which the Commission's decisions on disputed issues will be incorporated.

ISSUE 1: What are the appropriate fora for the submission of disputes under the new agreement?

RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes that the appropriate forum for the submission of disputes under the new agreement is the Commission.
(KNIGHT, KEATING)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: The Commission should resolve disputes [between] BellSouth and Supra arising under the parties' interconnection agreement. The Commission should reject Supra's request for a commercial arbitration clause.

SUPRA: As the current Agreement requires commercial arbitration and the parties have and are using same as the alternative dispute resolution mechanism, there is no reason to disrupt the process. Commercial arbitration assures expediency and informal conflict resolution.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Arguments

BellSouth witness Cox, in adopting the testimony originally filed by BellSouth's John Ruscilli, asserts that the appropriate regulatory authority should resolve disputes, and that BellSouth should not be precluded from petitioning the Commission for resolution of disputes under the interconnection agreement. (Cox TR 172-173) She believes that commercial arbitration has proven to be an impractical, time-consuming and costly way to resolve interconnection disputes. (Cox TR 173) In her estimation, the Commission and its staff are more capable of handling disputes between telecommunications carriers than are commercial arbitrators. She believes this stems from the difficulty in finding arbitrators that are sufficiently experienced in the telecommunications industry so that decisions can be made expeditiously and without having to train the arbitrators on the very basics of the industry. (Cox TR 174) The BellSouth witness is also concerned from a public policy perspective that it is critical that interconnection agreements be interpreted consistently. Witness Cox believes this goal cannot be reached without a means to insure that similar disputes arising under different agreements are handled in a similar fashion. (Cox TR 174) She states that

Commission control of dispute resolution ensures that disputes between two carriers that potentially affect the entire industry are dealt with consistently. (Cox TR 174)

In its brief BellSouth also asserts that the Commission lacks the authority to compel BellSouth to go to a third party to resolve a dispute that falls within the providence of the Commission. BellSouth cites Commission Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP, issued June 28, 2001, wherein the Commission observed that "nothing in the law gives us explicit authority to require third party arbitration." Id. at p. 111. BellSouth does not wish to waive its right to have the Commission hear disputes. (BellSouth BR at 6)

In its supplemental brief filed February 19, 2002, BellSouth contends that the BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. v. MCIMetro Access Transmission Services, Inc., et al., 2002 U.S. App. Lexis 373 (11th Cir. 2002) (MCIMetro) decision is not "controlling" authority for the issues that have been presented to this Commission for decision. At most, emphasizes BellSouth, the 11th Circuit's decision in MCIMetro stands for the proposition that, under that court's interpretation of federal law and Georgia law, the Georgia Public Service Commission (GPSC) has no authority to interpret or enforce the terms of the agreement between BellSouth and MCIMetro, but the Court did not consider the issue of whether the Florida Commission has jurisdiction, under Florida law, to resolve disputes arising out of an interconnection agreement. BellSouth also maintains that the 11th Circuit did not address, even indirectly, the issue of whether a state commission could compel parties to submit to binding commercial arbitration. Finally, BellSouth argues that the Commission is not limited to choosing between the parties' proposed language for the new interconnection agreement, but may exercise its independent judgment to refrain from imposing either parties' proposed language addressing this issue.

Specifically, in arguing that the MCIMetro case did not address this Commission's authority under Florida law to resolve contract disputes, BellSouth concedes that the 11th Circuit concluded both that the 1996 Act did not expressly provide for a state commission to resolve disputes arising after an interconnection agreement was approved and that no such authority should be implied from the federal Act:

The plain meaning of [47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(1)], however, grants state commissions, like the GPSC, the power to approve or reject interconnection agreements, not to interpret or enforce them. It would seem, therefore, that the 1996 Act does not permit a State commission, like the GPSC, to revisit an interconnection agreement that it has already approved, like the ones in this case.

2002 WL 27099, slip op. at 6. (BST Supp. BR 3) BellSouth noted that the 11th Circuit's posture conflicts with that of six other Courts of Appeal, as well as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

However, states BellSouth, the 11th Circuit's analysis of the 1996 Act is not necessary to resolve Issue 1 of this docket, because the Court expressly found that a state commission's authority may be found in an analysis of state law. 2002 WL 27099, slip op. at 9 ("Having determined that the GPSC has no power under federal law to interpret the interconnection agreements, we must now consider whether there is some other appropriate basis for the GPSC to interpret these agreements.") (BST Supp. BR 3) BellSouth points to Section 364.162, Florida Statutes, as giving the Commission express authority to interpret and enforce interconnection agreements between ILECs and ALECs. According to BellSouth, the statute specifically grants the FPSC "the authority to arbitrate any disputes regarding interpretation of interconnection or resale prices and terms and conditions." Fla. Stat. § 364.162(1). BellSouth believes this grant of authority includes the authority to interpret such terms and conditions when they are included within an interconnection agreement. (BST Supp. 4)

BellSouth also notes that the 11th Circuit in MCIMetro based its decision on a finding that the GPSC was merely a "quasi-legislative body" unsuited to hear contract disputes. 2002 WL 270999, slip op. at 9-11. BellSouth believes that under Florida law, however, this Commission exercises quasi-judicial authority when such authority is delegated to it by the Florida legislature. As in Southern Bell Tel. and Tel. Co. v. Florida Pub Serv. Comm'n, 453 So.2d 780, 781 (Fla. 1984) (statute authorizing Commission to adjudicate contract disputes concerning toll revenue was a "proper assignment of quasi-judicial authority" pursuant to Fla. Const. art. V, 5 1), BellSouth asserts that the express authority under

Fla. Stat. § 364.162 to resolve "any dispute regarding interpretation" of the terms and conditions of interconnection or resale is also "a proper assignment of quasi-judicial authority" under the Florida Constitution. (BST Supp. BR 4)

In addition, BellSouth believes that Supra lacks legal support for its position that BellSouth could be compelled to submit to binding arbitration. BellSouth cites the U.S. Supreme Court holding that "[a]rbitration is a matter of contract and a party cannot be required to submit to arbitration any dispute which he has not agreed so to submit." AT&T Technologies v. Communications Workers of America, 475 U.S. 643, 648, 106 S. Ct. 1415, 89 L.Ed.2d 648 (1986) (emph. added by BellSouth; BST Supp. BR 5). BellSouth asserts that this Commission also addressed this issue in the recent AT&T/BellSouth arbitration, where it concluded that "nothing in the law gives [the Commission] explicit authority to require third party arbitration." Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP (June 28, 2001) at p. 111. Thus, says BellSouth, the Commission cannot force BellSouth to give up legal rights and submit to binding commercial arbitration. (BST Supp. BR 5-6)

BellSouth further argues that the Commission is not obligated to choose between the options presented to it by the parties. Rather, contends BellSouth, "the Florida Public Service Commission is required by Florida's statutes and case law to reach its own independent findings and conclusions based upon the record before it." Citing International Minerals & Chemical Corp. v. Mayo, 217 So.2d 563, 566 (Fla. 1969)⁴. On this point, BellSouth also challenges Supra's reliance upon MCI Telecom. Corp. v. BellSouth Telecom., Inc., 112 F. Supp. 2d 1286 (N.D. Fla. 2000), for the proposition that the Commission must adopt Supra's proposed language. (BST Supp. BR 6) BellSouth believes that case actually leads to the opposite conclusion. There, notes BellSouth, the

⁴ Also citing Kimball v. Hawkins, 264 So.2d 463, 465 (Fla. 1978) (noting "legislative intent to extend broad discretion to the Public Service Commission in making its decision"); Gulf Electric Cooperative, Inc. v. Johnson, 727 So.2d 259 (Fla. 1999) (affirming Commission's decision not to impose territorial boundaries); and Fort Pierce Utilities Authority v. Beard, 626 So.2d 1356 (Fla. 1993) (FPSC properly exercised independent judgment to reject parties' joint petition for approval of territorial agreement). (BST Supp. BR 7)

court held that while the Commission cannot refuse to consider an issue before it for arbitration, the Court did not conclude that the Commission was required to adopt the proposals of either party. "Had the Florida Commission decided, as a matter of discretion, not to adopt such a provision, MCI would bear a substantial burden in attempting to demonstrate that that determination was contrary to the Telecommunications Act or arbitrary and capricious." 112 F. Supp. 2d at 1297. Therefore, asserts BellSouth, the Commission is entitled to take into consideration all of the evidence and applicable law and decide the manner as it sees fit, as long as the Commission's decision is neither arbitrary nor capricious.⁵

Supra's current agreement with BellSouth provides for commercial arbitration, and Supra believes that this method of resolving disputes has proven its worth by providing judicial economy, the ability to award damages, due deference to the precedence of Commission orders, and the speedy and efficient resolution of disputes. Supra witness Ramos argues that BellSouth's position is based on nothing more than the fact that BellSouth has received unfavorable results before commercial arbitrators. (Ramos TR 629) He points out that in order to resolve disputes, commercial arbitrators consider the terms and conditions of the parties' agreement in conjunction with all applicable federal and state rules, just as the Commission would do. The difference is that commercial arbitrators have the ability to award damages, whereas the Commission does not. (Ramos TR 630) Given the parties' tumultuous relationship, Supra believes that it is important to have a venue that provides for the quick and expeditious resolution of issues, without running to the Commission at every turn. In the parties' current agreement the commercial arbitrators must resolve the complaint within 90 days unless there is an explicit agreement to waive the 90-day requirement. More importantly, says witness Ramos, the commercial arbitrator's award is final. (Ramos TR 770)

However, before the Public Service Commission, parties may litigate the issue, then seek reconsideration of the Order of the Commission, and then avail themselves of the appellate process, the

⁵ Also Citing Order No. PSC-01-0824-FOF-TP, issued in Docket No. 000649-TP, MCI/BellSouth Arbitration Final Order, wherein the Commission declined to impose limited liability provisions. (BST Supp. BR 8)

witness contends. (Ramos TR 770) Witness Ramos states that the Commission procedure is a much longer process than a commercial arbitration proceeding as contained in Attachment 1 of the parties' current agreement. (Ramos TR 770-771) Witness Ramos also notes that in his testimony, BellSouth witness Ruscilli states that the Commission's decision would also be appealable, and the Commission would resolve the matter only by ordering remedies within its power. (Ramos TR 631) Finally, witness Ramos believes

. . . public policy dictates that taxpayers money should not be used to finance a party's noncompliance with an agreement approved by the PSC based on the CPR rules and the parties' current agreement, the losing party pays the cost of the arbitration proceeding. Whereas, any proceeding before the FPSC, it is the taxpayers that have got to fund the bill. (Ramos TR 771)

In its supplemental brief, Supra first argues that as of January 10, 2002, the MCIMetro decision became binding authority in the 11th Circuit.⁶ As such, Supra contends, the Court's determination that ". . . the 1996 Act does not permit a State commission, like the GPSC, to revisit an interconnection agreement that it has already approved. . . ." is binding upon the Florida Commission and precludes Commission action on this matter. Id. at p. 26. (Emphasis added by Supra, Supra Supp. BR 1-2). Supra believes this clearly indicates that this Commission cannot revisit interconnection agreements it has approved pursuant to the Act. Thus, Supra maintains, the only possible remaining jurisdictional authority upon which the FPSC could rely is Florida law.

Supra asserts that in construing statutory provisions, one must first look to the plain meaning of the language used.⁷ Supra believes Florida law, in particular Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, is silent on whether the Commission has the authority to adjudicate a dispute involving an interconnection agreement that has already been approved by the FPSC. Thus, Supra maintains that consistent with the MCIMetro decision, no such authority exists. (Supra Supp.

⁶Citing Martin v. Singletary, 965 F.2d 944, 945 n.1 (11th Cir. 1992).

⁷Citing Harris v. Garner, 216 F.3d 970, 972 (11th Cir. 2000). (Supra Supp. BR 2)

BR 2) Supra notes that the 11th Circuit Court rejected any implication of "general authority" over all telecommunications providers in the state as a basis for Commission adjudication of disputes. (Supp. BR 2 - 3)

Nothing in the Georgia Act gives the GPSC the right to interpret a contract between two parties, just because the two parties happen to be certified telecommunications carriers.

MCIMetro at p. 42; Supra Supp. BR 3). As such, Supra believes general authority is not a substitute for specific statutory authority to adjudicate disputes involving previously approved interconnection agreements. Supra also notes the Court's opinion that as a functional matter, judicial forums - and not quasi-legislative regulatory bodies - are better suited for the purely legal exercise of construing the terms of interconnection agreements. Id. at 42-43.

Supra further asserts that the 11th Circuit could find no provision in the Georgia statutes which provides support for any adjudicatory powers. Likewise, says Supra, each provision of Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, focuses on the Commission's regulatory role, but nowhere is the Commission given the power to adjudicate contractual disputes involving previously approved interconnection agreements. Supra contends that the Florida legislature "said what it meant" when it used the terms "regulatory" and "regulating," and as noted by the 11th Circuit, "given a straightforward statutory command, there is no reason to resort to legislative history."⁸

In addition, Supra argues that the 11th Circuit in MCIMetro also undertook a "functional" test, which the Court addressed as follows:

Another section of the Georgia Act underscores this distinction. Section 46-5-168(f) . . . allows the GPSC to petition, intervene or otherwise commence proceedings

⁸ Citing United States v. Steele, 147 F.3d 1316, 1318 (11th Cir. 1998); and CBS Inc. v. PrimeTime 24 Joint Venture, 245 F.3d 1217, 1222 (11th Cir. 2001); Supra Supp. BR 4.

before the appropriate . . . courts . . . There would be no need for the GPSC to commence a proceeding in a court of law, however, if it had the authority to adjudicate those proceedings itself.

Id. at pg. 42. (Emphasis added by Supra; Supra Supp. BR 5). Supra argues that Section 364.015, Florida Statutes, imposes the same substantive restrictions on the Florida Commission where it provides that:

The legislature finds that violations of commission orders or rules in connection with the impairment of . . . service, constitutes irreparable harm for which there is no remedy at law. The Commission is authorized to seek relief in circuit court.

According to Supra, application of the 11th Circuit's "functional" test to Section 364.015, Florida Statutes, clearly demonstrates that if the Commission itself had the authority to enforce Commission orders or rules, then it would not need to seek relief in circuit court. Thus, under the "functional" test, the Commission must not have jurisdiction to do so. Supra notes, however, that the Commission is confined in circuit court to matters involving the violation of a rule or statute, and that contractual disputes involve no such violations. (Supra Supp. BR 6)

Supra further emphasizes that under the 11th Circuit's MCIMetro decision, it is clear that a state commission can only adjudicate those matters which it has the ability to enforce. (Supra Supp. BR 6) Because the Commission can only penalize a telecommunications company for violation of a statute, rule, or order, pursuant to Section 364.285, Florida Statutes, and must seek enforcement of its decision elsewhere, Supra believes it is clear that in this matter, the Commission is clearly without authority to adjudicate disputes arising out of the approved interconnection agreement. (Supra Supp. BR 7) Supra also maintains that Rules 25-22.036 and 28-106.301, Florida Administrative Code, also do not authorize the Commission to act because the breach of an interconnection agreement does not constitute the breach of a statute, rule, or order. Thus, Supra concludes that the Commission cannot find authority in Florida law.

Finally, Supra contends that Section 364.07, Florida Statutes, does not authorize the Commission to adjudicate disputes, because this provision only pertains to contracts involving the "joint provision of intrastate interexchange service." (Supra Supp. BR 8) Supra argues that this provision further crystalizes the Commission's lack of authority to adjudicate interconnection disputes, because the Legislature saw fit to include adjudicatory authority in one provision, Section 364.07, Florida Statutes, and declined to do so in another provision more pertinent to the matter at issue here, Section 364.162, Florida Statutes. (Supra Supp. BR 9)

Conclusion

Supra's current agreement with BellSouth provides for commercial arbitration, and Supra believes that this method of resolving disputes has proven its worth by providing judicial economy, the ability to award damages, due deference to the precedence of Commission orders, and the speedy and efficient resolution of disputes. BellSouth, however, views commercial arbitration as costly, time consuming, and impractical, and a process which may lead to decisions inconsistent with Commission orders.

The parties' current agreement requires that commercially arbitrated issues be resolved within 90 days of a complaint being raised. Supra compares the time consumed in its commercial arbitration, with the time it takes for the Commission to resolve the issues raised in a particular complaint. Staff notes, however, that in Supra's commercial arbitration, it was necessary for the parties to waive the 90-day requirement for the resolution of the disputed issues. Once waived, the commercial arbitration is open-ended, with resolution being determined by the complexity of the issues, the procedural motions raised by the parties, and the parties continued efforts to reach agreement on the issues outside the confines of the tribunal. Complaints brought before the Commission are influenced by the same factors, and these are often the greatest determinants of the duration of a Commission proceeding.

Neither party quantified the issue of cost to any great extent. Proceedings before either a commercial arbitration panel or this Commission would follow many of the same steps in that parties would be faced with the costs of discovery, providing

witnesses, attorneys' fees, etc. The prevailing party in a commercial arbitration may be able to recoup its expenses from the losing party. Supra ~~feels~~ believes that this is as it should be, and Florida taxpayers money should not be used to finance parties' noncompliance with an agreement approved by the PSC. (TR 771) However, as noted by a Commissioner at the hearing, the regulatory assessment fees paid by the regulated utilities pay the salaries of Commission personnel. (TR 772) Therefore, it is the general body of the ratepayers of both Supra and BellSouth that pay for the litigation before the Commission. Thus, the record indicates that it is equally likely that the ratepayers of both parties would bear the costs of either commercial arbitration or dispute resolution proceedings before the Commission.

BellSouth is particularly concerned with the consistency in Commission-approved agreements. It believes that the Commission and its staff are clearly more capable to handle disputes between telecommunications carriers than are commercial arbitrators. (Cox TR 175) Supra believes that once the initial agreement is approved, the enforcement of the agreement itself should be left in the hands of commercial arbitrators who can deal with this in a commercial way. (Ramos TR 771)

Staff notes that on January 30, 2002, Supra filed a Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Authority. Supra sought to bring to the Commission's attention the 11th Circuit's decision in, Cir. Order Nos. 00-12809 and 00-12810, the consolidated appeals of BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. v. MCIMETRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC., D.C. Docket No. 99-00248-CV-JOF-1 and BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. v. WORLDCOM TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND E.SPIRE COMMUNICATIONS, INC., Docket No. 99-00249-CV-JOF-1, respectively (MCIMetro). By Commission Order No. PSC-02-0159-PCO-TP, issued February 1, 2002, the Motion was granted. ~~The decision held that Section 252(e) of the Act provided no authority for the Georgia Public Service Commission to interpret and enforce the terms of interconnection agreements it had approved. The ruling is not as yet final, as the time for filing a motion for rehearing has not passed and a mandate has not been issued, and so it does not presently have the force of law. Further, that ruling was based in part on the Court's review of Georgia law, the applicable provisions of which appear to be significantly more restrictive than Florida law regarding the Commission's jurisdiction to enforce interconnection agreements. Nevertheless, this decision could ultimately determine the Commission's ability to address complaints~~

~~arising under interconnection agreements, in which case staff believes the "change of law" provision in the agreement would be operative.~~

Thereafter, in accordance with subsequent Order No. PSC-02-0202-PCO-TP, BellSouth and Supra were afforded the opportunity to file briefs on the impact of the 11th Circuit Court's decision in MCIMetro on Issue 1 of this Docket. The parties agree that MCIMetro clearly holds that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 does not authorize state commissions to interpret or enforce the terms of an interconnection agreement. Where they diverge is in their interpretation of MCIMetro's effect on this Commission's authority to resolve disputes arising under an interconnection agreement, pursuant to Florida state law.

Supra maintains that Florida law is silent with respect to whether the Commission has the authority to adjudicate a dispute involving an interconnection agreement that has already been approved by the Commission; the 11th Circuit has clearly stated that a state commission cannot glean such authority from general provisions such as Section 364.01, Florida Statutes, which focuses on this Commission's regulatory role.

To the contrary, BellSouth argues that Section 364.162, Florida Statutes, does indeed grant the Commission express authority to interpret and enforce interconnection agreements between ILECs and ALECs. Section 364.162(1), Florida Statutes, provides:

Whether set by negotiation or by the commission, interconnection and resale prices, rates, terms, and conditions shall be filed with the commission before their effective date. The commission shall have the authority to arbitrate any dispute regarding interpretation of interconnection or resale prices and terms and conditions.

Staff notes that it does not agree with Supra's contention that the 11th Circuit's decision in MCIMetro is controlling at this

time.⁹ However, even if it is, staff believes there is sufficient authority in state law for the Commission to act.

The federal Act is clear that parties have the ability to arrive at interconnection agreements either through negotiation or through arbitration with the Commission, as in the instant docket. Thereafter, such agreements must be approved by the state commission in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act. Once approved, however, the 11th Circuit's MCIMetro decision is clear that the Commission is not authorized by the Act to resolve complaints arising out of that agreement, but may only do so pursuant to a grant of authority under state law. While the 11th Circuit Court found the Georgia PSC lacked an express grant of authority in Georgia statutes, the 11th Circuit has not made such a determination regarding Florida state law. Were the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida given an opportunity for such consideration, staff believes that the Court would find such authority for the Florida PSC in the language of Section 364.162(1), Florida Statutes, which expressly confers upon the Commission the authority "to arbitrate any dispute regarding interpretation of interconnection or resale prices and terms and conditions." Staff believes that such language would survive the scrutiny of the federal courts. Moreover, staff believes that the authority to resolve such disputes is clearly an assignment of quasi-judicial authority by the state legislature, a factor the 11th Circuit also found lacking in Georgia. Staff further emphasizes that Section 364.162, Florida Statutes, does not limit or otherwise distinguish between the Commission's authority to resolve (1) disputes arising out of the initial establishment of an interconnection or resale agreement and (2) disputes arising out of

⁹Staff notes that the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida has issued Orders in several of its pending cases regarding disputes arising out of interconnection agreements recognizing the 11th Circuit's opinion in MCIMetro; nevertheless, the Court continues to stay (rather than dismiss) those proceedings, pending issuance of a mandate by the 11th Circuit and resolution of pending U.S. Supreme Court cases involving this and other issues.

previously approved agreements. Thus, the Florida Legislature apparently intended the Commission to act in this area.¹⁰

Supra also asserts that part of having the power to adjudicate a dispute is the power to enforce the findings at the conclusion of the hearing. Staff believes, however, that enforcement of agency action may be had by means other than seeking relief in court. In the case of telecommunications companies, the Commission is authorized to fine any company that has "refused to comply or to have willfully violated any lawful rule or order," in accordance with Section 364.285, Florida Statutes. In that it allows penalties for refusal to comply, it is clearly a method of "enforcement." Staff further emphasizes that Section 364.015, Florida Statutes, upon which Supra relies for the proposition that the Commission cannot enforce its Orders, was developed to provide the Commission with an avenue to address matters pertaining to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The intent was to outline the means by which the Commission can seek injunctive relief in court. It does not, however, lend any support to Supra's argument that the Commission cannot enforce its Orders, because as set forth herein, the Commission clearly has that authority, albeit by means other than issuance of injunctions. Thus, inability to enforce the decision cannot serve as a basis for finding the Commission is not authorized to resolve interconnection disputes.

Although both parties set forth persuasive arguments, staff believes that consistent with Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP, the Commission should not prescribe that the parties enter into a provision outside the scope of the Act, and for which they have not duly bargained. Therefore, the parties should not be required to utilize commercial arbitration as a method for resolving disputes arising out of its interconnection agreement with Supra. Staff believes that the appropriate forum for the resolution of such disputes is at the Commission. Staff notes, however, that the Commission is not constrained by the proposals of either party and has the discretion to decline to require a provision identifying the forum in which disputes will be addressed. In requiring the parties to submit their final arbitrated agreement, the Commission

¹⁰See Florida Public Service Commission v. Bryson, 569 So.2d 1253 (Fla. 1990) (PSC is authorized "to interpret statutes that empower it, including jurisdictional statutes, and to make rules and issue orders accordingly.").

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

may, instead, allow the parties to either include a negotiated provision addressing this issue, or no provision at all.

ISSUE 4: Should the Interconnection Agreement contain language to the effect that it will not be filed with the Florida Public Service Commission for approval prior to an ALEC obtaining ALEC certification from the Florida Public Service Commission?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. The agreement should include language that it will not be filed with the Florida Public Service Commission for approval prior to an ALEC obtaining ALEC certification from this Commission. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: The parties' agreement should include language stating that it will not be filed with the Commission for approval prior to an ALEC obtaining ALEC certification from the Commission.

SUPRA: Any ALEC (whether certified or not) should have the right to adopt any interconnection agreement and conduct test operation thereunder, so long as that carrier is not providing telecommunications services to the public. This is consistent with both federal law and Fla. Stat. § 364.33.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Arguments

BellSouth witness Cox adopted the prefiled direct testimony of witness Ruscilli. Witness Cox argues that because any ALEC, whether certificated or not, may adopt this agreement, this Commission should require any adopting entity to be certificated prior to the filing of the agreement with the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) for approval. (TR 177) In support of this position, witness Cox quotes from a letter dated April 25, 2000, from Walter D'Haeseleer, Director of the FPSC Division of Telecommunications, to Nancy Sims of BellSouth: "BellSouth's caution in deciding to hold filing for non-certificated entities until they obtain certification is appropriate." (TR 177; EXH 7, p. 33) Furthermore, witness Cox wonders why Supra has taken this position because it is a fully certificated ALEC in the state of Florida. (TR 220)

Supra witness Ramos claims BellSouth requests that an ALEC be certificated prior to submitting an adopted agreement to the FPSC for approval in order to delay entry of new carriers in its service

territory. (TR 547) Witness Ramos claims the Commission only mandates that an ALEC be certificated before it begins providing telecommunications services in Florida. The witness quotes Rule 25-4.004, Florida Administrative Code, as stating:

Except as provided in Chapter 364 of the Florida Statutes, no person shall begin the construction or operation of telephone lines, plant or systems or extension thereof, or acquire ownership or control thereof, either directly or indirectly, without first obtaining from the Florida Public Service Commission, a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require such construction, operation or acquisition. (TR 547)

Witness Ramos claims non-certificated ALECs have the right to conduct test operations in Florida so long as they do not sell telecommunications services to consumers, and this right is consistent with Section 364.33, Florida Statutes. (TR 547) There are no laws or decisions that support BellSouth's position, according to witness Ramos. (TR 547) Witness Ramos states BellSouth's fear that a non-certificated ALEC will adopt an agreement and illegally provide telecommunications service to the public is unjustified. (TR 548) He points out that the agreement will require certification before service is provided and that the indemnification provisions contained in the follow-up agreement are more than adequate to address BellSouth's concerns regarding liability for service provided by a non-certificated entity. (Ramos TR 548)

Analysis

This issue addresses whether or not an ALEC can adopt and submit an interconnection agreement to the Florida Public Service Commission without first obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity. BellSouth believes a company must be certificated before it can submit an adopted agreement for approval. Supra believes an ALEC should be allowed to adopt an agreement and conduct test operations as long as the ALEC does not provide telecommunications services to the public.

Rule 25-4.004, Florida Administrative Code, in pertinent part provides :

Except as provided in Chapter 364 of the Florida Statutes, no person shall begin the construction or operation of telephone lines, plant or systems or extension thereof, or acquire ownership or control thereof, either directly or indirectly, without first obtaining from the Florida Public Service Commission, a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require such construction, operation or acquisition.

While Supra believes this rule only requires certification for entities providing telecommunications services to the public, staff believes the rule makes no such distinction. The text of the rule is totally devoid of any exception. Furthermore, staff believes that requiring certification before an ALEC can conduct test operations under an adopted agreement is clearly reasonable. Currently, an ALEC is required to obtain certification before it begins constructing any telecommunications facilities.

Furthermore, staff disagrees with Supra's arguments that testing operations are permitted by Section 364.33, Florida Statutes. Section 364.33, Florida Statutes, provides:

A person may not begin construction or operation of any telecommunications facility, or any extension thereof for the purpose of providing telecommunications services to the public, or acquire ownership or control thereof, in whatever manner, including the acquisition, transfer, or assignment of majority organizational control or controlling stock ownership, without prior approval. This section does not require approval by the commission prior to the construction, operation, or extension of a facility by a certified company within its certificated area nor in any way limit the commission's ability to review the prudence of such construction programs for ratemaking as provided under this chapter.

While staff agrees with Supra that this statute does not explicitly require certification, staff believes it does not conflict with Rule 25-4.004, Florida Administrative Code, which does. Staff believes this statute requires some kind of "approval" from this Commission before taking steps to enter the telecommunications industry. Staff believes that this Commission is free to specify what kind of steps are necessary for approval and has done so by

requiring companies to be certificated pursuant to Rule 25-4.004, Florida Administrative Code.

While requiring ALECs to be certificated before they can conduct test operations under an adopted agreement may slow competitors from entering the local phone market as Supra has alleged, staff believes certification is required, pursuant to Rule 25-4.004, Florida Administrative Code. In addition, staff believes that this approach is in the best interests of Florida consumers because it ensures that only certificated companies can provide telecommunications services to the public. Therefore, staff recommends that the interconnection agreement allow BellSouth to hold adopted agreements from being submitted to the FPSC for approval until such time as the adopting ALEC obtains certification.

Conclusion

Staff recommends the agreement should include language that it will not be filed with the Florida Public Service Commission for approval prior to an ALEC obtaining ALEC certification from this Commission.

ISSUE 5: Should BellSouth be required to provide to Supra a download of all of BellSouth's Customer Service Records ("CSRs")?

RECOMMENDATION: No, BellSouth should not be required to allow Supra to download all CSRs as that would be contrary to the Telecommunication Act's prohibitions against unauthorized access or disclosure of Customer Proprietary Network Information (CPNI). (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: Supra is entitled to view customer service records only for those records where the end-user customer has given specific permission to do so. Providing Supra with a download of all CSRs, without authorization, of each and every BellSouth customer would constitute a breach of confidentiality and privacy.

SUPRA: Yes. BellSouth's interfaces are subject to extended downtime, thus providing unreliable access to CSRs. Supra should have CSRs available in its systems and agree not to access any CSR until authorized by the applicable customer. Such agreement is similar to Supra's current Blanket Letter of Authorization.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This issue considers whether BellSouth should be required to provide Supra with a download of its CSRs and whether such a download would violate the Customer Proprietary Network Information (CPNI) rights outlined in § 222 of the Telecom Act.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Pate contends that allowing Supra to download all CSRs would violate BellSouth's duty under the Act not to disclose CPNI without the permission of the individual user. (TR 1155) Witness Pate states that downloading CSRs would "constitute a breach of confidentiality and privacy for which Supra is not entitled." (TR 1155) BellSouth offers both electronic and manual access to BellSouth's CSRs as a pre-ordering functionality and therefore a download is not necessary, according to witness Pate. (TR 1097) He asserts that this electronic pre-ordering functionality is available to ALECs through Local Exchange Navigation System (LENS), and Telecommunications Access Gateway (TAG). (TR 1097) Pre-ordering functionality, witness Pate states, is also available through RoboTAG, which offers real-time access to

BellSouth's CSRs. (TR 1097) Witness Pate describes the steps an ALEC has to take to access CSRs through BellSouth's LENS system. These steps include: 1) Signing a blanket letter of authorization (LOA) which states that an ALEC will obtain permission before accessing that end-user's CSRs; (TR 1098) 2) logging onto LENS and selecting the "Inquiry Mode" and selecting the "view customer record option;" (TR 1099) 3) having an employee populate the phone number and location where a customer resides; (TR 1099) and 4) having an employee select the "proceed with inquiry" prompt and click ok, when prompted by the computer to answer, "are you authorized to view this CSR?" (TR 1099-1100)

BellSouth witness Pate contends that the 1996 Act and the FCC only require BellSouth to provide nondiscriminatory access to OSS, not identical access or interfaces as Supra has suggested. (TR 1153) Witness Pate asserts the FCC has defined nondiscriminatory access as access to OSS that allows ALECs to perform the functions of pre-ordering, ordering and provisioning for resale services in substantially the same time and manner as BellSouth does for itself. (TR 1154) In the case of unbundled network elements, the FCC requires that the OSS provide an efficient competitor with a meaningful opportunity to compete, according to witness Pate. (TR 1154) Witness Pate asserts that BellSouth's OSS, which ALECs use to access CSRs, meets the requirements of both the Act and the FCC. (TR 1153) In support of this conclusion, witness Pate submitted an exhibit of computer records showing LENS and TAG have unscheduled downtimes of less than 1 percent. (EXH 38)

Supra witnesses Ramos and Zejinilovic contend that BellSouth's OSS systems for ALECs to access CSRs are subject to frequent outages and are inadequate. (Ramos TR 632-33; Zejinilovic TR 1058) Witness Zejinilovic submitted an exhibit showing numerous outages of BellSouth's systems. (EXH 32) Witness Zejinilovic asserts that these crashes were often accompanied with TAG error messages. (TR 1058)

Witness Ramos contends that a download of CSRs would provide the best solution to BellSouth's chronically down OSS. (TR 632-33) A download of CSRs would put Supra at true parity with BellSouth and that is what is required by the Act, according to witness Ramos. (TR 523-539) Witness Ramos claims that "[w]ithout true parity in OSS, no competition can develop in the local exchange market." (TR 646) He claims downloading CSRs would not violate the Act because Supra would sign a blanket LOA agreeing that Supra

would only access CSRs for those customers who have given permission. (Ramos TR 633) Supra witness Ramos claims this is not much different from the current system where Supra representatives are allowed to view any CSR as long as they certify they have the customer's permission and enter certain information from the customer as required by FPSC rules such as their social security number, date of birth, driver's license number, and mother's maiden name. (TR 633) Witness Ramos states if given permission to download CSRs, Supra representatives would only view CSRs for which they had permission; the only difference is that Supra representatives would be able to view CSRs even when BellSouth's systems are down. (TR 633)

Analysis

With respect to using customer proprietary network information (CPNI), Section 222 of the Telecommunications Act requires:

Except as required by law or with the approval of the customer, a telecommunications carrier that receives or obtains customer proprietary network information shall only use, disclose, or permit access to individually identifiable customer propriety network information in its provision of (A) the telecommunications service from which such information is derived, or (B) services necessary to, or used in, the provision of such telecommunications service, including the publishing of directories.

47 U.S.C. § 222(c)(1)¹¹ (emphasis added) The Telecommunications Act of 1996, in pertinent part, defines "Customer Proprietary Network Information" as: "(a) information that relates to the quantity, technical configuration, type, destination, and amount of use of a telecommunications service subscribed to by any customer of a telecommunications carrier, and that is made available to the carrier solely by virtue of the carrier-customer relationship." 47 U.S.C. § 222(f)(1)(A). Supra does not contest BellSouth's

¹¹For a similar statute predicated on Florida State law, see §364.24(2), Florida Statutes. §364.24(2), Florida Statutes, provides in pertinent part: "Any officer or person in the employ of any telecommunications company shall not intentionally disclose customer account records except as authorized by the customer or as necessary for billing purposes, or required by subpoena, court order, other process of the court, or otherwise by law."

assertions that CSRs constitute CPNI and that CSRs contain exactly the type of sensitive, individually identifiable information described within the Act's definition. Therefore, the sole remaining issue related to § 222 is whether a download of the records by Supra would constitute access or disclosure for which individual customer permission is required.

Witness Ramos asserts individual customer permission is not required to download CSRs because Supra would be willing to sign a blanket LOA agreeing to view only the CSRs for which they have permission. (TR 633) However, staff agrees with witness Pate that such a practice is not permissible under the Act. Since downloading the CSRs would necessarily involve physical possession of those records by Supra, staff believes it would constitute disclosure within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. § 222(c)(1). In such a case, the Act requires individual customer permission. Staff believes the Act does not allow downloads of CSRs even though Supra promises to view only those CSRs for which it has permission, because Supra would still possess CSRs of customers who have not consented.

The Act specifically provides that CPNI can be accessed or disclosed without customer permission only to carriers "in its provision of (A) the telecommunications service from which such information is derived, or (B) services necessary to, or used in, the provision of such telecommunications service, including the publishing of directories." 47 U.S.C. § 222(c)(1) Where Congress explicitly enumerates certain exceptions to a general prohibition, additional exceptions are not to be implied, in the absence of evidence of a contrary legislative intent. See, TRW Inc., v. Andrews, 2001 U.S. Lexis 10306 (2001)(citations omitted) The download Supra proposes does not fall within these carefully tailored exceptions. Supra clearly intends to download CSRs for customers for which it will not be providing service. (Ramos TR 633) Staff believes this Commission should not create an additional exception to Congress' detailed listing of when CPNI can be used without customer permission, based on Supra's generalized notions of parity.

While downloading of CSRs has not been addressed explicitly by the FCC, the FCC in its Second Report and Order (CC Docket Nos. 96-115, 96-149) issued February 26, 1998, with regard to CPNI stated:

In contrast to other provisions of the 1996 Act that seek to open all telecommunications markets to competition, and mandate competitive access to facilities and services, the CPNI regulations in section 222 are largely consumer protection provisions that establish restrictions on carrier use and disclosure of personal customer information. Congress expressly directs a balance of both competitive and consumer privacy interests with respect to CPNI. Congress' new balance, and privacy concern, are evidenced by the comprehensive statutory design, which expressly recognizes the duty of all carriers to protect customer information and embodies the principle that customers must be able to control information they view as sensitive and personal from use, disclosure, and access by carriers.

FCC 98-27 ¶ 1. Staff believes a download of CSRs would be in clear violation of § 222 of the Act and the FCC's above statement. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission deny Supra's request for a download of all BellSouth CSRs.

Despite the fact that staff believes Supra is requesting a remedy that cannot be granted, staff believes Supra's problems with BellSouth's OSS for accessing CSRs are legitimate. Staff notes the testimony of Supra witnesses Ramos and Zejinilovic that BellSouth's system is subject to frequent crashes and downtime. (Ramos TR 632-33; Zejinilovic TR 1058) Staff is particularly persuaded by Exhibit 32 which provided a detailed recording of each such crash. Staff discounts BellSouth's Exhibit 38, submitted by witness Pate, claiming LENS and TAG downtime is in the neighborhood of 1% because witness Pate admitted on cross-examination that the exhibit only depicts outages of twenty minutes or more. (TR 1225)

However, no matter how real Supra's problems with BellSouth's OSS are, staff believes this Commission should not order a download of CSRs as that appears contrary to Federal law. Staff suggests if these problems continue, Supra could at a later date file a complaint with this Commission or avail itself of other appropriate dispute resolution to address system downtime.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Conclusion

BellSouth should not be required to allow Supra to download all CSRs as that would be contrary to the Telecommunication Act's prohibitions against unauthorized access or disclosure of Customer Proprietary Network Information (CPNI).

ISSUE 10: Should the rate for a loop be reduced when the loop utilizes Digitally Added Main Line (DAML) equipment?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Staff recommends that BellSouth's rate for a loop should not be reduced when the loop utilizes Digitally Added Main Line (DAML) equipment. When changes are to be made to an existing Supra loop that may adversely affect the end user, BellSouth should provide Supra with prior notification.
(J-E. BROWN)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: The unbundled loop rates the Commission recently approved in the UNE cost docket (Docket No. 990649-TP) are appropriate and do not require any adjustment to recognize the use of DAML equipment.

SUPRA: DAML is a line-sharing technology. Where line-sharing technology is involved in the UNE environment, Supra Telecom should only be obligated to pay the pro-rated cost of the shared network elements; such as the shared local loop.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This issue considers BellSouth's unbundled loop rate and whether that rate should be discounted when BellSouth provides loops to Supra via Digitally Added Main Line (DAML) equipment. Supra also broadened its position to include that BellSouth be required to notify Supra periodically when DAML equipment is deployed. (Supra BR at 5; Nilson TR 840)

Arguments

Staff notes that BellSouth witness Cox adopted the direct testimony of BellSouth witness Ruscilli. (TR 169) BellSouth witness Cox believes that this Commission should affirm the rates for unbundled loops which have recently been approved by the Commission. She maintains that these rates are appropriate for those instances where DAML equipment is used. (TR 182) The witness states:

The use of DAML equipment is a means to meet a request for service in a timely manner. It is not generally a more economic means of meeting demand on a broad basis than using individual loop pairs. Supra apparently believes that a

loop utilizing DAML equipment should be offered at a lower cost than other loops. However, cost for unbundled loops have been calculated in compliance with Federal Communications Commission rules on a forward-looking basis without regard to the manner in which the customer is served (e.g., copper or digital loop carrier). (TR 181-182)

BellSouth witness Cox asserts that DAMLs are perfectly acceptable items of network equipment or BellSouth would not employ them for its customers. (TR 400) She concedes that use of DAML equipment has resulted in substandard modem performance, but contends that BellSouth has a solution that the company implements whenever a complaint is logged. (Cox TR 430) BellSouth witness Kephart states:

It is true that the original Terayon DAML COT cards applied to some loops (all copper or integrated SLC96 circuits in particular) resulted in decreases in modem performance and risk for customer dissatisfaction and complaints. However, BellSouth has worked with Terayon to support a new card that will not produce a significant impairment to the signal. This card has undergone final testing and is currently being deployed in BellSouth. (TR 393-394)

Witness Kephart also wants to emphasize that BellSouth's loop costs are not based on actual cost, but on TELRIC cost, which is based on a forward-looking network design. (Kephart TR 435) Additionally, witness Kephart testifies:

BellSouth deploys DAML equipment on a very limited basis to expand a single loop to derive additional digital channels, each of which may be used to provide voice grade service. The deployment is limited to those situations where loop facilities are not currently available for the additional voice grade loops(s). DAML systems are generally not an economical long-term facility relief

alternative except possibly in slow growth areas. (TR 391)

As to notifying Supra when DAML is deployed, BellSouth witness Kephart asserts that the current loop provisioning process is sufficient. During his cross examination he stated: "In order to determine a loop's makeup, a CLEC who has access to a particular system, inputs a telephone number or circuit ID and gets back information about the cabling pair or pairs that serve the address location in question." (TR 429)

As previously noted, Supra believes that DAML is a line-sharing technology. When line-sharing technology is involved in the UNE environment, Supra contends it should only be obligated to pay the prorated cost of the shared network elements. (Supra BR at 5) Supra witness Nilson states:

BellSouth should be enjoined from deploying this technology on ALEC subscriber circuits. The potential for abuse and "bad acts" is just too high, because it is an anti-competitive tool for ILECs. Should an agreement be reached to deploy such equipment on specific ALEC lines, the ALEC should not be charged for two loops, when it is in fact utilizing just one, or in some cases, just half a loop. (TR 840)

Supra witness Nilson believes that DAML lines are less expensive and more technologically problematic than copper lines. He argues that this increases Supra's support cost. Therefore, witness Nilson claims that the rate for a UNE loop should be discounted when DAML equipment is used. (Nilson TR 838) Witness Nilson goes on to say:

DAML served loops do not provide all the features, capabilities and functions of a copper loop. DAML electronics have higher failure rates than bare copper, high speed DSL services cannot be provisioned over customer lines served by DAML. (TR 952)

In its brief, Supra contends that "BellSouth is being unduly enriched by providing 2:1, 4:1, 6:1, and even 8:1 DAML lines while

charging Supra the full cost for each access line." (Supra BR at 6) Supra witness Nilson believes that BellSouth should only be allowed to charge Supra the relative portion or fraction of the 1:1 copper line (enhanced by the deployment of DAML equipment) Supra uses to provide service to its customer(s). (TR 840) According to Supra, it is "not equitable" for it to pay "full cost" for a line that previously served one customer, but is now capable of serving 2, 4, 6, or even 8 customers with the use of DAML equipment. (Supra BR at 6)

Supra witness Nilson believes that BellSouth should be required to periodically disclose the use of such equipment if this Commission does not prohibit BellSouth from deploying DAML equipment on ALEC subscribed circuits. (TR 840) Currently, BellSouth does not notify Supra when the technology has been deployed to a Supra customer, which Supra witness Nilson believes increases its troubleshooting cost. (TR 953) This cost increase is due to increased call volumes handled by Supra customer service representatives (CSRs) and the cost to identify and correct the problem, both caused by a lack of notification/authorization prior to a BellSouth action. (TR 838)

Analysis

It appears that the situations in which DAML equipment is actually deployed are minuscule according to Exhibit 17, a proprietary document in this proceeding. Because the question of what is the appropriate disclosure method when DAML equipment is deployed is addressed by the parties in their testimony, staff is compelled to recognize the issue as having been broadened to include notification/authorization. (Kephart TR 429; Nilson TR 840) On numerous occasions in his testimony, Supra witness Nilson contends that BellSouth converts Supra customer lines to DAML with no prior warning to Supra. (TR 838, 839, 953) Though given the opportunity to rebut these allegations made by Supra witness Nilson, BellSouth witness Kephart's only response was that "the deployment (of DAML equipment) is limited to those situations where loop facilities are not currently available for the additional voice grade loop(s)" and "it is not BellSouth policy to utilize DAML equipment on CLEC customers in order to free up a loop for a BellSouth customer." (TR 391, 392) Further, in his cross examination, BellSouth witness Kephart states that BellSouth does not currently have a process for "informing CLECs of the type of plant that we use to serve their customers." (TR 434) Therefore,

staff opines that there may be situations in which BellSouth does switch Supra end users from a standard copper loop to a loop supported by DAML equipment without notifying Supra. Staff believes that in cases where BellSouth makes changes to one of Supra existing loops that may adversely affect a Supra end user, it is reasonable to require BellSouth to provide prior notification. Under cross examination BellSouth witness Kephart infers that there are "few cases" when a BellSouth engineer may resort to DAMLs; therefore, staff trusts that notifying Supra will not be an overly burdensome task for BellSouth to complete. (TR 433)

Staff believes that there are two questions that must be answered in order to arrive at a recommendation on the remaining issue. First, is the use of DAML equipment an appropriate alternative for BellSouth to provide timely service to its customers and second, should loop rates be discounted when DAML is utilized? Although Supra witness Nilson contends that BellSouth uses DAML "to provide additional loops where they have run out of loops" and as an "anti-competitive tool," staff agrees with BellSouth witness Cox that the use of DAML equipment is a means to meet a request for service in a timely manner. (Nilson TR 836, 840; Cox TR 181) Staff notes that BellSouth deploys DAML equipment on a very limited basis, primarily to expand a single loop to derive additional channels, each of which may be used to provide voice grade service. (Cox TR 181) The deployment is limited to those situations where loop facilities are not currently available for additional voice grade loops. Staff believes DAML systems are generally not an economical long-term facility relief alternative, except possibly in slow growth areas. (Kephart TR 391)

Although BellSouth witness Cox argues that DAMLs are perfectly acceptable items of network equipment, she concedes that use of DAML lines can result in substandard modem performance. (Cox TR 400, 430) Supra witness Nilson claims that "DAML served loops do not provide all the features, capabilities and functions of a copper loop. DAML electronics have higher failure rates than bare copper, high speed DSL services cannot be provisioned over customer lines served by DAML." (TR 952) In response, BellSouth witness Kephart states that BellSouth has worked with Terayon to support a new card that will not result in a significant impairment to the signal. This card has undergone final testing and is currently being deployed by BellSouth whenever a complaint is logged. (TR 393-394) Staff believes that Supra and its end users will have

fewer complaints if BellSouth provides Supra information in advance when Supra customer lines are switched to DAML-supported lines.

Supra witness Nilson claims that BellSouth should only be allowed to charge Supra the relative portion or fraction of the copper line (enhanced by the deployment of DAML equipment) Supra uses to provide service to its customers. (TR 840) However, staff points out that the argument of Supra witness Nilson fails to consider that the price of BellSouth's UNE loops are not based on actual cost, but on a forward-looking, most efficient network design without regard to the manner in which the customer is actually served today (e.g., copper or digital loop carrier). (Kephart TR 393) According to BellSouth witnesses Cox and Kephart, the current BellSouth loop rates are those approved in Docket No. 990649-TP. (Cox TR 182; Kephart TR 393) In this proceeding the Commission accepted the use of the BellSouth Loop Model (BSTLM) to yield loop costs. The BSTLM incorporates what is often referred to as the "scorched node" assumption (Order No. PSC-01-1181-FOF-TP, p. 120), as required by 47 CFR Section 51.505(b)(1):

The total element long-run incremental cost of an element should be measured based on the use of the most efficient telecommunications technology currently available and the lowest cost network configuration, given the existing location of the incumbent LEC's wire centers.

Under a scorched node analysis, total demand is to be met instantaneously using the least-cost, most efficient technology, constrained only by the location of existing wire centers. Consequently, the network facilities design is optimally sized to meet all demand, and a technology such as DAML would not be deployed; in fact, the BSTLM does not use this technology. Accordingly, since BellSouth's UNE loop rates are based on a least-cost technology, instead of DAML, it would not be appropriate to further discount them. (Kephart TR 431)

Based on these facts, it is clear to staff that the Commission-approved rates for unbundled loops are appropriate and do not require any adjustment to recognize the use of DAML equipment. Staff believes that DAML equipment serves an intended purpose in the timely provisioning of service to end users.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Conclusion

Staff recommends that BellSouth's rate for a loop should not be reduced when the loop utilizes DAML equipment. When changes are to be made to an existing Supra loop that may adversely affect the end user, BellSouth should provide Supra with prior notification.

ISSUE 11A: Under what conditions, if any, should the Interconnection Agreement state that the parties may withhold payment of disputed charges?

ISSUE 11B: Under what conditions, if any, should the Interconnection Agreement state that the parties may withhold payment of undisputed charges?

ISSUE 63: Under what circumstances, if any, would BellSouth be permitted to disconnect service to Supra for nonpayment?

RECOMMENDATION: Both parties should be allowed to withhold payment of charges disputed in good faith during the pendency of the dispute. Neither party should be allowed to withhold payment of undisputed charges. BellSouth should be permitted to disconnect Supra for nonpayment of undisputed charges. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth should be permitted to disconnect service to Supra or any other ALEC that fails to pay undisputed charges within an applicable time period.

SUPRA: The parties should be entitled to offset disputed charges. BellSouth cannot refuse to pay charges due an ALEC or refund past overcharges already paid and force the ALEC to litigation for payment, while requiring an ALEC to pay BellSouth or lose service. This drains ALECs of cash and drives [sic] into bankruptcy. BellSouth cannot use the threat of disconnection while a payment dispute is pending. The appropriate remedy should be determined through dispute resolution.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Issues 11A, 11B, and 63 relate to the parties' abilities to withhold payment during the pendency of a billing dispute and whether the adversely affected party can disconnect the other one for such nonpayment. Staff notes these issues address similar problems and involve substantial overlapping testimony. Therefore, staff believes it is appropriate to address these issues together in order to provide the most thorough analysis.

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Cox asserts both parties should pay undisputed charges regardless of the amount of charges one party disputes from another. (TR 222) In regard to billing disputes, witness Cox states:

BellSouth must be able to deny service in order to obtain payment for services rendered and/or prevent additional past due charges from accruing. It would not be a reasonable business practice for BellSouth to operate "on faith" that an ALEC will pay its bills. Indeed, a business could not remain viable if it were obligated to continue providing services to customers who refuse to pay lawful charges. (TR 223)

Witness Cox points out that BellSouth is seeking to compel the parties only to pay undisputed amounts. (TR 223) ALECs would have little incentive to pay their bills without the threat of disconnection for nonpayment, according to witness Cox. (TR 222) Allowing one party to withhold payment of all charges, not just those that are in dispute, would enable that party to "game" the billing system to delay paying bills. (Cox TR 222) In support of this, BellSouth, on page 12 of its brief, cites the cross-examination testimony of Supra witness Ramos, where he states that Supra has not paid BellSouth for two years. (TR 712)

In addition, witness Cox claims BellSouth's position is consistent with the Commission's recent decision in the BellSouth/WorldCom arbitration proceeding in Docket No. 000649-TP. (TR 223) Witness Cox quotes the Commission as finding that:

BellSouth is within its rights to deny service to customers that fail to pay undisputed amounts within reasonable time frames. Therefore, absent a good faith billing dispute, if payment of account is not received in the applicable time frame, BellSouth shall be permitted to disconnect service to WorldCom for nonpayment.

Order No. PSC-01-0824-FOF-TP at pp. 155-156. As well as being consistent with prior Commission orders, witness Cox claims disconnection for nonpayment is the same policy BellSouth applies to its retail customers. (TR 243)

Finally, witness Cox requests this Commission to consider that the terms and conditions of any agreement it reaches with one ALEC are subject to being adopted by another ALEC. (TR 223) She contends that the FCC's Rule 51.809 requires BellSouth, subject to certain conditions, to allow requesting ALECs to adopt agreements approved by this Commission. (TR 223-24) Therefore, the Commission's decision in this matter has the possibility to govern more than just BellSouth's and Supra's relations. (TR 224) Witness Cox suggests the simple way to resolve this issue is for Supra to pay undisputed amounts within the applicable time frames, and this portion of the agreement will never become an issue. (TR 224)

Supra

Supra witness Ramos adopted the prefiled direct and rebuttal testimony of Supra witness Bentley. Witness Ramos argues that either party should be allowed to offset disputed charges. (TR 670) By offsetting, witness Ramos refers to the practice of withholding payment of undisputed charges in an amount equal to any charges disputed by the billing party during the pendency of a dispute. (TR 670) Offsetting is justified, according to witness Ramos, because the current interconnection agreement covers a business relationship whereby both parties bill and collect from each other, and therefore the billing, payment, collection and dispute processes must take into consideration all aspects of the billing process. (TR 670) He contends this Commission will benefit from reviewing billing, payment, and collections disputes as a whole, rather than on a piecemeal basis. (TR 670)

Witness Ramos cites BellSouth v. ITC Deltacom, 190 F.R.D. 693 (M.D. Ala., 1999) as illustrative of the dangers of viewing billing disputes piecemeal. (TR 670) In ITC DeltaCom, ITC DeltaCom, an ALEC, alleged BellSouth owed it reciprocal compensation for ISP-bound traffic and that it was not able to offset the monies owed against charges from BellSouth. (TR 670) Witness Ramos claims that while ITC Deltacom was able to prevail in the courts after several years of litigation, that was not before facing possible bankruptcy as a result of having to pay BellSouth its bills. (TR 670)

Since BellSouth has deeper pockets and significantly more resources, witness Ramos believes BellSouth is in a position to threaten Supra with a service disconnection during a billing dispute, absent contractual protection. (TR 671) Witness Ramos

states that it is possible for BellSouth to force Supra to make payments to BellSouth, while BellSouth withholds Supra's monies, thereby draining Supra of its financial resources during the pendency of protracted litigation. (TR 671) Witness Ramos alleges that BellSouth should not be allowed to disconnect Supra because Supra cannot similarly threaten BellSouth, a former monopoly provider on which Supra must now rely. (TR 671)

Moreover, witness Ramos maintains it is never appropriate for BellSouth to disconnect service to Supra or Supra's customers at BellSouth's discretion. (TR 680) Such a remedy may only be used as one of last resort, to be granted by an impartial third party such as this Commission, a panel of arbitrators, or a judge. (Ramos TR 680) He contends that if an ALEC's lines are disconnected for more than a few minutes or hours, it could potentially be out of business permanently. (TR 681) Witness Ramos believes this looming and potential threat of disconnection is not good for Florida consumers. (TR 681) The citizens of Florida should not have to worry that their services may be disconnected because their carrier and BellSouth may be engaged in a billing dispute, according to witness Ramos. (TR 681)

Witness Ramos alleges that BellSouth's proposed language on this issue allows BellSouth to act first, then to defend its actions later. (TR 681) He states that the moment BellSouth denies Supra's billing disputes, BellSouth considers the amount no longer in dispute and begins steps to initiate disconnection. (TR 681) Witness Ramos alleges that BellSouth has disconnected Supra without carrying out the required dispute resolution steps outlined in the parties' current agreement. (TR 681) More specifically, witness Ramos refers to May 16, 2000, when allegedly BellSouth disconnected Supra's access to ALEC OSS, and LENS, thereby substantially impairing Supra's ability to provide service its customers. (TR 681) This disconnection lasted three days and nearly put Supra out of business, according to witness Ramos. (TR 682)

While Supra's own tariff permits it to disconnect retail customers for nonpayment, witness Ramos believes this is not relevant to the BellSouth/Supra relationship. (TR 682) He contends this is because consumers throughout the state, rather than just one individual, would be unfairly affected if BellSouth were to wrongly disconnect Supra. (TR 682)

Analysis

As previously stated, these issues address withholding payment during a billing dispute and whether one party can discontinue service for what it considers nonpayment. Supra witness Ramos alleges that BellSouth uses the threat of disconnection to force Supra to pay charges from BellSouth, all the while unreasonably disputing bills rendered by Supra. (TR 670) To make up for this alleged inequity, witness Ramos proposes that the interconnection agreement allow Supra to withhold paying BellSouth an amount equal to the charges from Supra which BellSouth chooses to dispute (offsetting) and require BellSouth to pursue dispute resolution before disconnecting Supra. (TR 670) However, staff believes Supra's proposed remedies would provide little incentive for Supra to pay its bills and that other adequate remedies exist based on the record.

Staff agrees with BellSouth witness Cox that "offsetting" will give ALECs too much of an incentive to delay paying legitimate charges. (TR 222) Staff notes the testimony of Supra witness Ramos during cross examination, where he admits that Supra has not paid BellSouth since January of 2000. (TR 712) Staff believes an ILEC's ability to receive timely payment for undisputed charges is important. This Commission recognized as much when addressing the BellSouth/WorldCom arbitration, in Docket No. 000649, by stating:

BellSouth must be able to deny service in order to obtain payment for services rendered and/or prevent additional past due charges from accruing. It would not be a reasonable business practice for BellSouth to operate "on faith" that an ALEC will pay its bills. Indeed, a business could not remain viable if it were obligated to continue providing services to customers who refuse to pay lawful charges.

Order No. PSC-01-0824-FOF-TP at p. 162. Also, staff believes offsetting would unduly confuse litigation by artificially switching the party seeking relief. Such actions would increase the amount of time required for dispute resolution, and would not be in the interest of ALECs, ILECs and, more importantly, Florida consumers.

Staff also notes that Supra does not allow its retail customers to offset charges, nor does it require dispute resolution

before disconnection of retail customers for nonpayment. (TR 682) This Commission found a company's policies towards its retail customers relevant when considering appropriate billing terms in the past. See Order No. PSC-01-0824-FOF-TP at p. 162. Supra's treatment of its retail customers provides additional justification for allowing BellSouth to disconnect Supra for nonpayment. Staff notes that Supra argues how it treats its retail customers should not be relevant because only one person could be affected unfairly in a billing dispute between a customer and Supra while a multitude of customers could be affected by a dispute between Supra and BellSouth. (TR 681) Staff disagrees with Supra's claim that its billing practices toward retail customers are not relevant, because Supra's own practices directly contradict its claim that offsetting is a widely accepted business practice. Therefore, staff believes Supra's treatment of its retail customers is yet another factor that supports requiring both parties to pay undisputed charges and not allow offsetting.

However, while staff disagrees with Supra about the relevance of its billing practices towards retail customers, it does agree that the effects of the billing disputes are likely to be different. More specifically, a billing dispute between BellSouth and Supra has the potential to unfairly affect customers throughout the state while a dispute with an individual customer does not. (TR 681) Furthermore, staff believes disconnection could likely have devastating business consequences for Supra. However, staff believes Supra can easily avoid disconnection by paying undisputed bills. If BellSouth threatens Supra with disconnection for nonpayment of a bill Supra believes it has legitimate grounds to dispute, Supra could petition this Commission to stay the disconnection on an interim basis. In the worst case scenario, Supra could pay the bill and then seek relief from the Commission to be reimbursed. Staff is confident that if BellSouth were to unreasonably threaten Supra with disconnection for nonpayment, this Commission could take appropriate remedial actions to make sure such conduct did not recur.

Furthermore, staff disagrees with Supra witness Ramos' allegation that Supra lacks a meaningful remedy if BellSouth were to unfairly withhold payment of charges from Supra. Staff believes if BellSouth were to dispute charges from Supra in bad faith, Supra should file a complaint with this Commission. This Commission, staff believes, is more than capable of adequately dealing with such a contingency. While Supra may suffer financial hardship

during a dispute where Supra ultimately prevails and yet this Commission finds BellSouth had a good faith belief to dispute charges, this is the same cost that BellSouth must bear when Supra exercises the same right under the same circumstances.

In conclusion, staff believes Supra's proposed payment terms would provide for little incentive for Supra to pay its bills and that other adequate remedies exist for billing disputes. Therefore, staff recommends this Commission should require both parties to pay all undisputed charges and not permit offsetting as Supra has requested. Further, staff recommends this Commission permit BellSouth to disconnect Supra for nonpayment of undisputed charges.

Conclusion

Both parties should be allowed to withhold payment of charges disputed in good faith during the pendency of the dispute. Neither party should be allowed to withhold payment of undisputed charges. BellSouth should be permitted to disconnect Supra for nonpayment of undisputed charges.

ISSUE 11B: Under what conditions, if any, should the Interconnection Agreement state that the parties may withhold payment of undisputed charges?

RECOMMENDATION: Both parties should be allowed to withhold payment of charges disputed in good faith during the pendency of the dispute. Neither party should be allowed to withhold payment of undisputed charges. BellSouth should be permitted to disconnect Supra for nonpayment of undisputed charges. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth should be permitted to disconnect service to Supra or any other ALEC that fails to pay undisputed charges with the applicable time period.

SUPRA: The parties should be entitled to offset disputed charges. BellSouth cannot refuse to pay charges due an ALEC or refund past overcharges already paid and force the ALEC to litigation for payment, while requiring an ALEC to pay BellSouth or lose service. This drains ALECs of cash and drives [sic] into bankruptcy.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff addresses this issue under 11A because it poses a similar, interrelated question and there is significant overlapping testimony.

ISSUE 12: Should BellSouth be required to provide transport to Supra Telecom if that transport crosses LATA boundaries?

RECOMMENDATION: No. BellSouth should not be required to provide transport to Supra Telecom if that transport crosses LATA boundaries. (TURNER)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: A plain reading of Section 271 of the Act reveals that BellSouth is prohibited from providing interLATA facilities or services to Supra or any other carrier.

SUPRA: Nothing, other than BellSouth, prevents Supra from providing unrestricted service across LATA boundaries. As such, Supra should be allowed to do so through the use of UNES. Therefore, BellSouth's refusal to allow Supra access to the transport UNE across LATA boundaries is a refusal to allow access to BellSouth's network.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The issue presented before the Commission for resolution is to determine whether BellSouth is required to provide interoffice transport, via UNES leased to Supra, when that transport crosses LATA boundaries. The dispute as framed appears to be a legal matter involving the parties' differing interpretations of Section 271(a) of the 1996 Act which specifically states:

GENERAL LIMITATION - Neither a Bell operating company, nor any affiliate of a Bell operating company, may provide interLATA service except as provided within this section.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Cox contends that Section 271 of the Act prohibits BellSouth or any of its affiliates from providing interLATA facilities or services to Supra or any other carrier prior to receiving authorization from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). (TR 184-185) She explains that the only interLATA services BellSouth is authorized to provide without FCC approval are out-of-region services and incidental services, neither of which applies to the DS1 interoffice transport requested by Supra. (TR 225)

Supra witness Nilson argues that Section 271 of the Act does not prohibit Supra from providing interLATA services as it does BellSouth. As such, witness Nilson believes that Supra should be allowed to provide interLATA services through the use of UNEs. Witness Nilson's claim is based upon his interpretation of Section 271(a) of the Act in which he argues that although BellSouth is itself precluded from providing services to its end users across LATA boundaries, it is not specifically precluded from "wholesaling such services to other carriers." (TR 841) He states that "the intent of the Act is clearly explained to give a CLEC access to local, intraLATA and interLATA interoffice facilities." (TR 842) (Emphasis in original) Moreover, witness Nilson reasons that interoffice transport is a UNE and that a CLEC's right to unbundled interoffice transport has been fully upheld. Accordingly, once that UNE is leased to Supra, Supra assumes exclusive rights to the use of that element. Thus, Supra, as a facilities-based provider, would be deemed as providing the transport across LATA boundaries, not BellSouth. Witness Nilson further propounds that "(B)ellSouth's only role would be providing wholesale elements to a carrier, not prohibited retail service to an end-user." (TR 844)

Witness Nilson maintains that this interpretation is consistent with FCC Order 96-325, ¶449, which states in part:

...the ability of a new entrant to obtain unbundled access to incumbent LECs' interoffice facilities, including those facilities that carry interLATA traffic, is essential to that competitor's ability to provide competing telephone service. (TR 841)

Further, 47 C.F.R. § 51.309(b) specifies:

(A) telecommunications carrier purchasing access to an unbundled network element may use such network element to provide exchange access services to itself in order to provide interexchange services to subscribers. (TR 843)

Additionally, witness Nilson explains that the FCC in FCC Order 96-325 at ¶356, concluded that Section § 251(c)(3) permits all telecommunications carriers, including interexchange carriers, to purchase UNEs for the purpose of offering exchange access services or to provide exchange access services to themselves in order to provide interexchange services to consumers. (TR 844) Further, he states:

In ¶440, the FCC concluded that ILECs must provide interoffice facilities between central offices, not limit facilities to which such interoffice facilities are connected, allow a competitor (ALEC) to use an interoffice facility to connect to an ILEC's switch, provide unbundled access to shared transmission facilities between end offices and the tandem switch, as well as transmission capabilities such as DS1. (TR 844)

Therefore, in witness Nilson's view, "BellSouth's refusal to provide Supra with interoffice transport, is a refusal to provide Supra with the Services and Elements contained in the Agreement and required by the FCC's First Report and Order, ¶¶342 to 365." (TR 845)

BellSouth witness Cox acknowledges that the interoffice transport requested by Supra is a UNE. However, she maintains that BellSouth is still prohibited from providing this transport across LATA boundaries. Moreover, witness Cox states, "[S]ection 271(a) of the Act provides no qualification of the nature of the service, whether retail or wholesale, in the phrase 'interLATA services'." (TR 225)

Analysis

The issue, as stated previously, is framed as a legal matter in which the parties have differing interpretations of Section 271(a) of the Act. Both parties appear to agree that the DS1 interoffice transport that Supra requests is an unbundled network element (UNE). However, the parties disagree as to whether BellSouth is obligated to provide interoffice transport between BellSouth central offices, across LATA boundaries. (Cox TR 225, 270; Nilson TR 954-955)

BellSouth witness Cox maintains that BellSouth is prohibited, pursuant to Section 271(a), from providing interLATA services to any carrier. (TR 224-225) On the other hand, Supra witness Nilson goes to great length to argue that the Act's intent is to give CLECs access to the incumbent's local, intraLATA and interLATA interoffice facilities. (TR 841-845) Supra contends that its request for interLATA interoffice transport is consistent with the Act and the FCC's First Report and Order, which states that "the ability of a new entrant to obtain unbundled access to incumbent LECs' interoffice facilities, including those facilities that carry

interLATA traffic, is essential to that competitor's ability to provide competing telephone service." (Nilson TR 841; TR 954-955)

While staff agrees that DS1 interoffice transport is an unbundled network element (UNE) that the incumbent is obligated to provide, staff is not persuaded that Supra's request for BellSouth to provide interoffice transport across LATA boundaries is consistent with Section 271 of the Act. In particular, staff is dissuaded by witness Nilson's argument that if DS1 interoffice transport were leased from BellSouth by Supra (as a facilities-based carrier) via UNEs, and provided across LATA boundaries, that Supra would be deemed as providing the interLATA service. (TR 844) In other words, staff agrees with witness Cox's argument that BellSouth would still be providing interLATA transport to Supra, and hence an "interLATA service." (TR 269)

Furthermore, staff is not convinced that BellSouth "terribly confuses its prohibition from offering interLATA services directly to end users, and leasing network facilities to another carrier." (Nilson TR 842) Staff disagrees with Supra's interpretation of BellSouth's obligations under Section 271(a) with regard to providing "interLATA services." Specifically, staff notes that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 defines "interLATA services" in the following manner:

InterLATA service: The term "interLATA service" means telecommunications between a point located in a local access and transport area and a point located outside such area.

Thus, staff concurs that no qualification of services, whether retail service to end users or wholesale service to other carriers, is provided for in the phrase "interLATA services." While staff believes that the record supports BellSouth's position on this issue, staff notes that this issue may warrant further investigation. Particularly, it may be unclear as to whether or not the Telecommunications Act's definition of "telecommunications" differentiates between service to an end-user and service provided to a carrier. Nonetheless, based on the record, staff agrees with BellSouth witness Cox, that the plain language of Section 271(a) specifically precludes BellSouth from providing interLATA services to any carrier and, consequently, finds no basis for requiring BellSouth to provide interoffice transport to Supra across LATA boundaries. (Cox TR 184-185)

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, staff recommends that BellSouth should not be required to provide transport to Supra Telecom if that transport crosses LATA boundaries.

ISSUE 15: What Performance Measurements should be included in the Interconnection Agreement?

RECOMMENDATION: Staff acknowledges Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP, in the generic Performance Measurements docket, Docket No. 000121-TP, established appropriate performance measurements applicable to BellSouth in the state of Florida. These measurements and BellSouth's forthcoming performance assessment plan will apply to BellSouth only. Staff does not believe that it is necessary to include those performance measurements in the parties' interconnection agreement, although the parties may choose to do so. (T. BROWN)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: This issue will be decided in Docket No. 000121-TP. The Commission convened that proceeding to consider the very issues Supra seeks to arbitrate in this docket. The generic docket is the appropriate vehicle for all interested parties to collaborate on the set of performance measures appropriate in Florida.

SUPRA: BellSouth must provide Supra with the same or better service. The performance measurements in the prior agreement have practical standards, directly related to how quickly BellSouth must provision service to Supra. With a different set of standards, BellSouth must provide effective performance measurements.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The issue before the Commission is to determine which performance measures should be included in the parties' Interconnection Agreement.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Cox asserts that this issue should not be addressed in the current proceeding. (TR 188) Witness Cox believes that the Commission's generic Performance Measurements docket, Docket No. 000121-TP, addresses the very issues raised by Supra. (TR 188, 292) As such, witness Cox contends that:

[t]his generic docket is the appropriate vehicle for collaborating on the performance measures appropriate to the ALEC industry in Florida. Performance measures

should not be decided in individual ALEC arbitration proceedings. Since all ALECs in Florida, including Supra, had the opportunity to participate in this docket, this Commission should require Supra to abide by the Commission's decision in the generic performance measurement docket. (TR 189-190)

BellSouth witness Cox asserts that this issue is directly addressed in the generic docket. (TR 188) In support of this assertion, witness Cox offers several issues from that docket that relate to Supra's concerns:

Issues from Docket No. 000121-TP that pertain to measurements:

Issue 1.a: What are the appropriate service quality measures to be reported by BellSouth?

Issue 1.b: What are the appropriate business rules, exclusions, calculations, and levels of disaggregation and performance standards for each measurement? (TR 188-189)

Supra witness Ramos contends that "Supra wants to have a clear performance measurement included in the parties' agreement." (TR 707) In an effort to increase clarity, effectiveness, and parity, witness Ramos states:

Supra proposes the establishment of Performance Measures for pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, billing, maintenance, systems performance and quality of service provided. As a rule, all measures should be a comparison of like activities between the ILEC and ALEC. (TR 673)

In addition, "Supra further proposes that the Performance Measures should include standard and/or targeted achievement levels." (Ramos TR 673) He also asserts that:

Supra's past experience with BellSouth on this matter is that BellSouth consistently and repeatedly acts in bad faith. The SQMs that are part of the parties' existing Agreement and the Interim Performance Metrics proposed by BellSouth are inadequate. At first glance, the metrics proposed seem quite extensive, however upon more thorough

examination it is apparent that BellSouth has no intention of measuring the metrics that have the most bearing on ALECs. (Ramos TR 672)

In addressing the Commission's generic docket and BellSouth's assertions, Supra witness Ramos states that "Supra is unwilling to waive its rights by agreeing now, to comply with some unknown outcome of ongoing or future proceedings concerning Performance Measurements." (TR 671-672, 708) Supra argues that many of the pre-ordering and ordering performance measures Supra is requesting would be unnecessary if BellSouth would simply provide direct access to its OSS. (TR 673) Furthermore, witness Ramos asserts "that the performance measurements should include standards and/or targeted achievement levels." (TR 673) He goes on to state that "to go through the exercise of measuring and reporting if there is no attempt to reach parity or agreed upon standards" would be pointless. (TR 673) In lieu of the generic docket's performance measurements, witness Ramos proposes nineteen performance measures that would apparently address Supra's concerns. (TR 674-675) Those measures would compare the performance of BellSouth's retail operations to BellSouth's performance when handling Supra's orders. (TR 674) Supra also requests that the related measurement reports be e-mailed to Supra on a monthly basis. (TR 675)

Staff's Analysis

When addressing which performance measurements should be included in the agreement, Supra witness Ramos, adopting the testimony of Carol Bentley, asserts that performance measurements "are of an utmost concern to Supra." (TR 671) He goes on to state, "the fact that these dockets and/or proceedings are pending provides further weight to the importance of Performance Measurements." (Ramos TR 674) Staff does not dispute the importance of performance measurements and reiterates that:

[p]erformance monitoring is necessary to ensure that ILECs are meeting their obligation to provide unbundled access, interconnection and resale to ALECs in a nondiscriminatory manner. Additionally, it establishes a standard against which ALECs and this Commission can measure performance over time to detect and correct any degradation of service provided to ALECs. (Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP, p.7)

Staff notes that the measurement categories proposed by Supra are similar to those contained in the Commission's order, which states:

[t]he major measurement categories are preordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing. In addition, the following categories are also included: operator service and directory assistance, database information, E911, trunk group performance, collocation, and change management. (Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP, p.9)

Based on the record, Supra did not review the metrics established in the generic docket, issued September 10, 2001, to determine whether the metrics specified therein satisfied any of Supra's demands. (TR 705, 706, 708) Staff believes that Supra's concerns have been adequately addressed in the Commission's generic Performance Measurements Docket. Staff does not believe that any additional set of performance measures that might be developed in this, or any other, individual arbitration proceeding is necessary. As such, staff believes that the generic docket is the proper venue for identification and implementation of performance measurements.

Staff agrees with BellSouth that the question of performance measurements before the Commission in this arbitration, was addressed in the generic docket. The generic Performance Measurements Docket was designed "to develop permanent performance metrics for the ongoing evaluation of operational support systems (OSS). . ." and includes a monitoring and enforcement program to eliminate concerns over nondiscriminatory access to the ILEC's OSS. (Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP, p.7) That order also specifies that the measurement reports be posted to BellSouth's website by a specified due date. (Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP, p.130) Although the end results may differ somewhat from Supra's proposal, staff believes that the conclusions reached in the generic docket adequately address Supra's concerns.

Conclusion

Staff acknowledges that the generic Performance Measurements docket, Docket No. 000121-TP, established the appropriate performance measurements applicable to BellSouth. The resulting measurements, as approved by the FPSC in Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP, and BellSouth's forthcoming performance assessment plan, will apply to BellSouth only. BellSouth has no option but to abide by

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

them and as such, staff does not believe that it is necessary to include those performance measurement metrics in the parties' interconnection agreement, although the parties may choose to do so.

ISSUE 16: Under what conditions, if any, may BellSouth refuse to provide service under the terms of the interconnection agreement?

RECOMMENDATION: BellSouth should not be required to provision services for which rates, terms and conditions are not identified in the interconnection agreement, prior to negotiating and executing an amendment. (TURNER)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: In order to incorporate new or different terms, conditions or rates into the parties Agreement, it is imperative that an Amendment be executed. The 1996 Act requires that BellSouth and ALECs operate pursuant to filed and approved interconnection agreements.

SUPRA: BellSouth cannot refuse to provide services ordered by Supra under any circumstances. If the services have not yet been priced under the agreement or by the Commission, BellSouth must provide the services, and bill Supra retroactively once the prices have been set by the Commission or negotiated by the parties.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The issue presented before the Commission for resolution is to determine the conditions under which BellSouth can refuse to provide services to Supra under the parties' interconnection agreement. Specifically, the dispute centers around whether or not BellSouth should be required to provide services to Supra when those services are not identified in the interconnection agreement.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Cox testifies that her company's position is that in order to incorporate new or different terms, conditions or rates into the parties' agreement, an amendment must be executed. She explains that "[W]hen an ALEC notifies BellSouth that it wishes to add something to or modify something in its Agreement, BellSouth negotiates an Amendment with that ALEC if the agreement has not expired." (TR 227) According to witness Cox, this is not only BellSouth's policy, but the Act requires that BellSouth and ALECs operate under filed and approved interconnection agreements. (TR 227)

Witness Cox believes that BellSouth's position, with regard to requiring amendments to agreements, is also supported by Order No. PSC-01-1181-FOF-TP, p. 473, issued May 25, 2001, in Docket No. 990649-TP, wherein the Commission states:

Therefore, upon consideration, we find that it is appropriate for the rates to become effective when the interconnection agreements are amended to reflect the approved UNE rates and the amended agreement is approved by us. (TR 191)

According to witness Cox, except in specific instances where the Commission orders otherwise (such as the Order in Docket 990649-TP), the Amendment becomes effective when it is signed by both parties, and thereby acts as BellSouth's authority to effectuate any required billing changes. (TR 192)

Moreover, witness Cox believes that given the Commission order in Docket No. 990649-TP, "there will never be a case where BellSouth provides a service to Supra that is not part of its Interconnection Agreement." (TR 228) She further argues that not to include all of the services that BellSouth provides to Supra in its interconnection agreement, as Supra requests, circumvents the "pick and choose" opportunity of other ALECs. In addition she states, "if BellSouth did provide services to Supra not covered by the agreement, there would be no language to turn to in cases of a dispute over what was provided or how it was provided." (TR 228)

Supra witness Ramos argues that under the terms of an interconnection agreement, BellSouth should not, under any circumstance, refuse to provide any service requested by Supra, regardless of whether or not the service is addressed in the parties' agreement. (TR 549, 637) He states that "such services should be provided at the time of the request and that for new items, elements or service [sic], upon Supra's acceptance of a relevant and reasonable cost study, the prices should be applied retroactively." (TR 637) Witness Ramos likens this scenario to that of the concept of "true-ups" as applied to ALECs seeking to collocate equipment in BellSouth central offices. (TR 637)

In his testimony, witness Ramos affirms that the Follow-On Agreement should be a substantially complete agreement, "subject only to amendments negotiated by the parties or mandated by law and regulatory authorities," and that Supra would do its best to

identify all services and elements for which no rate has been established. However, he believes that to the extent that some rates are left out or not determined at the time the agreement is executed, Supra's request is reasonable, and "would be in the best interests of Florida's consumers, as they would not have to wait for the parties to arbitrate additional rates before being provided with a competitive service." (TR 550) He further explains the procedure by which services should be provisioned when those services are not identified in the Agreement prior to execution:

If a rate is not provided in the Follow-On Agreement for a service, item or element, and that service, item or element could not reasonably be identified prior to execution (of the Follow-On Agreement), then BellSouth must provide that service, item or element without any additional compensation. This includes components of any service, item or element for which there are cost studies or for which it can be reasonably concluded that BellSouth is compensated for the component within the cost of the entire service, item or element.

If the Follow-On Agreement does not directly address a service, item or element, but that service, item or element is necessary to provide a service, item or element directly addressed by the Follow-On Agreement, then BellSouth must provide that service, item or element without additional compensation if cost studies show or one could reasonable [sic] conclude that the cost of the service, item or element not addressed is included in the cost of the service, item or element addressed in the Follow-On Agreement.

Finally, if the Follow-On Agreement does not address a new service, item or element and new contract terms are necessary, then BellSouth must still provide that service, item or element; but, if the parties cannot expediently negotiate a new amendment, and must proceed according to the dispute resolution process in the Follow-On Agreement to resolve the terms of the new amendment [sic]. However, absent a Commission order, BellSouth should not be able to refuse to provide the service, item or element while the parties are resolving the new amendment. The new amendment should be applied

retroactively to the date the service is first provisioned. (TR 551-552)

Witness Ramos believes that language must be included in the agreement to provide an incentive for BellSouth to provision services requested by Supra. Moreover, he contends that the need for language providing incentive for ILEC compliance is evidenced in FCC Order 01-204 in Docket No. 98-147. In his testimony, witness Ramos states:

With respect to collocation issues, the FCC affirmatively stated that "[they] recognize that an incumbent LEC has powerful incentives that, left unchecked, may influence it to allocate space in a manner inconsistent with [its] duty." (Id. at paragraph 92) and, "...incumbents also have incentives to overstate security concerns so as to limit physical collocation arrangements and discourage competition." Id. at paragraph 102. This language properly reflects the FCC's conclusions that ILECs require incentives in order to ensure compliance with the Act." (Emphasis in original) (TR 636)

Witness Ramos further alleges that BellSouth seeks to use the amendment process as a tactic to hinder and delay provisioning of services which Supra requests under the agreement. He believes that BellSouth's position that the "Amendment will become effective when signed by both parties" allows BellSouth to "put off the adoption of more favorable terms until the longest date possible." (TR 635) In his testimony, he explains the basis for his allegations:

(U)nder the parties' various agreements, BellSouth would often refuse to provide Supra with requested services, claiming that the agreements did not provide for a certain rate, and therefore, until the parties agreed to a rate or the parties reached an arbitrated rate, BellSouth would continue to deny the requested services. (TR 549-550)

Further, with respect to Supra's attempts to adopt the "comparative advertising" provision contained in the Mpower Interconnection Agreement, witness Ramos testifies:

Although Supra requested the right to adopt that provision via correspondence dated October 6, 2000 (**Supra Exhibit OAR 41**), BellSouth has never responded, and has instead chosen to ignore Supra's request. (Emphasis in original) (TR 635; EXH 18, OAR-41)

In response to BellSouth witness Cox's testimony that an amendment must be executed in order to incorporate new or different terms, conditions or rates into the parties' agreement, witness Ramos retorts that any time Supra would request an amendment to the current agreement, BellSouth insisted that before it (BellSouth) could agree to the amendment, Supra would have to delete an entire Attachment. According to witness Ramos, the most recent example of this practice was evidenced in Supra's request to amend the parties' agreement to incorporate rates pursuant to Order No. PSC-01-1181-FOF-TP, in Docket 990649-TP. Witness Ramos recounts:

On July 12, 2001, I spoke with Mr. Greg Follensbee, BellSouth's lead negotiator who told me that "BellSouth objects strongly to Supra's amendment request" and "promised to send a formal response explaining BellSouth's objections." See **Supra Exhibit OAR 76**, letter dated July 23, 2001 to Mr. Follensbee. Mr. Follensbee replied to my letters dated July 11 and 23, 2001 via his misdated letter dated July 19, 2001. See attached **Supra Exhibit OAR 77**, In his response, Mr. Follensbee stated that:

In order to provide those rates, it will be necessary to replace the existing attachment 2 with a new attachment 2 that incorporates the terms and conditions that coincide with the new rates. (TR 634; Emphasis in original)

Consequently, witness Ramos holds that if BellSouth's position is accepted, then BellSouth would have no incentive to provide services requested by Supra, and could "delay executing an amendment indefinitely." (TR 635)

Analysis

As stated previously, the issue as addressed by the parties appears to center around BellSouth's obligations with regard to the provisioning of services not identified in the Agreement prior to

its execution. Supra witness Ramos makes several allegations involving what he believes to be BellSouth's use of its amendment process to delay and hinder the provisioning of services which Supra requests under the interconnection agreement or seeks to adopt under its right to "pick and choose" more favorable terms. (TR 549-550, 635-636) He strongly believes that the language of the follow-on agreement must provide an incentive for BellSouth to comply with the terms of the agreement with respect to amending the agreement and provisioning services requested by Supra. (TR 635-636) Staff notes that BellSouth did not respond in the record to any of the allegations made by Supra.

Staff acknowledges Supra's concerns, as expressed by witness Ramos, regarding delays in adopting more favorable terms and conditions. (TR 635-636) Although outside the record evidence of this issue, staff notes that, post-hearing, the Parties have agreed to BellSouth's proposed language in resolution of Issue 44 with respect to Supra's adoption of rates, terms and conditions found in other agreements pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252. Staff observes that the agreed upon language requires the parties to amend the current agreement within 30 days of Supra's request, or in the event of a dispute, within 30 days of any determination made through the Dispute Resolution Process as set forth in the agreement. (EXH 7, JAR-1) Staff notes that this language appears to be responsive to Supra's concern in this regard.

In any event, staff believes that the fundamental issue is whether or not BellSouth is legally bound by terms and conditions not specifically expressed or stated in the parties' interconnection agreement. Supra witness Ramos acknowledges that "the Follow-On Agreement should be a substantially complete agreement, subject only to amendments negotiated by the parties or mandated by law and regulatory authorities." (TR 634-635) At the same time, however, he contends that to the extent rates are left out or not identified at the time the agreement is implemented, BellSouth should provide those services at the time of request and then negotiate the amendment, applying the negotiated rates retroactively. (TR 550-552, 634-635, 637)

Staff is not persuaded by Supra witness Ramos' argument. Staff notes that Section 252 of the Act lays out the process by which parties are to negotiate interconnection agreements which govern the parties' relationship. In particular Section 252(a)(1) states in part:

Upon receiving a request for interconnection, services, or network elements pursuant to section 251, an incumbent local exchange carrier may negotiate and enter into a binding agreement with the requesting telecommunications carrier or carriers without regard to the standards set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 251. **The agreement shall include a detailed schedule of itemized charges for interconnection and each service or network element included in the agreement.** The agreement...shall be submitted to the State commission under subsection (e) of this section. (Emphasis added)

Further, Section 252(e)(1) states:

Any interconnection agreement adopted by negotiation or arbitration shall be submitted for approval to the State commission. A State commission to which an agreement is submitted shall approve or reject the agreement, with written findings as to any deficiencies. (Emphasis added)

As such, staff concurs with BellSouth witness Cox that the 1996 Telecom Act requires BellSouth and ALECs to operate under approved interconnection agreements. (TR 227) Further, staff believes, as does witness Cox, that requiring amendments to agreements in order to effect changes or additions is consistent with Order No. PSC-01-1181-FOF-TP, in Docket No. 990649-TP, in which the Commission states that "it is appropriate for the rates to become effective when the interconnection agreements are amended to reflect the approved UNE rates and the amended agreement is approved by us." (TR 191)

Moreover, as stated by both parties, ALECs are entitled to "pick and choose" more favorable terms from other interconnection agreements. (Cox TR 228; Ramos TR 635) Staff believes, as does BellSouth witness Cox, that to provide services to Supra when those services are not identified in the parties' interconnection agreement, circumvents the "pick and choose" entitlement due other ALECs, and constitutes a discriminatory practice. (Cox TR 228) In addition, staff is persuaded by BellSouth witness Cox's argument that "if BellSouth did provide services to Supra not covered by the agreement, there would be no language to turn to in case of a dispute over what was provided or how it was provided." (TR 228) Given the parties' prior relationship and apparent inability to negotiate the most straightforward terms and conditions of the

previous agreement(s), staff believes that it is imperative that the rates, terms and conditions governing the parties' contractual relationship in the Follow-On Agreement be clearly and unambiguously defined.

Finally, staff concludes that the record does not reflect that BellSouth is legally obligated to provide services not agreed to in the parties' interconnection agreement without executing an amendment, and thus finds no basis upon which the Commission should compel such a requirement.

Conclusion

Given the evidence presented in the record of this proceeding, staff recommends that BellSouth should not be required to provision services for which rates, terms and conditions are not identified in the interconnection agreement, prior to negotiating and executing an amendment.

ISSUE 18: What are the appropriate rates for the following services, items or elements set forth in the proposed Interconnection Agreement?

- (A) Resale
- (B) Network Elements
- (C) Interconnection
- (D) Collocation
- (E) LNP/INP
- (F) Billing Records
- (G) Other

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the appropriate rates to be set forth in the Interconnection Agreement for (B) Network Elements, (C) Interconnection, (E) LNP/INP, (F) Billing Records, and (G) Other are those ordered in Docket No 990649-TP, and in Docket No. 000649-TP (specifically for line-sharing). For the network elements for which rates have not been established by this Commission, the rates should be BellSouth's tariffed rates, which should not be subject to true-up. (J-E. BROWN)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: The rates the Commission established in its May 25, 2001 Order in Docket No. 990649-TP are the rates that should be incorporated into the Agreement. For collocation rates and other rates not addressed in that docket, BellSouth's tariffed rates, which are cost-based, should be incorporated into the Agreement. With regard to line sharing, the rates the Commission established in the MCI arbitration decision (Docket No. 000649-TP) should be incorporated into Supra's Agreement.

SUPRA: The rates set forth in the Interconnection Agreement should be those rates already established by the FCC and this Commission in current and/or prior proceedings. To the extent neither the FCC or this commission has established such rates, the rates should be those set forth in the current Interconnection Agreement between the parties.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This issue considers what rates are appropriate for the following services, items, or elements to be set forth in the Interconnection Agreement. Initially, the list consisted of: (A) Resale, (B) Network Elements, (C) Interconnection, (D) Collocation, (E) LNP/INP, (F) Billing Records, and (G) Other.

Subsequent to the hearing, both sides settled on (A) Resale and (D) Collocation rates. (BellSouth BR at 15; Supra BR at 10) Accordingly, the rates to be addressed in this recommendation are: (B) Network Elements, (C) Interconnection, (E) LNP/INP, (F) Billing Records, and (G) Other.

Arguments

Staff notes that BellSouth witness Cox adopted the direct testimony of BellSouth witness Ruscilli. (TR 169) Witness Cox believes that the Commission-established rates in Docket No. 990649-TP and Docket No. 000649-TP (specifically for line-sharing) should be incorporated into the Agreement. For those rates not addressed in these dockets, the witness believes that its tariffed rates should be incorporated into the Agreement. (Cox TR 194) Witness Cox states:

BellSouth's position on these issues is that the rates the Commission established in its May 25, 2001 Order in Docket No. 990649-TP are the rates that should be incorporated into the Agreement. Of course, while that docket established cost-based rates for the vast majority of elements, including conversion of tariffed services to UNEs or UNE combinations, there are a few elements that were not addressed in that docket. (TR 194)

For those elements that were not addressed in Docket No. 990649-TP, BellSouth witness Cox proposes that BellSouth's tariffed rates, which are cost-based, be incorporated into the Agreement. (TR 194) For line-sharing, witness Cox proposes that "the rates this Commission established in the MCI arbitration decisions [sic] be incorporated into Supra's Agreement." (TR 194)

Supra, on the other hand, proffered at least two different positions. First, in his direct testimony, Supra witness Ramos states the rates should be those set forth in the parties' current agreement. (TR 556) Second, in his rebuttal testimony, witness Ramos states the parties should negotiate the rates for such items. (TR 639) Then, in its post-hearing brief, Supra attempted to clarify this issue. Supra witness Ramos believes that the rates in the "follow-on agreement" should be those rates established by this Commission in recent or prior proceedings. (TR 556) In particular, the Florida generic UNE Docket, No. 990649-TP, provides Supra and all other ALECs with rates for most of the network elements

identified in this issue. In its brief, Supra further adds that it wishes to opt into the terms and conditions associated with line sharing contained in the MCI/BellSouth agreement which was approved by this Commission in Docket No. 000649-TP. (Supra BR at 11-12) However, Supra contends all interim rates, until made permanent by this Commission, should be subject to true-up. Accordingly, for the network elements where the generic UNE Docket did not establish a rate, Supra seeks to use BellSouth's proposed rates from the SGAT in BellSouth's 271 filing in Docket Number 960786A-TL as interim rates. (Supra BR at 11-12)

Analysis

Based on the testimony and post-hearing briefs of the parties it appears that BellSouth and Supra actually have similar views on the rates in this issue. The only exception is the rates which Supra wishes to designate as interim rates subject to true-up. Staff believes that this issue has been substantially narrowed to include the network elements for which rates have been established by this Commission and the network elements for which rates have not been established. Since the parties appear to agree on a majority of the "items" in this issue staff believes that the rates established by this Commission in Docket Nos. 990649-TP and 000649-TP are the appropriate rates for (B) Network Elements, (C) Interconnection, (E) LNP/INP, (F) Billing Records¹², and (G) Other¹³. (Cox TR 193; Ramos TR 556)

With regard to those elements for which rates have not been previously established by this Commission, staff believes that the rates proposed by BellSouth are reasonable. As suggested by BellSouth witness Cox, for those elements not addressed in the aforementioned dockets, BellSouth's tariffed rates should be incorporated into the agreement. (TR 194) Supra witness Ramos

¹² Although there is no discussion as to specific billing records, staff presumes the items intended to be addressed are Access Daily Usage File (ADUF), Optional Daily Usage File (ODUF), and Enhanced Optional Daily Usage File, for which rates have been established by this Commission in Docket No. 990649-TP.

¹³ Although there is no discussion as to a specific "other" network element(s) by either party, staff presumes the item intended to be addressed is line-sharing, for which rates were established by this Commission in Docket No. 000649-TP.

suggested in his direct testimony that the rates for the unaddressed elements should be taken from an expired agreement, while in rebuttal testimony, he argued that the parties should negotiate the rates for such items. Due to the apparently conflicting testimony, staff is unable to determine what specific items are being referenced and is therefore unable to justify why these items should be subject to true-up. (Ramos TR 556, 639)

While narrowing this issue, neither party specified which elements of concern were not addressed in Docket Nos. 000649-TP and 990649-TP. Due to the history of these parties' relationship as reflected in the record, staff does not, however, believe that a consensus is likely to be reached by them regarding network element rates which this Commission has yet to establish. Accordingly, staff notes that under the provisions of the Act, Supra is free to opt into the terms and conditions of an agreement or any portion of an agreement that may offer it more favorable rates, such as the line-sharing rates approved by this Commission in the MCI/BellSouth arbitration in Docket No. 000649-TP. (Section 252(i))

Conclusion

Staff strongly believes that if both parties had put the same thought and effort into resolving this issue as was placed in drafting post-hearing briefs, an agreement could have been reached on this issue in its entirety. Staff believes the proposals Supra made in its testimony were not supported by the record. Therefore, in the absence of record support to the contrary, staff recommends that the appropriate rates to be set forth in the Interconnection Agreement for (B) Network Elements, (C) Interconnection, (E) LNP/INP, (F) Billing Records, and (G) Other should be those established in Docket No 990649-TP, and in Docket No. 000649-TP (specifically for line-sharing). For the network elements for which rates have not been previously established by this Commission, the rates should be BellSouth's tariffed rates, which should not be subject to true-up.

ISSUE 19: Should calls to Internet Service Providers be treated as local traffic for the purposes of reciprocal compensation?

RECOMMENDATION: The FPSC currently lacks the jurisdiction to address the issue of whether calls to ISPs should be treated as local traffic for the purposes of reciprocal compensation. (BARRETT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: This issue cannot be arbitrated in this proceeding.

SUPRA: ISP calls should be treated as local traffic for purposes of reciprocal compensation. AT&T (sic) still incurs the cost of the ISP Traffic over its network. Additionally, such calls are treated as local under BellSouth's tariffs and the FCC has treated ISP Traffic as intrastate for jurisdictional separation purposes.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This issue considers the treatment of calls to Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and whether such calls should be treated as local traffic for the purposes of reciprocal compensation.

Argument

Supra witness Nilson asserts that the FCC's April 27, 2001 order, FCC 01-131, is significant to this issue, but also believes that BellSouth is acting in bad faith and misrepresenting the findings of FCC 01-131. (TR 956, 1024) The witness attests:

BellSouth is expecting Supra to adopt language that would forgo the interim measures ordered by the FCC in favor of the language that represents where the FCC would like to be on this issue in the future. While we have guidance from the FCC on the future, we have clear and effective orders from the FCC that reciprocal compensation be paid for ISP-bound traffic in the interim. (Nilson TR 956)

In ¶82 of FCC 01-131, the witness believes that the FCC has exercised its right to set a national rate for this traffic while preventing state commissions from setting a different rate. (Nilson TR 956) Witness Nilson asserts, "[t]he FCC has done nothing that prevents a state commission from ordering the FCC rates into

specific interconnection agreements." (TR 956) Paragraph 82 of FCC 01-131 states:

82. The interim compensation regime we establish here applies as carriers re-negotiate expired or expiring interconnection agreements. It does not alter existing contractual obligations, except to the extent that parties are entitled to invoke contractual change-of-law provisions. This order does not preempt any state commission decision regarding compensation for ISP-bound traffic for the period prior to the effective date of the interim regime we adopt here. Because we now exercise our authority under section 201 to determine the appropriate intercarrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic, however, state commissions will no longer have authority to address this issue. For this reason, as of the date this Order is published in the Federal Register, carriers may no longer invoke section 252(i) to opt into an existing interconnection agreement with regard to the rates paid for the exchange of ISP-bound traffic. Section 252(i) applies only to agreements arbitrated or approved by state commissions pursuant to section 252; it has no application in the context of an intercarrier compensation regime set by this Commission pursuant to section 201. (Footnotes omitted) (TR 956-957)

The witness asserts that the specific rates that Supra is seeking are found in ¶98 of FCC 01-131. (Nilson TR 958) In part, ¶98 of FCC 01-131 states:

The Commission exercises jurisdiction over ISP-bound traffic pursuant to section 201, and establishes a three-year interim intercarrier compensation mechanism for the exchange of ISP-bound traffic that applies if incumbent LECs offer to exchange section 251(b)(5) traffic at the same rates. During this interim period, intercarrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic is subject to a rate cap that declines over a three-year period, from \$.0015/mou [minutes of use] to \$.0007/mou. (TR 958)

In its Brief, Supra states that it "seeks that the follow-on agreement reflect current FCC rulings and Part 51, Subpart H of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) as adopted on April 18, 2001." (Supra BR p. 12)

BellSouth categorically believes that the subject matter of this issue is one that state commissions no longer have the authority to address. (Cox TR 186, BellSouth BR p. 16) Witness Cox asserts that for all practical purposes, the FCC recently resolved this issue when it issued its Order on Remand and Report and Order, FCC 01-131. (TR 186) The witness states:

In this Order [FCC 01-131], the FCC affirmed its earlier conclusion that ISP-bound traffic is predominantly interstate access traffic that is not subject to reciprocal compensation obligations of section 251(b)(5) but is within the jurisdiction of the FCC under section 201 of the Act. [FCC 01-131 at ¶1] The FCC made it clear that because it has now exercised its authority under section 201 to determine the appropriate intercarrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic, state commissions no longer have the authority to address this issue. [FCC 01-131 at ¶82] (Cox TR 186)

BellSouth concludes that the FPSC does not have jurisdiction to require payment of reciprocal compensation for ISP-bound traffic and believes that this issue cannot be arbitrated in this proceeding. (BellSouth BR p. 16)

Analysis

Staff believes the core matter at issue hinges on the interpretation of FCC 01-131. Staff believes the overall intent of FCC 01-131 was to establish a compensation regime for ISP-bound traffic, and notes that both Supra and BellSouth cite this order as the basis for their respective positions. (Supra BR p. 12; BellSouth BR p. 16)

Staff believes that Supra relies upon what FCC 01-131 did not say, while BellSouth points to what the FCC's order did say. For example, in his analysis of ¶82, Supra witness Nilson asserts that "[t]he FCC has done nothing that prevents a state commission from ordering the FCC rates into specific interconnection agreements." (TR 956) Staff would agree that FCC 01-131 does not explicitly state that the FCC allows - or restricts - state commissions from ordering the FCC rates into specific interconnection agreements. However, staff believes that the FCC states in clear and unequivocal terms that "[b]ecause we now exercise our authority under section 201 to determine the appropriate intercarrier

compensation for ISP-bound traffic, however, state commissions will no longer have authority to address this issue." (See FCC 01-131)

Supra's witness Nilson characterizes the FCC's action in this matter as "where the FCC would like to be on this issue in the future," yet he believes the interim compensation rates offered in ¶98 should be applicable now. (TR 956) He believes that the FCC's action sets a national rate for ISP traffic while simultaneously preventing state commissions from setting a different rate. (Nilson TR 956) Witness Nilson emphasizes the opening sentence demonstrates the applicability of FCC 01-131 to this arbitration:

82. The interim compensation regime we establish here applies as carriers re-negotiate expired or expiring interconnection agreements. (TR 956)

Staff agrees with the witness that FCC 01-131 sets the course for where the FCC would like to be in the near future, but believes that the applicability of the interim compensation rates is not a matter over which the state commissions can exert jurisdiction, since the FCC has deemed ISP traffic subject to its section 201 authority. (See ¶98 of FCC 01-131) Additionally, staff notes as significant ¶89 of FCC 01-131, which states in part:

89. The rate caps for ISP-bound traffic that we adopt here apply, therefore only if the incumbent LEC offers to exchange all traffic subject to section 251(b)(5) at the same rate . . . For those incumbent LECs that choose not to offer to exchange section 251(b)(5) traffic subject to the same rate caps we adopt for ISP-bound traffic, we order them to exchange ISP-bound traffic at the state-approved or state-arbitrated reciprocal compensation rates reflected in their contracts. This "mirroring" rule ensures that incumbent LECs will pay the same rates for ISP-bound traffic that they receive for section 251(b)(5) traffic. (Footnotes omitted)

Staff believes the compensation arrangement hinges on how the ILEC - BellSouth in this case - offers to exchange ISP-bound traffic with the ALEC (Supra). By virtue of FCC 01-131 and the jurisdictional considerations therein, staff believes state commissions, including the FPSC, cannot order the ILEC to exchange such traffic in a specific manner.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Therefore, staff recommends that this Commission lacks the jurisdiction to address the issue of whether calls to ISPs should be treated as local traffic for the purposes of reciprocal compensation.

Conclusion

The FPSC currently lacks the jurisdiction to address the issue of whether calls to ISPs should be treated as local traffic for the purposes of reciprocal compensation.

ISSUE 20: Should the Interconnection Agreement include validation and audit requirements which will enable Supra Telecom to assure the accuracy and reliability of the performance data BellSouth provides to Supra Telecom?

RECOMMENDATION: No. The Interconnection Agreement need not include validation and audit requirements which would enable Supra Telecom to assure the accuracy and reliability of the performance data BellSouth provides to Supra Telecom. Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP in the generic Performance Measurements Docket, Docket No. 000121-TP, established the appropriate validation and audit requirements applicable to BellSouth. Even though staff does not recommend requiring the parties to include the validation and audit requirements in the Interconnection Agreement, staff acknowledges that the parties may choose to do so. (T. BROWN)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: This issue will be decided in Docket No. 000121-TP. The Commission convened that proceeding to consider the very issues Supra seeks to arbitrate in this docket. The generic docket is the appropriate vehicle for all interested parties to collaborate on the set of performance measures appropriate in Florida.

SUPRA: BellSouth must have an independent audit conducted of its performance measurement systems, annual audits, and, when requested by Supra, audits when performance measures are changed or added; all paid for by BellSouth.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The issue before the Commission is to determine whether the Interconnection Agreement should include validation and audit requirements which will enable Supra Telecom to assure the accuracy and reliability of the performance data BellSouth provides to Supra Telecom.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Cox contends that this issue is among the issues included in the Commission's generic Performance Measurement Docket No. 000121-TP. (TR 188) Witness Cox believes that this issue is addressed in the generic docket, and the outcome of that docket will address this issue for the entire ALEC industry in Florida.

(TR 188) Witness Cox provides the following issues from the generic docket to illustrate that the issue in this proceeding has been addressed:

Issues from Docket No. 000121-TP that pertain to audits:

Issue 24.a: Should periodic third-party audits of performance assessment plan data and reports be required?

Issue 25: If periodic third-party audits are required, who should be required to pay the cost of the audits?

Issue 27.a: Should an ALEC have the right to audit or request a review by BellSouth for one or more selected measures when it has reason to believe the data collected for a measure is flawed or the report criteria for a measure is not being adhered to?

Issue 27.b: If so, should the audit be performed by an independent third party? (TR 189)

Witness Cox states that "[s]ince all ALECs in Florida, including Supra, had the opportunity to participate in this docket, this Commission should require Supra to abide by the Commission's decision in the generic performance measurement docket." (TR 190)

Supra witness Ramos, adopting the testimony of Carol Bentley, contends that BellSouth should be required to adopt validation and audit requirements. (TR 675) He believes that this requirement "would enable Supra and the FPSC to be assured of the accuracy and reliability of the performance data BellSouth provides." (Ramos TR 675) Witness Ramos goes on to state that "[i]t is essential that performance measurement standards are established, reported, and, more importantly, that they are accurate and can be relied upon." (TR 675-676) Witness Ramos argues that these very standards are used to determine ILEC §271 applications and are evaluated in the event of a dispute between the parties. (TR 676) Therefore, witness Ramos asserts, "there must be a method to validate the accuracy of the measurement and the performance against the standard." (TR 676)

Staff's Analysis

Due to the relatively small amount of evidence proffered by the parties in the record on this issue, staff believes that the

validation and audit requirements set forth in Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP, in the generic Performance Measurements Docket, Docket No. 000121-TP, are the appropriate requirements. However, staff does not believe that these requirements need to be included in the parties' Interconnection Agreement. Staff recognizes, however, that the parties may choose to do so.

Staff believes that the validation and audit requirements set forth in Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP satisfy both parties' needs. The generic docket addressed Supra's concerns for accuracy and reliability of the performance data, and BellSouth's preference to use the requirements set forth in the generic docket. (Ramos TR 675-676; Cox TR 188-189) BellSouth witness Cox affirms BellSouth's position and states, "it should be the plan that's been developed by this Commission and will be implemented as a result of their generic docket . . ." (TR 292) Staff agrees.

Staff believes that Supra's concerns have been adequately addressed in the Commission's generic Performance Measurements Docket. Staff sees no need for an additional set of validation and audit requirements that might be developed in this, or any other, individual arbitration proceeding.

Conclusion

Staff acknowledges that the validation and audit requirements set forth and approved by the FPSC in Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP are the applicable validation and audit requirements. Those requirements are mandatory for BellSouth and as such, staff does not believe they need to be included in the parties' Interconnection Agreement as requested by Supra. BellSouth has no option but to abide by the validation and audit requirements set forth in the generic docket. There is no need for those same validation and audit requirements to be included in the parties' interconnection agreement, although the parties may choose to do so.

ISSUE 21: What does "currently combines" mean as that phrase is used in 47 C.F.R. §51.315(b)?

ISSUE 22: Under what conditions, if any, may BellSouth charge Supra Telecom a "non-recurring charge" for combining network elements on behalf of Supra Telecom?

ISSUE 23: Should BellSouth be directed to perform, upon request, the functions necessary to combine unbundled network elements that are ordinarily combined in its network? If so, what charges, if any, should apply?

ISSUE 24: Should BellSouth be required to combine network elements that are not ordinarily combined in its network? If so, what charges, if any, should apply?

RECOMMENDATION: BellSouth should only be required to provide combined UNEs at TELRIC prices, if such elements are already physically combined in BellSouth's network. In all other instances, BellSouth should not be obligated to combine UNEs for Supra; however, BellSouth may agree to do so, and should be allowed to charge ~~whatever fee it deems appropriate~~ a market-based fee. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth will provide combinations to Supra at cost-based rates if the elements are, in fact, already combined in BellSouth's network. That is, BellSouth will make combinations of UNEs available to Supra consistent with BellSouth's obligations under the 1996 Act and applicable FCC rules.

SUPRA: The Commission should allow Supra to provide telecommunications services to any customer using any combination of elements that BellSouth routinely combines in its own network and to purchase such combinations at TELRIC rates. This interpretation of the term "currently combines" is consistent with the nondiscrimination policy of the Act. BellSouth should not impose any additional charge on Supra for any combination of network elements above the TELRIC cost of the combination.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

These issues require this Commission to decide when, if ever, BellSouth is obligated to combine unbundled network elements for Supra and if so, what price should apply. Staff believes these issues should be addressed together because they involve similar interrelated issues and overlapping testimony.

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Cox has adopted the prefiled direct testimony of witness Ruscilli. Witness Cox asserts that the interconnection agreement should only require BellSouth to provide cost-based combinations to Supra, if such elements are in fact already combined in BellSouth's network. (TR 196) This policy, witness Cox believes, is consistent with BellSouth's obligations under the 1996 Act and applicable FCC rules. (TR 196)

Witness Cox contends that this Commission has consistently ruled that BellSouth is not required to combine UNEs for ALECs. (TR 196) She asserts that this Commission in the BellSouth/AT&T arbitration, Docket No. 000731-TP, concluded that:

Based on the foregoing, we find that it is not the duty of BellSouth to "perform the functions necessary to combine unbundled network elements in any manner." Rule 51.315(b) only requires BellSouth to make available at TELRIC rates those combinations requested by an ALEC that are, in fact, already combined and physically connected in its network at the time a requesting carrier places an order. Accordingly, we conclude that the phrase "currently combines" pursuant to FCC Rule 51.315(b) is limited to combinations of unbundled network elements that are, in fact, already combined and physically connected in BellSouth's network to serve a specific customer or location at the time the requesting carrier places an order. In other words, there is no physical work that BellSouth must complete in order to effect the combinations that the requesting telecommunications carrier requests.

Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP at p. 23. Similarly, witness Cox quotes from this Commission's order in the BellSouth/WorldCom arbitration, Docket No. 000649-TP, that "BellSouth is not required to combine unbundled network elements that are ordinarily combined in its network for ALECs at TELRIC rates." Order No. PSC-01-0824-

FOF-TP at p. 35. Witness Cox contends that this Commission relied on the Eighth Circuit Court's July 18, 2000 ruling in which it reaffirmed that the FCC's Rules 51.315(c)-(f), which required ILECs to combine UNES on behalf of ALECs, were to remain vacated as inconsistent with the Act. Id. Finally, witness Cox cites the BellSouth/Sprint arbitration, Docket No. 000828-TP, as yet another example of this Commission ruling that BellSouth is not required to combine network elements for ALECs. See Order No. PSC-01-1095-FOF-TP at p. 23.

Witness Cox disagrees with Supra witness Nilson's assertion that FCC rule 51.315(b) requires BellSouth to combine UNES for Supra. (TR 229) Witness Cox asserts that the FCC in its UNE Remand Order¹⁴ specifically declined to interpret "currently combines" to impose on BellSouth a duty to combine UNES. (TR 229-230) More specifically, BellSouth, in its brief, quotes the UNE Remand Order as stating "to the extent an unbundled loop is in fact connected to unbundled dedicated transport, the statute and our rule 315(b) require the incumbent to provide such elements to requesting carriers in combined form." (BellSouth BR at 18) Witness Cox readily agrees that Rule 51.315(b) prevents BellSouth from separating network elements that are combined in the BellSouth network at the time an ALEC requests them. (TR 229) However, witness Cox steadfastly maintains that FCC Rule 51.315(b) does not require BellSouth to combine UNES for ALECs such as Supra. (TR 229)

Supra

Supra witness Nilson first argues that FCC Rule 51.315(b) requires ILECs to combine UNES for ALECs. (TR 861) Rule 51.315(b) provides that: "Except upon request, an incumbent LEC shall not separate requested elements that the incumbent LEC currently combines." The FCC would have used the past tense combined instead of the present and future tense combines if this rule was not meant to require ILECs to combine UNES, according to witness Nilson. (TR 861) He contends that if Congress had intended to restrict the UNE entry strategy by compelling ALECs to combine UNES, Congress would have used "combined" instead of "combines." (TR 862) Therefore, witness Nilson requests this Commission find "currently combines" means the normal, expected, and possible future work done to

¹⁴In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Third Report and Order, CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 99-238, released November 5, 1999 (UNE Remand Order).

establish a BellSouth tariffed telecommunications service and require BellSouth to combine UNEs on Supra's behalf. (TR 862)

Second, witness Nilson argues that BellSouth should be required to combine UNEs on Supra's behalf to redress BellSouth's failure to combine UNEs under past agreements that allegedly required it to do so. (TR 864) Despite Supra's repeated attempts to order UNE combinations while operating under the first BellSouth/Supra agreement, witness Nilson contends BellSouth never provided Supra with a single UNE combination despite contractual language requiring BellSouth to do so. (TR 865) Witness Nilson asserts that to overcome BellSouth's refusal, Supra adopted the AT&T/BellSouth agreement in Florida on October 5, 1999. (TR 865) According to witness Nilson, this Commission, while resolving an interconnection dispute between BellSouth and AT&T in Docket No. 971140-TP, required BellSouth to provide UNE combinations at TELRIC prices. (TR 865) Despite the fact that this order addressed the same AT&T/BellSouth agreement that Supra adopted, witness Nilson asserts that BellSouth still failed to provide Supra with UNE combinations. (TR 865) He states that BellSouth's claims regarding UNE combinations, must be viewed in light of BellSouth's continuous refusal to comply with this Commission's orders, its contractual obligations, and its "tortious [sic] intent to harm." (TR 867) Witness Nilson contends this Commission should require BellSouth to combine UNEs for Supra at cost-based rates to make up for what he believes is BellSouth's illegal refusal to do so under the two previous agreements. (TR 868)

Third, witness Nilson contends that 47 C.F.R. §51.309 requires BellSouth to combine UNEs for Supra. (TR 868) He states that 47 C.F.R. §51.309 requires ILECs to provide unbundled network elements without,

limitations, restrictions, or requirements on request for, or the use of, unbundled network elements that would impair the ability of a requesting telecommunications carrier to offer a telecommunications service in the manner that the requesting telecommunications carrier intends. (TR 868)

BellSouth's refusal to combine UNEs, witness Nilson contends, denies Supra the right to provide telecommunications services as it intends and therefore violates 47 C.F.R. §51.309. (TR 869) Witness Nilson states that BellSouth cannot dictate uses of UNEs, or require collocation as a method to combine UNEs to provide services. (TR 869) To support this conclusion, witness Nilson notes the Supreme Court's ruling in AT&T v. Iowa Util. Bd., 525, U.S. 366, 392 (2000), which held that facilities ownership is not necessary to lease UNEs under the Act. (TR 869) According to witness Nilson, ALECs are in a bind because the Supreme Court has ruled that a collocation requirement can be placed upon an ALEC in order to combine UNEs. (TR 869)

As a fourth argument, witness Nilson contends that BellSouth's refusal to combine UNEs is inconsistent with the Act and implementing FCC Orders. By not combining UNEs at cost-based rates, ILECs make leasing UNEs a less effective, less pervasive entry strategy, according to witness Nilson. (TR 871) Witness Nilson asserts this impediment to UNE entry violates the Act and ¶ 12 of the FCC's First Report and Order.¹⁵ (TR 871) Further, witness Nilson alleges that ILECs have vigorously denied their obligation to provide UNE combinations and only just recently have begun to comply. To support this allegation, witness Nilson cites the FCC's UNE Remand Order, ¶ 12, where the FCC found ILECs only began providing UNE combinations in 1999, and only then had local competition for residential services begun to appear. (TR 871-872) Because the margins on resale are allegedly very thin, witness Nilson believes that if BellSouth can prevail on limiting the types of circuits provided as UNE combinations or UNE-P, BellSouth will win the battle for local competition. (TR 872)

As further support for his claim that BellSouth should be required to combine UNEs at cost based rates, witness Nilson adopts pages 5-9 of the testimony of Gregory Follensbee, formerly of AT&T and now the lead contract negotiator at BellSouth for Supra's interconnection agreement with BellSouth. (TR 876-877; EXH 29, DAN-5) This adopted testimony was originally presented in Docket No.

¹⁵In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, First Report and Order, CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 96-325, issued August 8, 1996 (First Report and Order).

000731-TP, the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration. The testimony argues that ILECs should be required to combine UNEs at cost-based rates because to do otherwise penalizes ALECs for using UNEs as an entry strategy into the competitive market as compared to resale or facilities-based entry. (EXH 29, DAN 5-9)

Should this Commission impose the obligation upon Supra to combine UNEs, witness Nilson sees two unanswered questions:

1. Must an ALEC be allowed to combine UNEs without restriction, and

2. How can Supra combine UNEs without violating other provisions of the law? (TR 873)

The Supreme Court in AT&T v. Iowa Util. Bd., 525 U.S. 366, 368 (1999), upheld UNE combinations and stated that UNEs provisioned by ILECs to ALECs must be in a form that allows them to be combined at the ALEC's request, according to witness Nelson. (TR 874) Witness Nelson asserts the Iowa Util. Bd. Court also held that the Act does not require an ALEC to perform the work itself. (TR 874) In fact, witness Nilson suggests some ILECs voluntarily offer to combine UNEs in order to have tighter control over who enters their facilities. (TR 874) Witness Nilson states the Supreme Court in Iowa Util Bd. affirmed that ALECs can lease an ILEC's entire preassembled network at cost-based rates. (TR 875) He wonders how ALECs can take advantage of this right without having ILECs combine UNEs for the benefit of the ALECs. (TR 875)

Witness Nilson argues that if this Commission does not find BellSouth is obligated to combine UNEs on Supra's behalf, the Commission must grant Supra certain rights in order to ensure that Supra can combine UNEs for itself. (TR 876) At a minimum, witness Nilson contends Supra must be granted the unbridled right to enter any BellSouth central office for the purpose of effecting its own cross-connects, facilities assignments, and switch translations. (TR 876) Furthermore, Supra will need full access to BellSouth's OSS including PREDICTOR, LFACS, COSMOS, ERMA, and all other provisioning interfaces that are currently restricted from ALEC access, according to witness Nilson. (TR 876) At the very least, witness Nilson contends, BellSouth should allow Supra this type of

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

access if BellSouth refuses to combine any UNES, given they agreed to do so for AT&T in 1996. (TR 876)

In response to BellSouth witness Cox's assertion that this Commission's previous rulings mandate that Supra's position be denied, witness Nilson states those rulings are erroneous and should not be binding on Supra. (TR 961) According to witness Nilson, Supra has presented new arguments that this Commission has yet to consider. (TR 961) Furthermore, witness Nilson believes that Supra has not made the errors previous parties have, thereby negating any binding effect on Supra the prior rulings by this Commission may have. (TR 961)

As an example of errors other competitors have made, witness Nilson raises AT&T's defense of Issue 27 in Docket No. 000731-TP, the BellSouth/AT&T arbitration. (TR 961) Witness Nilson contends AT&T lost on this issue because it failed to make an argument and waived its position. (TR 962) He states other errors were made by AT&T in addressing an ILEC's duty to combine UNES. (TR 962). AT&T failed to provide legal authority as to why this Commission could order UNE combinations, according to witness Nilson, something he believes Supra has done. (TR 963) Furthermore, witness Nilson asserts that staff's recommendation in that docket did not cite specific federal law that would be violated if AT&T were to prevail. (TR 964)

Should this Commission seek to accommodate Supra's urging in this matter, witness Nilson believes it would be doing so where there is no prevailing law, definition or rule subsections that are currently vacated. (TR 964) Witness Nilson believes staff erred in its recommendation for the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration by stating "the Commission should not impose requirements that conflict with Federal law." (TR 964)

Witness Nilson also claims that recommendation was inconsistent with comments filed by the Florida Public Service Commission to the FCC regarding its First Report and Order. (TR 966) This Commission filed comments seeking the ability to adopt its own requirements for fostering competition, according to witness Nilson. (TR 966) Witness Nilson contends that the FCC has recognized that state commissions "share a common commitment to

creating opportunities for efficient new entry into the local market. And [sic] provide for state commissions to ensure that states can impose varying requirements." (TR 964, internal quotations omitted)

According to witness Nilson, the Supreme Court ruled in AT&T v. Iowa Util Bd., that this Commission is free to determine the resolution of any issue that the FCC failed to specifically address, and UNE combinations are such an issue. (TR 967) In other words, witness Nilson urges this Commission to reconsider its prior position regarding these issues based on these new legal and factual arguments presented by Supra.

Witness Nilson contends that leasing a line for resale and then converting to UNEs is not a realistic option. (TR 860) Witness Nilson states Supra would need additional employee training, and a new CLEC OSS in order to be able to lease resale lines from BellSouth. He states the high costs associated with these improvements ensure that converting resale lines to UNE combinations is not a viable alternative to having BellSouth combine UNEs or leasing collocation space. (TR 860)

Supra, in its brief, argues that BellSouth should not be allowed to assess any additional charge on Supra for any combination of network elements above the TELRIC cost of the combination. (Supra BR at 17) To hold otherwise, Supra argues, would allow BellSouth to charge an unregulated, and likely exorbitant, amount in order to combine network elements that it ordinarily combines. (Supra BR at 17) Therefore, Supra requests this Commission limit BellSouth to charging cost-based rates for combining UNEs.

In his testimony, witness Nilson also addresses the decision this Commission made in the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration, Docket No. 000731-TP, regarding whether BellSouth was required to provide unbundled local switching to customers that have a certain number of lines in the nation's top 50 Metropolitan Statistical Areas. He claims this Commission erroneously determined that BellSouth is not required to provide unbundled local switching in such instances. (TR 878) Witness Nilson states this Commission based its conclusion on the mistaken premise that alternative suppliers of

local switching exist. (TR 878) He contends neither AT&T nor Sprint have been able to find such an alternative source, so it is therefore unreasonable to expect Supra to find such a source either. (TR 878) Furthermore, according to witness Nilson, the Supreme Court's decision in Iowa Util. Bd. prevents this Commission from requiring Supra to provide its own local switching. (TR 878) Therefore, witness Nilson requests this Commission require BellSouth to sell unbundled local switching to Supra even when the unbundled local switching exception applies. (TR 878)

Analysis

Again, these issues require this Commission to decide when, if ever, BellSouth is obligated to combine unbundled network elements for Supra and if so, at what price. Staff believes these issues should be addressed together because they involve similar, interrelated questions and overlapping testimony.

Supra witness Nilson presented numerous arguments as to why BellSouth should be required to combine UNEs. However, staff believes these arguments cannot prevail in the face of federal case law stating that requiring ILECs to combine UNEs would be a violation of the Act. This Commission has consistently followed federal case law, holding that the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeal's decision in Iowa Util. Bd. v. F.C.C., 219 F. 3d 744 (8th Circuit, 2000), prohibits requiring ILECs to combine UNEs for ALECs. (See e.g., Order Nos., PSC-01-1095-FOF-TP, PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP) Staff believes Supra has failed to produce any new evidence that justifies reaching a different conclusion in this case. In Iowa Util Bd., the Eighth Circuit reaffirmed its invalidation of FCC Rules 51.315 (c)-(f), which required ILECs to combine UNEs for ALECs, after the case was remanded from the Supreme Court. See Iowa Util Bd, 219 F.3d at 759. The Appeals Court also recognized that the Supreme Court reinstated Rule 51.315(b) which required ILECs not to separate UNEs that were currently combined unless requested by an ALEC, but the Court stated this did not affect its decision. Id. The Eighth Circuit explained these results were consistent, because the Supreme Court only found the Act was ambiguous on the issue of whether network elements had to be separated before being provided to ALECs, and it did not contradict the Eighth Circuit's earlier conclusion that the Act specifically

forbids ILECs from being required to combine UNEs for ALECs. Id. Explaining its rationale, the Eighth Circuit stated:

Unlike 51.315(b), subsections (c)-(f) pertain to the combination of network elements. Section 251(c)(3) specifically addresses the combination of network elements. It states, in part, "An incumbent local exchange carrier shall provide such unbundled network elements in a manner that allows requesting carriers to combine such elements in order to provide such telecommunication service." Here Congress has directly spoken on the issue of who shall "combine such elements." It is not the duty of the ILECs to "perform the functions necessary to combine unbundled network elements in any manner" as required by the FCC's rule. See 47 C.F.R. § 51.315(c). We reiterate what we said in our prior opinion: "The Act does not require the incumbent LECs to do all the work." Iowa Utils. Bd., 120 F.3d at 813. Under the first prong of Chevron, subsections (c)-(f) violate the plain language of the statute. We are convinced that rules 51.315(c)-(f) must remain vacated.

Id. This decision only required ILECs to provide UNEs in combined form if the elements are already physically combined in the ILEC's network.

Staff also disagrees with Supra's assertion that FCC Rule 51.315(b) requires ILECs to combine network elements for Supra. Rule 51.315(b) states: "Except upon request, an incumbent LEC shall not separate requested network elements that the incumbent LEC currently combines." Witness Nilson argues because the FCC used combines rather than combined, it meant to impose a duty on ILECs to combine UNEs. (TR 862) However, the Supreme Court, in AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd., 525 U.S. 366 (1999), described the reach of this rule as being much more limited. The Supreme Court stated:

As the Commission explains, it is aimed at preventing incumbent LECs from "disconnecting previously connected elements, over the objection of the requesting carrier, not for any productive reason, but just to impose wasteful reconnection costs on the new entrants." It is

true that Rule 315(b) could allow entrants access to an entire preassembled network. In the absence of Rule 315(b), however, incumbents could impose wasteful costs on even those carriers who requested less than the whole network.

AT&T Corp. at 395. In addition, the FCC, in its UNE Remand Order, specifically declined to adopt the broad interpretation of Rule 51.315(b) that Supra is seeking. In paragraphs 479 and 480 of the UNE Remand Order, the FCC stated:

A number of commentators argue that we should reaffirm the Commission's decision in the Local Competition First Report and Order. In that order the Commission concluded that the proper reading of "currently combines" in rule 51.315(b) means "ordinarily combined within their network, in a manner which they are typically combined." Incumbent LECs, on the other hand, argue that rule 51.315(b) only applies to unbundled network elements that are currently combined and not to elements that are "normally" combined. Again, because this matter is currently pending before the Eighth Circuit, we decline to address these arguments at this time

UNE Remand Order, ¶¶ 479, 480. Staff believes this Order combined with the Eighth Circuit's ruling in Iowa Util. Bd. v. AT&T where it stated that requiring ILECs to combine UNEs violates the 1996 Act, makes it clear that Rule 315(b) only requires ILECs not to separate UNEs that are currently combined.

In addition, staff disagrees with Supra witness Nilson that BellSouth should be required to combine UNEs to make up for an alleged failure to do so under past agreements. Staff believes that whatever obligations BellSouth had under those past agreements, expired with those agreements. Therefore, staff recommends Supra witness Nilson's claim that BellSouth be required to combine UNEs in this new agreement for failure to do so in past agreements should not be persuasive.

Furthermore, staff disagrees with Supra that 47 C.F.R. 51.309 requires ILECs to combine network elements for ALECs when

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

requested. 47 C.F.R. 51.309 states that BellSouth must provide without

limitations, restrictions, or requirements on the request for, or the use of, unbundled network elements that would impair the ability of a requesting telecommunications carrier to offer a telecommunications service in the manner the requesting telecommunications carrier intends.

(emphasis added) Supra witness Nilson argues BellSouth must combine network elements because to do otherwise would prevent Supra, the requesting carrier, from providing service as it intended. (TR 869) Staff believes Supra's interpretation of the statute is too broad. Staff notes that the FCC specifically promulgated Rules 51.315(c)-(f) to require ILECs to combine UNES. If the FCC meant for Rule 51.309 to require ILECs to combine network elements, there would have been no need for Rules 51.315(c)-(f), which specifically required ILECs to do so.

Based on the record, staff believes that Supra has several viable options to combine UNES other than requiring BellSouth to do so on its behalf. First, staff believes Supra can combine UNES by obtaining collocation space. While witness Nilson argues that the Supreme Court in its Iowa Util. Bd. decision ruled that ALECs cannot be required to obtain collocation to combine UNES, staff disagrees. (TR 769) Staff believes the Supreme Court's decision determined that facilities ownership cannot be a pre-condition to leasing UNES. Staff does not believe the Court addressed ALECs that lease facilities for the purpose of combining UNES. The Supreme Court specifically contemplated that ALECs would not be able to lease an ILEC's entire network and hence must combine UNES on their own. See Iowa Util. Bd., 525 U.S. at 392. Therefore, staff believes that collocation presents a viable alternative to having BellSouth combine UNES on Supra's behalf.

In addition to being able to combine UNES through collocation, staff believes ALECs can lease assembled lines for resale and then convert them to UNE-P to provide service without requiring ILECs to combine UNES. When deciding the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration, Docket No. 000731-TP, this Commission recognized that conversion from resold lines to UNE-P was a viable alternative to having ILECs

combine UNEs or lease collocation space. Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP at p. 22. Staff recognizes this may not be as cost-effective for Supra as having BellSouth combine UNEs on Supra's behalf. However, staff disagrees with Supra witness Nilson's claim that the cost of converting resold lines to UNE service makes conversion not feasible based on the record. Furthermore, because of the alternatives to having an ILEC combine UNEs on an ALEC's behalf described above, staff believes Supra does not need extensive access to BellSouth's OSS to ensure that Supra can combine UNEs for itself.

In conclusion, while staff believes Supra has presented some good policy arguments on why ILECs should combine network elements for ALECS, it has not shown that such a Commission action would be consistent with Federal law. This Commission during the BellSouth/AT&T arbitration stated, "while we are free to impose additional requirements consistent with federal law, we should not impose requirements that conflict with federal law." Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP at p. 22. Furthermore, compliance with federal law is mandated by § 252(e)(6) of the Act which grants federal court review of state commission arbitration decisions. Regardless of how strong the policy arguments may be, staff believes that the decisions by the Eighth Circuit Court and Supreme Court in Iowa Util Bd. are controlling in this instance. These decisions have the combined effect of invalidating FCC Rules 51.315(c)-(f) and reinstating Rule 51.315(b), which together merely require that ILECs not separate UNEs that are currently combined, but impose no obligation to combine UNEs that are currently separated. Therefore, staff recommends that BellSouth only be required to provide combined UNEs at cost-based rates when the network elements are physically combined at the time Supra requests them.

Because staff believes BellSouth has no duty to combine UNEs on Supra's behalf, staff recommends that if BellSouth voluntarily chooses to do so, BellSouth should be permitted to charge ~~whatever fee it deems appropriate~~ a market-based fee. This Commission previously found it was appropriate for BellSouth to charge ALECs such a market-based rate when it voluntarily agreed to perform the functions of combining UNEs. BellSouth/AT&T Arbitration at 25. While Supra in its brief argued that BellSouth may charge an unduly excessive fee if this Commission does not act, there is no evidence

in the record to support that argument. Further, staff believes BellSouth should be free to set the fee for a discretionary service, one which it has no obligation to provide. In summary, because BellSouth has no duty to combine UNEs on Supra's behalf, staff believes that if BellSouth voluntarily agrees to combine UNEs for Supra, BellSouth should be permitted to charge whatever fee it deems appropriate.

As a final matter, staff would like to address Supra witness Nilson's argument that BellSouth should be required to provide unbundled local switching to ALECs, in the top 50 metropolitan statistical areas, even if BellSouth offers enhanced extended links (EELs). Staff believes this testimony is beyond the scope of this issue. Section 252 (b) (4) (A) requires, "The State commission to limit its consideration of any petition under paragraph(1) (and any response thereto) to the issues set forth in the petition and in the response, if any, filed under paragraph (3)." Staff notes this request was not addressed in Supra's response to BellSouth's petition, and BellSouth provided no testimony on this issue. Therefore, staff recommends the Commission not render a decision addressing this point as it is beyond the scope of this proceeding.

Conclusion

BellSouth should only be required to provide combined UNEs at TELRIC prices, if such elements are already physically combined in BellSouth's network. In all other instances, BellSouth should not be obligated to combine UNEs for Supra; however, BellSouth may agree to do so, and should be allowed to charge ~~whatever fee it deems appropriate~~ a market-based fee.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 22: Under what conditions, if any, may BellSouth charge Supra Telecom a "non-recurring charge" for combining network elements on behalf of Supra Telecom?

RECOMMENDATION: BellSouth should only be required to provide combined UNEs at TELRIC prices, if such elements are already physically combined in BellSouth's network. In all other instances, BellSouth should not be obligated to combine UNEs for Supra; however, BellSouth may agree to do so, and should be allowed to charge ~~whatever fee it deems appropriate~~ a market-based fee. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth will provide combinations to Supra at cost-based rates if the elements are, in fact, already combined in BellSouth's network. That is, BellSouth will make combinations of UNEs available to Supra consistent with BellSouth's obligations under the 1996 Act and applicable FCC rules.

SUPRA: BellSouth should not impose any additional charge on Supra for any combination of network elements above TELRIC cost of the combination.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff addresses this issue under Issue 21 because it poses a similar, interrelated question, and there is significant overlapping testimony.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 23: Should BellSouth be directed to perform, upon request, the functions necessary to combine unbundled network elements that are ordinarily combined in its network? If so, what charges, if any, should apply?

RECOMMENDATION: BellSouth should only be required to provide combined UNEs at TELRIC prices, if such elements are already physically combined in BellSouth's network. In all other instances, BellSouth should not be obligated to combine UNEs for Supra; however, BellSouth may agree to do so, and should be allowed to charge ~~whatever fee it deems appropriate~~ a market-based fee. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth will provide combinations to Supra at cost-based rates if the elements are, in fact, already combined in BellSouth's network. That is, BellSouth will make combinations of UNEs available to Supra consistent with BellSouth's obligations under the 1996 Act and applicable FCC rules.

SUPRA: The Commission should allow Supra to provide telecommunications services to any customer using any combinations of elements that BellSouth routinely combines in its own network and to purchase such combinations at TELRIC rates. This interpretation of the term "currently combines" is consistent with the nondiscrimination policy of the Act.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff addresses this issue under Issue 21 because it poses a similar, interrelated question, and there is significant overlapping testimony.

ISSUE 24: Should BellSouth be required to combine network elements that are not ordinarily combined in its network? If so, what charges, if any, should apply?

RECOMMENDATION: BellSouth should only be required to provide combined UNEs at TELRIC prices, if such elements are already physically combined in BellSouth's network. In all other instances, BellSouth should not be obligated to combine UNEs for Supra; however, BellSouth may agree to do so, and should be allowed to charge ~~whatever fee it deems appropriate~~ a market-based fee. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth will provide combinations to Supra at cost-based rates if the elements are, in fact, already combined in BellSouth's network. That is, BellSouth will make combinations of UNEs available to Supra consistent with BellSouth's obligations under the 1996 Act and applicable FCC rules.

SUPRA: This Commission should allow Supra to provide telecommunication services to any customer using any combination of elements that BellSouth routinely combines in its own network and to purchase such combinations at TELRIC rates. This interpretation of the term "currently combines" is consistent with the nondiscriminatory policy of the Act.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff addresses this issue under Issue 21 because it poses a similar, interrelated question, and there is significant overlapping testimony.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 28: What terms and conditions and what separate rates, if any, should apply for Supra Telecom to gain access to and use BellSouth's facilities to serve multi-tenant environments?

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that in order for Supra to gain access to and use BellSouth facilities to serve multi-tenant environments, an ALEC access terminal should be established to accommodate the necessary connections. Staff recommends that the appropriate rates for all of the addressed subloop elements should be the BellSouth rates established by this Commission in its Final Order in Docket No. 990649-TP. (J-E. BROWN)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth will provide access to INC and/or NTW wire pairs as requested by Supra by terminating such pairs on separate connecting blocks serving as an access terminal for Supra. With regard to garden apartments, BellSouth will prewire the necessary pairs to serve each apartment on the access terminal BellSouth builds. The treatment for high rise buildings will be different. Rather than prewiring the access terminal, BellSouth proposes that it will then receive orders from Supra and will wire the access terminal it has created as facilities are needed by Supra. In either case, Supra will still have to build its own terminal for its cable pairs. The rates the Commission adopts in its final order in Docket 990649-TP should apply.

SUPRA: BellSouth should cooperate with Supra Telecom, upon request, in establishing a single point of interconnection on a case-by-case basis at multi-unit installations. Where such points of interconnection do not exist, BellSouth should construct such single points of interconnection, and Supra Telecom should be charged no more than its fair share, as one service provider using this facility, of the forward-looking price. The single point of interconnection should be fully accessible by Supra Telecom technicians without the necessity of having a BellSouth technician present.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This issue considers what terms, conditions, and rates are appropriate for Supra Telecom to gain access to and use BellSouth's facilities to serve multi-tenant environments.

Arguments

BellSouth makes three points on this issue. First, BellSouth witness Kephart believes that the Commission should affirm its prior decisions that the appropriate access method is for BellSouth to construct an access terminal for access to network terminating wire (NTW) or intra-building network cable (INC) pairs as may be requested by an ALEC, as set forth in Docket Nos. 000731-TP and 990149-TP. (TR 369) The charges for this provision should be the rates this Commission adopted in its final order in Docket No. 990649-TP. (Cox TR 195) Supra would interconnect its network to these constructed access terminals. BellSouth witness Kephart believes this method permits Supra appropriate access to end users, while providing both companies the ability to maintain appropriate records on an on-going basis. (TR 395) BellSouth witness Kephart states:

BellSouth will provide access to INC and/or NTW wire pairs as requested by the Alternative Local Exchange Carrier (ALEC) by terminating such pairs on separate connecting blocks serving as an access terminal for the ALEC. BellSouth currently has its own terminal in each garden apartment arrangement or high rise building. BellSouth will create a separate access terminal for any building for which such service is requested. (TR 360)

Second, BellSouth witness Kephart believes that there are two types of multi-unit installations: 1) garden apartment arrangements and 2) high rise buildings. As a result, there are two separate procedures required for provisioning. (TR 360) Witness Kephart goes on to say:

With regard to garden apartments, BellSouth will prewire the necessary pairs to serve each apartment on the access terminal BellSouth builds. For garden apartments, this means that each cable pair available to serve customers in that garden apartment building will appear on BellSouth's terminal and on the access terminal. An ALEC wanting to serve a customer in the garden apartment situation would build its terminal at that location and then wire its cable pair to the appropriate prewired

location on the access terminal. The treatment for high rise buildings will be different. BellSouth will still build an access terminal to complement BellSouth's own terminal located in the high rise building. The ALEC wanting to access those facilities will still have to build its own terminal for its cable pairs. However, rather than prewiring the access terminal, BellSouth proposes that it will then receive orders from the ALEC and will wire the access terminal it has created as facilities are needed by the ALECs. (TR 360)

BellSouth does not propose to prewire every pair to the access terminal in high rise buildings because it is simply impractical to do so. The garden apartment terminal might have 20 to 25 loops terminated on it, thus making prewiring the access terminal something that can be done with a reasonable effort. On the other hand, high rise buildings may have hundreds or even thousands of pairs, which would make prewiring the access terminal impractical. (TR 360-361)

Finally, BellSouth witness Kephart believes that the FPSC's rulings in Docket Nos. 000731-TP and 990149-TP are consistent with all the FCC requirements outlined in witness Nilson's testimony. (TR 395) Witness Kephart further explains that it is BellSouth's intention to follow the law with regard to the issue of access to BellSouth facilities in multi-tenant environments. He continues that Supra offers no specific case in its testimony that attempts to show otherwise: "It is difficult to understand from Mr. Nilson's testimony what, if any, problem Supra has with BellSouth on this issue." (Kephart TR 394)

Conversely, Supra witness Nilson believes that BellSouth's current position on multi-unit environments raises the potential for anticompetitive behavior. (TR 991-992) Witness Nilson states:

What BellSouth has proposed are a series of two or more points of interconnection, one reserved for BellSouth and another for the entire ALEC community. Mr. Kephart attempts to justify this position by claiming security and reliability issues will [sic] all ALECs having access

to the BellSouth terminal. Surprisingly so, he fails to discuss how all his concerns aren't embodied in the second(ALEC) terminal as the rule is now proposed. (TR 991)

The Supra witness further argues that BellSouth's position is not in compliance with the FCC's order. (Nilson TR 991) He points to ¶226 of FCC 99-238 which states:

Although we do not amend our rules governing the demarcation point in the context of this proceeding, we agree that the availability of a single point of interconnection will promote competition. To the extent there is not currently a single point of interconnection that can be feasibly accessed by a requesting carrier, we encourage parties to cooperate in any reconfiguration of the network necessary to create one. If parties are unable to negotiate a reconfigured single point of interconnection at multi-unit premises, we require the incumbent to construct a single point of interconnection that will be fully accessible and suitable for use by multiple carriers. (FCC 99-238, ¶226)

Finally, Supra witness Nilson believes that in those cases where Supra utilizes this proposed single point of interconnection, Supra should be charged no more than its fair share of the forward-looking price. (Supra BR at 17)

Analysis

Staff notes that this issue has come before this Commission in at least two prior dockets, Docket Nos. 000731-TP and 990149-TP. Staff believes that no new facts or arguments have been presented in this proceeding to merit a change from the Commission's prior decisions. Therefore, staff's recommendation is consistent with the previous recommendations on this issue.

Although it is unclear, staff believes that by referencing 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(a)(2)(E) and ¶226 of FCC 99-238 (the UNE Remand Order), Supra wants direct access to a single point of interconnection (access terminal) and that Supra witness Nilson

believes an intermediate terminal potentially violates FCC rules. (TR 898,900) Staff believes that while these passages merit consideration, the proposed ALEC access terminal will provide the access that is the subject of the aforementioned FCC rules. Therefore, staff agrees with BellSouth that the Commission should affirm its decisions that the appropriate method is for BellSouth to construct an access terminal where an ALEC can obtain access to NTW or INC pairs in both the garden apartment and the high rise building situations as described by BellSouth witness Kephart.

Staff acknowledges that in any cross-connect setting, the potential exists for human error that could lead to unintended disruption of an existing customer's services, and that use of a terminal would add another layer of connection to a given circuit. However, staff disagrees with Supra's contention that this "raises potential for anticompetitive behavior". (Nilson TR 992) Staff believes that the use of an ALEC access terminal will reduce potential risks for both BellSouth and for Supra, because each company will have the ability to more adequately monitor the activities of their respective terminals and the benefit of this increased control would contribute to overall network reliability for all concerned, Supra included.

In the MediaOne order, the Commission stated:

We also conclude that the BellSouth-installed access terminal should be reserved for exclusive use by MediaOne. If other ALECs are permitted access to the terminal installed for MediaOne, MediaOne would be subject to the same network security and control problems that BellSouth uses in its arguments. In addition, because MediaOne is required to pay BellSouth for the access terminal and the labor to install it, we believe it would be inappropriate for BellSouth to offer other ALECs a sharing arrangement on this terminal, without MediaOne's approval. Order No. PSC-99-2009-FOF-TP, p.4

Finally, regarding the matter of proposed rates, staff notes that Supra did not propose any rates in this proceeding for this Commission to consider, nor did Supra challenge the rates proposed

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

by BellSouth witness Cox.¹⁶ (TR 195) Accordingly, staff believes that the new interconnection agreement should include the rates proposed by BellSouth as they are the only rates supported by the record.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that in order for Supra to gain access to and use BellSouth facilities to serve multi-tenant environments, an ALEC access terminal should be established to accommodate the necessary connections. Staff recommends that the appropriate rates for all of the addressed subloop elements should be the BellSouth rates established by this Commission in its Final Order in Docket No. 990649-TP.

¹⁶ The rates proposed by witness Cox are those rates approved by this Commission in Docket No. 990649-TP. (TR 195)

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 29: Is BellSouth obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve the first three lines to a customer located in Density Zone 1? Is BellSouth obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve four or more lines provided to a customer located in Density Zone 1?

RECOMMENDATION: Staff's recommendation is twofold. First, staff recommends that BellSouth should be obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve the first three lines to a customer located in Density Zone 1. Second, staff recommends that BellSouth should not be obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve four or more lines provided to a customer located in Density Zone 1, as long as the other criteria for FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2) are met. (BARRETT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: ALECs are not entitled to unbundled local circuit switching in Density Zone 1 in the top 50 MSAs for any of the end user's lines when the end user has four or more lines in the relevant geographic area, as long as BellSouth will provide the ALEC with EELs at UNE rates.

SUPRA: Supra is entitled to purchase local circuit switching at UNE rates to provide service to ALL customer lines in Density Zone 1, not just for the first, second, and third lines purchased by customers when those customers have four lines or more.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The two parts to this issue are similar to an issue in the recent AT&T/BellSouth arbitration in Docket No. 000731-TP. The Commission is tasked with deciding whether BellSouth is obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates, irrespective of the line counts of a customer located in Density Zone 1. Consistent with the prior case, staff believes an underlying assumption is that alternative switching providers are likely to be located in the Density Zone 1 areas of Florida, which include the Miami, Orlando, and Ft. Lauderdale Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs).

Arguments

As in other issues, Supra alleges that BellSouth has conducted itself in bad faith throughout this arbitration process, contending that BellSouth has refused to provide Supra with network information that would have assisted Supra. (Nilson TR 912, 979)

Supra states in its brief that BellSouth must provide the Enhanced Extended Loop (EEL) as a cost-based UNE if it intends to restrict the purchase of local circuit switching to serve a customer with four or more lines to one location. (Supra BR p. 18) However, Supra's witness Nilson states that there is no evidence to confirm that BellSouth even provides the EEL UNE in the top 50 MSAs in its serving area. (TR 908) Supra believes that ¶241-300 of the FCC's Third Report and Order (FCC 99-238) clearly require that until the ILEC offers EELs throughout Density Zone 1, the ILEC must continue to sell the ALEC its local switching for all lines to the same customer at the same address. (Supra BR p. 18)

Supra also questions the availability of unbundled local switching from sources other than BellSouth. (TR 910) The witness states that the Commission only assumed that unbundled local switching from sources other than BellSouth actually exists. (Nilson TR 910) He states that no evidence was presented in the AT&T case (Docket No. 000731-TP) or in this case to affirm that alternative providers of local switching even exist in the Orlando, Ft. Lauderdale, and Miami MSAs. (Nilson TR 979) He states:

It is not merely enough to **assume** that there is local switching available to meet the FCC requirement [in FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2)], because there really isn't such a supply . . . Both AT&T and Sprint [in the recent arbitration dockets] . . . petitioned the FPSC to require BellSouth to sell Unbundled Local Switching. If these two behemoths are unable to (1) supply their own switching in the top 50 MSAs, and (2) have enough clout in the industry to identify suppliers of unbundled switching that can provide [the] same to customers of BellSouth's UNEs, then frankly, the supply doesn't actually exist. Supra maintains that the availability of Unbundled Local Switching in the Top 50 MSAs is an

illusory issue. It should exist, but it doesn't.
(emphasis in original) (Nilson TR 910)

The witness firmly believes that "BellSouth has the burden of proof on this issue," and asserts that it should be required to substantiate the existence of unbundled local switching options to allow customers of its EEL UNE to purchase the same without the need for facilities ownership by the ALEC. (Nilson TR 909-910) The witness contends that the Commission should have a clear understanding of how the end use subscribers in Florida will be affected if BellSouth is allowed to discontinue offering unbundled local switching as a UNE. (Nilson TR 911) Witness Nilson believes the potential is great for BellSouth to engage in anti-competitive behavior, considering that Supra presently serves tens of thousands of customers via UNE combinations. (TR 911)

Supra advocates for three things in this issue. First, Supra believes that BellSouth should be ordered to prove to the Commission that an alternative supplier of unbundled local switching exists before relieving BellSouth of its obligation to provide the same at UNE rates. Second, Supra believes that BellSouth should demonstrate that the effects of such a discontinuance would not adversely affect Florida's telephone subscribers. Finally, Supra believes that the Commission should adopt a liquidated damages provision to incent BellSouth to comply with the FPSC's rules and orders. (Nilson TR 911-912)

BellSouth witness Cox states that this issue concerns the application of FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2) regarding the exception for unbundling local circuit switching. (TR 200-201) The witness believes that when "a customer has four or more lines within a specific geographic area, even if those lines are spread over multiple locations, BellSouth is not required to provide unbundled local circuit switching to ALECs, so long as the other criteria for FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2) are met." (Cox TR 200-201) FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2) provides:

Notwithstanding the incumbent LEC's general duty to unbundle local circuit switching, an incumbent LEC shall not be required to unbundle local circuit switching for requesting telecommunications carriers when the

requesting telecommunications carrier serves end-users with four or more voice grade (DS0) equivalents or lines, provided that the incumbent LEC provides non-discriminatory access to combinations of unbundled loops and transport (also known as the "Enhanced Extended Link") throughout Density Zone 1, and the incumbent LEC's local circuit switches are located in:

- (i) The top 50 Metropolitan Statistical Areas as set forth in Appendix B of the Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 96-98, and
- (ii) In Density Zone 1, as defined in §69.123 of this chapter on January 1, 1999. (Cox TR 201)

The witness believes that ALECs are not impaired without access to unbundled local switching when serving customers with four or more lines in Density Zone 1 in the top 50 MSAs. (Cox TR 202)

The BellSouth witness asserts that Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TL, the Commission's final order in the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration, issued June 28, 2001, sets a precedent in deciding this case. Therein at ¶61, the Commission found that "BellSouth will be allowed to aggregate lines provided to multiple locations of a single customer, within the same MSA to restrict AT&T's ability to purchase local circuit switching at UNE rates to serve any of the lines of that customer." (Cox TR 202) The witness believes the Commission should reach a similar finding here, and has offered Supra the same language it offered AT&T, consistent with the Commission's Order. (Cox TR 202, 218)

Analysis

The fundamental arguments presented in this issue are similar to those in the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration, Docket No. 000731-TP. The Commission's ruling from the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration considered the aggregation of line counts. Specifically, the Commission considered whether the FCC's intent behind Rule 51.319(c)(2) was that it be applied on a "per-account" basis, or on

a "per-location-within-the MSA" basis. In Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP, the Commission favored the "per-location-within the MSA" basis. In its ultimate finding, the Commission found "that BellSouth will not be allowed to aggregate lines provided to multiple locations of a single customer, within the same MSA, to restrict AT&T's ability to purchase local circuit switching at UNE rates to serve any of the lines of that customer." (See Order No. PSC-01-1951-FOF-TP, p.7) Staff believes that the rationale in the AT&T decision is applicable to this issue.

Staff notes, however, that a BellSouth witness cited the Commission's ultimate finding from the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration erroneously when quoting text from No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TL. (Cox TR 202) Following the issuance of Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP, AT&T identified what it perceived as an inconsistency therein. The Commission agreed, and the inconsistency was subsequently clarified and resolved in Order No. PSC-01-1951-FOF-TP, issued September 28, 2001. In relevant part, Order No. PSC-01-1951-FOF-TP states as follows:

The quoted portion of the Order [Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP] referenced in the first paragraph of Section VI of the AT&T Motion is as follows: "While FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2) is silent on answering this specific concern in a direct fashion, we believe that the FCC's intent was to have the rule apply on the 'per-location-within the MSA' basis that AT&T supported." AT&T's Motion contends that the concluding paragraph in our Order contradicted the above-noted finding. We agree, and observe that text was inadvertently omitted from the concluding paragraph of the Order, either through scrivener's or electronic error, which may have contributed to this confusion. The incorrect text of the paragraph read "Therefore, we find that BellSouth will be allowed to aggregate lines provided to multiple locations of a single customer, within the same MSA, to restrict AT&T's ability to purchase local circuit switching at UNE rates to serve any of the lines of that customer." It should actually have read: "Therefore, we find that BellSouth will not be allowed to aggregate lines provided to multiple locations of a single customer, within the same MSA, to

restrict AT&T's ability to purchase local circuit switching at UNE rates to serve any of the lines of that customer." Accordingly, Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP is corrected to reflect the above quote. (See Order No. PSC-01-1951, pp. 6-7)

Staff acknowledges that the AT&T case and the Supra case each must stand on their own merits. However, staff notes that BellSouth's witness Cox errs in citing the portions of Order No. PSC-01-1402-FOF-TP from the AT&T case as reasoning in the instant proceeding that the Commission should reach a similar finding, because those portions were later clarified. Although Order No. PSC-01-1951-FOF-TP was issued on the day following the conclusion of the hearing in the instant docket, BellSouth made no effort to acknowledge the clarifying order or the contradictory testimony from witness Cox, though it could have done both in its post-hearing brief.

The instant issue considers two questions: (1) whether BellSouth is obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve the first three lines to a customer located in Density Zone 1; and (2) whether BellSouth is obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve four or more lines provided to a customer located in Density Zone 1. As with the argument in the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration, the sub-parts to this issue rely upon the Commission's interpretation of FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2).

According to Supra's interpretation of FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2), BellSouth must offer proof in two regards before it can overcome the presumption therein. First, BellSouth should prove that it offers EELs throughout the MSA; second, BellSouth should prove that unbundled local switching options exist in the MSA. (Nilson TR 908, 910) Supra's witness Nilson contends that BellSouth must offer proof to the Commission in each regard before it will have met the presumption of FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2), and thereby be permitted to discontinue offering its unbundled local switching at UNE rates. (TR 910, 979) Overall, the Supra witness contends that "BellSouth has the burden of proof on this issue," and that BellSouth did not provide the conclusive proof to meet the presumption of FCC Rule §51.319. (Nilson TR 909)

While we agree with Supra that BellSouth did not offer specific proof for either of Supra's contentions, staff believes that the plain language of the Rule does not require a showing. Although staff believes that witness Cox's conditional statement that "so long as the other criteria for FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2) are met" implies that BellSouth is cognizant of its general obligations to offer EELs throughout Density Zone 1 in the top 50 MSAs, staff does not believe that BellSouth is obligated to offer specific proof to the Commission regarding either of Supra's enumerated concerns. (TR 200-201) Staff is unaware of any such requirement of proof in the Act, the FCC's rules, the Florida Statutes, or the Commission's Rules.

Staff believes that BellSouth has no control over whether alternative switching providers exist throughout Density Zone 1 in the top 50 MSAs. Staff does not agree with the Supra witness' conclusion that since Sprint and AT&T petitioned this Commission for relief on similar issues, that alternative switching providers do not exist. (Nilson TR 910) As with the prior decisions involving Sprint and AT&T, staff makes the assumption that choices exist, and staff does not believe that the FCC's Rule requires a showing. In addition, there is no specific data in the record of this proceeding for staff to evaluate whether alternative switching providers exist. Last, staff notes that the topic of liquidated damage provisions is addressed elsewhere in this recommendation, in Issues 65 and 66.

Based on the foregoing, staff believes that BellSouth is obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve the first three lines to a customer located in Density Zone 1. Additionally, staff believes that BellSouth is not obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve four or more lines provided to a customer located in Density Zone 1, as long as the other criteria for FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2) are met.

Conclusion

Staff's recommendation is twofold. First, staff recommends that BellSouth should be obligated to provide local circuit switching at UNE rates to Supra to serve the first three lines to a customer located in Density Zone 1. Second, staff recommends that BellSouth should not be obligated to provide local circuit switching

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

at UNE rates to Supra to serve four or more lines provided to a customer located in Density Zone 1, as long as the other criteria for FCC Rule 51.319(c)(2) are met.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 32: (A) Under what criteria may Supra Telecom charge the tandem switching rate?

(B) Based on Supra Telecom's network configuration as of January 31, 2001, has Supra Telecom met these criteria?

RECOMMENDATION: Staff notes that Phase II of Docket No. 000075-TP will address this very issue in detail, and the criteria developed in that docket will apply. However, staff believes that the initial threshold, based on § 51.711(a)(2), is that Supra's "switch" must serve a geographic area comparable to that served by BellSouth's tandem switch. Staff believes the record indicates that Supra has not deployed a switch in the state of Florida; therefore, staff recommends that Supra does not meet the criteria for the tandem switching rate at this time. (T. BROWN)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH:

(A) and (B) The Commission is currently considering the issue in Phase 2 of Docket No. 000075-TP. As such, the Commission should defer any decision in this immediate proceeding to its decision in Docket No. 000075-TP. In any event, Supra cannot meet any test because it does not have a switch operational in Florida.

SUPRA:

(A) and (B) When Supra's switches serve a geographic area comparable to that served by BellSouth's tandem switch, then Supra should be permitted to charge tandem rate elements.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The issue before the Commission is to determine what criteria Supra Telecom must satisfy in order to charge the tandem switching rate. Based on that determination, the Commission must then determine whether Supra Telecom's network configuration met those criteria as of January 31, 2001.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Cox argues that the Commission should defer any decision in this docket to its decision in Phase 2 of Docket No. 000075-TP. (TR 203) Witness Cox contends that "[w]hile the Commission has addressed this issue in previous arbitrations, the Commission is currently considering this issue in a generic docket to address all reciprocal compensation issues." (TR 203) BellSouth witness Cox also states that even if this issue was not addressed in the generic proceeding:

. . . Supra does not utilize its own switch in Florida. The fact that Supra does not utilize its own switch to serve its customers, clearly demonstrates that Supra is unable to satisfy the criteria that its switch covers a geographic area comparable to that of BellSouth's tandem switch. (TR 203)

Supra argues that it only has to show that "its switches serve geographic areas comparable to those served by BellSouth in order to charge tandem rates." (Nilson TR 916) Supra witness Nilson states that "Supra is currently in the process of collocating a number of switches in BellSouth central offices throughout the state of Florida." (TR 916) He contends that once Supra has been able to collocate its switches, Supra's switches will be in the same location as BellSouth's switches. As such, Supra switches will therefore be able to serve geographic areas comparable to those served by BellSouth. (Nilson TR 917) Witness Nilson asserts that Supra will be entitled to charge the tandem switching rate, "once those switches are installed and operational." (TR 1026) Witness Nilson contends that because Supra has been "unduly delayed" in its collocation efforts with BellSouth, he is unable to provide further evidence. (TR 917)

Staff's Analysis

Staff believes that it is necessary to look no further than 47 C.F.R. § 51, specifically § 51.711(a)(2), which states:

Where the switch of a carrier other than an incumbent LEC serves a geographic area comparable to the area served by the incumbent LEC's tandem switch, the appropriate rate for the carrier other than an incumbent LEC is the incumbent LEC's tandem interconnection rate.

Supra does not currently, nor did it as of January 31, 2001, have a switch that serves a geographic area comparable to any area served by a BellSouth switch. Supra witness Nilson's own testimony purports that:

1. BellSouth operates a total of 9 tandem offices in the State of Florida.
2. These Tandem offices form the core point of interconnection for all ALECs and IXCs operating in BellSouth's Florida Region.
3. That an ALEC who were to collocate a telephone switch such as the Lucent 5ESS or Nortel DMS 500 in each of those 9 BellSouth Tandem offices would not only cover a comparable geographic area to BellSouth, but it would cover an area IDENTICAL to BellSouth, serve all customer [sic] over the SAME trunk facilities and end user loops as by BellSouth.
4. Supra has been granted collocation of either a Lucent 5ESS or Nortel DMS 500 switch in each of the BellSouth Tandem offices in the state of Florida, and the Miami Red Road and Fort Lauderdale Plantation Local Tandems as well. (emphasis in original) (TR 985-986)

Staff does not evaluate the validity of witness Nilson's forward-looking statements here. Staff merely notes that Supra has not deployed a single switch in any BellSouth office in Florida to date. (TR 737, 798, 1026) In fact, witness Nilson admitted this when he stated, "we're entitled to charge the tandem switching rate once those switches are installed and operational." (emphasis added) (TR 1026) Supra witness Ramos also admitted in his cross examination that Supra depends "solely on BellSouth's network" and that Supra did not have its own switch. (TR 737)

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Based on the language contained in §51.711(a)(2), staff acknowledges that "a carrier other than an incumbent LEC" must, at a minimum, have a switch. Based on the evidence of record, Supra has not deployed a switch in the state of Florida and does not meet that threshold requirement. Additionally, staff notes that much of Supra's arguments are speculative; thus, staff has not addressed them at this time.

Conclusion

Staff notes that Phase II of Docket No. 000075-TP will address this very issue in detail, and the criteria developed in that docket will apply. However, staff believes that the initial threshold, based on § 51.711(a)(2), is that Supra's "switch" must serve a geographic area comparable to that served by BellSouth's tandem switch. Staff believes the record indicates that Supra has not deployed a switch in the state of Florida; therefore, staff recommends that Supra does not meet the criteria for the tandem switching rate at this time.

ISSUE 33: What are the appropriate means for BellSouth to provide unbundled local loops for provision of DSL service when such loops are provisioned on digital loop carrier facilities?

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that either of BellSouth's two proposed solutions would permit Supra to provide unbundled local loops for the provision of DSL service when such loops are provisioned on DLC facilities. The first solution would move the end user to a loop that is suitable for xDSL service. The second solution is to allow Supra to collocate its DSLAM equipment in the same RT housing where BellSouth's DSLAM equipment is located. If BellSouth cannot accommodate collocation at a particular RT where a BellSouth DSLAM is located, staff recommends that BellSouth unbundle the BellSouth packet switching functionality at the RT in accordance with FCC requirements. (BARRETT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth offers two solutions that will allow Supra to provide its xDSL services in such a situation. The first solution is to move the end user to a loop that is suitable for xDSL service. The second solution is to allow Supra to collocate its DSLAM in the remote terminal housing the DLC and give Supra access to the UNE known as loop distribution.

SUPRA: When existing loops are provisioned on digital loop carrier facilities, and Supra requests such loops in order to provide xDSL service, BellSouth should provide Supra with access to other loops or subloops so that Supra may provide xDSL service to a customer.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Four acronyms are used prominently throughout this issue. They are:

<u>ACRONYM</u>	<u>DEFINITION</u>
DLC	Digital Loop Carrier
DSL	Digital Subscriber Line (a.k.a., xDSL)
DSLAM	Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer
RT	Remote Terminal

This issue considers BellSouth's provision of unbundled local loops to Supra to support its DSL service when such loops are provisioned on BellSouth DLC facilities.

Argument

Supra witness Nilson states that the FCC's First and Third interconnection Orders, FCC 96-325 and 99-238, respectively, factor into the consideration of this issue. (TR 919-920) The witness states that ¶12 of the FCC's First Report and Order (FCC 96-325), outlines the three market entry methods for ALECs. (Nilson TR 920) Witness Nilson believes that certain changes to Rule 47 C.F.R. §51.319 were a direct result of FCC 99-238, the Third Report and Order. (TR 920) Witness Nilson acknowledges that the changes to Rule §51.319(c)(5) answer most of Supra's concerns surrounding this issue, but nonetheless believes the rule imposes a collocation requirement on ALECs that choose to provide facilities via UNE combinations, one of the three market entry methods for ALECs outlined in FCC 96-325. (Nilson TR 920) Rule 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5) states:

An incumbent LEC shall be required to provide nondiscriminatory access to unbundled packet switching capacity only where each of the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) The incumbent LEC has deployed digital loop carrier systems, including but not limited to, integrated digital loop carrier or universal digital loop carrier systems; or has deployed any other system in which fiber optic facilities replace copper facilities in the distribution section (e.g., end office to remote terminal, pedestal, or environmentally controlled vault);

(ii) There are no spare copper loops capable of supporting the xDSL services the requesting carrier seeks to offer;

(iii) The incumbent LEC has not permitted a requesting carrier to deploy a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer at the remote terminal, pedestal, or environmentally controlled vault or other interconnection point, nor has the requesting carrier obtained a virtual collocation arrangement at these subloop interconnection points as defined by § 51.319(b); and

(iv) The incumbent has deployed packet switching capability for its own use.

Specifically, the witness believes that §51.319(c)(5)(iii) imposes a collocation requirement on ALECs that choose to provide facilities exclusively via UNE combinations. (Nilson TR 920)

Witness Nilson contends that a collocation requirement would be an opportunity for BellSouth to delay Supra's market entry. (TR 1001) He states:

BellSouth is in a position to delay nearly forever collocation in a remote terminal for reasons associated with budget shortages, lack of sufficient setback or right of way to effect expansion, local zoning and permitting issues, in addition to outright refusal to implement effective Commission orders. (Nilson TR 1001)

Supra believes its track record for collocation with BellSouth is not good, specifically mentioning the North Dade Golden Glades and West Palm Beach Gardens central offices, where collocation has been delayed pending litigation since December of 1998. (Nilson TR 1000)

Witness Nilson asserts that BellSouth's position on this issue "flip-flopped" from what it had been before testimony was filed. (TR 998) The "flip-flop" resulted in Supra missing out on an opportunity to possibly close this issue prior to the Commission's consideration of it. (Nilson TR 998) Supra believes BellSouth's changed position is a prime example of BellSouth's bad-faith dealings with Supra. (Nilson TR 998)

Witness Nilson states that what Supra desires is "xDSL loop capability on the same terms it [BellSouth] supplies itself and its affiliates." (TR 998) Supra's witness states that BellSouth should be ordered to provide "unbundled packet switching to Supra, at Supra's option, not BellSouth's, whenever the end user is served via DLC and BellSouth has deployed its own DSLAMs in a given RT." (Nilson TR 1001) Supra would like the ability to order from BellSouth the packet switching UNE and a collocated DSLAM at UNE rates, wherever BellSouth deploys local switching over DLC facilities. (Supra BR p. 22) Without such capability, Supra believes that BellSouth can, in effect, deny Supra's entry into the packet switching market. (Nilson TR 1002) Supra's witness believes ¶313 of the Third Report and Order (FCC 99-238) supports its request:

313. We agree that if a requesting carrier is unable to install its DSLAM at the remote terminal or obtain spare copper loops necessary to offer the same level of quality for advanced services, the incumbent LEC can effectively deny competitors entry into the packet switching market. We find that in this limited situation, requesting carriers are impaired without access to unbundled packet switching. Accordingly, incumbent LECs must provide requesting carriers with access to unbundled packet switching in situations in which the incumbent has placed its DSLAM in a remote terminal (emphasis added by witness) (Nilson TR 999)

Supra rejects BellSouth's proposed solutions, stating that BellSouth has omitted or failed to account for unbundled access to the packet switching UNE where an xDSL compatible loop cannot be provisioned over existing copper facilities in a normal timeframe or at all. (Nilson TR 998; Supra BR pp. 20-21) Supra believes that collocation introduces delays inherent in its provisioning, and that BellSouth could "use any and all means to exercise its monopoly powers to 'effectively deny competitors entry into the packet switching market,'" according to the witness. (Nilson TR 1000-1001) Through cross-examination of a BellSouth witness, Supra advocates that if it had to wait for an augment at a BellSouth RT, that it

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

should be entitled to a packet switching UNE while waiting on the augment. (TR 407)

Witness Nilson believes that according to ¶135-137 of FCC 96-325, state commissions, including the FPSC, can assert authority to compel BellSouth to unbundle its packet switching. (TR 1001). In his concluding assertion, the witness offers that "Supra hopes this Commission will exercise its rights to foster local competition and grant Supra this protection from BellSouth's obvious and shameful attempts to 'effectively deny [Supra] entry into the packet switching market . . .'" (emphasis added by witness) (Nilson TR 1002)

BellSouth witness Cox states that a "packet switching UNE" is not the sole means by which ALECs such as Supra can offer xDSL services via UNE-P. (TR 232) In countering Supra witness Nilson's argument, the BellSouth witness asserts that it was "without merit and misplaced." (Cox TR 232) Witness Cox believes that Supra's market entry method is not significant, since "Supra has the ability to provide DSL service to its end users by UNE-P." (TR 232)

BellSouth is willing to provide Supra with two distinct methods that would allow Supra to offer xDSL services when such loops are provisioned on BellSouth's DLC facilities. (TR 370-371) Witness Kephart elaborates:

The first solution is to move the end user to a loop that is suitable for xDSL service. For example, if the end user is served via DLC but a spare copper loop is available to the end user's premises, BellSouth agrees to move the end user to the copper loop that is capable of supporting xDSL services . . . The second solution is to allow Supra to collocate its DSLAM in the remote terminal housing the DLC and give Supra access to the unbundled network element referred to as loop distribution. BellSouth agrees that in any case where it has installed its own DSLAM in a given remote terminal, BellSouth will accommodate collocation requests from Supra or from any other ALEC even if it means that room inside the remote terminal must be augmented or that the remote terminal

itself must be expanded or replaced to make room for Supra's or any other ALEC's DSLAM. (TR 370-371)

BellSouth's witness Cox provides more information on the collocation option. Witness Cox claims that through the standard collocation process, an ALEC that wants to provide xDSL service where a BellSouth DSLAM is deployed, can collocate its own DSLAM equipment at the very same BellSouth DLC RT site. (Cox TR 232) Collocation at the RT "allows the ALEC to provide the high speed access in the same manner as BellSouth," according to witness Cox. (TR 232) She continues:

BellSouth will attempt in good faith to accommodate any ALEC requesting such collocation access at a BellSouth DLC RT that contains a BellSouth DSLAM. In the very unlikely event that BellSouth cannot accommodate collocation at a particular RT, where a BellSouth DSLAM is located, BellSouth will unbundle the BellSouth packet switching functionality at that RT in accordance with FCC requirements. (Cox TR 232)

BellSouth believes that its unbundling obligation is very limited. (Cox TR 232-233; BellSouth BR p. 24) BellSouth witness Cox claims that only when all four of the subparts of 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5) are met, would an incumbent LEC be obligated to unbundle packet switching technologies deployed in its network. (Cox TR 232-233) Witness Cox cites ¶311 of the Third Report and Order as support, stating the FCC expressly addressed incumbent LECs' unbundling obligations therein. (Cox TR 232) The witness believes that since all four of the subparts of 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5) have not been satisfied, BellSouth is not obligated to unbundle its packet switching. (Cox TR 233)

Analysis

Staff believes that the FCC's Rule 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5) is crucial to the resolution of this issue. As previously stated, this issue considers BellSouth's provision of unbundled local loops to Supra to support its DSL service when such loops are provisioned on BellSouth DLC facilities.

Staff believes that most of Supra's case was built on the premise that BellSouth was not offering ALECs, including Supra, the opportunity to collocate in the RT. In effect, staff believes Supra argued that it was entitled to relief from this Commission because of its perception that Rule §51.319(c)(5)(iii) imposes a collocation requirement. In relevant part, 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5) states:

An incumbent LEC shall be required to provide nondiscriminatory access to unbundled packet switching capacity only where each of the following conditions are satisfied:

(iii) The incumbent LEC has not permitted a requesting carrier to deploy a Digital Subscriber Access Line Multiplexer at the remote terminal, pedestal, or environmentally controlled vault or other interconnection point, nor has the requesting carrier obtained a virtual collocation arrangement at these subloop interconnection points as defined by § 51.319(b);

Staff believes that Rule §51.319(c)(5) requires that all four of its sub-parts must be satisfied in order for an ILEC to be obligated to unbundle packet switching. BellSouth and Supra appear to agree that all of the sub-parts (i) - (iv) of the Rule have to be satisfied before BellSouth would be required to unbundle its packet switching capability. (Nilson TR 919-920; Cox TR 232-233) Nonetheless, Supra witness Nilson believes that state commissions, including the FPSC, can assert authority to compel BellSouth to unbundle its packet switching. (TR 1001). Supra hopes this Commission will "exercise its rights to foster local competition and grant Supra this protection from BellSouth's obvious and shameful attempts to 'effectively deny [Supra] entry into the packet switching market . . .'" (emphasis added by witness) (Nilson TR 1002)

With respect to this issue, staff believes that Supra has three primary concerns: first, the imposition of a collocation requirement stemming from 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5)(iii); second, the delays associated with obtaining collocation; and last, Supra's belief that BellSouth has omitted or failed to account for unbundled access to

the packet switching UNE where an xDSL compatible loop cannot be provisioned over existing copper facilities in a normal timeframe, or at all. (Nilson TR 920, 998, 1000) Staff, however, believes Supra's arguments are largely mitigated by BellSouth's proposal to provide Supra with two distinct methods that would allow it to offer xDSL services when such loops are provisioned on BellSouth's DLC facilities. (Kephart TR 370-371) Staff believes that BellSouth's agreeing to provide collocation for DSLAM equipment in the RT is in accordance with the FCC's Rule 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5), because BellSouth's proposal and the FCC's rule essentially mirror one another.

Staff believes that Supra's first and second concerns are largely overcome by BellSouth's offer to permit requesting carriers, including Supra, to collocate DSLAM equipment at the RT. Although BellSouth acknowledges that collocation in the RT may entail a time investment "in the neighborhood of 60 days," staff believes that the time investment is necessary to effect the collocation in the RT. (Kephart TR 408).

Staff is unclear about witness Nilson's intent in expressing Supra's third concern. Staff believes that Supra's third concern is subject to two possible interpretations: first, whether there is a limiting factor in the physical plant or at the RT; or second, whether Supra would be "denied entry into the packet switching market" if this Commission did not order BellSouth to unbundle its packet switching. (Nilson TR 1002) Staff will analyze each individually.

Supra witness Nilson expresses concern about unbundled access to packet switching in cases where an xDSL compatible loop cannot be provisioned over existing copper facilities. (TR 998) Supra's witness does not offer any detail to support this assertion, though staff believes he may be referring to the unavailability of copper facilities in the feeder network or at an RT as the basis for his requested relief. In response to Supra's general concern, BellSouth's witness Cox does not rule out the possibility, but believes it would be "very unlikely" that BellSouth would not be able to accommodate a request by Supra for collocation in one of its RTs. (TR 232) In like manner, staff acknowledges the possibility that BellSouth may not be able to accommodate all collocation

requests for its RTs, but believes that such a circumstance would be limited. As such, staff believes that this concern of Supra's is met by BellSouth's above-noted offer to unbundle the packet switching functionality under specific circumstances:

In the very unlikely event that BellSouth cannot accommodate collocation at a particular RT, where a BellSouth DSLAM is located, BellSouth will unbundle the BellSouth packet switching functionality at that RT in accordance with FCC requirements. (Cox TR 232)

Supra witness Nilson states that BellSouth should be ordered to provide "unbundled packet switching to Supra, at Supra's option, not BellSouth's, whenever the end user is served via DLC and BellSouth has deployed its own DSLAMs in a given RT." (TR 1001) Supra asserts that its own track record of collocation efforts with BellSouth demonstrates that Supra could effectively "[be] denied entry into the packet switching market" if this Commission did not order BellSouth to unbundle its packet switching. (Nilson TR 1002) Supra specifically mentions BellSouth's North Dade Golden Glades and West Palm Beach Gardens central offices, and states that Supra's collocation efforts there have been delayed pending litigation since December of 1998. (Nilson TR 1000) Staff, however, does not agree that BellSouth would maliciously "deny entrance to a competitor," as witness Nilson fears. (TR 1001) Staff would note BellSouth witness Kephart's estimate that collocation in RTs should take "in the neighborhood of 60 days." (TR 408) Staff observes that this estimated interval does not exceed the provisioning interval for a conventional (e.g., central office) collocation.

Witness Nilson believes that the Commission has the latitude to order an unbundled packet switching UNE, based upon authority granted by the FCC in ¶135-136 of the First Report and Order (FCC 96-325). (TR 1001-1002) The witness also cites to ¶313 of the Third Report and Order (FCC 99-238) for support, although staff believes that Supra's apparent reliance thereon is misguided because staff does not believe the "impair" standard of Rule 47 C.F.R. §51.317(b)(1) was adequately addressed by Supra.

Staff believes that the "impair" standard of Rule 47 C.F.R. §51.317(b)(1) must be met if state commissions mandate UNEs in addition to those established by the FCC. The Rule states:

A requesting carrier's ability to provide service is "impaired" if, taking into consideration the availability of alternative elements outside the incumbent LEC's network, including self-provisioning by a requesting carrier or acquiring an alternative from a third-party supplier, lack of access to that element materially diminishes a requesting carrier's ability to provide the services it seeks to offer. . . . If the Commission determines that lack of access to an element impairs a requesting carrier's ability to provide service, it may require the unbundling of that element

Although Supra offers anecdotal evidence regarding its overall collocation experience with BellSouth, staff does not believe that this evidence alone demonstrates that the "impair" standard has been met. Staff does not believe that any other evidence supports a showing regarding the "impair" standard. Staff believes that BellSouth's unbundling obligation is very limited and clear under Rule 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5).

In summary, staff believes that both of Supra's concerns are largely overcome by BellSouth's offer to permit requesting carriers, including Supra, to collocate DSLAM equipment at the RT, in accordance with the FCC's Rule 47 C.F.R. §51.319(c)(5). Furthermore, in the unlikely event that BellSouth cannot accommodate collocation at a particular RT where a BellSouth DSLAM is located, BellSouth will unbundle its packet switching functionality at that RT in accordance with the above-named FCC rule, states witness Cox. (TR 232) Staff believes the two solutions proposed by BellSouth should meet Supra's concerns, are in accordance with the FCC's Rule, and would permit Supra to provide unbundled local loops for the provision of DSL service when such loops are provisioned on DLC facilities.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Conclusion

Staff recommends that either of BellSouth's two proposed solutions would permit Supra to provide unbundled local loops for the provision of DSL service when such loops are provisioned on DLC facilities. The first solution would move the end user to a loop that is suitable for xDSL service. The second solution is to allow Supra to collocate its DSLAM equipment in the same RT housing where BellSouth's DSLAM equipment is located. If BellSouth cannot accommodate collocation at a particular RT where a BellSouth DSLAM is located, staff recommends that BellSouth unbundle the BellSouth packet switching functionality at that RT in accordance with FCC requirements.

ISSUE 34: What coordinated cut-over process should be implemented to ensure accurate, reliable and timely cut-overs when a customer changes local service from BellSouth to Supra Telecom?

RECOMMENDATION: The coordinated cut-over process proposed by BellSouth should be implemented to ensure accurate, reliable and timely cut-overs when service is transferred from a BellSouth switch to a Supra switch. ~~Alternatively, the language agreed to by BellSouth and AT&T, and approved by this Commission in Order No. PSC-01-2357-FOF-TP, in resolution of this issue in Docket 000731-TP, should be incorporated.~~ Additionally, staff recommends that BellSouth should be required to implement a single "C" (Change) order process in lieu of its "D" (Disconnect) and "N" (New) order process when provisioning UNE-P conversions. (TURNER)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth uses a very detailed process for conversion of live local service. No changes in the process are necessary at this time. BellSouth's processes provide for a smooth transition for an end user electing to change local service providers from BellSouth to Supra with minimal end user service interruption.

SUPRA: The coordinated cut-over process proposed by Supra should be implemented to ensure an accurate, reliable, and timely cut-over within a 5 minute time frame. BellSouth's proposed process does not ensure that customers switching from BellSouth to Supra receive the same treatment that BellSouth customers receive.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The issue before the Commission contemplates which parties' proposed coordinated cut-over process should be implemented in order to ensure accurate, timely, loop cut-overs when a BellSouth retail customer changes local service to Supra. Although the issue as stated embodies a process in which there is a manual transfer of service (i.e. a physical disconnection of the loop or "hot-cut") from a BellSouth switch to a CLEC switch, staff notes that a portion of Supra's testimony raises concerns regarding BellSouth's practice of issuing two orders, a "D" (Disconnect) order and an "N" (New) order, in lieu of a single "C" (Change) order when provisioning UNE-P conversions. Supra claims that this practice has

resulted in an increase in customer service outages shortly after conversion and subsequent damage to Supra's reputation.

Thus, staff observes that the record addresses two distinctly different issues: (1) which coordinated cut-over process should be followed in the transfer of live local service from a BellSouth switch to an ALEC switch, and (2) whether or not BellSouth should be required to discontinue its use of the "D" and "N" orders in place of a single "C" order when provisioning UNE-P conversions. Consequently, staff will address both issues below.

Arguments

Regarding coordinated cut-overs, BellSouth witness Kephart testifies that this issue arose from the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration and specifically dealt with the case where AT&T wanted to use its own switch to serve the end user. He explains:

In such a case a coordinated cutover process results in a transfer of service from a BellSouth switch to a CLEC switch and is much more than a simple billing change. It requires a disconnect from a BellSouth switch and a reconnect to a CLEC switch as discussed in my previous testimony. (TR 395)

In his testimony, the witness describes in detail the loop cut-over process that BellSouth uses to change a customer line from a BellSouth switch to an ALEC switch. (TR 372-374, 377; EXH 14, JK-2, JK-3) He testifies that this procedure is used for all ALECs across the region with high levels of success. (TR 376)

According to witness Kephart, this procedure involves a high level of coordination between BellSouth and the ALEC in order to ensure timely, successful conversions. Consequently, the witness states that "[a]ny errors (both BellSouth's and the ALEC's errors) slow the process while corrections are identified and made." As such, he argues that while BellSouth should be responsible for its own errors during the cut-over process, it should not be held responsible for delays resulting from errors caused by the ALEC. (TR 375) Moreover, witness Kephart explains:

A customer may experience service outage if either service provider fails to follow a rational and consistent process for converting live service. However, this is not the norm nor has BellSouth exhibited a pattern of failure that has resulted in the level of service outage alleged to have been experienced by Supra end users. (TR 376)

Furthermore, witness Kephart affirms that the language proposed by BellSouth in resolution of this issue is supportive of its hot-cut process and its commitment to provide coordinated conversions to Supra which "afford a meaningful opportunity for Supra to compete for local service." (TR 377; EXH 7, pp.19-20) Additionally, he states at the hearing that BellSouth's process "has evolved and been improved over the years in collaboration with the ALECs so that it now works quite effectively the vast majority of the times [sic]." (TR 401)

On the other hand, Supra witness Nilson characterizes witness Kephart's procedure as a "good starting point only." (TR 1007, 1030) He believes that witness Kephart's proposal lacks the coordination necessary to ensure successful conversions without Supra customers experiencing service outages. In fact, witness Nilson asserts that "Mr. Kephart's proposed language allows and encourages such service outages by failing to actually maintain any coordination at all." (TR 1004)

Witness Nilson contends that witness Kephart's proposal leaves serious omissions in the process, excluding steps which he claims were initially proposed to Supra by BellSouth's UNE loop product manager, Jerry Latham. (TR 1004) Specifically, witness Nilson refers to a proposal to provide a link-up of the ALEC personnel (including various departments as necessary), the BellSouth frame technician and the BellSouth personnel effecting local switch translations and local number portability translations during the process. (Nilson TR 1004-1005) He explains:

...most of the time a BellSouth retail customer converts to an ALEC, they want to keep their existing number. Therefore, the number must be "ported" to the ALEC. This is effected through Global Title Translations at a

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

national level such that after the conversion, the nationwide, multicarrier SS7 signaling network ubiquitously knows that the number no longer resides on the BellSouth switch with SS7 point code abcd, but that it resides on the ALEC switch with point code zxyw. Once that change is made, and it propagates through the SS7 network, the number is ported to the new switch. (Emphasis in original) (TR 1005)

Witness Nilson continues, stressing the importance of coordinating the timing of LNP (Local Number Portability) translations with BellSouth and ALEC switch translations:

If done early, the ALEC switch translation may not be in place to handle it and calls will, effectively, drop off into a black hole. If done early and the ALEC translations are in place, the switch will respond as it should and switch the call...into thin air.

If done late, other strange things occur. If done late, and the BellSouth switch translations are not yet backed out (After all if the loop is moved no calls will be coming in...) the BellSouth switch will improperly and incorrectly handle the call and switch the call...into thin air. If done late and the BellSouth switch translation has already backed out the call will be routed to a BellSouth that has no clue what to do with it and the caller ends up in a black hole.

The timing and propagation of LNP translations, if initiated at the same time as BellSouth and ALEC switch translations are changed, will result in undefined response for some period of time as perhaps both switches are correct, but there will be some uncertainty as to witch [sic] switch the incoming call will be routed to depending upon where the call originates from and LNP propagation delays to the SS7 STP/SCP serving that switch. (Emphasis in original) (TR 1006)

Witness Nilson believes that the omission of this type of coordination in the coordinated hot-cut process will result in

numerous service outages by Supra end users during conversion. (TR 1004) Supra concludes in its brief, that in order to prevent service outages as a result of the cut-over process, Supra must have proper coordination with the BellSouth frame technician and personnel effecting local switch translations and local number portability translations. (Supra BR at 22-23)

Additionally, Supra witness Nilson raises concerns over BellSouth's practice of submitting "D" and "N" (Disconnect and New) orders instead of a single "C" (Change) order when Supra converts a BellSouth retail customer using UNE-P. He states that "the effect of this is that a customer's service is actually disconnected during the conversion process. According to the witness, these service outages have resulted in numerous customer service complaints against Supra. (TR 922-924) At the hearing the witness states:

Now, the fact of the matter is, Supra issued a conversion order. The fact that Supra's conversion order gets disassociated into a D and an N, which is a disconnect and a new order, oftentimes -- and I know those two orders are supposed to be tied together when they go through the system, but there have been numerous instances where the disconnect order would get worked, and then due to some other eligibility reason, like the customer had BellSouth paging service, BellSouth.net Internet service or something of the like, the new order couldn't get processed because there was a problem with the customer service record. (TR 1050)

Witness Nilson testifies that the customer would be left with disconnected service until the "associated eligibility issues" were sorted out. (TR 1050) The witness contends that BellSouth's process has caused "hundreds of cases of lost dialtone, BellSouth Winback, and Public Service Commission and Better Business Bureau complaints again [sic] Supra." (TR 924) Witness Nilson asserts that "no customer should ever go without service as a result of a conversion" as the conversion is only a "billing change." (TR 923)

Under cross-examination, BellSouth witness Kephart retorts that the conversion of a customer from BellSouth to a CLEC via UNE-P is "not exactly a billing change." He admits that the conversion does

not require a physical disconnection of the line; however, he states that BellSouth issues the disconnect and reconnect orders as a means of accurately recording the conversion in its system. (TR 410-411) He explains:

We are effectively turning over a portion of our plant on the UNE basis to another company, and there are billing issues that have to go with that, because that's a different price for doing that than it is for, say, resale, but - so we have to address that within our systems and make sure it's recorded correctly so that we can handle everything, but it is a case where now the CLEC has ownership of the physical plant through leasing it from us versus a resale situation, so there is a difference from a systems standpoint, in particular. (TR 410)

He further explains that BellSouth has looked at various methods of accomplishing UNE-P conversions and determined that the most effective method was to do the "D" and "N" order process. He testifies that BellSouth has completed studies in recent months showing the process to have an error rate of around 1%. (TR 412; EXH-15)

Analysis

As stated previously, the record addresses two distinctly different issues needing resolution by the Commission: (1) which coordinated cut-over process should be implemented in the transfer of live local service from a BellSouth switch to an ALEC switch, and (2) whether or not BellSouth should be required to discontinue its use of the "D" and "N" orders in place of a single "C" order when provisioning UNE-P conversions.

Regarding coordinated cut-overs from a BellSouth switch to a Supra switch, BellSouth witness Kephart contends that BellSouth provides a very detailed coordinated cutover process which ensures accurate and timely cutovers for conversion of service from BellSouth to Supra. According to the witness, this same process is used "across the region for ALECs with a high level of success." (TR 372-377) Supra witness Nilson states that witness Kephart's

procedure is a "good starting point only," and must include the proper coordination of LNP translations with both BellSouth and ALEC switch translations during customer conversions in order to prevent service outages. (Nilson 1004-1007) Staff notes that Supra fails to document a procedure or propose contract language for this Commission to consider in order to resolve this issue.¹⁷

Staff observes, however, that the language proposed by BellSouth regarding this issue includes a provision for translations coordination, as noted by Supra in its brief. (Supra BR at 23) BellSouth's proposed language at Attachment 2, Section 3.8, reads in part:

Supra Telecom shall order Services and Elements as set forth in this Attachment 2 and BellSouth shall provide a Firm Order Confirmation within the interval set forth in this Agreement. When Supra Telecom desires to dictate a specific time for the coordinated cutover of a local loop ordered, Supra Telecom shall do so by requesting on the Local Service Request, Order Coordination - Time Specific and paying the appropriate rate set forth in Exhibit A, incorporated herein by this reference. **Any coordinated conversion and associated translations requirements shall be performed so as to limit end user service outage.** In all other instances of coordination the procedures set forth in this section shall apply. (EXH 7, JAR-1, pp.19-20; Emphasis added)

Additionally, staff observes that this exact issue appeared in the AT&T/BellSouth arbitration and was resolved by the parties. Staff notes that BellSouth is willing to accept language agreed to with AT&T in settling this issue. (Kephart 372)

Consequently, in light of Supra's failure to document a process in resolution of this issue, staff believes that BellSouth's coordinated cut-over process should be implemented when service is

¹⁷Although Supra asserts in its post-hearing statement that its (Supra's) proposed coordinated cut-over process should be implemented, staff notes that Supra fails to provide such process anywhere in the record evidence.

transferred from a BellSouth switch to a Supra switch. Alternatively, staff notes that Supra may choose to adopt the provisions ~~the language~~ agreed to by BellSouth and AT&T regarding coordinated conversions, and approved by this Commission in Order No. PSC-01-2357-FOF-TP in Docket No. 000731-TP, ~~should be incorporated.~~

With respect to UNE-P conversions, staff notes that BellSouth witness Kephart admits that no physical disconnection of service occurs during a UNE-P conversion. However, he explains that in a UNE-P conversion, BellSouth is "effectively turning over a portion of (its) plant on the UNE basis to another company." He contends that there are "billing issues" that are associated with the conversion and that BellSouth has to address those issues within its system. (TR 410) Witness Kephart states that the "D" and "N" order process is the most effective method BellSouth has come up with to accomplish UNE-P conversions, and that this process has an error rate of "somewhere around 1% or less." (Kephart 412; EXH 15)

While staff finds no evidence in the record disputing BellSouth's claim that the process results in an error rate of 1% or less, staff observes that when customers go without service as a result of this process, the customer blames Supra, not BellSouth, for the problem. (TR 923-924) Furthermore, staff agrees with Supra witness Nilson that the conversion process is a "billing change" and consequently, a customer should not experience a disconnection of service during a conversion. (TR 923) As such, staff believes that BellSouth should be required to implement a single "C" (Change) order instead of two separate orders, a "D" (Disconnect) order and an "N" (New) order, when provisioning UNE-P conversions.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that BellSouth's coordinated cut-over process should be implemented when service is transferred from a BellSouth switch to a Supra switch. ~~Alternatively, the language agreed to by BellSouth and AT&T, and approved by this Commission in Order No. PSC-01-2357-FOF-TP, in resolution of this issue, should be incorporated.~~ Additionally, staff recommends that BellSouth should be required to implement a single "C" (Change) order process in lieu

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

of its "D" (Disconnect) and "N" (New) order process when provisioning UNE-P conversions.

ISSUE 38: Is BellSouth required to provide Supra Telecom with nondiscriminatory access to the same databases BellSouth uses to provision its customers?

RECOMMENDATION: No. BellSouth is only required to provide Supra with nondiscriminatory access to OSS functionality, and not to provide direct access to the same databases BellSouth uses to provision its customers. (BARRETT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: Direct access to BellSouth's databases is unnecessary and more importantly is not required by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. BellSouth provides Supra and other ALECs with the nondiscriminatory access required by the 1996 Act and the FCC.

SUPRA: This issue is resolved by OAR-3. BellSouth was ordered to give Supra direct non-discriminatory access to BellSouth's OSS starting June 15, 2001. Additionally, such is mandated by the Act, as Supra should be allowed direct access to the same OSS, databases and legacy systems that BellSouth uses itself.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This issue considers whether BellSouth is required to provide Supra with nondiscriminatory access to the same OSS databases it uses to provision services for BellSouth end-use customers.

Arguments

Supra witness Ramos believes that Supra should be allowed direct access to the same OSS, databases, and legacy systems that BellSouth uses to provision service to its own customers. (TR 526) The witness asserts that FCC Rule 47 CFR §51.313 supports Supra's position. Rule 47 CFR §51.313(c) states:

An incumbent LEC must provide a carrier purchasing access to unbundled network elements with the pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing functions of the incumbent LEC's operations support systems. (TR 649)

Witness Ramos believes that Supra's current agreement with BellSouth contains provisions designed to ensure that BellSouth provides ALECs, including Supra, with nondiscriminatory access to its OSS at parity with what BellSouth provides itself. (TR 521) These "Parity Provisions" are relevant to this and several other issues, according to the witness. (Ramos TR 521-526) With respect to this issue, witness Ramos believes that the terms and conditions of Section 28.6.12 support his argument. Section 28.6.12 states:

BellSouth will provide [Supra] with the capability to provide [Supra] customers the same ordering, provisioning intervals, and level of service experiences as BellSouth provides its own customers, in accordance with standards or other measurements that are at least equal to the level that BellSouth provides or is required to provide by law and its own internal procedures. (TR 522)

The witness believes that "[w]ithout true parity in OSS, no competition can develop in the local exchange market." (Ramos TR 646)

BellSouth offers two OSS platforms, one system for its own purposes, and a separate one for the ALEC community, according to witness Ramos. (TR 646) The videotape exhibit, "This Ol' Service Order," gives an overview of how BellSouth retail orders flow through the BellSouth OSS, but witness Ramos contends that the existence of separate OSS systems inherently makes the two OSS systems unequal. (EXH 18, OAR 31; Ramos TR 646) Supra seeks direct access to all of BellSouth's OSS systems. (Ramos TR 780)

BellSouth witness Pate believes that this issue hinges on the FCC's definition of "nondiscriminatory access to OSS systems." (TR 1102) He believes BellSouth's obligation to offer nondiscriminatory access to OSS systems encompasses two components. First, such OSS access must be equal across all carriers, and also equal-in-quality to its own OSS, according to ¶312 of the FCC's First Report and Order (FCC 96-325). Second, the OSS should allow ALECs to perform the functions of pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing for resale services in substantially the same time and manner as BellSouth provides for itself, according to ¶518 of FCC 96-325. (Pate TR 1102) Continuing, the witness notes one

exception -- OSS functions that do not have retail analogues. (Pate TR 1102) For the exception, witness Pate believes that BellSouth must offer OSS access "sufficient to allow an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete." (TR 1102-1103)

Witness Pate states that BellSouth has designed and implemented a variety of electronic interfaces to suit the business plans and entry methods of ALECs in the BellSouth region. (TR 1107) "An ALEC's selection of an interface depends on its business plan and entry strategy," states witness Pate. (TR 1107) He offers:

BellSouth provides access to its OSS via the following electronic interfaces: Electronic Data Interchange ("EDI") for ordering and provisioning; Local Exchange Navigation System ("LENS"), Telecommunications Access Gateway ("TAG"), and RoboTAG™ for pre-ordering, ordering and provisioning; Trouble Analysis and Facilities Interface ("TAFI") for maintenance and repair; Electronic Communications Trouble Administration ("ECTA") for maintenance and repair; and for the function of billing, Access Daily Usage File ("ADUF"), Enhanced Optional Daily Usage File ("EODUF") and Optional Daily Usage File ("ODUF"). In conformance with the FCC's requirements, these interfaces allow the ALECs to perform the functions of pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing for services in substantially the same time and manner as BellSouth does for itself; and, in the case of unbundled network elements, provide a reasonable competitor with a meaningful opportunity to compete, which is also in conformance with the FCC's requirements. (TR 1104)

The witness believes that BellSouth provides to Supra and all ALECs nondiscriminatory access to its OSS by way of electronic and manual interfaces. (Pate TR 1104) "Direct access to BellSouth's databases is unnecessary and more importantly is not required by the Telecommunications Act of 1996," states BellSouth witness Pate. (TR 1101) In conclusion, the witness states that providing Supra with direct access to its OSS would mean providing it with access no other ALEC has. (Pate TR 1116)

Analysis

Staff believes that this issue considers whether BellSouth is required to provide Supra with direct, nondiscriminatory access to the same OSS databases it uses to provision services for BellSouth end-use customers. Staff, however, disagrees with Supra witness Ramos's strict interpretation of FCC Rule 47 CFR §51.313(c) as obligating BellSouth to provide Supra with direct access to its OSS. (TR 649) Rather, staff believes that FCC Rule 47 CFR §51.313(c) obligates BellSouth to provide to ALECs and Supra nondiscriminatory access to the functionalities of pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing of the incumbent LEC's OSS, but not the direct access that Supra is seeking.

As stated by witness Pate, BellSouth developed its ALEC OSS interfaces to suit the business plans and entry methods of all ALECs in the BellSouth region. (TR 1107) Staff would note that ALECs, including Supra, may enter the market by means of resale, UNEs, or through the provision of their own facilities. According to BellSouth witness Pate, "ALECs can select . . . the interfaces . . . to match their particular mix of services, volume of orders, technical expertise, resources, and future plans." (TR 1107) Staff, however, does not agree with witness Ramos that the existence of separate OSS systems inherently makes the two OSS systems unequal, primarily because staff believes that retail and wholesale provisioning can be dissimilar processes. (Ramos TR 646) Furthermore, staff agrees with witness Pate that "[a]n ALECs's selection of an interface depends on its business plan and entry strategy." (TR 1107)

Although witness Ramos states that he has personally seen two of BellSouth's retail OSS systems and believes that Supra could readily make use of the identical OSS systems, staff does not agree. (TR 779) Staff acknowledges that while certain retail and wholesale provisioning processes may look similar, the products themselves are different. As a result, staff believes the support mechanisms and inter-related systems (e.g., the respective OSS platforms) would not be compatible, without considerable modification. While modification or integration is conceivable, staff does not believe that BellSouth is specifically obligated to grant Supra direct

access to its OSS, and therefore does not recommend that BellSouth be required to provide Supra with direct access to the same databases BellSouth uses to provision service to its retail customers. Staff believes the ALEC OSS interfaces allow ALECs, including Supra, to perform the functions of pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing in substantially the same time and manner as BellSouth provides for itself, as described in ¶518 of FCC 96-325. Staff notes, however, that OSS performance levels were not evaluated in the context of this issue, or in this docket.

Conclusion

BellSouth is not required to provide Supra with direct access to the same databases BellSouth uses to provision its customers. BellSouth is only required to provide Supra with nondiscriminatory access to OSS functionality, and not to provide direct access to the BellSouth OSS.

ISSUE 40: Should Standard Message Desk Interface-Enhanced ("SMDI-E"), Inter-Switch Voice Messaging Service ("IVMS") and any other corresponding signaling associated with voice mail messaging be included within the cost of the UNE switching port? If not, what are the appropriate charges, if any?

RECOMMENDATION: No. SMDI-E, IVMS, and any other corresponding signaling associated with voice mail messaging should not be included within the cost of the UNE switching port. The appropriate rates are those found in BellSouth's FCC No. 1 tariff. In addition, if Supra chooses to provide its own link, it should notify BellSouth and BellSouth should determine within a reasonable time frame whether or not there are any other unbundled elements associated with completing that service and what, if any, additional charges are associated with that service. (KING)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: SMDI-E and IVMS have data transmission capabilities that exceed the functionality of an unbundled port. BellSouth offers these capabilities to Supra at the same tariffed rates that it provides SMDI-E and IVMS to other unaffiliated voice messaging providers. As an alternative, Supra may provide its own data transmission links or purchase such links from BellSouth at UNE prices.

SUPRA: These signals are features and functions of the switch port to inform the end user of a voice message. The previous agreement recognized that this signaling and all other related voice mail signaling are part of the switch port; therefore, there should be no additional charges beyond the port cost for such signaling.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

This issue is to address if Standard Message Desk Interface-Enhanced ("SMDI-E"), Inter-Switch Voice Messaging Service ("IVMS") and any other corresponding signaling associated with voice mail messaging should be included within the cost of the UNE switching port.

Parties' Arguments

According to BellSouth witness Kephart, Standard Message Desk Interface-Enhanced (SMDI-E) is the industry term for BellSouth's Simplified Message Desk Interface (SMDI) service. SMDI is a feature that provides the capability for sending call data to a voice messaging service (VMS) provider and allows the VMS provider to signal its end user. Data transmitted from a BellSouth switch to the VMS platform includes the calling telephone number, the called telephone number and the reason for the call being forwarded. (Kephart TR 383) Data transmitted from the VMS platform to the BellSouth switch includes the message waiting indication. The message waiting indication may be either audible (such as "stutter dialtone") or visual (such as a message waiting light on the telephone set). (Kephart TR 383-384)

IVMS (which is also referred to as Interoffice Simplified Message Desk Interface or "ISMDI") is the inter-switch version of SMDI. ISMDI takes advantage of the BellSouth CCS7 signaling network which allows a voice messaging provider to offer service to multiple switch locations using a single data facility interconnection. (Kephart TR 384)

According to BellSouth witness Kephart, he believes that Supra intends to use SMDI-E and ISMDI to provide an information service (a voice messaging service) rather than to provide a telecommunications service. (TR 384) The Act defines "information service" as:

The term 'information service' means the offering of a capability for generating, acquiring, storing, transforming, processing, retrieving, utilizing, or making available information via telecommunications, and includes electronic publishing, but does not include any use of any such capability for the management, control, or operation of a telecommunications system or the management of a telecommunications service. Section 3(a)41. (TR 384-385).

The witness notes that he believes that Supra does not dispute that voice messaging service is an information service rather than a telecommunications service. (TR 385)

Witness Kephart argues that BellSouth's SMDI-E and IVMS both have capabilities that go beyond the functionality contained in an unbundled switch port. (TR 385) He notes that both features provide for data transmission to and from the customer's voice mail platform. As such, he maintains that BellSouth will provide these data transmission capabilities to Supra at the same tariffed rates that it provides SMDI-E and IVMS to other unaffiliated voice messaging providers. Moreover, he acknowledges that these are also the same tariffed rates BellSouth charges to its own affiliated voice messaging provider. As an alternative, witness Kephart believes that Supra may provide its own data transmission links or purchase such links from BellSouth at UNE prices. (TR 385)

On cross examination BellSouth witness Kephart was questioned regarding what charges, if any, would apply if Supra provided its own transport via unbundled switching. (TR 425) The witness explained that:

What we've tried to say here, because we're not really sure what Supra wants to do, but we have this service capability that is used by people that provide voice mail service which are information service providers by definition, and that includes BellSouth as well. We utilize the service as well. (TR 425)

And what we have said is that [sic] sell that communication service to voice mail providers, information providers, out of the tariff. We use it for our own memory call service and purchase it from the tariff at the same rates as unaffiliated voice message providers would purchase it, and we would also offer to sell it to Supra for its voice mail service when it's acting as an information service provider at the same tariff rate. That's the first option. (TR 425)

The second option is that Supra has indicated, from what I've been able to gather from some of the testimony, that

they would like to provide some portion of that capability themselves, and we have said that that's okay. As a CLEC they can do that, and we will sell them the remaining portion of the service at unbundled rates for the UNEs that are required to provide it, and that would take -- this is not something we've done in the past, so it would take an analysis of what it is that Supra wants to do, what portion they want to provide themselves, and then we're going to have to look at the rest of the service and the capability, break it down into the UNEs that are there, and say we'll charge you the UNE rates for these additional elements, and that's basically what our position -- I've tried to espouse on this issue, if that makes sense. (TR 425-426)

At hearing the BellSouth witness clarified that if Supra were providing its own link for SMDI, BellSouth would not charge Supra for that link. (Kephart TR 426) However, whether or not there are any other unbundled elements associated with completing that service is an analysis that BellSouth would have to undertake to determine whether or not there were any additional charges associated with that service. As an example witness Kephart notes that if Supra were only interested in SMDI, it would have some kind of a link from the central office, the host office, over to a voice mailbox, and BellSouth would provide Supra a connection to the host switch at the demarcation point in the central office in order to complete that circuit. BellSouth would review whether or not there were any additional unbundled elements associated with that service. (TR 427) With ISMDI, as the witness explains, there are multiple offices involved and there are additional unbundled elements associated with signaling to get it to the different offices. Witness Kephart acknowledged that BellSouth would not expect Supra to pay for anything that it was providing itself. (TR 427)

According to Supra witness Nilson, unbundled local switching requires that the ALEC who leases a switching port be given all features and functionalities of the port. He argues that one such feature is the ability of the port to produce stutter dialtone or to activate a light on the telephone set of a subscriber, in response to a signal from a voice mail system provider, to let the telephone subscriber know there is a message waiting. (TR 926) He

notes that traditionally this task has been done via SMDI and enhancements to it such as IVMS which allow one switch to pass messaging requests across the SS7 network to other switches without the use of a dedicated network. (Nilson TR 927)

Witness Nilson maintains that while SMDI is clearly a function of the switch port, and the functionality of it comes with the switch port, in Florida there is no unbundled access to this "fundamentally important signaling network/switch port functionality." (TR 927) Therefore, he argues an ALEC is not in parity with the ILEC for the local switching UNE. (Nilson TR 927) Specifically, he argues that BellSouth does not provide unbundled access to this signaling network, but in its FCC #1 Access Tariff lists SMDI and something called ISMDI. (TR 927) He notes:

The description of ISMDI is an SS7/TCAP based network that through a convoluted conversion of conversion [sic] between SMDI, ISDN, and SS7/TCAP messages provides a single connection to a signaling connection that is supposed to be able to activate a Message Waiting Indicator (MWI) on a Latawide basis. (TR 927)

Witness Nilson believes that ISMDI is clearly not as cost effective as the IVMS approach. He argues that "The alternative an ALEC has would be to establish an SMDI connection to each and every BellSouth switch in Florida, a total of 206 individual connections at last count." (Nilson TR 927) He argues that this presents a substantial barrier to entry. (TR 927-928)

Furthermore, witness Nilson contends that there is no separate signaling network required to transmit messages from switch-to-switch. He argues that it is included in the basic switch port functionality, and network-wide signaling across the SS7 network. The witness bases this on information obtained during a meeting with Bell Labs personnel on this issue. (TR 928) Additionally, witness Nilson notes that the Bell Labs engineers confirmed that IVMS has been adopted as an industry standard for approximately seven years; this standard is also supported by Nortel and Siemens. Accordingly, the witness believes that all switches in BellSouth's network are compliant and that the required software is already loaded on BellSouth's switches. (TR 928) He argues that ALEC's access to the

IVMS signaling network should be defined as a fundamental component of local switching line and trunk ports, and ALEC access to this network should be provided by all Florida ILECs as it is elsewhere in the country. (TR 929) He maintains the various message-signaling networks are necessary for an ALEC to compete with the ILEC, and failure to have access to such signaling impairs Supra Telecom's ability to acquire new customers who view such limitations as the mark of an inferior company. (TR 929)

In his rebuttal testimony witness Nilson further argues that BellSouth witness Kephart began his testimony on this issue by making a "huge mistake." (TR 1008) Specifically, he notes that witness Kephart testified that SMDI-E and SMDI are the same thing. Witness Nilson believes this is wrong and notes that "I would doubt every other word Mr. Kephart writes on this subject." (TR 1008) In his own testimony witness Nilson attempts to explain what the differences are between SMDI-E and SMDI and what is incorrect in witness Kephart's testimony. (TR 1009)

According to witness Nilson, SMDI is essentially called party/calling party ID service intended to support voice mail services that have calls forwarded to them. He believes that it provides calling party number and name (CNAM) information in a digital format. Witness Nilson explains that since calls are forwarded into a hunt group at the voice mail system, that system needs to know on whose behalf to record the incoming message. (TR 1009) He continues by noting:

So SMDI also supplies the number of the called party and the CNAM information as well. This enables the voice mail system to immediately determine for who the call was intended and transfer the recorded message into that subscribers voice mail box. It is this very requirement to know the called party that makes SMDI essential. Caller ID is just not enough to operate voice mail systems today. (TR 1009)

SMDI provides the reason the call was forwarded to voice mail (line busy, no answer, etc.) And can provide other

information to the voice mail system, but these five items are the primary ones needed¹⁸. (TR 1009)

With regard to SMDI-E, witness Nilson notes:

I believe what Mr.,. [sic] Kephart wanted to say in the first line of his testimony is that SMDI-E is BellSouth's term for the industry standard Inter-Switch Voice Messaging Service ("ISVM") protocol jointly supported by Lucent Technologies, Nortel Networks, and Siemens systems. (TR 1010)

ISVM/SMDI-E uses the facilities and message sets of the SS7 network to transmit SMDI from one switch to another connected to the voice mail platform. This allows distributed networks to be built without having to tie a voice mail system to each and every switch. (TR 1010)

Finally, with regard to BellSouth witness Kephart's testimony that SMDI is used to provide an information service, not a telecommunications service, Supra witness Nilson notes:

First of all I'm not clear what this has to do with anything in this docket. I see it as another BellSouth attempt to obfuscate what should be a crystal clear issue. (TR 1010)

However, witness Nilson does agree with witness Kephart that voice mail meets the statutory definition for an information (or advanced/enhanced) service as defined by the Act. However, he believes that there is no explicit rule that would require that it can only be an information service. (TR 1010)

Analysis

Staff believes that the Commission must determine if the signaling associated with voice mail messaging should be included within the cost of the UNE switch port. Stated differently, the issue is whether or not Supra must pay any charge for signaling

¹⁸ Witness Nilson does not identify what the "five items" are.

associated with voice mail messaging when it purchases the UNE switch port.

BellSouth argues that these messaging features have capabilities that go beyond the functionality contained in an unbundled switch port and as such, BellSouth will provide these data transmission capabilities to Supra at the same tariffed rates that it provides SMDI-E and IVMS to other unaffiliated voice messaging providers. These are also the same tariffed rates BellSouth charges to its own affiliated voice messaging provider. Furthermore, BellSouth witness Kephart maintains that Supra intends to use SMDI-E and ISMDI to provide an information service rather than to provide a telecommunications service. (TR 384)

Supra witness Nilson maintains that SMDI is one of the "features, functions, and capabilities" of the unbundled local switching port. He maintains that the software to support SMDI and IVMS (SMDI-E) is part of the base generic software load of Lucent, Nortel, and Siemens switches. Furthermore, he believes that SMDI-E uses the SS7 signaling network which is also considered part of the UNE switch port. (TR 1012)

Staff is not persuaded by witness Nilson's argument that the signaling associated with voice mail messaging should be considered part of the UNE switch port. Staff believes that voice mail messaging services are nonregulated, nontelecommunications information services and as such BellSouth is not required to offer the components as part of the switch port. As stated in Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunication Act of 1996, each telecommunications carrier has the duty to provide:

. . . to any requesting telecommunications carrier for the provision of a telecommunications service, nondiscriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement and the requirements of this section and section 252. (emphasis added)

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Furthermore, staff notes that in Docket No. 990649A-TP, Order No. PSC-01-1181-FOF-TP, issued May 25, 2001, the Commission approved switch port charges that do not include the switch features and functions; a separate charge applies for switch features. As such, staff believes Supra should purchase these services out of BellSouth's FCC tariff, or as suggested by witness Kephart, Supra may provide its own data transmission links or purchase such links from BellSouth at UNE prices.

Conclusion

SMDI-E, IVMS, and any other corresponding signaling associated with voice mail messaging should not be included within the cost of the UNE switching port. The appropriate rates are those found in BellSouth's FCC No. 1 tariff. In addition, if Supra chooses to provide its own link, it should notify BellSouth and BellSouth should determine within a reasonable time frame whether or not there are any other unbundled elements associated with completing that service and what, if any, additional charges are associated with that service.

ISSUE 42: What is the proper time frame for either party to render bills?

RECOMMENDATION: The proper time frame for either party to render bills is one year, unless the bill was in dispute, meet point billing guidelines require either Party to rely on records provided by the other Party, or customer provided data such as PLU or PIU factors or other ordering data is incorrect. (T. BROWN)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: In general, twelve months is sufficient time to bill for services. However, there are instances where BellSouth relies on billing information from either third parties or from Supra itself to bill accurately. In these cases, BellSouth should be permitted to bill charges to the full extent allowed by law rather than artificial time limits proposed by Supra.

SUPRA: BellSouth should be required to continue its current practice of not rendering bills for charges more than one year old. BellSouth does not render bills to its own retail customers for charges more than one year old, and BellSouth should not bill Supra, as a wholesale customer, any differently.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The issue before the Commission is to determine what the proper time frame should be for either party to render bills.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Greene contends that in most situations, "twelve months is more than sufficient time to bill Supra for the services that it has ordered from BellSouth." (TR 315, 328) He notes however, that there are cases where BellSouth relies on billing information from third parties or Supra to bill accurately. (TR 316, 344) Witness Greene purports that some of those situations might include a case where BellSouth was relying on usage records from a third party to bill Supra for services which are jointly provided by that third party (via meet point billing procedures). (Greene TR

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

316, 344) Still other cases might exist where Percent Interstate Usage (PIU) and Percent Local Usage (PLU) factors may have been misreported. (Greene TR 316) In those instances, witness Greene states that "BellSouth should be permitted to bill charges to the full extent allowed by law rather than artificial time limits proposed by Supra." (TR 315, 329)

As stated above, BellSouth witness Greene contends that BellSouth should not be constrained by "artificial time limits." (TR 329) Instead, BellSouth believes that the applicable limiting factor should be "the applicable laws and commission rules set out in each state." (TR 316)

BellSouth witness Greene notes that this very issue has been resolved by other parties, specifically AT&T and MCI WorldCom. (TR 317) BellSouth's proposed language for this issue is the same as the language that was proposed between BellSouth and MCI WorldCom. (TR 317; EXH 7, JAR 1, pp.23-24) In the current proceeding, BellSouth proposed the following language for the agreement:

Bills shall not be rendered for any charges which are incurred after the applicable statute of limitations has run or as stated in any Access Billing Supplier Quality Certification Operating Agreement. Until an Access Billing Supplier Quality Certification Operating Agreement is developed, the statute of limitations applies. (TR 316)

Supra argues that it relies on BellSouth to provide the billing records and the bills to determine the billing amount. (Ramos TR 679) Supra witness Ramos, adopting the testimony of Carol Bentley, contends that Supra cannot record its cost of sales unless those charges are provided within a reasonable period of time. (TR 679) Additionally, witness Ramos asserts that Supra must be able to close its books once a year and provide a complete accounting to stockholders. (TR 679) He states, "it would never be possible to completely close a company's books if there were potentially unbilled charges." (Ramos TR 679)

Supra witness Ramos asserts that "Supra is not asking any party to waive its statutory rights to collect charges for services

provided, but simply suggesting that bills for those services must be rendered within a reasonable time frame." (TR 679) He contends that the interconnection agreement between the parties is "an all inclusive agreement." (Ramos TR 686) As such, witness Ramos believes that no side agreements should be required. (TR 686) He specifically requests that the length of time for billings be included in the agreement and that the proper time frame should be 180 days after services have been rendered. (Ramos TR 687) Additionally, witness Ramos notes that standard commercial practice is that bills are rendered within six months of providing the goods or services. Witness Ramos believes that even then, six months should be "the exception, not the rule." (TR 679, 688)

Staff's Analysis

Even though BellSouth has proposed some language, staff believes that it would be helpful to have additional language included in the Agreement. Staff would expect that any additional language would specify any exceptions that might apply. In fact, the language that BellSouth has included in several recent agreements appears to be much more detailed and appropriate. The following language appears in the MCI/BellSouth Interconnection Agreement, approved by this Commission in Order No. PSC-01-2238-FOF-TP, issued November 16, 2001:

4.2.3.5 The Bill Date must be present on each bill transmitted by the Parties, and must be a valid calendar date and not more than ninety (90) days old. Bills should not be rendered for any charges which are incurred under this Agreement on or before one (1) year proceeding the bill date. However, both Parties recognize that situations exist that would necessitate billing beyond the one year limit as permitted by law. These exceptions include;

+ charges connected with jointly provided services whereby meet point billing guidelines require either Party to rely on records provided by the other Party.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

+ charges incorrectly billed due to an error or omission of customer provided data such as PLU or PIU factors or other ordering data.

Both Parties agree that these limits will be superseded by any Bill Accuracy Certification Agreement that might be negotiated between the Parties.

Similar language can also be found in the agreement between BellSouth and AT&T which was recently approved by this Commission in Order No. PSC-01-2357-FOF-TP, issued December 7, 2001.

Staff believes that even though Supra argued that six months (180 days) was an adequate amount of time to render bills, Supra's counsel proposed one year to BellSouth witness Greene during the hearing. (Greene TR 344) Witness Greene agreed to the one year limit with certain exceptions as outlined during his testimony and his cross examination. Those conditions were that there might be certain situations that require billing beyond one year. (TR 344-345) In fact, witness Greene specifically addressed several situations in which there may be problems or errors in reporting PLU and PIU factors and obtaining meet point billing data. (TR 344-345)

Conclusion

Staff believes that the proper time frame for either party to render bills is one year, unless the bill was in dispute, meet point billing guidelines require either Party to rely on records provided by the other Party, or customer provided data such as PLU or PIU factors or other ordering data is incorrect.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 46: Is BellSouth required to provide Supra Telecom the capability to submit orders electronically for all wholesale services and elements?

RECOMMENDATION: No. BellSouth is not required to provide Supra with the capability to submit orders electronically for all wholesale services and elements, as long as BellSouth provisions orders for complex services for itself and ALECs in a like fashion and in substantially the same time and manner. (BARRETT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: Non-discriminatory access does not require that all LSRs be submitted electronically and involve no manual processes. BellSouth's own retail operations often involve manual processes. Therefore, there is no requirement that every LSR be submitted electronically in order to provide non-discriminatory access.

SUPRA: This issue was resolved by OAR-3. Non-discriminatory direct access to BellSouth's OSS will provide Supra the ability to submit orders electronically for all services and elements available for such, just as BellSouth.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This issue considers whether BellSouth should be required to provide Supra with the capability to submit orders for all products and service via electronic means.

Arguments

Supra witness Ramos contends that BellSouth refused to provide information regarding its network, which resulted in Supra being restricted in developing its position on this issue through pre-filed testimony. (TR 564) Supra's position, therefore, is based upon its understanding of and response to BellSouth's position. (Ramos TR 564-565)

As with numerous other issues, Supra witness Ramos believes that "Parity Provisions" should be a consideration in this issue. (TR 521-526, 564) The parity argument for this issue, according to witness Ramos, is the same as that put forth in Issue 38, which discussed the BellSouth retail and CLEC OSS systems. (TR 646)

Witness Ramos believes that "the dual system of OSS (i.e., one system for the ILEC and another for the ALEC) which are common today are inherently unequal." (TR 646) The witness believes that BellSouth witness Pate has made false statements with respect to the capabilities of certain CLEC OSS platforms. (TR 646) He offers evidence in the form of select interrogatories from FPSC Docket No. 980119-TP to support his contentions. (Ramos TR 646-649) The interrogatories primarily focus on edit-checking capabilities, but the final one more directly addresses the specific issue of manual versus electronic ordering. (TR 649) Witness Ramos asserts that BellSouth's witness Pate contradicts prior testimony and that BellSouth can, in fact, process its complex service requests electronically. (TR 649) Though not explicitly stated, the Supra witness infers that a similar functionality (i.e., the ability to process complex orders via electronic means) is not offered to ALECs.

BellSouth witness Pate states that BellSouth's own retail operations make use of manual ordering processes. (TR 1117) He states that the same manual processes that BellSouth employs for its retail services are also used for ALEC services. (Pate TR 1121) The witness offers:

Many of BellSouth's retail services, primarily complex services, involve substantial manual handling by BellSouth account teams for BellSouth's own retail customers. Non-discriminatory access to certain functions for ALECs legitimately may involve manual processes for these same functions. Therefore, these processes are in compliance with the Act and the FCC's rules. (Pate TR 1118)

The witness asserts that complex services fall primarily into two categories, "Non-designed" and "Designed," with the latter involving special engineering and provisioning. (Pate TR 1118) The witness states that BellSouth's MultiServ® service is an example of a "Designed" complex service. Witness Pate offers contrasting flow chart diagrams (RMP-4 and RMP 5) to demonstrate the manual handling necessary to process retail and wholesale orders for MultiServ® service. (TR 1119; EXH 34) Witness Pate also contends that wholesale orders for certain UNEs and resold services also necessitate a degree of manual handling:

Some Unbundled Network Elements ("UNEs") and complex resold services require manual handling. The manual processes used by BellSouth are accomplished in substantially the same time and manner as the processes used for BellSouth's complex retail services. The specialized and complicated nature of complex services, together with the relatively low volume for them relative to basic exchange services, renders them less suitable for mechanization, whether for resale or retail applications. Complex, variable processes are difficult to mechanize, and BellSouth has concluded that mechanizing many low volume complex retail services for its own retail operations would be an imprudent business decision, in that the benefits of mechanization would not justify the cost. (TR 1121)

In concluding his argument, witness Pate states that he believes the Commission has previously addressed this issue and ruled upon it in a recent proceeding. (TR 1181) The witness believes that the Commission's decision in the AT&T arbitration (Docket No. 000731-TP) suggests that the appropriate mechanism to address this issue is the Change Control Process (CCP). (Pate TR 1122) He asserts that this issue should first be addressed through the CCP . . . and "[i]t appears that no such change control request has been submitted to the CCP." (Pate TR 1122) He states that Supra is a registered member of the CCP, but has not participated or taken advantage of its membership by submitting change requests, for this or any other matter. (Pate TR 1124-1125)

Analysis

Staff notes this issue considers whether BellSouth should be required to provide Supra with the capability to submit orders for all wholesale products and service via electronic means. While the wording of the issue encompasses "all wholesale services and elements," the testimony for this issue focuses primarily on the services and elements which make up complex services.

By and large, Supra's argument for this issue was blended with its position in Issue 38. Staff would note that Supra offered limited testimony specific to this issue in the form of rebuttal to statements of the BellSouth witness.

Supra witness Ramos asserts that BellSouth witness Pate was untruthful in making sworn statements regarding the capabilities of certain CLEC OSS platforms. (TR 646) He offers evidence in the form of select interrogatories from FPSC Docket No. 980119-TP to support his contentions. Staff notes that Docket No. 980119-TP was a complaint matter which involved Supra's prior interconnection agreement with BellSouth. Staff believes that the interrogatories the witness offers are not responsive to the issue at hand, which pertains to whether BellSouth should be required to provide Supra with the capability to submit orders for all wholesale products and service via electronic means. Witness Ramos, however, interprets the final interrogatory offered to demonstrate that BellSouth processes its complex service requests electronically. The relevance of the referenced text to this current matter is, nevertheless, unclear. Staff, therefore, is reluctant to give significant credence to the excerpt.

Staff notes BellSouth witness Pate's assertion that many of BellSouth's retail services, primarily complex services, involve manual handling by BellSouth account teams for BellSouth's own retail customers. The witness offers BellSouth's MultiServ® service as an example and testifies about the ordering process for this particular service. (TR 1118-1119) Staff notes the contrasting flow chart diagrams witness Pate offers (RMP-4 and RMP 5) for retail and wholesale orders for MultiServ® service, and believes a comparable amount of manual handling is depicted therein. (EXH 34) Though BellSouth's MultiServ® service was the only specific example noted, witness Pate states that "BellSouth has concluded that mechanizing many low volume complex retail services for its own retail operations would be an imprudent business decision, in that the benefits of mechanization would not justify the cost." (TR 1121) Staff agrees. Witness Pate goes so far as to state that some UNE orders and complex services "require" manual handling. (TR 1121) Staff, therefore, believes that BellSouth will be involved in some degree of manual handling for complex orders regardless of whether the order is wholesale (e.g., to an ALEC) or retail.

Witness Pate offers that ALECs process approximately 90% of their LSRs via electronic means. (TR 1120) Staff therefore makes the assumption that the remaining LSRs, approximately 10%, are processed manually. Staff infers that the bulk of these orders that are not processed electronically would fit witness Pate's description of

orders for complex services, either "Non-designed" or "Designed" circuits. (TR 1118) The witness also asserts that wholesale and retail provisioning for these services is performed in substantially the same time and manner. (TR 1121)

Staff believes that some level of manual processing is likely to exist for both wholesale and retail orders, simply because of the complexities of modern telecommunications. Witness Pate states that "[b]ecause the same manual processes are in place for both ALEC [wholesale] and BellSouth retail orders, the processes are non-discriminatory and competitively neutral." (TR 1120) Staff believes the lone example noted, BellSouth's MultiServ[®] service, demonstrates that retail and wholesale orders for this service involve a comparable amount of manual handling. Staff believes that as long as BellSouth provisions orders for complex services for itself and ALECs in a like fashion and in substantially the same time and manner, it meets the non-discriminatory requirement of the Act. However, while noting BellSouth's concern over the suitability and the cost/benefit relationship of mechanization, staff believes that a more comprehensive evaluation of electronic order submission may be helpful. Such an evaluation could be conducted in the context of a generic proceeding, which staff believes would enable the Commission to more fully consider the policy implications for electronic order submission.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that BellSouth should not be required to provide Supra with the capability to submit orders electronically for all wholesale services and elements, as long as BellSouth provisions orders for complex services for itself and ALECs in a like fashion and in substantially the same time and manner.

ISSUE 47: When, if at all, should there be manual intervention on electronically submitted orders?

RECOMMENDATION: BellSouth should be allowed to manually intervene on Supra's electronically submitted orders in the same manner as it does for its own retail orders. (BARRETT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: Non-discriminatory access does not require that all LSRs be submitted electronically and involve no manual processes; BellSouth's own retail processes often involve manual processes. Therefore, there is no requirement that every LSR has to be submitted electronically in order to provide non-discriminatory access. Moreover, Supra is responsible for submitting complete and accurate LSRs.

SUPRA: This issue was resolved by OAR-3. Non-discriminatory direct access to BellSouth's OSS will enable Supra's electronically submitted orders to receive the same amount of manual processing as BellSouth's orders.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This issue considers under what circumstances, if any, should there be manual intervention on electronically submitted orders.

Arguments

Supra witness Ramos contends that BellSouth refused to provide information regarding its network, which resulted in Supra being restricted in developing its position on this issue through pre-filed testimony. (TR 564)

As with numerous other issues, Supra witness Ramos believes that "Parity Provisions" should be a consideration in this issue. (TR 521-526, 564) The parity argument for this issue, according to witness Ramos, is the same as that put forth in Issues 38 and 46, which were OSS related. (TR 654) The witness firmly believes that the parity provisions of the Act "require that BellSouth provide the same electronic interfaces to Supra." (Ramos TR 654)

Witness Ramos believes that "BellSouth has an electronic interface for every occasion." (TR 654) He asserts that BellSouth does not submit manual orders for any of its own products. (Ramos TR 654)

BellSouth witness Pate is uncertain what Supra hopes to achieve in this issue, since its position was not set forth through prior meetings or testimony. (TR 1126) The witness offers two possibilities, as follows:

[Either] (A) Supra is requesting that all complete and correct LSRs submitted electronically flow through BellSouth systems without manual intervention [; or] (B) Supra is asking that BellSouth relieve Supra of its responsibility to submit a complete and accurate LSR. (Pate TR 1126)

BellSouth's position on (A) is that it provides non-discriminatory access to OSS systems, but non-discriminatory access does not require that all LSRs be submitted electronically and not involve any manual handling. (Pate TR 1126) "BellSouth's own retail processes often involve manual processes," states the witness. (Pate TR 1126) According to witness Pate, the manual handling consideration is directly related to complex orders. He states:

The orders at issue here are those that the ALEC may submit electronically, but fall out by design. In most cases, these orders are complex orders. For certain orders, BellSouth has, for the ease of the ALEC, allowed them to be submitted electronically even though such orders are then manually processed by BellSouth . . . Because the same manual processes are in place for both ALEC and BellSouth retail orders, the processes are competitively neutral, which is exactly what both the Act and the FCC require. (Pate TR 1128)

Witness Pate states that the Commission has previously ruled on (A) in the recent AT&T arbitration. (TR 1130) In that matter, the Commission found that to accommodate the requested actions (i.e., allow additional order types to flow through without manual handling), BellSouth would be required to modify its systems, and that the proper mechanism to achieve this would be through the

Change Control Process (CCP). (Pate TR 1130) Quoting the finding, witness Pate states, "the system in place does not create disparity for AT&T regarding order submission as stated earlier. Therefore this issue is currently best suited to be pursued through the CCP process." (TR 1130) Finally, the witness states that BellSouth is willing to incorporate the same language in Supra's agreement as agreed to in the AT&T case. (Pate TR 1131)

With respect to (B), he states that Supra should not expect BellSouth to assume what is clearly Supra's obligation. (Pate TR 1131) Witness Pate stresses that "Supra must understand its obligation to provide a complete and accurate LSR." (TR 1133-1134) Witness Pate believes that the language BellSouth and WorldCom agreed to could be incorporated here to resolve (B). (TR 1133)

Analysis

Testimony from the Supra witness is very limited on this specific matter. Nonetheless, staff evaluated the available testimony to consider under what circumstances, if any, there should be manual intervention on electronically submitted orders.

Staff notes that aspects of this issue are enveloped in the arguments for Issues 38 and 46. As with Issues 38, 46, and numerous others, Supra witness Ramos states that "Parity Provisions" should be a consideration in this issue. (TR 521-526, 564) Staff agrees, but believes that BellSouth is meeting its obligations set forth in the Act.

Staff believes that Supra is requesting that all complete and correct LSRs that it submits electronically flow through BellSouth systems without manual intervention, based on its belief that BellSouth's own retail orders do this. Supra believes "parity" considerations of the Act obligate BellSouth to treat Supra in a like manner. (Ramos TR 654) However, staff points out that not all complete and correct LSRs that are submitted electronically flow through without manual intervention, according to BellSouth's witness Pate. (TR 1126)

Based on the testimony which affirms that the same manual processes are in place for both ALEC and BellSouth retail orders and that BellSouth processes the orders in a non-discriminatory manner,

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

staff agrees with witness Pate's assertion that BellSouth's practices with respect to manual handling are competitively neutral. (TR 1128) Unless or until such practices change for all ALECs, staff believes that when processing Supra's complex orders, BellSouth should be permitted to manually process those orders that would be processed similarly for retail orders.

With regard to (B), staff agrees with witness Pate that asking BellSouth to relieve Supra of its responsibility to submit a complete and accurate LSR is unreasonable. (TR 1126) Supra should be capable of fulfilling its obligation with respect to submitting complete and accurate LSRs to BellSouth.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that BellSouth should be allowed to manually intervene on Supra's electronically submitted orders in the same manner as it does for its own retail orders.

ISSUE 49: Should Supra Telecom be allowed to share with a third party the spectrum on a local loop for voice and data when Supra Telecom purchases a loop/port combination and if so, under what rates, terms and conditions?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. Staff recommends that Supra Telecom be allowed to share with a third party the spectrum on a local loop for voice and data when it purchases a loop/port combination (alternatively referred to as "line splitting"). In addition, staff recommends that BellSouth should not be required to provide its DSL services to Supra's voice customers served via UNE-P. (KING)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: The Commission should find, consistent with the FCC and its previous rulings, that BellSouth is obligated to provide line sharing to ALECs only where BellSouth is providing the voice service. Moreover, BellSouth is not required to offer its tariffed ADSL service to Supra customers served in a UNE-P arrangement.

SUPRA: When utilizing the voice spectrum of the loop and another carrier utilizes the high frequency spectrum (or vice versa), Supra must be compensated one half of the local loop cost.¹⁹ BellSouth refuses to pay line-sharing charges for customers with BellSouth xDSL. BellSouth proposes to disconnect the ADSL of any customer (regardless of provider) if provisioned by UNE-P.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

This issue addresses whether or not Supra should be allowed to share with a third party the spectrum on a local loop for voice and data when Supra Telecom purchases a loop/port combination and if so, under what rates, terms, and conditions. In addition, based on the testimony presented, it appears that this issue has evolved to now also include an issue as to whether or not BellSouth is obligated to provide its DSL service to Supra's voice customers served in a UNE-P arrangement. (Cox TR 236, 271; Nilson TR 1031)

¹⁹FCC Advanced Services Order 98-147 in Docket 98-48.

According to the testimony of Supra witness Nilson, Supra requests that BellSouth be required to 1) allow Supra access to the spectrum on a local loop for voice and data when Supra purchases loop/port combinations; and 2) continue to provide data services to customers who currently have such services, after the customer decides to switch to Supra's voice services. (Nilson TR 936, 938).

The testimony of BellSouth witness Cox leads staff to believe that there is not a dispute regarding Supra's first request. Specifically, witness Cox notes that BellSouth's position on this issue does not prevent Supra from having access to the high frequency portion of the loop. (TR 235) She states:

When Supra purchases UNE-P from BellSouth, it becomes the owner of all the features, functions and capabilities that the switch and loop is capable of providing. This includes calling features and capabilities, carrier pre-subscription, the ability to bill switched access charges associated with this service, and access to both the high and low frequency spectrums of the loop. (TR 235-236)

Based on this testimony, staff believes that Supra is not precluded from accessing both the high and low frequency spectrum of the loop when it purchases UNE-P. Accordingly, staff does not believe that this matter need be addressed further in this recommendation.

With regard to Supra's second request, the parties do not agree. According to BellSouth witness Cox, BellSouth is not obligated to provide its DSL service on a line where it is not the voice provider. (TR 236) She notes that the FCC addressed this issue in its line sharing order and clearly stated that incumbent carriers are not required to provide line sharing to requesting carriers that are purchasing UNE-P combinations. (TR 236) Specifically, witness Cox points to the FCC's Line Sharing Reconsideration Order (FCC 01-26), where it stated:

We deny, however, AT&T's request that the Commission clarify that incumbent LECs must continue to provide xDSL service in the event customers choose to obtain service from a competing carrier on the same line because we find that the Line Sharing Order contained no such requirement. See In Re: Deployment of Wireline Services

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, Order No. FCC 01-26 in CC Docket Nos. 98-147, 96-98 (Release January 19,2001) at 126. (TR 236)

Furthermore, she argues that the FCC expressly stated that the Line Sharing Order does not require that the LECs provide xDSL service when they are no longer the voice provider. (Cox TR 236)

Witness Cox also notes that the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) previously ruled on this issue. In Order No. PSC-01-0824-FOF-TP, issued March 20, 2001, the FPSC stated:

While we acknowledge WorldCom's concern regarding the status of the DSL service over a shared loop when WorldCom wins the voice service from BellSouth, we believe the FCC addressed this situation in its Line Sharing Order. . . . We believe the FCC requires BellSouth to provide line sharing only over loops where BellSouth is the voice provider. If WorldCom purchases the UNE-P, WorldCom becomes the voice provider over that loop/port combination. Therefore, BellSouth is no longer required to provide line sharing over that loop/port combination. (Order at p. 51) (Cox TR 237)

Witness Cox maintains that contrary to Supra's position, the Commission should again find consistent with the FCC and its previous rulings, that BellSouth is not obligated to provide DSL services for customers who switch to Supra's voice services. She contends that nothing precludes Supra from entering into a line splitting arrangement with another carrier to provide DSL services to Supra's voice customers. As such, she believes that the language that BellSouth has proposed for inclusion in the new Agreement is consistent with the FCC's rules and the FPSC's decisions. (TR 237)

With regard to this issue, Supra witness Nilson adopted pages 23-31 of the direct testimony of Gregory Follensbee, formerly of AT&T, filed in Docket No. 000731-TP. (TR 931) The witness notes that " . . . I will be adopting his testimony in regard to AT&T issue number 33 which directly corresponds to Supra issue 49." (TR 931) According to the direct testimony adopted by witness Nilson, Supra seeks to gain reasonable and nondiscriminatory access to the "high frequency spectrum" portion of the local loops that it leases

from BellSouth to provide services to customers based upon the UNE-P architecture. (EXH 29, DAN-5, p. 23) As previously noted, based on the testimony of BellSouth witness Cox, staff believes that Supra is permitted access to the loop spectrum when it purchases the UNE-P; therefore, this does not appear to be a disputed matter. (Cox TR 235)

According to witness Nilson, BellSouth has stated in inter-company review board meetings that because of the final order in FPSC Docket No. 000731-TP, it will no longer be providing xDSL transport service to customers served by UNE combinations in Florida. (TR 931-932) Furthermore, on July 11, 2001 BellSouth sent a letter to Supra Business Systems, Inc. announcing the unilateral disconnection of all xDSL services provided over UNE Combinations. Additionally, in his testimony, witness Nilson addresses why he believes it is essential that BellSouth provide line splitters and that the issue of the line splitter be investigated; he also provides several arguments as to why "line sharing between ALECs doesn't exist in Florida at all." (TR 933-934, 936)

Analysis

It appears to staff that Supra is not precluded from sharing with a third party the spectrum on a local loop for voice and data when Supra Telecom purchases a loop/port combination. As stated by BellSouth witness Cox, when Supra purchases UNE-P from BellSouth, it becomes the owner of all the features, functions and capabilities that the switch and loop is capable of providing. This includes access to both the high and low frequency spectrum of the loop. (TR 235-236)

With regard to Supra's position that it must be compensated one half of the local loop cost when it utilizes the voice spectrum of the loop and another carrier utilizes the high frequency spectrum (or vice versa), Supra presented no direct or rebuttal testimony to support its position on this matter. (Supra BR at 28) Moreover, staff believes this would require Supra to contract with a third party. As such, staff believes that the Commission need not address this point.

With regard to the remaining issue, staff agrees with BellSouth that it is not required to offer its tariffed xDSL service to Supra

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

customers served via a UNE-P arrangement. This Commission and the FCC have both concluded that BellSouth is only required to provide line sharing over loops where BellSouth is the voice provider. If Supra purchases UNE-P, it becomes the voice provider over that loop/port combination.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that Supra Telecom be allowed to share with a third party the spectrum on a local loop for voice and data when it purchases a loop/port combination (alternatively referred to as "line splitting"). In addition, staff recommends that BellSouth should not be required to provide its DSL services to Supra's voice customers served via UNE-P.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 57: Should BellSouth be required to provide downloads of RSAG, LFACS, PSIMS and PIC databases without license agreements and without charge?

RECOMMENDATION: No. BellSouth should not be required to provide downloads of RSAG and LFACS without license agreements and without charge. However, the parties may choose to negotiate downloads of these databases as well as the rates, terms, and conditions of such an arrangement. (TURNER)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth should not be required to provide a download of RSAG because Supra already has real-time access to RSAG through BellSouth's robust electronic interfaces.

SUPRA: This issue was resolved by OAR-3. Alternatively, BellSouth should provide these database downloads without a license agreement or use restrictions and should provide these downloads at no cost. Supra already has the right to RSAG in its present agreement "batch feeds" with "monthly updates."

STAFF ANALYSIS: The issue before the Commission is to determine if BellSouth should be required to provide downloads of its RSAG (Regional Service Address Guide) and LFACS (Loop Facility Assignment Control System) databases. Staff notes that the scope of the issue has been narrowed since the filing of the petition as the parties have agreed to language regarding the PSIMS and PIC databases.

Arquments

BellSouth witness Pate testifies that BellSouth should not be required to provide downloads of RSAG because Supra already has real-time access to RSAG through BellSouth's "robust electronic interfaces." (TR 1139) According to the witness, BellSouth makes available pre-ordering and ordering functionality which provides access to the necessary databases via LENS, TAG, RoboTAG, and EDI in a manner that is consistent with what the Act requires. Witness Pate contends that the Telecommunications Act does not require BellSouth to provide direct access to the same databases that it uses for its retail operations. (TR 1177) However, the witness states that BellSouth is willing to resolve the issue by

incorporating language agreed to with MCIm in which BellSouth will provide the RSAG data through a "mutually agreeable electronic means" once a "single mutually acceptable license agreement" has been executed. (Pate TR 1141; EXH 7, JAR-1)

In response to BellSouth's position, Supra witness Ramos asserts that Supra should be provided with "nondiscriminatory, direct access to these databases that BellSouth's retail departments enjoy." (TR 575) He contends that the ALEC interfaces provided by BellSouth to access its OSS are inadequate. Consequently, witness Ramos believes that anything less than direct access to these databases is discriminatory. (TR 575)

According to witness Ramos, there is no legitimate reason why Supra should have a different access than BellSouth's retail departments. (TR 575) He holds that "[W]hen BellSouth's internal OSS is malfunctioning, BellSouth retail departments have direct access to these databases." Conversely, the witness asserts that when CLEC pre-ordering interfaces are malfunctioning, Supra has no means of accessing the necessary databases. (TR 575) Witness Ramos contends that BellSouth is failing to provide parity in accordance with the Act and "should be required to provide downloads of the relevant databases as this would allow Supra to operate, albeit in a limited fashion, when the interfaces are down." (TR 575)

Analysis

As stated previously, the parties have resolved a portion of this issue with regard to PSIMS and PIC database downloads. (TR 448) However, it remains for the Commission to determine whether or not BellSouth should be required to provide Supra with a download of the RSAG and LFACS databases without license agreements and without charge.

BellSouth witness Pate maintains that Supra already has real-time access to the RSAG database via LENS, TAG, RoboTAG, and EDI, and that this access is consistent with what is required by the Telecommunications Act. (TR 1177) In contrast, Supra witness Ramos claims that Supra has no way of accessing any of these databases when the CLEC interfaces are malfunctioning, while BellSouth's retail departments enjoy direct access to these databases when BellSouth's OSS is malfunctioning. (TR 575) As such, witness Ramos

believes that BellSouth is not providing access at parity to these systems, and must be required to provide downloads of these databases. (TR 575)

While staff notes witness Ramos's concerns that the ALEC interfaces provided by BellSouth to access its OSS, including the relevant databases, are inadequate, staff disagrees that anything less than direct access to these databases is "discriminatory." (TR 575) To the contrary, staff believes, as does BellSouth witness Pate, that BellSouth is not obligated by the Act to provide direct access to these databases. (TR 1177) Specifically, FCC rule 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(g) states in part:

An incumbent LEC shall provide nondiscriminatory access in accordance with §51.311 and section 251(c)(3) of the Act to operations support systems on an unbundled basis to any requesting telecommunications carrier for the provision of a telecommunications service.

Further, the FCC concludes in FCC 96-325, ¶312 that:

...the phrase "nondiscriminatory access" in section 251(c)(3) means at least two things: first, the quality of an unbundled network element that an incumbent LEC provides, as well as the access provided to that element, must be equal between all carriers requesting access to that element; second, where technically feasible, the access and unbundled network element provided by an incumbent LEC must be at least equal-in-quality to that which the incumbent LEC provides to itself.

Additionally, FCC 96-325, ¶518, requires BellSouth to provide access to its OSS which allows ALECs to perform the functions of pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing for resale services in substantially the same time and manner as BellSouth does for itself. Thus, staff believes that BellSouth is only required to provide non-discriminatory access to the databases that its retail departments use, and not direct access. Finally, staff notes that the Commission specifically concluded in Order No. PSC-98-1001-FOF-TP of Docket No. 980119-TP, in response to Supra's request for access to the very same interfaces that BellSouth uses for its retail service (including

RSAG), that "BellSouth is not required to provide Supra with the exact same interfaces that it uses for its retail operations." (P. 23)

While staff notes witness Ramos's concerns regarding problems with BellSouth's ALEC interfaces, staff does not believe that these concerns and any appropriate remedy can be addressed here.²⁰ Staff believes that BellSouth has made pre-ordering and ordering functionality available, as required by the Act, through the LENS, TAG, RoboTAG and EDI interfaces, which in turn provide access to the necessary databases. As such, staff is not persuaded that BellSouth ~~should be required~~ is obligated to provide Supra with downloads of its RSAG database and ~~should not be required to do so~~ without license agreements or without charge. Staff notes, however, that the parties may negotiate such an arrangement and any associated rates, terms, and conditions. Similarly, staff believes the same analysis is applicable to requests made by Supra for downloads of BellSouth's LFACS database.²¹

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, staff recommends that BellSouth should not be required to provide downloads of RSAG and LFACS databases without license agreements and without charge.

²⁰Staff notes that BellSouth's OSS performance levels, though not assessed in the context of this issue or this docket, are being evaluated in Docket No. 960786B.

²¹Staff notes that BellSouth did not provide testimony regarding Supra's request for a download of the LFACS database, nor was it addressed in BellSouth's post hearing brief.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 59: Should Supra Telecom be required to pay for expedited service when BellSouth provides services after the offered expedited date, but prior to BellSouth's standard interval?

RECOMMENDATION: No, this Commission should not require Supra to pay for expedited service when BellSouth provides the service after the promised expedited date, but prior to BellSouth's standard interval. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth is under no obligation to expedite service for Supra or any other ALEC. If BellSouth does so, however, Supra should be required to pay expedite charges when BellSouth expedites a service request and completes the order before the standard interval expires.

SUPRA: This issue was resolved by OAR-3. BellSouth should not receive additional payment when it fails to perform in accordance with the specified expedited time-frame. (confidential omitted)

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Arguments

BellSouth

BellSouth witness Cox adopted witness Ruscilli's prefiled direct testimony. Witness Cox contends that Supra should have to pay for expedited service as long as the order is completed before the standard interval. (TR 208-209) According to witness Cox, BellSouth is under no obligation to expedite service for Supra or any other ALEC. (TR 208) Since BellSouth charges its end users for expedited due dates, witness Cox believes Supra should pay these same expedite charges. (TR 239) Witness Cox observes that, "Supra does not want to pay the costs incurred by BellSouth to expedite due dates." According to witness Cox, BellSouth has offered to resolve this issue with the following language:

Supra may request an expedited service interval on the local service request (LSR). BellSouth will advise Supra whether the requested expedited date can be met based on

work load and resources available. For expedited requests for loop provisioning, Supra will pay the expedited charge set forth in this Agreement on a per loop basis for any loops provisioned in 4 days or less. Supra will not be charged an expedite charge for loops provisioned in five or more days, regardless of whether the loops were provisioned in less than the standard interval applicable for such loops. (TR 239)

Further, witness Cox questions why Supra is even raising this issue, since Supra does not purchase stand alone UNE loops, the only product that is expedited, according to witness Cox. (TR 208)

Supra

Supra witness Ramos contends that BellSouth provides expedited service to its retail customers at no charge while denying Supra the same capability. (TR 576) According to witness Ramos, there is nothing to suggest that BellSouth's "standard" orders cost more than BellSouth's "expedited" orders. (TR 576) As such, witness Ramos believes BellSouth should not be allowed to charge a premium fee for expedited service under any circumstances. (TR 576) Witness Ramos alleges that BellSouth is merely trying to increase Supra's cost of competing with BellSouth. (TR 576) Witness Ramos contends that BellSouth should not receive additional payment when it fails to perform in accordance with a specified expedited schedule, but rather should have to give Supra a credit in such instances to address the cost of customer complaints. (TR 576)

Also, witness Ramos asserts BellSouth has willfully and intentionally failed to provide Supra with the same quality of service because it has not provided Supra with BellSouth's Quickserve. (TR 658) Quickserve is used to provide customers with expedited service in circumstances where the phone line at the location is already connected for service (i.e., has a soft dial tone). (Ramos TR 658) Witness Ramos states it is BellSouth's position that, because the word Quickserve is not contained in the agreement, BellSouth is under no obligation to provide it to Supra. (TR 568) Witness Ramos alleges this violates the parity provisions of the 1996 Act. (TR 568) Supra is at a competitive disadvantage because BellSouth has refused to set up a system that would allow Supra to use Quickserve to provide one day service like BellSouth,

according to witness Ramos. (TR 659) Witness Ramos contends that while Supra can submit local service requests (LSRs) for Quickserve manually (i.e., via fax), they are generally provisioned later than electronically submitted LSRs. (TR 659) While BellSouth has developed a "workaround" that allows Supra to call in such orders, this workaround is unworkable, according to witness Ramos, because Supra customer service representatives have to hold as long as 45 minutes, trying to get a BellSouth representative to change a maximum of 3 orders per call. (TR 659) Witness Ramos views Quickserve as a competitive advantage for BellSouth, because it allows BellSouth to affirmatively state, where Quickserve is available, that a customer can receive service on the same day while Supra cannot. (TR 659) This practice is particularly vexing according to witness Ramos, in light of the fact that customers who convert from BellSouth to Supra must wait 5 to 12 days, even though the conversion is simply a billing change. (TR 660)

Analysis

This issue addresses whether BellSouth can charge an expedite fee, when a requested service is provisioned after the promised date but before the standard interval.

Based on a somewhat limited record on this issue, staff believes denying extra compensation for expedited orders not completed in a timely manner encourages BellSouth to keep its promises that expedited orders will be completed by a certain date. Staff believes the reason ALECs agree to pay extra for expedited service is so that service will be provisioned by a certain time, not merely to encourage BellSouth to try to do it a little quicker. If expedited service is not provisioned when promised, the ALEC loses the primary benefit of expedited service, i.e., the ability to affirmatively tell customers exactly when service will begin. Staff agrees with Supra witness Ramos that ALECs may lose goodwill and customer confidence when they are unable to deliver expedited services on time because the ILEC was unable to meet the agreed upon date. (TR 659) Staff believes encouraging timely completion of expedited orders will foster the pro-competitive environment envisioned by the 1996 Act. While staff notes that it is not possible for BellSouth to complete every expedited order in a timely fashion, staff believes compensation arrangements should encourage BellSouth to do so. By being able to provide timely expedited

service more often, staff believes ALECs can come even closer to replicating the customer experience BellSouth provides. While BellSouth witness Cox states that expedite fees are pro-rated based on when the order is actually completed, staff believes this does not justify allowing BellSouth to charge a premium for broken promises. (TR 304-305) Further, BellSouth failed to submit evidence in the record showing how expedited service increases BellSouth's costs of operation. Staff believes this lack of justification for expedite charges provides further support for not allowing expedite charges when the service is not delivered as promised.

Staff does not believe that this Commission should require BellSouth to create an electronic ordering system for Quickserve, or require BellSouth to provide free expedited service, as witness Ramos has requested. Staff believes these requests exceed the scope of the issue. Further, Section 252 (b)(4)(A) requires, "The State commission to limit its consideration of any petition under paragraph(1) (and any response thereto) to the issues set forth in the petition and in the response, if any, filed under paragraph (3)." Staff notes these requests were not addressed in BellSouth's petition or Supra's response to BellSouth's petition. Therefore, staff recommends this Commission not grant Supra free expedited service or require BellSouth to provide electronic ordering for Quickserve.

However, while staff believes this Commission should not grant Supra's request for electronic ordering of Quickserve in this docket, staff notes Supra raises meaningful points about the value of electronic ordering. Staff is concerned by the testimony of witness Ramos noting that electronic Quickserve orders are provisioned quicker than manual orders which Supra must use, and that Supra customer service representatives have wait times as long as 45 minutes when trying to phone in Quickserve orders. (TR 659) Staff believes the issue of whether BellSouth should have to create an electronic ordering interface for ALECs that use Quickserve could be explored more effectively in the context of a generic proceeding.

Further, staff disagrees with Supra that this issue is controlled by OAR-3. (confidential EXH 21; Supra BR 32) That exhibit, a copy of a commercial arbitration award, relates to a dispute between BellSouth and Supra under their now expired interconnection agreement. Staff believes whatever force that award

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

had, expired with the term of the agreement. Therefore, staff believes this Commission, in choosing the appropriate terms for this new interconnection agreement, is not bound by the terms of that commercial arbitration.

Conclusion

This Commission should not require Supra to pay for expedited service when BellSouth provides the service after the promised expedited date, but prior to BellSouth's standard interval.

ISSUE 60: When BellSouth rejects or clarifies a Supra Telecom order, should BellSouth be required to identify all errors in the order that caused it to be rejected or clarified?

RECOMMENDATION: No. BellSouth should not be required to identify all errors in the order. Because it may not be feasible for BellSouth to process the order beyond the point where the rejection occurred, BellSouth should only be required to identify the error that triggered the rejection. (BARRETT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: It is the responsibility of Supra to submit complete and accurate LSRs such that rejections and/or clarifications are not necessary.

SUPRA: This issue was resolved by OAR-3. Identifying all errors at once will prevent the need for submitting the order multiple times and reduce cost. Additionally, if any order has been clarified, BellSouth should be required to immediately notify Supra of such clarification in the same manner as BellSouth notifies itself.

STAFF ANALYSIS: An underlying assumption in this issue is that Supra has submitted a service order to BellSouth, and for some reason BellSouth has not accepted it (e.g., BellSouth "rejected" the Supra order). The issue considers whether BellSouth should be required to identify and notify Supra of all errors in the order at the time of the rejection.

Arguments

Supra witness Ramos contends that BellSouth refused to provide information regarding its network, which resulted in Supra being restricted in developing its position on this issue through pre-filed testimony. (TR 576-577) Supra's position, therefore, is based upon its understanding of and response to BellSouth's position. (Ramos TR 577)

As with numerous other issues, Supra witness Ramos believes that "Parity Provisions" should be a consideration in this issue.

(TR 521-526, 576) Parity, according to witness Ramos, becomes an issue because BellSouth does not provide to Supra a real-time edit checking capability. (TR 577) BellSouth's retail OSS identifies errors and provides notification in real-time through its edit-checking capabilities, claims witness Ramos. (TR 577)

BellSouth places the responsibility on the ALEC (e.g., Supra) to submit a complete and accurate LSR, and thus avoid the resubmission of an order, states witness Ramos. (TR 577) The Supra witness states that "[i]dentifying all errors in the LSR or order will prevent the need for submitting the LSR or order multiple times." (Ramos TR 577) Witness Ramos claims that there have been numerous instances where Supra has had to track LSRs because BellSouth failed to notify Supra that the order was rejected. (TR 577-578) "Without first correcting the error in question and then resubmitting [the LSR] for further processing, other errors on the LSR cannot be identified," states witness Ramos. (TR 577) Through its proposed language, Supra believes that BellSouth should identify all reasons for a rejection in a single review of the LSR. (Ramos TR 578) Specifically, Supra has proposed the following language:

BellSouth shall reject and return to Supra any service request or service order that BellSouth cannot provision, due to technical reasons, or for missing, inaccurate or illegible information. When a LSR or order is rejected, BellSouth shall, in its reject notification, specifically describe all of the reasons for which the LSR or order was rejected. BellSouth shall review the entire LSR or order, and shall identify all reasons for rejection in a single review of the current version (e.g., ver 00, 01, etc.) of the LSR. (Ramos TR 578)

BellSouth witness Pate acknowledges what Supra desires in this issue, but states that "the type and severity of certain errors may prevent some LSRs from being processed further once the error is discovered by BellSouth's system." (TR 1141-1142) The witness clarifies:

An example of this type of error . . . is an invalid address. If the address is incorrect, the LSR cannot be processed further and will be returned to the ALEC

[Supra]. This is because the address for a service request is a major determinate as to the services available from the central office serving switch. As a result, a LSR with an incorrect address must be returned to the ALEC [Supra] before additional edit checks are applied against the LSR for the specific services being requested. (Pate TR 1142)

Witness Pate believes that BellSouth's systems could not easily be modified to accomplish a comprehensive review of an ALEC's LSR. He states that "much work would be necessary to even evaluate what would be involved in modifying BellSouth's systems as proposed by Supra," and if so, any such modification could only be accomplished at "considerable time and expense." (Pate TR 1142) Witness Pate asserts that Supra can avoid the issue of repeated submissions by rendering a complete and accurate LSR to BellSouth, and concludes his argument by offering that BellSouth is willing to incorporate the same language it offered to WorldCom. (TR 1142, 1177, 1181)

Analysis

Staff believes that this issue has broad implications with respect to BellSouth's OSS, and whether or not BellSouth should be obligated to modify a component of its OSS to meet the individual needs of an ALEC such as Supra. The issue at hand considers whether BellSouth should be required to identify and notify Supra of all errors in the order at the time of the rejection. Staff believes that what Supra is seeking in this issue would involve modifications to one or more of BellSouth's OSS systems, which would be a significant undertaking. In addition, staff infers from witness Pate's testimony (TR 1141-1142) that such an undertaking may not be technically feasible.

Staff agrees with witness Ramos that "[i]dentifying all errors in the LSR or order will prevent the need for submitting the LSR or order multiple times," (TR 577) although staff does not believe BellSouth is capable of accomplishing such a task without modifications to its systems, and even then, staff believes there is a question about the technical feasibility. Regarding the types and severity of errors in LSRs, BellSouth witness Pate asserts that "certain errors may prevent some LSRs from being processed further once the error is discovered by BellSouth's system." (TR 1141-1142)

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

This is due to the fact that certain edit checks cannot be performed if an earlier, dependent edit check triggers a rejection.

As such, staff believes that Supra's request for this capability may not be feasible, noting BellSouth witness Pate's testimony that BellSouth's systems could not easily be modified. (TR 1142) Staff believes that if Supra is requesting that BellSouth modify its OSS to identify all errors in the order at the time of rejection, such a request would be better handled outside the confines of a §252 arbitration. Although concerned over the feasibility of modifying BellSouth's systems as proposed by Supra, staff believes that a more comprehensive evaluation of electronic order processing may be helpful. Such an evaluation could be conducted in the context of a generic proceeding, which staff believes would enable the Commission to more fully consider the technical feasibility and policy implications.

Staff believes that Supra can avoid the issue of repeated submissions by rendering a complete and accurate LSR to BellSouth, and therefore does not recommend that BellSouth should be required to modify its OSS to enable it to identify all errors in the LSR at the time of the rejection.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that BellSouth should not be required to identify all errors in the order. Because it may not be feasible for BellSouth to process the order beyond the point where the rejection occurred, BellSouth should only be required to identify the error that triggered the rejection.

ISSUE 61: Should BellSouth be allowed to drop or "purge" orders? If so, under what circumstances may BellSouth be allowed to drop or "purge" orders, and what notice should be given, if any?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes, BellSouth should be allowed to "purge" orders on the 11th business day after a clarification request, if a supplemental LSR is not submitted by Supra that is responsive to the clarification request on the original LSR. Furthermore, staff recommends that no additional notification is necessary on the 11th business day when an LSR is about to be purged, provided that the BellSouth Business Rules are universally available to Supra and all ALECs. (BARRETT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: Supra expects BellSouth to (1) maintain orders in clarification status for more than 10 days and (2) notify Supra when 10 days has passed and that the order has been dropped. This expectation is totally unreasonable.

SUPRA: This issue was resolved by OAR-3. BellSouth should not be allowed to purge LSRs once the LSRs pass through the front-end ordering interface. Alternatively, if any LSRs are dropped by BellSouth's systems, BellSouth must notify Supra (electronically or in writing) within 24 hours of the LSRs being dropped.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This is a two-part issue that is closely related to the previous issue, but assumes Supra has submitted a service order to BellSouth, and the order has been returned to Supra for clarification. The first part of this issue considers whether BellSouth should be allowed to drop (i.e., purge) Supra's LSR after 10 days or some other time period if Supra does not respond to BellSouth's request for clarification. The second part of this issue considers whether BellSouth should be required to notify Supra on the day the LSR is purged.

Argument

Supra witness Ramos contends that BellSouth refused to provide information regarding its network, which resulted in Supra being restricted in developing its position on this issue through pre-filed testimony. (TR 579) Supra's position, therefore, is based

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

upon its understanding of and response to BellSouth's position.
(Ramos TR 579-580)

As with numerous other issues, Supra witness Ramos believes that "Parity Provisions" should be a consideration in this issue. (TR 521-526, 579) Parity, according to witness Ramos, becomes an issue because BellSouth does not purge its own retail orders after 10 days. (TR 580)

Witness Ramos believes that BellSouth should not be allowed to purge LSRs when the LSR has passed the front-end ordering interface (such as LENS). (TR 580) He believes that if purged, BellSouth is skirting its responsibility to successfully complete the order. (Ramos TR 580) Witness Ramos states:

Upon acceptance [of the front-end interface], completion of the LSR or order is the responsibility of BellSouth and such LSRs or orders should remain on BellSouth's system until their personnel resolve the clarification problems. Alternatively, if any LSRs or orders are dropped, BellSouth should be under an obligation to affirmatively notify Supra (electronically or in writing) within twenty-four (24) hours of the LSR or order being dropped. (TR 580)

The witness concludes his argument by stating his belief that purging Supra's orders after 10 days is discriminatory, since BellSouth does not purge its own retail orders in a like manner. (TR 580) Further, witness Ramos advocates that this issue would be moot if Supra had direct access to BellSouth's OSS. (TR 580)

BellSouth witness Pate believes that Supra's own inefficiency is a factor in this issue. (TR 1143) He asserts that the ALEC, not BellSouth, has the primary responsibility to its end-user with respect to ordering and tracking of service requests. (TR 1146) He continues:

BellSouth does not manage other ALEC's inefficiency and should not be expected to manage Supra's. Supra should be required to manage its ordering process and manage it in such a way that Supra has responsibility for ensuring that its representatives submit a complete and accurate

LSR. Supra cannot and must not assume that BellSouth should handle this responsibility. Supra must take responsibility for managing its operation. (Pate TR 1143)

The witness states that when BellSouth returns a LSR to an ALEC for a clarification, it does so because the order is incomplete, incorrect, or has conflicting information. As a result, BellSouth is unable to issue the order(s) contained on the LSR. (Pate TR 1144)

Witness Pate offers that BellSouth provides complete ordering instructions for ALECs in a document titled the "BellSouth Business Rules" (BBR). (TR 1144) The BBR is available to all ALECs, including Supra, and "provides a common point of reference to simplify the manual and electronic ordering processes for ALECs that conduct business with BellSouth," states the witness. (Pate TR 1144) The BBR contains provisions that address clarifications, including the information about responding to a clarification request. (TR 1145) Witness Pate states that an ALEC has a maximum of ten (10) business days to respond to a clarification request with a supplemental LSR, consistent with the BBR. (TR 1145) If a response is not received on the 10th business day, BellSouth cancels the LSR on the 11th business day, without any further notice, again, as provided in the BBR. (Pate TR 1145-1146) BellSouth believes that ten (10) business days is an ample period of time for an ALEC to respond, and further, believes that it is not obligated to issue "reminder" notices when a response is not forthcoming. (Pate TR 1146)

Analysis

Staff notes that this is a two-part issue. The first part of this issue considers whether BellSouth should be allowed to drop (i.e., purge) Supra's LSRs after 10 days or any other time period if Supra does not respond to BellSouth's request for clarification. The second part of this issue considers whether BellSouth should be required to notify Supra about the imminent purging of its LSR.

Though framed as an issue about LSRs and clarification notifications, staff believes the fundamental consideration in this issue is which party has the responsibility to the end-use customer for ordering and the ultimate provisioning of service. Staff agrees with witness Pate that the ALEC, not BellSouth, has the primary responsibility to its end-user with respect to ordering and tracking

of service requests. (TR 1146) In the final analysis, witness Pate offers that "Supra should be concerned with the end-user satisfaction level," and staff agrees. (TR 1179)

Staff believes the responsibility for a complete and accurate LSR rests with the ALEC, Supra. (Pate TR 577, 1143) As witness Pate elaborated, when BellSouth returns a LSR to an ALEC for a clarification, it does so because the order is incomplete, incorrect, or has conflicting information. (TR 1143) Staff believes that BellSouth and the respective ALEC should be able to work through the clarification requests; an order that is incomplete, incorrect, or has conflicting information is of no use to BellSouth and cannot be provisioned until the clarification issue is resolved. Staff believes that the ALEC has a key role in this matter and, by implication, shares in the responsibility for the successful provisioning.

Staff notes that BellSouth provides complete ordering instructions for ALECs, including Supra, in the BBR. As previously stated, this set of instructions contains provisions that address BellSouth's requests for clarifications, including information about responding to these requests. (Pate TR 1145) Witness Pate states that an ALEC should properly respond to a clarification request by submitting a supplemental LSR. (TR 1145) Staff notes that Supra did not offer any testimony to support whether or not a 10 business day clarification response period was adequate, so staff can only conclude that 10 days is a reasonable period for an ALEC to submit a supplemental LSR. Furthermore, staff notes that 10 business days represents a maximum, and an ALEC is not precluded from responding in a more expeditious manner.

Staff believes that an ALEC that has pending service order activity with BellSouth should be responsible for monitoring the provisioning process for its end use customers. If an ALEC was duly notified about the clarification request and has not responded to BellSouth within the 10 business day period, staff believes that BellSouth should be allowed to cancel the LSR on the 11th business day without further notification, because the specific parameters for this occurrence are detailed in the universally-available BBR.

BellSouth witness Pate believes that Supra is advocating that BellSouth issue a "reminder" notice for orders that are about to be

purged. (TR 1143) The witness believes that imposing such an obligation on BellSouth would mask an ALEC's inefficiency. (TR 1143) Staff agrees, and notes that the universally-available BBR offers fair warning to incent the ALEC to be responsive, notwithstanding the ALEC's own reputation with its end-use customers if it is not responsive. Therefore, staff does not believe that BellSouth should be required to issue "reminder" notices when a LSR is about to be purged. (TR 1146)

In summary, staff believes that the ALEC has primary responsibility to its end-user with respect to ordering and tracking of service requests.

Conclusion

Provided that the guidelines of the BBR are equally available to Supra and all ALECs, staff recommends that BellSouth should be allowed to "purge" orders on the 11th business day after a clarification request, if a supplemental LSR is not submitted by Supra that is responsive to the clarification request on the original LSR. Furthermore, staff recommends that no additional notification is necessary prior to the 11th business day when an LSR is about to be purged.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 62: Should BellSouth be required to provide completion notices for manual orders for the purposes of the interconnection agreement?

RECOMMENDATION: No. BellSouth should not be required to provide completion notices for manual orders for the purposes of the interconnection agreement. (TURNER)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: While BellSouth cannot provide the same kind of completion notification to Supra as when the order is submitted electronically, BellSouth does provide information regarding the status of an order, including completion of the order, through its CLEC Service Order Tracking System ("CSOTS").

SUPRA: This issue was resolved by OAR-3. Supra should receive completion notices for all orders, including manual orders. Giving Supra a Firm Order Commitment, missing that date and never giving notice of when the service is actually turned on leads to customer complaints, billing issues and increased costs.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The Commission is being asked to determine if, for the purposes of the interconnection agreement between the parties, BellSouth should be required to provide completion notices for Local Service Requests submitted manually by Supra.

Arguments

BellSouth witness Pate contends that although BellSouth cannot provide the same kind of completion notification to Supra as when the order is submitted electronically, BellSouth does provide Supra with the "operational tools" necessary to determine the status of its orders on a daily basis, including manual orders. (TR 1147-1148) Witness Pate holds that BellSouth's CLEC Service Order Tracking System (CSOTS) provides ALECs with the capability to view service orders on-line, determine the status of their orders, including the status on manual orders, and track service orders. (TR 1148)

Witness Pate states that "CSOTS interfaces with BellSouth's Service Order Communications System (SOCS) and provides service order information on a real-time basis for manually submitted and

electronically submitted LSRs." (TR 1148) According to witness Pate, CSOTS is available on BellSouth's website, and provides the ALEC community with access to the same service order information that is available to BellSouth's retail units, including the completion notification required by Supra. He states, "(R)egion wide, 320 ALECs are using CSOTS." (TR 1180)

Supra witness Ramos contends that BellSouth should be required to provide completion notices to Supra for manual LSRs or orders. He testifies that a completion notice advises Supra that BellSouth has provisioned an LSR or order and that the customer has been switched over from BellSouth to Supra. Without this notice, witness Ramos asserts that Supra cannot accurately and efficiently determine if or when BellSouth has switched over service for a Supra customer. (TR 581) In order to properly bill its customer and provide maintenance and repair services, witness Ramos contends that Supra must have knowledge of the date that it actually began providing service to the customer. "[P]roviding Supra with a FOC (Firm Order Commitment)," witness Ramos states, "and failing to provide service on the date requested coupled with a lack of notice, can only lead to a number of billing issues, including the potential of double-billing customers." (TR 582) Witness Ramos claims that this "double billing" harms Supra's reputation and its ability to generate revenue. (TR 582)

According to witness Ramos, the CLEC Service Order Tracking System (CSOTS) provided by BellSouth, does not provide a satisfactory alternative to an actual completion notice. He asserts that "[S]upra's representatives would be required to monitor CSOTs on a regular basis for completion indications (with the attendant errors that would flow from using such a process)." (TR 582) Although convenient for BellSouth, witness Ramos believes this system is "costly and inefficient" for Supra. He reasons that a system in which BellSouth provides Supra with an electronic or manual completion notice would be simpler and thus, "result in fewer errors and therefore fewer problems for Florida's consumers and both parties." (TR 582) Moreover, witness Ramos asserts that "since BellSouth service technicians report all completions to BellSouth for correct billing purposes, BellSouth is clearly failing to provide Supra with OSS parity on this issue." (TR 582)

Analysis

As mentioned previously, the Commission must determine if BellSouth should be required to provide completion notices to Supra when the orders are submitted manually. BellSouth witness Pate testifies that although BellSouth does not provide completion notices for manual orders (for ALECS or for its own retail service orders), it provides an efficient means for ALECs to determine the completion status of their manual orders via its web-based interface, CSOTS. (TR 1179) On the contrary, Supra witness Ramos argues that BellSouth's CSOTS system, although convenient for BellSouth, is "costly and inefficient" for Supra. He asserts that it is imperative for Supra to be able to determine when BellSouth has switched over service for a Supra customer in order to correctly bill and provide maintenance and repair services to that customer. He maintains that a process in which BellSouth provides an electronic or manual completion notice would be "simpler and result in few errors and therefore fewer problems for Florida consumers and both parties." (TR 581-582)

Staff is not persuaded by the evidence presented in the record of this docket that BellSouth's CSOTS system is "costly and inefficient" for Supra. Although a process in which BellSouth provides an electronic or manual completion notice may be simpler for Supra, staff does not believe that BellSouth is obligated to provide completion notification to Supra that it does not provide to other ALECs or for its own retail service orders. Since information regarding the status of orders is made available to all ALECs on BellSouth's web-based CSOTS system, staff believes that Supra is provided with sufficient real-time completion notification.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, staff recommends that, for the purposes of the interconnection agreement, BellSouth should not be required to provide completion notices for manual orders.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 63: Under what circumstances, if any, would BellSouth be permitted to disconnect service to Supra for nonpayment?

RECOMMENDATION: Both parties should be allowed to withhold payment of charges disputed in good faith during the pendency of the dispute. Neither party should be allowed to withhold payment of undisputed charges. BellSouth should be permitted to disconnect Supra for nonpayment of undisputed charges. (SCHULTZ)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: BellSouth should be permitted to disconnect service to Supra or any other ALEC that fails to pay undisputed charges within the applicable time period.

SUPRA: BellSouth should not be able to use the threat of disconnection while a payment dispute is pending. The appropriate remedy should be determined in dispute resolution.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff addresses this issue under 11A because it poses a similar, interrelated question and there is significant overlapping testimony.

ISSUE 65: Should the parties be liable in damages, without a liability cap, to one another for their failure to honor in one or more material respects any one or more of the material provisions of the Agreement for purposes of this interconnection agreement?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Staff believes that it is appropriate for the Commission to make its determination on whether or not to impose a condition or term based upon whether the term or condition is required to ensure compliance with the requirements of Sections 251 or 252. Liability for damages, without a liability cap, is not an enumerated item under Sections 251 and 252 of the Act. Further, Staff believes that the record does not support a finding that a liability for damages provision, without a liability cap, is required to implement an enumerated item under Sections 251 and 252 of the Act. Staff recommends that the Commission not impose adoption of such a provision. (KNIGHT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: Each party's liability arising from any breach of contract should be limited to a credit for the actual cost of the services or functions not performed or performed improperly.

SUPRA: There should be no limitation of liability for material breaches of the agreement.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Arguments

Supra's witness Ramos testified that a party that is found to be in breach must be liable to the other in damages, without a liability cap. (Ramos TR 583) His position is that there should be no limitation on liability for material breaches of the agreement. Witness Ramos believes that absent significant penalties for intentional and willful noncompliance, or gross negligence, BellSouth will find it financially beneficial not to comply with the Act as well as its many contractual terms. (TR 585)

BellSouth witness Cox, in adopting witness Ruscilli's testimony, contends that each party's liability arising from any breach of contract should be limited to a credit for the actual cost

of the services or functions not performed or performed improperly. BellSouth states that limitations of liability clauses are standard practice in contracts, and can be found in BellSouth's tariffs for its retail and business customers. BellSouth does not believe Supra should be able to seek more damages as a result of a mistake by Supra than BellSouth's retail and wholesale access customers would have available to them. (TR 210)

Analysis

The issue of the Commission's authority and obligations to arbitrate a damages liability provision must be determined in light of WorldCom Telecommunication Corp. v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Order on the Merits, issued June 6, 2000, in Case No. 4:97cv141-RH. Prior to Order on the Merits issued in WorldCom Telecommunication Corp. v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., the Commission had declined to arbitrate damages liability or specific performance provisions.

In Order on the Merits, the Court rejected the Commission's two arguments. WorldCom Telecommunication Corp. v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Order on the Merits, issued June 6, 2000, in Case No. 4:97cv141-RH, at 32. The Commission argued that it did not have the authority to arbitrate the liquidated damages issue because the liquidated damages issue was not an enumerated item to be arbitrated under Sections 251 and 252 of the Act. Id. Second, the Commission argued that under state law it did not have the authority to mandate a compensation mechanism of this type. Id. The Court rejected the Commission's "narrow reading" of the arbitration provisions of the Act. Id.

The Court states that the Act sets forth two methods that an incumbent carrier and a competitive carrier use to determine the terms and conditions of an interconnection agreement. Id. The Court states that the first and preferable method is through voluntary negotiation between the incumbent carrier and the competitive carrier. Id. at 33. The Court states that the second method, applicable only to the extent voluntary negotiations fail, is arbitration of "any open issue." Id. The Court held that the statutory terms "any open issues" make it clear that the freedom to arbitrate is as broad as the freedom to agree. Id. The Court found that any issue on which a party seeks agreement and is unsuccessful,

may then be submitted for arbitration. Id. The Court concluded that because nothing in the Act foreclosed the parties from voluntarily entering into a compensation mechanism for breaches of the agreement, the damages issue became an open issue which a party was entitled to submit for arbitration. Id. Thus, the Court found that the Commission was obligated to arbitrate and resolve "any open issue." Id. at 33-34.

However, the Court distinguishes between the Commission's obligation to arbitrate and the Commission's obligation to adopt a provision of this type. Id. at 34. The Court stated that had the Commission as a matter of discretion, decided not to adopt this type of provision, that the complainant would bear a substantial burden attempting to demonstrate that the decision was contrary to the Act or arbitrary and capricious. Id. The Court further found that if this type of provision was truly required by the Act and could be adopted in a form that would not impose an unconstitutional burden, then any contrary Florida law would not preclude the adoption of such a provision. Id. at 36.

Staff believes that in the Order on the Merits, the Court makes it clear the Commission has the authority and the obligation pursuant to the Act to arbitrate "any open issue." However, staff believes that the Court does make a distinction regarding whether the Commission is obligated to adopt a damages provision. Pursuant to Section 252(c) of the Act, a State Commission in resolving any open issue and imposing conditions upon the parties to the agreement, shall ensure that the resolution and conditions meet the requirements of Section 251. In U.S. West Communications v. MFS Intelenet, Inc. et. al., 193 F. 3d 1112 (9th Cir. 1999), the Court stated:

State Commissions impose "appropriate conditions as required" **only** to "ensure that such resolutions and conditions meet the requirements of section 251." 47 U.S.C. Sections 252 (b)(4)(c), 252 (c)(1). Id. at 1125. (emphasis added)

Staff believes that while "any open issue" may be arbitrated, the Commission may only impose a condition or term required to ensure that such resolutions and conditions meet the requirements of Section 251.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

Conclusion

Staff believes that the Commission should make its determination on whether or not to impose a condition or term based upon whether the term or condition is required to ensure compliance with the requirements of Sections 251 or 252. Staff notes that liability for damages is not an enumerated item under Sections 251 and 252 of the Act. Staff believes that the record does not support a finding that a liability for damages provision is required to implement an enumerated item under Sections 251 and 252 of the Act.

Based on the foregoing, staff recommends that the Commission not impose adoption of a liability in damages provision.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 66: Should Supra Telecom be able to obtain specific performance as a remedy for BellSouth's breach of contract for purposes of this interconnection agreement?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Staff believes that it is appropriate for the Commission to make its determination on whether or not to impose a condition or term based upon whether the term or condition is required to ensure compliance with the requirements of Sections 251 or 252. Specific performance is not an enumerated item under Sections 251 or 252 of the Act. Further, Staff believes that the record does not support a finding that a specific performance provision is required to implement an enumerated item under Sections 251 or 252 of the Act. Staff recommends that the Commission not impose a specific performance provision when it is not required under Section 251 or 252 of the Act. (KNIGHT)

POSITION OF THE PARTIES:

BELLSOUTH: Specific performance is a remedy, not a requirement of Section 251 of the 1996 Act nor is it an appropriate subject for arbitration under Section 252. Further, specific performance is either available (or not) as a matter of law.

SUPRA: The current agreement allows for the remedy of specific performance and so should this agreement. Services under the agreements are unique, and specific performance is an appropriate remedy for BellSouth's failure to provide the required service.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Arguments

BellSouth witness Cox argues that specific performance is a remedy, not a requirement of Section 251 of the 1996 Act, nor is it an appropriate subject for arbitration under Section 252. (Cox TR 212) Further, specific performance is either available (or not) as a matter of law. Witness Cox states that to the extent Supra can show that it is entitled to obtain specific performance under Florida law, Supra can make this showing without agreement from BellSouth. (Cox TR 212)

Supra witness Ramos believes that the inclusion of specific performance provisions serve as a deterrent to BellSouth from failing to abide by the terms of the Follow-On Agreement or otherwise from committing egregious acts when the benefit to BellSouth exceeds its potential liability. (Ramos TR 585) Witness Ramos acknowledged that in Docket No. 000649-TP, the Commission therein found, based upon record evidence, that the specific performance provision is not necessary to implement the requirements of Section 251 or 252 of the Act. He does believe that the record in this proceeding along with the findings of the Award should allow the language proposed by Supra to be included in this agreement. (TR 586-587) Witness Ramos further asks that if the Commission were to find that such provisions do not meet the requirements of Sections 251 or 252 of the Act, then Supra requests that "there be no mention of any limitation of remedies." (Ramos TR 587)

Analysis

The issue of the Commission's authority and obligations to arbitrate a specific performance provision must be determined in light of WorldCom Telecommunication Corp. v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Order on the Merits, issued June 6, 2000, in Case No. 4:97cv141-RH. Prior to the Order on the Merits issued in WorldCom Telecommunication Corp. v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., the Commission had declined to arbitrate liquidated damages or specific performance provisions.

In the Order on the Merits, the Court rejected the Commission's two arguments. WorldCom Telecommunication Corp. v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Order on the Merits, issued June 6, 2000, in Case No. 4:97cv141-RH, at 32. The Commission argued that it did not have the authority to arbitrate the liquidated damages issue because the liquidated damages issue was not an enumerated item to be arbitrated under Sections 251 and 252 of the Act. Id. Second, the Commission argued that under state law it did not have the authority to mandate a compensation mechanism of this type. Id. The Court rejected the Commission's "narrow reading" of the arbitration provisions of the Act. Id.

The Court states that the Act sets forth two methods that an incumbent carrier and a competitive carrier use to determine the terms and conditions of an interconnection agreement. Id. The Court

states that the first and preferable method is through voluntary negotiation between the incumbent carrier and the competitive carrier. Id. at 33. The Court states that the second method, applicable only to the extent voluntary negotiations fail, is arbitration of "any open issue." Id. The Court held that the statutory terms "any open issues" makes it clear that the freedom to arbitrate is as broad as the freedom to agree. Id. The Court found that any issue on which a party seeks agreement and is unsuccessful, may then be submitted for arbitration. Id. The Court concluded that because nothing in the Act foreclosed the parties from voluntarily entering into a compensation mechanism for breaches of the agreement, the liquidated damages issue became an open issue which a party was entitled to submit for arbitration. Id. Thus, the Court found that the Commission was obligated to arbitrate and resolve "any open issue." Id. at 33-34.

However, the Court distinguishes between the Commission's obligation to arbitrate and the Commission's obligation to adopt a provision of this type. Id. at 34. The Court stated that had the Commission as a matter of discretion decided not to adopt this type of provision, that the complainant would bear a substantial burden attempting to demonstrate that the decision was contrary to the Act or arbitrary and capricious. Id. The Court further found that if this type of provision was truly required by the Act and could be adopted in a form that would not impose an unconstitutional burden, then any contrary Florida law would not preclude the adoption of such a provision. Id. at 36.

Staff believes that in the Order on the Merits, the Court makes it clear the Commission has the authority and the obligation pursuant to the Act to arbitrate "any open issue." However, staff believes that the Court does make a distinction regarding whether the Commission is obligated to adopt a specific performance provision. Pursuant to Section 252 (c) of the Act, a State Commission in resolving any open issue and imposing conditions upon the parties to the agreement, shall ensure that the resolution and conditions meet the requirements of Section 251. In U.S. West Communications v. MFS Intelenet, Inc. et. al., 193 F. 3d 1112 (9th Cir. 1999), the Court stated:

State Commissions impose "appropriate conditions as required" only to "ensure that such resolutions and

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

conditions meet the requirements of section 251." 47
U.S.C. Sections 252 (b)(4)(c), 252 (c)(1). Id at 1125.
(emphasis added)

Staff believes that while "any open issue" may be arbitrated, the Commission may only impose a condition or term required to ensure that such resolutions and conditions meet the requirements of Section 251.

Conclusion

Staff believes that it is appropriate for the Commission to make its determination on whether or not to impose a condition or term based upon whether the term or condition is required to ensure compliance with the requirements of Sections 251 or 252. Staff notes that specific performance is not an enumerated item under Sections 251 and 252 of the Act. Staff believes that the record does not support a finding that a specific performance provision is required to implement an enumerated item under Sections 251 and 252 of the Act.

Based on the forgoing, staff recommends that the Commission not impose a specific performance provision when it is not required under Section 251 of the Act.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP
DATE: February 25, 2002

REVISED

ISSUE 67: Should this docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: No, the parties should be required to submit a signed agreement that complies with the Commission's decisions in this docket for approval within 30 days of issuance of the Commission's Order. This docket should remain open pending Commission approval of the final arbitration agreement in accordance with Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. (KNIGHT)

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The parties should be required to submit a signed agreement that complies with the Commission's decisions in this docket for approval within 30 days of issuance of the Commission's Order. This docket should remain open pending Commission approval of the final arbitration agreement in accordance with Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.