

LAW OFFICES
Messer, Caparello & Self
A Professional Association

Post Office Box 1876
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876
Internet: www.lawfla.com

November 8, 2004

BY HAND DELIVERY

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

Re: Docket 040156-TP

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of MCImetro Access Transmission Services LLC, MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc, Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc., and Intermedia Communications, Inc. (collectively, "MCI") are an original and fifteen copies of MCI's Proposed Issue List in the above referenced docket.

Please acknowledge receipt of these documents by stamping the extra copy of this letter "filed" and returning the same to me.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing.

Sincerely yours,


Floyd R. Self

FRS/amb
Enclosures

**MCI'S PROPOSED ISSUE LIST
DOCKET NUMBER 040156-TP**

ISSUE	DRAFT AMENDMENT SECTION	SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF ISSUE (FACT-BASED OR LEGAL)	PARTIES SEEKING TO ARBITRATE
1	2.1	Should Verizon be required to follow the change of law provision in the existing interconnection agreement if it seeks to discontinue the provisioning of UNEs?	Legal	MCI
2	2.2	Should changes in law with respect to use restrictions on UNEs be handled by the change of law provisions in the current interconnection agreement?	Legal	MCI
3	2.3	Should the re-imposition of unbundling obligations be handled by the change of law provisions in the current interconnection agreement?	Legal	MCI
4	3.1; 4.7.3	Should the proposed amendment address <i>future</i> changes in Verizon's unbundling obligations?	Legal	MCI
5	3.1; 3.4; 4.7.3	Should the proposed amendment be the exclusive source of Verizon's right to discontinue the provisioning of a UNE or UNE combination?	Legal	MCI

6	3.1; 3.4; 4.7.3	Should Verizon be permitted to provide notice of discontinuance in advance of the effective date of removal of unbundling requirements?	Legal	MCI
7	3.2	Should Verizon be permitted to re-price existing arrangements through application of a surcharge?	Legal	MCI
8	3.2	Should Verizon be permitted to assess non-recurring charges for the disconnection of a UNE arrangement or the re-connection of service under an alternative arrangement?	Legal	MCI
9	3.3	Does Section 252 of the 1996 Act apply to agreements on replacement arrangements?	Legal	MCI
10	3.5	Should rate increases or new charges established by the FCC in the <i>Interim Order</i> be implemented according to the change of law provisions in the parties' interconnection agreements?	Legal	MCI
11	MCI proposed 4	Should the interconnection agreement be amended to include changes arising from the TRO with respect to commingling of UNEs with wholesale services, EELs, and other combinations?	Legal	MCI
12	MCI proposed 5	Should the interconnection agreement be amended to include changes arising from the TRO with respect to conversion of wholesale services to UNEs/UNE combinations?	Legal	MCI

13	MCI proposed 6	Should the interconnection agreement be amended to include changes arising from the TRO with respect to line splitting?	Legal	MCI
14	MCI proposed 7	Should the interconnection agreement be amended to include changes arising from the TRO with respect to FTTP loops, hybrid loops, retirement of copper loops, and line conditioning?	Legal	MCI
15	MCI proposed 8	What transition arrangements should apply if the FCC were to determine that CLECs are not impaired without access to other UNEs?	Legal	MCI
16	VZ proposed 4.7; MCI proposed 9.7	What are the appropriate definitions, if any, for the following and should they be included in the amendment? a) combinations; commingling b) discontinued element c) entrance facility; d) four-line carve out switching; e) line splitting; f) local switching; g) loop; and h) tandem switching.	Legal	MCI