



Tracy Hatch
Senior Attorney
Law and Government Affairs
Southern Region

Suite 700
101 N. Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850-425-6360

November 8, 2004

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Blanca Bayó, Director
The Commission Clerk and Administrative Services
Room 110, Easley Building
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 040156-TP

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing is AT&T Communication of the Southern States, LLC's Proposed Issues List in the above-referenced docket. Pursuant to the Commission's electronic filing rules, this filing should be considered the "official" version for purposes of the docket file.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing.

Sincerely yours,

s/ Tracy Hatch
Tracy W. Hatch

TWH/scd
Enclosure
cc: Parties of Record

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

DOCKET NO. 040156-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished via U.S. Mail and electronic mail this the 8th day of November 2004, to the following parties of record:

/s/ Tracy W. Hatch

Tracy Hatch

Felicia Banks/Lee Fordham
Staff Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Verizon Florida Inc.
Mr. Richard Chapkis
201 N. Franklin Street, FLTC0007
Tampa, FL 33602
Phone: (813) 483-1256
Fax: (813) 273-9825

Stumpf, Craddock Law Firm
W. Scott McCollough/David Bolduc
1250 Capital of Texas Highway South
Building One, Suite 420
Austin, TX 78746

Kellog Huber Law Firm
Aaron Panner/Scott Angstreich
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc.
(GA)
Dulaney O'Roark, III
6 Concourse Parkway, Suite 600
Atlanta, GA 30328
Phone: 770-284-5498
Fax: 770-284-5499

Competitive Carrier Group (Messer)
C/O Messer Law Firm
Norman H. Norton, Jr.
PO BOX 1876
Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc.
Ms. Donna C. McNulty
1203 Governors Square Blvd., Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301-2960
Phone: (850) 219-1008
Fax: (850) 219-1018
Email: donna.mculty@mci.com

Competitive Carrier Group (Kelley)
C/O Kelley Drey Law Firm
Andrew M. Klein
1200 Nineteenth Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

Competitive Carrier Coalition (Swidler)
C/O Swidler Derlin Law Firm
Michael C. Sloan
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007

Eagle Telecommunications, Inc.
5020 Central Avenue
St. Petersburg, FL 33707-1942

McWhirter Law Firm
Vicki Kaufman
117 S. Gadsden St.
Tallahassee, FL 32301

LecStar Telecom, Inc.
Michael Britt
4500 Circle 75 Parkway
Suite D-4200
Atlanta, GA 30339-3025

Myatel
J.P. Dejoubner
PO BOX 100106
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33310-0106

Verizon Wireless
C/O Wiggins Law Firm
Patrick Wiggins
PO BOX 1657
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Sprint
Susan Masterton
PO BOX 2214
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214
Phone: (850) 599-1560
Fax: (850) 878-0777
Email: susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Re: Petition for Arbitration of Amendment)
to Interconnection Agreements With Certain) Docket No. 040156-TP
Competitive Local Exchange Carriers and)
Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers) Filed: November 8, 2004
in Florida by Verizon Florida Inc.)

AT&T'S PROPOSED ISSUES LIST

Pursuant to Commission Order No. PSC-04-1016-PCO-TP, establishing scope of proceedings and initial schedule, AT&T hereby files its proposed issues list. AT&T previously provided its list of issues in its issues matrix attached as Exhibit 2 to its Answer to Verizon's Petition for Arbitration, filed October 4, 2004. For the parties convenience, a copy of Exhibit 2 containing AT&T's current list of issues is attached. The issues identified in the attached issues matrix contains AT&T's proposal for issues to be addressed in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted this the 8th day of November 2004.

/s/ Tracy W. Hatch
Tracy Hatch
AT&T Communications of the Southern
States, LLC
101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850) 425-6360

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
1	General Terms and Conditions, Section 6 and 7, AT&T new § 2.1.8, 3.9; 3.1.1.3; 3.4.1; 3.4.2; 3.5.1; 3.5.2.3; 3.5.3.2; 3.8.1.1	Does the TRO require any amendment to the change in law provisions in the parties' interconnection agreements?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
2	General Terms and Conditions, Sections 6 and 7.	How should the Amendment address the results of state commission impairment proceedings, as well as any orders, rules, regulations, decisions, ordinances or statutes issued by the state commission, the FCC or any court of competent jurisdiction?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
3	TRO Attachment ¶ 6; TRO Attachment § 1.3 (and new 1.4 in CCC redline)	Should CLECs' reservation of rights mirror Verizon's reservation of rights?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T

¹ These section/paragraph numbers have not been updated to reference either party's proposed TRO-Amendment as modified for the Interim Rules. These will not be updated until those negotiations have concluded.

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
4	<p>§§ 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.16, 3.1.1.3; 3.4.1; 3.4.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.5.2.3, 3.5.3.2, 3.7.1, 3.8.1, 3.9</p> <p><i>See, e.g., 2.1</i></p>	<p>Are Verizon's legal obligations to provide access to UNEs based solely upon 47 U.S.C. § 251 and 47 CFR Part 51?</p> <p>Whether the provisions addressing change of law should be amended to delete Verizon's ability unilaterally to implement changes to the interconnection agreement?</p>	<p>Legal issue, only briefing required.</p> <p>Legal issue, only briefing required.</p>	<p>AT&T</p> <p>AT&T</p>
5	<p>Numerous sections of Verizon's Amendment state that Verizon is required to provide UNEs only to the extent required by 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(3) and 47 CFR Part 51.</p>	<p>Should this proceeding address terms and conditions that do not arise from the unbundled network element regulations promulgated in the TRO pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §§ 251 and 252, including issues that may arise under state law, 47 U.S.C. § 271, or the <i>Bell Atlantic/GTE</i> Merger Conditions?</p>	<p>Legal issue, only briefing required.</p>	<p>AT&T</p>
6	<p>1.3</p>	<p>Should the establishment of rates, terms, and conditions for new UNEs, UNE combinations or commingling be subject to the change of law provisions of the ICA?</p>	<p>Legal issue, only briefing required</p>	<p>AT&T</p>

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
7		Has the FCC specified that the TRO's changes in unbundling obligations must be implemented without waiting for any appeals of the TRO to become final and unappealable?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
8	3.8.3, 3.2.1.1	How should the Amendment reference or address commercial agreements that may be negotiated for services or facilities to which Verizon is not required to provide access as UNEs under the Act?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
9	§§ 2.1 – 2.23	Should the Commission approve Verizon's proposed definitions in the Amendment's TRO Glossary as amended by the CLECs?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
10	§§ 2.1 – 2.23	Should the Amendment's TRO Glossary include any other terms?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
11	§§ 2.16, 3.1.1, 3.1.3.2, 3.1.3.3, 3.1.3.4, 3.2, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.1, 3.4.1, 3.4.3, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.5.3	Should changes to the parties' interconnection agreements to reflect TRO requirements be effective retroactive to October 2, 2003 or should they be effective as of the amendment effective date?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
12	3.1.4.3	Whether Verizon should construct copper loop or UDLC facilities if 3.1.4.1 or 3.1.4.2 options are available.	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
13	AT&T new 3.1.2.4, 3.1.2.6, 3.1.2.7, 3.1.2.8, 3.1.2.9; TRO Attachment § 3.1.2.2	Should the Amendment include language addressing Verizon's obligation, under the TRO, to notify CLECs of retirement of copper loop facilities?	AT&T believes this issue will require testimony.	AT&T
14	AT&T new 3.1.2.4, 3.1.2.6, 3.1.2.7, 3.1.2.8, 3.1.2.9; TRO Attachment § 3.1.2.2	Are there other existing legal obligations pertaining to Verizon's retirement of copper loop facilities that must be reflected in the Amendment (such as state commission guidelines, change management procedures)? What obligations does Verizon have in connection with changes to underlying loop architectures and other related network changes?	AT&T believes this issue will require testimony.	AT&T
15	TRO Attachment § 3.1; AT&T new § 3.1.5	Does this Commission have the authority to determine whether, under section 251(d)(2) of the Act, CLECs are impaired without access to unbundled dark fiber loops?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
16	2.6, 3.1.1.1	How should the Amendment address unbundled access to DS1 loops?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
17	2.7, 3.1.1.2, 3.1.1.2.1, 3.1.1.3	How should the Amendment address unbundled access to DS3 loops, including the FCC's location-specific cap on access to DS3-level facilities?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
18	2.10, 3.1.2.1	How should the Amendment reflect the FCC's rulings on whether or not unbundled access to newly built FTTH loops is required?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
19	2.10, 3.1.2.2; AT&T new §§ 3.1.2.3, 3.1.2.5	How should the Amendment reflect the TRO's rulings on unbundled access to overbuilt FTTH loops?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
20	2.12, 3.1.3.2 3.1.3.3	How should the Amendment reflect Verizon's obligations to provide broadband services? How should the Amendment reflect the TRO's limitations on unbundled access to hybrid loops for purposes of providing narrowband services?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
21	3.1.4, 3.1.4.1, 3.1.4.2 AT&T new § 3.1.4	How should the Amendment reflect Verizon's obligation, under the TRO, to satisfy CLEC requests to provide narrowband services through unbundled access to hybrid loops served via Integrated Digital Loop Carrier ("IDLC")? Should Verizon be able to recover its multiple charges, e.g., engineering query, construction, cancellation charges, etc., from a CLEC where the CLEC has requested that Verizon build a new copper loop?	Legal issue, only briefing required	AT&T
22	3.1.4.3	Should Verizon be subject to standard provisioning intervals or performance measurements and potential remedy payments, if any, in the underlying Agreement or elsewhere, in connection with its provision of unbundled loops in response to CLEC requests for IDLC-served hybrid loops?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
23	2.17, 3.1.3.1	How should the Amendment address packet switching?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
24	AT&T new 3.1.6	How should the Amendment address Network Interface Devices ("NIDs")?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
25	3.2	How should the Amendment reflect the TRO's line sharing rulings and any transitional arrangements?	Legal issue, only briefing required	AT&T
26	3.2.1.1	Should line sharing requirements be moved to a separate agreement or remain in the ICA?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
27	AT&T new § 3.2(A)	Should the TRO Amendment include language addressing the TRO's clarification of line-splitting requirements?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
28	AT&T new § 3.2(B)	Should the TRO Amendment include language addressing the TRO's clarification of line conditioning requirements?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
29	AT&T new § 3.2(C)	Should Verizon provide an access point for CLECs to engage in testing, maintaining and repairing copper loops and copper subloops?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
30	3.3; AT&T new § 3.3	How should the Amendment implement Verizon's obligation, under the TRO, to provide unbundled access to subloops?	CLECs believe this issue will require presentation of testimony.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
31	3.3.1-3.3.12	<p>How should the Amendment address Verizon's obligations, under the TRO, to provide a single point of interconnection at a multi-unit premises suitable for use by multiple carriers? (This is but one example of multiple issues related to subloops encompassed in Issue 33, such as the scope of the TRO's requirements regarding: connecting to and provisioning of subloops; the need for Loop concentration /multiplexing functionality; loop distribution subloop component issues; Inside Wire Subloop for multi-tenant environments; demarcation points.)</p>	<p>AT&T believes this issue will require presentation of testimony.</p>	AT&T
32	2.8, 2.14, 2.15, 3.4, 3.4.1, 3.4.3	<p>How should the Amendment address unbundling of local circuit switching, including mass market and enterprise switching and tandem switching?</p> <p>Should the Amendment be revised to include vertical features, such as customized routing?</p>	<p>Legal issue, only briefing required</p>	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
33	2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2	How should the Amendment address unbundled access to dedicated transport, including the TRO's route-specific cap on access to DS3-level transport facilities?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
34	3.5.2.1, 3.5.3	Should the Amendment address the possibility of reverse collocation?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
35	SB CCC new § 3.5.4, 3.5.2.1	Whether the facilities provided by Verizon to interconnect in order to exchange traffic with a CLEC, such as interconnection trunks between a Verizon wire center and a CLEC wire center, are interconnection facilities under section 251(c)(2) that must be provided at TELRIC?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
36	3.6.1, 3.6.2	How should the Amendment reflect the TRO's requirements relating to Verizon's obligation to allow commingling of UNEs or combinations of UNEs with wholesale services?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
37	3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.3, 3.6.2.5	<p>How should the Amendment reflect Verizon's obligations with respect to conversion of wholesale services (<i>e.g.</i>, special access facilities) to UNEs or UNE combinations (<i>e.g.</i>, EELs)?</p> <p>May Verizon impose non-recurring charges (including, but not limited to, termination charges, disconnect and reconnect fees) on a circuit-by-circuit basis when wholesale services (<i>e.g.</i>, special access facilities) are being converted to UNEs or UNE combinations (<i>E.g.</i>, EELs)?</p>	AT&T believes this issue will require testimony.	AT&T
38	3.6.1, 3.6.2.6	Should Verizon's provision of commingled arrangements or conversions of access circuits to UNEs be subject to standard provisioning intervals or to performance measurements and potential remedy payments, if any, in the underlying Agreement or elsewhere?	AT&T believes this issue raises mixed questions of law and fact; testimony may be required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
39	3.6.2.2 3.10.3.3 (CCG)	Are CLECs required to provide unessential, specific information to request a new EEL or EEL conversion, such as specific local numbers assigned to a DS1 or DS3 circuit, the date each circuit was established in the 911/E911 database, or the collocation termination connecting facility assignment for each circuit?	AT&T believes this issue raises mixed questions of law and fact; testimony may be required.	AT&T
40	3.6.2.7	How should the Amendment implement Verizon's right, under the TRO, to obtain audits of CLEC compliance with the FCC's service eligibility criteria for EELs?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
41	3.61, 3.6.2.4	<p>Should Verizon's delays in implementing EELs conversions enable Verizon to continue to charge higher special access rates or should CLECs be entitled to UNE pricing treatment as of October 2, 2003, for conversion requests submitted prior to the amendment effective date?</p> <p>Should pricing changes to UNE rates for conversion requests submitted after the amendment effective date become effective upon receipt by Verizon of AT&T's request for conversion?</p>	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
42	AT&T new § 3.6.2.3A.1, 3.6.2.3A.2	When Verizon converts wholesale services to UNEs or UNE combinations, should the Amendment state that Verizon is prohibited from physically disconnecting, separating, altering or changing the facilities or equipment except at the request of AT&T?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
43	AT&T new § 3.6.2.3A.1, 3.6.2.3A.2	Must Verizon process expeditiously all conversion requested by AT&T without adversely affecting the service quality perceived by AT&T's end user customer?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
44	AT&T new § 3.7.1	May Verizon impose additional charges for Routine Network Modifications?	Requires Testimony	AT&T
45	AT&T new § 3.7.2	Should Verizon's provisioning of Loops or Transport (including Dark Fiber Transport and Loops) for which Routine Network Modifications are required be subject to standard provisioning intervals, and to performance measures and remedies contained in the ICA, PAP or otherwise determined by the Board?	Raises mixed issues of fact and law and may require testimony	AT&T
46	3.8.1, AT&T new §§ 3.8.2, 3.8.3, 3.8.4, 3.9	What transitional provisions should apply in the event that Verizon no longer has a legal obligation to provide a UNE? Should this transition section be referenced specifically in sections such as 3.1.1, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.3.4, 3.5.2, and 3.5.3?	AT&T believes this issue will require testimony.	AT&T
47	3.8.3 AT&T new Exhibit A	Should Verizon be required to negotiate terms for service substitutions for services or facilities replacing nonconforming facilities in accordance with the terms proposed by AT&T in its Exhibit A, and should exhibit A be included in the parties' interconnection agreements?	AT&T believes this issue raises mixed questions of law and fact; testimony may be required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
48	AT&T new § 3.10 AT&T new Exhibit B	Should the TRO Amendment contain performance metrics and remedies provisions related to batch hot cut, large job hot cut and individual hot cut processes?	AT&T believes this issue will require testimony.	AT&T Verizon states that terms regarding a batch hot cut process should not be included in this arbitration.
49	VZ new 2.1	Should Verizon be permitted to “decline to provide” access to UNEs and Combinations without adhering to the change in law provisions of the interconnection agreement?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
50	VZ new 2.1 & 2.3	Should Verizon be obligated to allow AT&T, without additional charge, to commingle and combine UNEs and Combinations with services that AT&T obtains at wholesale from Verizon?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
51	VZ new 2.3	What is the appropriate process for addressing any interim rules that the FCC may release subsequent to the Amendment Effective Date?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
52	VZ new 2.3	Notwithstanding the terms of the interconnection agreement, or any Verizon tariff or SGAT, must Verizon make routine network modifications without additional charge to AT&T?	AT&T believes that this issue will require testimony.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
53	VZ new 2.3	Whether the FCC Interim Rules apply and govern the parties' relationship when issued or whether the parties are not bound by the FCC order issuing the rules until such time as the parties negotiate an amendment to the ICA to implement them or Verizon issues a tariff reflecting them.	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
54	VZ new 3.1	Should the Amendment recount whether or not all "required notices of discontinuance" of facilities have been sent by Verizon, and whether or not any required notice periods have expired?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
55	VZ new 3.1	Should the Amendment modify any change in law terms of the interconnection agreement by allowing Verizon to "cease providing" facilities to AT&T "at any time and without further notice"?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
56	VZ new 3.2.1	Should there be an orderly transition period associated with Verizon's efforts to cease providing unbundled Enterprise Switching instead of a flash cut date established by Verizon as the date it will cease providing such service to new customers and only provide such service to existing customers at substantially increased rates?	Legal issue, only briefing required; provided, however, AT&T believes that the matter of any additional charges/surcharges for Enterprise Switching will require testimony.	AT&T
57	VZ new 3.3	Should the Amendment include language requiring Verizon to meet new orders for unbundled Network Elements, Combinations and Commingling that Verizon would categorize as "discontinued" when described in the context of services being provided to existing customers, in accordance with standard ordering procedures and pursuant to the rates, terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T
58	VZ new 3.3	Should Verizon be prohibited from unilaterally tacking surcharges onto facilities that Verizon claims are discontinued?	AT&T believes that this issue will require testimony.	AT&T

ISSUES TO BE ARBITRATED IN DOCKET NO. 040156, ICA ARBITRATION

AT&T issues re: Verizon's revised TRO Amendment (9/9/04)
Exhibit 2

ISSUE	DRAFT TRO AMENDMENT SECTION ¹	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR PURELY LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
59	VZ new 3.3	Should Verizon be prohibited from backbilling for surcharges and rate increases that it may seek to unilaterally impose but cannot implement in its billing systems on the date(s) that it claims such surcharges and rate increases take effect?	Legal issue, only briefing required.	AT&T