

ORIGINAL

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

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

RECEIVED-FPSC

05 MAR -4 AM 10:31

COMMISSION
CLERK

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

DATE: March 4, 2005
TO: Division of the Commission Clerk & Administrative Services
FROM: Todd M. Brown, Regulatory Analyst IV, Division of Competitive Markets & Enforcement
RE: Docket No. 041269-TP

Please add the attached document, "Change of Law Generic Docket Issues Matrix," to the docket file. When placing in the docket file, please identify the document as "BellSouth's Tennessee Issues Matrix." If you have any questions, please contact me at 413-6550.

cc: Adam Teitzman, Office of the General Counsel

- CMP _____
- COM _____
- CTR _____
- ECR _____
- GCL _____
- OPC _____
- MMS _____
- RCA _____
- SCR _____
- SEC 1
- OTH _____

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
02257 MAR -4 03
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET
ISSUES MATRIX**

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
1	FINAL RULES: Should existing Interconnection Agreements previously approved by the TRA be amended to include the FCC's transition plan for switching, loops and transport as detailed in the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order ("TRRO"), issued February 4, 2005.
2	MANDAMUS: In the event the FCC's TRRO is vacated or otherwise modified by a court of competent jurisdiction, should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to be consistent with the court's order as of the effective date of the order?
3	TRO – LINE SHARING: Pursuant to the 96 Act, are ILECs required to provide line sharing to new customers of CLECs after October 1, 2004?
4	TRO – LINE SHARING – TRANSITION: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to include the FCC's ordered transition (found in the TRO) for existing CLEC line sharing arrangements?
5	TRO – LINE SPLITTING: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to remove the existing line splitting provisions and provide only that the ILEC will assist in facilitating line splitting?
6	TRO – SUB-LOOP CONCENTRATION: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to eliminate any requirement that the ILEC unbundle the sub loop components identified as sub-loop feeder and sub-loop concentration?
7	TRO – PACKET SWITCHING: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to eliminate any requirement that the ILEC unbundle packet switching, including but not limited to routers and DSLAMs?
8	TRO – CALL-RELATED DATABASES: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to eliminate any requirement that the ILEC provide call-related databases in any situation other than when it provides switching?

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
9	<p>TRO – GREENFIELD AREAS: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to provide that the ILEC is not required to offer unbundled access to newly-deployed or ‘greenfield’ fiber loops, including fiber loops deployed to the minimum point of entry (“MPOE”) of a multiple dwelling unit that is predominantly residential regardless of the ownership of the inside wiring from the MPOE to each end user?</p>
10	<p>TRO – HYBRID LOOPS: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to provide that the ILEC is only required to offer unbundled access to the TDM portion of the hybrid loop?</p>
11	<p>TRO – END USER PREMISES: Under the FCC’s definition of a loop found in 47 C.F.R. §51.319(a), is a mobile switching center or cell site an “end user customer’s premises”?</p>
12	<p>TRO – ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATION: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to remove any requirement that ILECs provide network modifications to CLIECs, such as line conditioning, in situations where the ILEC would not make such modifications for its own end users?</p>
13	<p>TRO – ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATION: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to provide for the recovery of the cost of a Routine Network Modification that is not already recovered in the Commission-approved recurring or nonrecurring charges?</p>
14	<p>TRO – FIBER TO THE HOME: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to provide that an ILEC has no obligation to provide unbundled access to overbuild fiber to the home facilities except where the ILEC is retiring an existing copper facility, in which case the ILEC has an obligation to provide a 64kbps transmission path?</p>
15	<p>TRO – EELS AUDITS: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to allow ILECs to hire an independent auditor to conduct yearly AICPA-compliant audits to verify whether all EELs purchased by CLIECs comply with the requirements of the TRO?</p>
16	<p>TRO - ENTERPRISE SWITCHING: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Sections 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to eliminate any obligation for BellSouth to provide enterprise switching, as that term is defined in the TRO?</p>
17	<p>252(i): Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Sections 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to incorporate the FCC’s “entire agreement” rule regarding 252(i)?</p>
18	<p>TRO – TRANSPORT: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Sections 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to define dedicated transport to only include DSO level facilities between switches and wire centers owned by BellSouth?</p>