# ORIGINAL

OTH \_\_\_\_

# REDACTED

		2005 Competitive L	ocal Exchange Carrie	•	
			(Due by July 15, 200.	))	undockeded
	Legal Com	pany Name: <b>RNK Tele</b> c	com, Inc.		
	D/B/A: <b>N</b> /A	4			
	FPSC Com	pany Code (e.g., TX000	) TX799		
	Contact na	me & title: Michael Ten	ore, Counsel		
	Telephone	number: <b>781-613-6119</b>			
	E-mail add	ress: mtenore@rnktel.c	com		
	Stock Sym	bol (if company is public	cly traded): N/A		
		<b>Provided in Florida</b> you provide local teleph		Circle	your response:
	•	K only recently execute ilities based service is r		agreen	nent with BellSouth. As such,
	2. Ple	ase indicate which of the Local telephone serv	_	compa	ny provides. Select all that apply. Paging service
		Private line/special a Wholesale loops Wholesale transport		X X	Prepaid service (calling cards) VoIP (via resellers) Cable television
		X Interexchange service Cellular/wireless ser	ce		Satellite television Broadband Internet access
		lly recently received C an interconnection agr	•		and just recently (May, 2005)
CMP		our company provides provides provide in Florida? Circ		ie servi	ice, is this the only service you
CTR					
ECR					
GCL					
OPC					
RCA					
SCR					/
SGA					(DN 07082-05 appears) to be duplicate of 06923-05 Ay
SEC	PUBLIC V	ERSION	1		04923-05 AH
OTH	- CDEIG T				BOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07082 JUL 25 8

## **Bundled Services**

4. Please complete the following table. For each residential and business package of bundled services you sell, list its name (e.g., Sprint Solutions), mark the included services, and enter the price and take rate. The take rate is calculated by dividing the number of customers that have subscribed to the corresponding package by the number of customers that can obtain that package from your company. Examples have been shaded.

Residential	Name of Package	Local	Long Distance	Broadband	Wireless	Video Service	Price	Take Rate
	Resphone	V	•	Third As in		~	\$69.99	35%
	NA							
Business	Name of Package	Local	Long Distance	Broadband	Wireless	Video Service	Price	Take Rate
	Buservice	~	<b>V</b>	Y			\$89.99	25%
	NA							
		<u> </u>						
		<u> </u>						
		1						

# **VoIP**

5. Indicate below whether you are offering or providing VoIP service to end-user customers in Florida. For purposes of this question, VoIP service is defined as IP-based voice service provided over a digital connection. VoIP calls under this definition may or may not terminate on the PSTN.

Not offering VoIP service in Florida.

X Offering business VoIP services.

X Offering residential VoIP services.

If you are offering or providing VoIP service in Florida:

a. Provide the exchanges where you are offering VoIP service.

#### [CONFIDENTIAL]

b. Provide residential price(s) for VoIP service.

# RNK Telecom Suggested Retail \$24.95.

c. Provide business price(s) for VoIP service.

# RNK Telecom Suggested Retail \$9.95.

d. List all call features included with the service, e.g., call forwarding, caller ID, voice mail, etc.

Caller ID Block
Call Return
Call Forwarding
Speedial (0-9)
Do Not Disturb
Anonymous Call Rejection
International Call Blocking
Call Filter (0-9)
Blacklist (0-9)
Caller ID ANI only
Call Transfer
Call Waiting
Voicemail with email and web
notification
Music On Hold

Cł	ieck	all that apply to your VoIP service:
		Offer wireless VoIP service.
		Offer wireline VoIP service.
		911 (Location information not provided automatically to PSAP).
	X*	E911 (Location information provided automatically to PSAP).
		CALEA (Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act).
		Telephone Relay Service.
		Power Backup (If so, identify time duration below, e.g., 4 hours, 8 hours).
Ī		Time duration of power backup (in hours).
	X	Directory Assistance.
		Operator Services.
		Equal Access to long distance providers.
	X	Local Number Portability.
	X	Local Calling.
	X	Long Distance Calling.
	Y	International Calling

X Contribute to Universal Service Fund.

e.

	Require VoIP subscriber to also purchase Broadband service.  X Offered as primary line service.  X Offered as secondary line service only.  X Interconnected with PSTN. Peer-to-Peer only (no interconnection with PSTN).  X Use of public Internet. Use of private IP network.  X Call uptime 99.999%.  X Use of numbers from the North American Numbering Plan Administrator.
BellSouth, to arrange with the Fo the Matters Service Pro	ountered significant delays in obtaining an interconnection agreement with delaying deployment of a 911 solution (See Question 12). RNK is now beginning connections to the selective routers and plans to transmit 911 calls in compliance CC's recent 911 order. (See <i>First Report and Order and Notice of Public Rulemaking Interpretation of IP Enabled Services</i> , WC Docket No. 04-36, and E911 Requirements for IP-Enabled viders, WC Docket No. 05-196, FCC 05-116, June 3, 2005)). RNK intends to comply d all other directives of the FCC regarding VoIP service.
f.	If you are not offering or providing VoIP service to end-user customers in Florida, do you anticipate doing so? If yes, identify rollout month/year.
[CONFIDE	ENTIAL]
6. Info	nd Internet Access rmation provided in your response to this question will be reported on an aggregate, asis, not on a company-specific basis.
N/A	
a.	Please provide the percentage of residential households to which your broadband service is available in your service area.
b.	Provide the total number of <b>residential</b> lines and wireless channels over which you or an affiliate are providing broadband service in your service area.
c.	Provide the total number of <b>business</b> lines and wireless channels over which you or an affiliate are providing broadband service in your service area.
đ.	What type(s) of broadband connection(s) do you provide?xDSLcable modemsatellitefixed wireless

mobile wireless

	Broadband over power line
	Other (Specify)

e. Please fill out the following table providing the downstream and upstream data transfer rates and the monthly price for each tier of broadband service you offer.

Data Transfer Rate - Broadband Service

Residential	Downstream	Upstream	\$ Price/month		
Business	Downstream	Upstream	\$ Price/month		

#### FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order

- 7. The following questions relate to the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order (TRRO), released on February 4, 2005.
  - a. Has your business plan in Florida changed as a result of the TRRO? If so, how?

RNK only recently entered the Florida market after the TRRO was released and has not yet ordered traditional facilities that might involve the TRRO; as such the order has not impacted RNK's plans to date.

b. If you are primarily a UNE-P provider do you expect to migrate to UNE-L, negotiate commercial agreements (to provide loop, switching, and transport), or change the focus of your business?

No.

c. Have you executed any commercially negotiated agreements with any carriers? If so, please identify the carriers.

No.

d. Is there any other information (or comments) that you wish to provide?

No.

#### Mergers

8. Several mergers have been announced in the past year, e.g., Sprint-Nextel, SBC-AT&T, and Verizon-MCI.

6

a. Do you anticipate more mergers? Why or why not?

RNK does not possess sufficient information to answer this question effectively. However, Qwest, after its failure to obtain MCI, may still be in the market for a large IXC or CLEC and further market concentration in the hands of the ILECs may be forth coming.

b. What effects do you believe these mergers (if approved) will have on local competition in Florida?

As a new entrant into the Florida market, RNK cannot effectively comment on this matter, other than to comment generally that AT&T and MCI's competition in the local markets, and participation in PSC dockets, and before the courts and legislature has resulted in better competition and a more fair playing field that played a significant role in creating the local competition, while still dwarfed by the dominant ILECs, that exist today. As stated below, if they "join" the ILECs they attempted to "beat," there is no entity that can fill the massive void they leave, and competition under the current system will most definitely suffer greatly. To that extent, RNK hopes the PSC will play a larger role in fighting to maintain and improve the competitive landscape for local competition.

c. Has your local competition strategy changed as a result of the merger announcements? If so, please explain how.

With major CLECs merging with ILECs, RNK expects to spend more time negotiating agreements and have less bargaining power in such negotiations. In the past, major CLECs (such as MCI and AT&T) previously carried the lion's share of costly arbitrations and negotiations of interconnection agreements, and created good agreements that small CLECs could adopt into under Section 252(i) of the Telecommunications Act. The agreements RNK and other small CLECs could and did adopt, providing a cost effective way to obtain interconnection agreements upon more reasonable terms, and admittedly, likely provided agreements small carriers like RNK could not afford to litigate on their own. Now, RNK and other CLECs will be severely hampered in finding cost effective methods of interconnection. Further, RNK expects that costly arbitrations might very well be the only way to obtain reasonable terms from ILECS. RNK suggests that the Commission take the opportunity presented by these mergers to condition approval on obtaining various competitive concessions that will benefit local competition in Florida.

d. How will these mergers (if approved) affect your local competition strategy in Florida?

See above.

### **Miscellaneous**

9. In 2004, how much money did you invest in your network directly serving Florida's local service customers?

RNK only recently received CLEC authority in Florida and just recently (May, 2005) concluded an interconnection agreement with BellSouth.

10. Are you currently operating under Chapter 7 or Chapter 11 protection?

No.

11. If you filed Form 477 with the FCC to include data as of December 31, 2004, please provide us with a copy. This form only applies to CLECs with a minimum of 10,000 access lines in Florida.

N/A

#### **Comments**

12. Have you experienced any significant barriers in entering Florida's local exchange markets? Please list and describe any major obstacles or barriers encountered that you believe may be impeding the growth of local competition in the state, along with any suggestions as to how to remove such obstacles.

RNK encountered significant delays in obtaining an interconnection agreement in Florida from BellSouth. RNK first contacted BellSouth in September 2004 shortly after it received FPSC CLEC authority. Pursuant to Section 252(i) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, RNK requested adoption of the active Level 3 Interconnection Agreement. BellSouth refused the adoption claiming that the TRO Interim Rules Order prevented our adoption. RNK pointed to the FPSC's ruling against BellSouth's refusal to allow Z-Tel Communications to adopt a pre-TRO interconnection agreement as proof that BellSouth should relent. (See Notice of adoption of existing interconnection, unbundling, resale, and collocation agreement between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and Network Telephone Corporation by Z-Tel Communications, Inc. FPSC Docket No. 040779). BellSouth continued to refuse adoption, claiming that BellSouth did not have to offer an agreement that "was not complaint with the law." Essentially, BellSouth's position was that no pre-TRO agreement was consistent with the law and hence, since there were no post-TRO agreements available at that time, RNK had to negotiate. RNK made several settlement offers (such as stipulating that UNE terms were not adopted or that RNK would agree to adopt the TRO complaint UNE terms) that BellSouth consistently refused. RNK continued for months providing BellSouth with binding Florida precedent and reasonable interpretations of the Interim Rules so call "freeze" on interconnection agreement adoptions. Finally, after providing BellSouth with another ruling from the FPSC in Docket No. 040779, Bellsouth relented and allowed RNK to adopt the Level 3 agreement in May 2005, nearly 9 months after RNK first requested adoption. RNK believes that the FPSC should take and active role in preventing ILECs from forcing CLECs to negotiate in violation of 252(i) or unreasonably delaying adoptions.

13. Please provide any additional general comments or information you believe will assist staff in evaluating and reporting on the development of local exchange competition in Florida.

In terms of VoIP, it is crucial that ILECs, cable providers, and other broadband providers not be able to thwart competition through bundling their broadband product with a voice product, diminishing the quality or priority of other VoIP providers packets (to degrade quality), or take other steps that would prevent a broadband customer from being able to chose the VoIP provider of their choice.