

Gina Harrison
Director
Federal Regulatory Relations

1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 383-6423

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL
PACIFIC  TELESIS
Group-Washington

October 21, 1996

RECEIVED

OCT 21 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Mr. William F. Caton, Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 96-149

Dear Mr. Caton:

In response to a recent request by Mr. Joseph Farrell, Chief Economist, Office of Plans and Policy, Pacific Telesis Group is providing the following additional information to supplement the record in Docket 96-149.

1. A memorandum prepared by Professor Jerry A. Hausman that addresses
(1) competition in cellular, CPE, and information services markets and
(2) estimates of the expected economic benefit of undiscovered cost misallocation.
2. Excerpts from Pacific Bell's agreements with Cox California Telcom, Inc. and MFS Intelenet of California, Inc., which demonstrate that such agreements effectively preclude discrimination regarding directory assistance and white pages listings.

Very truly yours,



Gina Harrison

Attachments

cc w/encl.: Joseph Farrell, Gregory Rosston, Donald K. Stockdale, Jr.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0+1

To: Dr. Joseph Farrell
From: Jerry Hausman *JGH*
Re: Response to Information Request
Date: October 18, 1996

At our meeting on October 4, you asked for information on two questions: (1) competition in other markets where problems of cross subsidy or discrimination might have affected competition and (2) the expected economic benefit of \$1 of non-discovered cost misallocation. I provide information on both of these questions in what follows.

I. BOC Participation Has Not Adversely Affected Competition in Cellular, CPE, and Information Service Markets

A. Cellular

1. BOCs have provided cellular service since 1984. In almost every MSA, the Block B ("wireline") carrier is a BOC.¹ Thus, we have over a decade of experience. Anti-discrimination regulation has worked well in cellular telephony. BOCs compete with each other in a number of MSAs. Access to the local network and to IXCs has taken place in a non-discriminatory manner. The BOCs have not impeded competition. Indeed, cellular telephony has grown at a rate of 35%-50% per year. McCaw, which AT&T purchased in 1995, is the largest cellular company in the U.S. while GTE, another non-BOC, is the fourth largest cellular company. McCaw's and GTE's cellular operations have been extremely successful. BOCs do not hold large shares of cellular customers in their market where they are the landline network provider as well. The BOCs have not impeded competition but instead, they have enhanced competition in cellular markets.

2. The recent PCS auctions provide further market evidence of the lack of distortion to competition. Bidders in the recent PCS auctions have bid over \$10 billion to buy PCS spectrum. Almost all PCS carriers will depend on BOC networks for terminations of calls. If the new PCS entrants had realistic worries about BOC discrimination given that BOCs operate cellular networks in the same geographic areas, I would have expected to see lower bids or much more PCS spectrum bought by the BOCs. No such outcome occurred. Thus, PCS bidders have revealed by their recent market behavior that they believe they can compete with BOC cellular and landline operations, despite the dependence of PCS on the use of BOC networks

B. BOC Competition in CPE Markets

3. Anti-discrimination regulation has worked well in practice in CPE markets. The BOCs have been allowed to provide CPE since the AT&T divestiture in 1984, and they also provide Centrex which is a competing product to PBXs sold by AT&T, Seimens (Rolm), Northern Telecom, NEC, and other companies. The BOCs have competed in the PBX and Centrex market, and they have provided local loops for either PBX or Centrex in a non-discriminatory manner. Almost all analysts agree that the market for PBX and Centrex is extremely competitive. Centrex has only about a 20% market share. Furthermore, most BOCs became at most small competitors in PBX sales. AT&T and Rolm sell almost all of their PBXs direct, and the BOC share of PBXs sold in their regions rarely has ever risen above 25%. Thus, rather than impeding competition,

¹ Pacific Telesis spun off its cellular affiliate in 1995 which then became AirTouch. Thus, Pacific Telesis did not find any "advantages" it received from owning a cellular operation to be sufficient to continue to own and operate a cellular carrier. However, Pacific Telesis did buy PCS spectrum and will begin to offer PCS service within a few months.

where regulation has permitted the BOCs to compete, the result has been increased competition. Prices have not been higher nor has output been lower due to BOC participation in these markets. Indeed, economic efficiency and consumer choice have both benefitted by BOC participation.

C. BOC Provision of Information Services

4. BOCs were allowed to provide information services beginning in 1991 when the MFJ decree was modified. Opponents to BOC entry made the usual forecasts of cross subsidy and discrimination. However, the BOCs have not taken over any markets, and I am unaware of any information services market where the BOCs have above a 10% market share. Indeed, Internet growth has been phenomenal. BOCs have begun to provide Internet services, but by far the largest Internet companies are AOL, Prodigy, CompuServe, Microsoft, and other non-BOC competitors.

D. LEC Provision of Long Distance

5. GTE, and now Sprint, have provided both local exchange service and long distance service without impeding competition. GTE, which is larger than the majority of the BOCs, operated the IXC Sprint for almost 10 years without impeding competition.² Indeed, Sprint remained in a distant third place behind AT&T and MCI in long distance share and was unprofitable during most of the period. GTE subsequently sold Sprint to U.S. Telecom (which renamed itself as Sprint) and in 1993 Sprint was permitted by the DOJ to merge with Centel, a provider of local service in a number of geographic areas. Interestingly, economic analysis has demonstrated that Sprint's long distance share was not higher in states where it provided local exchange access than its overall market share.³ Thus, U.S. Telecom/Sprint has not impeded competition in long distance markets where it provides local exchange service and controls a "bottleneck" for some groups of customers.

6. More recent market experience for other LECs providing long distance also demonstrates the lack of competitive problems. SNET, the LEC for Connecticut, has been a successful competitor in long distance in Connecticut with no claims of discrimination against its IXC competitors. SNET, Southern New England Telephone Company, was part of the old AT&T system, but because of a historical quirk SNET, was not covered by the MFJ. SNET provides local telephone service to all of Connecticut (except for Greenwich). Thus, SNET is in a similar position to a BOC as a provider of state wide local service. SNET has been allowed to provide interLATA long distance service, and has offered attractive price plans. SNET is reported to have gained about a 25% share of long distance business in Connecticut. AT&T has petitioned the FCC (AT&T Petition, "Implementation of Section 254 (g)", September 16, 1996) to be allowed to lower its prices in Connecticut to meet the competition from SNET.

² While some analysts claim that GTE is different than the BOCs because it is more dispersed geographically, GTE has high geographic concentration in Hawaii (the entire state) and in California where it serves about 20% of all telephone customers.

³ I conducted this economic analysis during my analysis of the proposed merger.

II. Calculation of Benefit from a Hypothetical \$1 of Cost Misallocation

You stated at the meeting that "pure" price caps would not allow for potential cost misallocation problems, but because of sharing and possible changes in the future in the productivity factor, that a cost misallocation could have some effect on prices. I consider each of those possibilities.

A. Productivity Factor

I hypothetically assume that a BOC can misallocate \$1 from a non-regulated business to its regulated business. Of course, if the misallocation is discovered, it will be disallowed and the BOC can be fined which creates the cost of attempted misallocation. The potential benefit is that the productivity factor might be lower at the next review which I will assume will be five years in the future. Currently, the productivity factor covers a number of years, and USTA has recommended a five year average. Thus, I will use five years in my example. Suppose that the BOC succeeds in affecting the productivity factor. The BOC will only be about 11% (Pacific's amount) in the overall nationwide calculation of productivity. Thus, the \$1 becomes \$0.11. Now under separations the \$0.11 becomes $\$0.11 \times 0.20 = \0.022 . Even if interstate access prices were to increase by this amount, the BOC would need to account for the derived demand elasticity of long distance access which is about 0.25. Thus, the increase in revenue would be $\$0.022 \times 0.75 = \0.0165 . If I discount this amount over a 5 year period using a 12% discount rate, I calculate \$0.0094.⁴ If any reasonable amount of uncertainty is included for whether the price cap would be modified at all, I would get considerably less than a penny on one dollar of cost misallocation. Given the penalties for violating the regulations, this extremely small possible benefit demonstrates that attempts at cost misallocation would not be worthwhile.

B. Sharing

Pacific has not chosen the sharing option offered by the FCC since 1995. Indeed, Pacific has never chosen the sharing offer from the FCC since the beginning of price caps when a no sharing option was offered. No BOC currently has the sharing option with the FCC, except for US West. Of course, the FCC could always remove the sharing option if it believed that an anti-competitive problem could arise. My understanding is that since 1989 when price caps began in California, Pacific Bell has never reached the sharing level. Thus, in California, no effect would arise from \$1 of misallocated costs, based on Pacific Bell's experience to date. Under the previous FCC rules, I understand that Pacific shared in 3 years out of 6. Beginning with the hypothetical \$1, with sharing it would become \$0.50 and with the probability of sharing it becomes \$0.25. Then using the separations factor of 0.2, I calculate \$0.05. Multiplying this amount by the derived demand elasticity for access lead to an estimate of \$0.0375 for a \$1 misallocation.⁵ Any reasonable discount factor would probably decrease this amount by 50%. Once again the possible benefit from misallocation are very small, compared to the potential costs of being detected. Since the tradeoff offered by the FCC is a 0.6% lower productivity factor with sharing, yet all the BOCs (except for US West) have chosen not to share, the BOCs have demonstrated that they do not believe that misallocation to any significant degree which affects prices is a reasonable possibility. Otherwise, the BOCs would have chosen to share because it would allow them to earn higher profits.

⁴ The actual discount rate should probably be considerably higher given inherent uncertainties about possible penalties.

⁵ This estimate captures the essence of the effect of sharing, but it does not purport to analyze all factors that affected real world decisions, such as the change in the earnings cap effective in mid-1995.

C. Effect on Consumers from Not Permitting BOC Entry into IntraLATA

For a valid economic analysis, we must compare the possible losses to consumers if BOCs are not permitted to compete to provide interLATA long distance to losses which could arise from possible misallocations. I now calculate the consumer harm if long distance prices are \$.01 per minute higher if BOCs are not allowed to compete. I do the calculation only for residential consumers, without taking business traffic into account. I estimate the overall residential market to be about \$34 billion per year in 1995. According to my random sample of customer bills the average residential price per minute was about \$0.17 per minute. If instead the average price had been \$0.16 per minute, the consumer welfare gain to residential consumers would be about \$2 billion per year.⁶ In California the consumer welfare gain would exceed \$240 million per year. This amount far exceeds any possible misallocation. For instance, using the calculations above Pacific would need to be able misallocate costs of over \$6 billion per year before the consumer harm would be approximately equal to the consumer harm from keeping Pacific out of long distance. This amount is well beyond any conceivable amount of undetectable misallocation.

⁶ Note that the \$.01 decrease in long distance prices is likely to be an underestimate of BOC entry. In Connecticut, SNET offers interLATA long distance service at a considerably greater discount. The consumer welfare calculation uses an elasticity of -0.7 which is well accepted in the literature. See e.g. W. Taylor and L. Taylor, American Economic Review, 1993.

MODIFICATION TO
PACIFIC BELL AND MFS INTELENET OF CALIFORNIA, INC
CO-CARRIER AGREEMENT

JANUARY 26, 1996

WHEREAS, on November 17, 1995, Pacific Bell (Pacific) and MFS Intelenet of California, Inc. (MFS) entered into a Co-Carrier Agreement (Agreement) for the interchange of traffic between the two companies; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement was submitted for Commission approval with the filing of Pacific's Advice Letter No. 17879 on November 20, 1995; and

WHEREAS, in Commission Resolution T-15824, dated January 17, 1996, the Commission approved Advice Letter No. 17879 and the Agreement, subject to modifications specified in Resolution T-15824; and

WHEREAS, Pacific and MFS have agreed to accept the modifications and move forward with the Agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual provisions contained herein, as well as the provisions contained in the original Agreement, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, Pacific and MFS hereby covenant and agree to modify the Agreement as follows:

5. Pacific and MFS shall impose no per trunk monthly recurring charges for LISA and JANE trunks. However, MFS shall pay Pacific non-recurring charges for LISA trunks, and Pacific shall pay MFS non-recurring charges for JANE trunks. The non-recurring charges for LISA and JANE trunks shall be: (1) to the tandem, \$530 for the first trunk and \$8 each additional trunk; and (2) to the end office, \$650 for the first trunk and \$6 for each additional trunk. In addition, labor charges for work outside of normal day business hours or for additional testing beyond normal testing, when such work or testing is requested by either Party, shall apply to the Party requesting that the work be performed.

VII. ANCILLARY PLATFORM ARRANGEMENTS

A. E 9-1-1

1. Pacific will provide E9-1-1 service to MFS under the terms and conditions of its E9-1-1 tariff proposal in I.95-04-43 and R.95-04-044. When such tariff is approved by the Commission, to the extent it establishes lower rates and charges than those contained in this Agreement, such lower rates and charges shall apply and Pacific will credit MFS the difference between what it has paid Pacific under this agreement and what MFS would have paid Pacific under the approved tariff. This credit shall be for an amount of no more than the difference in rates and charges for three months of E-9-1-1 charges under this agreement.

2. Pacific will provide Enhanced 9-1-1 (E9-1-1) service to MFS at the following rates and charges:

<u>Service</u>	<u>Non-Recurring Charge</u>	<u>Monthly Rate</u>
Network		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAMA Trunk (Minimum of 2 trunks required) 	\$741 (per trunk)	\$26 (per trunk) \$2 per mile (per trunk)
Data Management		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E9-1-1 Tandem Switching (per 1,000 records) 		\$15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Management Support and storage, selective routing, and ALI retrieval (per 1,000 records) 		\$99
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manual Input of MFS subscriber records (per 100 records input in a one month period) 	\$342	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Error Correction of MFS subscriber records (per record) 	\$3.50	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charge for MSAG (per County/per sort) 	\$60	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACES Card Management (per card) 		\$6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACES Card replacement (lost or stolen) 	\$140	

3. Pacific will provide MFS with an electronic interface from which MFS may input and update subscriber records. To the extent this electronic interface is not available by February 1, 1996, Pacific will waive any charges associated with manual input of subscriber records until such time as the interface is made available.
4. Pacific and MFS will work cooperatively to arrange meetings with PSAPs to answer any technical questions the PSAPs or County coordinators may have regarding the E9-1-1 portions of this agreement.

B. Transfer of Service Announcements

When an end user customer changes from Pacific to MFS, or from MFS to Pacific, and does not retain its original telephone number, the Party formerly providing service to the end user will provide a transfer of service announcement on the abandoned telephone number. Each Party will provide this referral service consistent with its tariff. This announcement will provide details on the new number to be dialed to reach this customer.

C. Coordinated Repair Calls

MFS and Pacific will employ the following procedures for handling misdirected repair calls:

1. MFS and Pacific will educate their respective customers as to the correct telephone numbers to call in order to access their respective repair bureaus.
2. To the extent the correct provider can be determined, misdirected repair calls will be referred to the proper provider of local exchange service in a courteous manner, at no charge, and the end user will be provided the correct contact telephone number. In responding to repair calls, neither Party shall make disparaging remarks about each other, nor shall they use these repair calls as the basis for internal referrals or to solicit customers to market services. Either Party may respond with accurate information in answering customer questions.
3. MFS and Pacific will provide their respective repair contact numbers to one another on a reciprocal basis.

D. Busy Line Verification and Interrupt

1. Description
 - a. Each Party shall establish procedures whereby its operator bureau will coordinate with the operator bureau of the other Party in order to provide Busy Line Verification ("BLV") and Busy Line Verification and Interrupt ("BLVI") services on calls between their respective end users.

- b. BLV and BLVI inquiries between operator bureaus shall be routed over the LISA and JANE trunks.

2. Compensation

Each Party shall charge the other Party for BLV and BLVI at the rates contained in Pacific's CPUC tariff 175-T.

E. Directory Assistance (DA)

1. Description

At MFS' request, Pacific will:

- a. Provide to MFS over the LISA trunks unbranded directory assistance service which is comparable in every way to the directory assistance service Pacific makes available to interexchange carriers.
- b. In conjunction with sub-paragraph (a) above, provide caller-optional directory assistance call completion service which is comparable in every way to the directory assistance call completion service Pacific generally makes available to its own end users, to the extent Pacific generally offers such service to its end users.

2. Compensation

Pacific shall charge MFS for DA services at the rates contained in Pacific's CPUC tariff 175-T.

F. Directory Listings and Directory Distribution

The terms specified in this section shall apply to MFS customer numbers falling within NXX codes directly assigned to MFS, and to MFS customer telephone numbers which are retained by MFS pursuant to SPNP as described in Section IX.

1. Pacific publishes and distributes white pages directories through its wholly owned subsidiary, Pacific Bell Directory (PBD), which acts as its agent for the white pages. PBD also publishes and distributes yellow pages directories which PBD owns. Pacific and PBD will deal with subscribers of MFS on the same basis and in the identical manner as they deal with subscribers of Pacific respecting inclusion in and delivery of white and yellow pages directories (including all hard copy and electronic directories). Respecting inclusion in white pages directories, the Parties shall use their best reasonable efforts to develop and implement a process whereby MFS will be able to review and correct proofs of its customers' white pages listings in advance of directory publication. Respecting inclusion in and delivery of yellow pages directories, PBD will not discriminate against subscribers of MFS who seek advertising in the yellow pages by reason of their affiliation with MFS, but with respect to these subscribers, PBD will

use the same criteria in determining whether or not to publish advertisements and listings in the yellow pages as it uses for its other customers or potential customers for advertising.

By reason of this agreement, PBD assumes no liability toward MFS or toward any of its subscribers for errors in or omissions of advertisements or listings in the above-mentioned directories. PBD's liability, if any, for such errors or omissions shall be governed solely by its separate contracts with its individual customers, and shall be determined for MFS customers on the same basis as is the case for Pacific's customers. There are no third party beneficiaries to this agreement with respect to the commitments made on behalf of PBD herein.

Pacific will work cooperatively with MFS to ensure that Yellow Page advertisements purchased by customers who switch their service to MFS (including customers utilizing MFS-assigned telephone numbers and MFS customers utilizing SPNP) are maintained without interruption.

The services described in this sub-paragraph (1) will be provided without charge, provided Pacific's standard charges or tariff rates for white page or yellow page listings or advertising options not described in this sub-paragraph (1) shall apply for such services.

2. MFS will provide Pacific with its directory listings and daily updates to those listings in an industry-accepted format; Pacific will include MFS' customers in directory assistance databases associated with

the areas in which MFS provides Exchange Services to such customers. Pacific will provide MFS with the proper format which MFS shall employ in submitting directory listings and daily updates.

3. MFS and Pacific will accord MFS' directory listing information the same level of confidentiality which Pacific accords its own directory listing information, and Pacific shall ensure that access to MFS' customer proprietary confidential directory information will be limited solely to those Pacific employees who are directly involved in the preparation of listings.

G. Information Pages - Customer Guide Pages

Pacific will include in the "Information Pages" or comparable section of its White Pages Directories for areas served by MFS, listings provided by MFS for MFS' installation, repair and customer service and other service oriented information including appropriate identifying logo. Such listings shall appear in the manner and likeness as such information appears for Pacific and other LECs or CLCs. Reasonable non-discriminatory charges per page (or fraction of a page; limit of no more than one full page in a directory) will apply for this service, as identified in Pacific's CPUC 175T tariff, Section 9.2.6. To the extent this service is required prior to effectiveness of an appropriate CLC rate, the rate currently listed for long distance company provision of similar information shall apply.

**COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, INC.
AND
PACIFIC BELL'S
LOCAL INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT**

**Carrington F. Phillip, Esq.
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, INC.
1400 Lake Hearn Drive
Atlanta, GA 30319**

**Lee Burdick, Esq.
Glenn A. Harris, Esq.
PRIMA LEGAL SERVICES
2317 Broadway, Suite 350
Redwood City, CA 94063**

**Attorneys for
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, INC.**

**Theresa Cabral, Senior Counsel
PACIFIC BELL
2600 Camino Ramon, Room 2W806
San Ramon, CA 94583**

**Attorney for
PACIFIC BELL**

July 25, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. **RECITALS & PRINCIPLES** 1

II. **DEFINITIONS**..... 2

III. **TECHNICAL PROVISIONS**..... 11

 A. INITIAL INTERCONNECTION..... 11

 B. INTERCONNECTION MODEL 11

 C. INTERCONNECTION FACILITY DESIGN 11

 D. TRUNKING CONVENTIONS 12

 E. SIGNAL PROTOCOL 12

IV. **LOCAL INTERCONNECTION TRUNK ARRANGEMENT** 12

 A. DESCRIPTION..... 12

 1. LOCAL EXCHANGE TRAFFIC TRUNKING..... 12

 2. COMMON CHANNEL SIGNALING..... 12

 3. DIGITAL HAND OFF..... 12

 4. 64Kbps CLEAR CHANNEL FORECASTING 12

 5. FEATURE GROUP B, D INTERCONNECTION..... 13

 6. THIRD PARTY TRAFFIC 13

 7. WIRELESS SERVICE PROVIDER TRAFFIC 13

 8. TANDEM AND END OFFICE NXX CONNECTIVITY 13

 9. LERG ROUTING 13

 10. MISCELLANEOUS CALL ROUTING 14

 11. N11 CODE TREATMENT 14

 12. EXCHANGE OF BILLING RECORDS 14

B.	COMPENSATION FOR CALL TERMINATION	14
1.	COX TO PACIFIC TRAFFIC	14
2.	PACIFIC TO COX TRAFFIC	15
3.	INTRA-LATA TOLL FREE TRAFFIC.....	16
4.	TRAFFIC RECORDINGS	16
5.	USAGE ROUND OFF.....	16
6.	USAGE REPORTS	16
7.	LATE PAYMENT CHARGES	16
8.	SS7 SYSTEM INTERCONNECTION CHARGES	16
C.	COMPENSATION FOR FACILITIES	17
1.	COX POI AT PACIFIC SWITCH LOCATIONS	17
2.	COX AT NON-SWITCH WIRE CENTERS	17
3.	PACIFIC ENTRANCE FACILITIES.....	18
4.	MID SPAN MEETS.....	18
D.	COMPENSATION FOR JOINTLY PROVIDED WSP ACCESS.....	18
1.	RE-NEGOTIATION PROVISIONS	18
2.	TANDEM FUNCTION RATES.....	19
3.	LM2 AND LP2 NPA-NXXS.	20
4.	PLU REPORTS AND WSP TRAFFIC.....	20
5.	PAYMENT INTERVALS.....	20
6.	LATE PAYMENT CHARGES APPLIED.....	20
7.	USAGE AUDITS.....	20
8.	TRAFFIC FORECAST DETAIL	20
E.	MAINTENANCE OF SERVICE	20
1.	NO TROUBLE FOUND.....	20
2.	ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY	20
3.	FAULTY DISPATCH.	20

F.	E-911 SERVICE.....	21
G.	END USER REPAIR CALL REFERRALS.....	21
H.	REFERRAL SERVICES	21
I.	BUSY LINE VERIFICATION AND INTERRUPT	22
J.	DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE.....	22
V.	<u>MEET-POINT TRUNKING ARRANGEMENTS</u>	22
A.	TWO WAY TRUNKS.....	22
B.	FEATURE GROUP B/D TRUNK ARRANGEMENTS.....	23
C.	TRUNK TERMINATION LOCATION & COMPENSATION.....	23
D.	BLOCKING CAPABILITY.....	23
E.	COMMON CHANNEL SIGNALING.....	23
F.	MF SIGNALING PROVISIONS.....	23
G.	TOLL FREE SERVICE, PACIFIC CALL FORMATS.....	23
H.	TOLL FREE SERVICE, COX CALL FORMATS	24
I.	FEATURE GROUP B ORIGINATING FORMAT.....	24
J.	MEET POINT BILLING	24
VI.	<u>INSTALLATION OF TRUNKS</u>	24
VII.	<u>LINK SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS</u>	24
A.	BASIC AND ASSURED LINKS	24
B.	ISDN LINKS	24
C.	COOPERATIVE TESTING.....	24
D.	LINK INTERCONNECTION	25
E.	PROVISIONING INTERVALS.....	25
F.	SERVICE COORDINATION.....	25
G.	SERVICE PROVIDER NUMBER PORTABILITY	26
H.	ELECTRONIC ORDERING/TRACKING.....	26
I.	MAINTENANCE AND TESTING	27

J.	LINK PROVISIONING REQUIREMENTS	27
K.	COMPENSATION	27
1.	BILL FORMAT AND ISSUANCE	27
2.	LINK SERVICE PRICES.....	27
L.	OTHER LINKS RE BONA FIDE REQUEST PROCESS.....	29
VIII.	<u>PORT SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS</u>	29
A.	DESCRIPTION	29
B.	PORTS AVAILABLE WITHOUT BONA FIDE REQUEST	30
1.	BASIC PORT.....	30
2.	FLAT RATE PORT	30
C.	OTHER PORTS	30
1.	PBX TRUNK PORTS.....	30
2.	DS1 PBX TRUNK PORT.....	30
3.	DID PORT.....	31
4.	CENTREX™ PORT	31
5.	BASIC RATE ISDN PORT:	31
6.	PRIMARY RATE ISDN PORT:.....	31
D.	PORT QUANTITIES	31
E.	PORT TESTING	31
F.	PORT INTERCONNECTION.....	31
G.	PORT MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	32
H.	CONNECTION, DISCONNECTION AND RECONNECTION ORDERS	32
I.	ELECTRONIC ORDERING AND TRACKING INTERFACE.....	32
J.	COMPENSATION	33
1.	BILL FORMAT AND ISSUANCE	30
2.	PORT RATES.....	31
K.	OTHER PORT TYPES RE BONA FIDE REQUEST.....	35

IX.	<u>BONA FIDE REQUEST PROCESS</u>	35
	A. PROMPT CONSIDERATION.....	35
	B. BONA FIDE REQUEST INFORMATION	35
	C. RECEIPT NOTICE INTERVAL	36
	D. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS REPORT	36
	E. COX ELECTS BFR/ OPTION A.....	37
	F. COX ELECTS BFR / OPTION B	37
	G. DEVELOPMENT COST TREATMENT	37
	H. CANCELLATION AND COST RECAPTURE	37
	I. LIMITATION OF FINANCIAL LIABILITY	38
	J. MEDIATION AND ARBITRATION.....	38
X.	<u>COLLOCATION</u>	38
	A. PHYSICAL COLLOCATION	38
	B. EISCC FOR COLLOCATION.....	38
	C. RATES.....	38
XI.	<u>TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES RESALE</u>	39
XII.	<u>DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE AND WHITE PAGES LISTINGS</u>	39
	A. LISTING INFORMATION PRIVACY	39
	B. DIRECTORY DELIVERY.....	39
	C. LISTING AVAILABILITY	39
	D. COOPERATIVE INTERACTION.....	39
XIII.	<u>CUSTOMER GUIDE AND CARRIER INFORMATION PAGES</u>	40
XIV.	<u>NUMBER RESOURCE ARRANGEMENTS</u>	40
	A. AVAILABILITY OF NXX CODES.....	40
	B. NON-MATCHING RATE CENTERS.	40
	C. RATING POINTS.....	40
	D. PACIFIC'S TREATMENT OF COX NPA-NXX CODE REQUESTS	40

E.	INDUSTRY GUIDELINE COMPLIANCE.....	41
F.	SWITCH UPDATES RE LERG.....	41
G.	LERG UPDATES	41
H.	NPA EXHAUST	41
XV.	<u>SERVICE PROVIDER NUMBER PORTABILITY ARRANGEMENTS</u>	41
A.	SPNP IS RECIPROCAL.....	41
B.	CALLING CARD TREATMENT	41
C.	SPNP CANCELLATION	41
D.	EVOLUTION TO PERMANENT NUMBER PORTABILITY.....	41
XVI.	<u>POLES, CONDUITS, AND RIGHTS OF WAY</u>	42
XVII.	<u>FORECASTING</u>	42
A.	TRUNK FORECASTING	42
1.	SEMI ANNUAL FORECAST INFORMATION.....	42
2.	FORECAST VARIANCE.....	42
3.	RESIZING TRUNK GROUPS	42
4.	POINTS OF CONTACT.....	42
B.	LINK FORECASTING.....	43
C.	PORT FORECASTING	43
XVIII.	<u>GRADE OF SERVICE</u>	43
XIX.	<u>TRUNK SERVICING</u>	43
A.	INTERCONNECTION SERVICE REQUEST	43
B.	CIRCUIT PROVISIONING ASSIGNMENT CENTER.....	43
C.	MAJOR PROJECTS	44
D.	NETWORK ENGINEERING RESPONSIBILITY.....	44
XX.	<u>TROUBLE REPORTS</u>	44
XXI.	<u>NETWORK MANAGEMENT</u>	44
A.	PROTECTIVE CONTROLS	44

B.	EXPANSIVE CONTROLS	44
C.	MASS CALLING	44
D.	HIGH VOLUME CALLING TRUNK GROUPS	44
XXII.	<u>RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES</u>	45
A.	FAIR TREATMENT	45
B.	REPORTS AND DATA EXCHANGED	45
C.	TRUNK ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	45
D.	CONTROL OFFICE FUNCTIONS - LOCAL INTERCONNECTION	45
E.	CONTROL OFFICE FUNCTIONS - MEET POINT	45
F.	END USER SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT	45
G.	REPAIR CALL REFERRAL	45
H.	END USER AUTHORIZATION	45
I.	SLAMMING RULE APPLICABILITY	46
J.	E-911 LISTING RESPONSIBILITY	46
K.	COX/PACIFIC INTER-ACTION	46
L.	BILATERAL AGREEMENTS	46
M.	BILLING CONTACT NUMBERS	46
N.	FRAUD MINIMIZATION	46
O.	UNIQUE RATE CENTER ESTABLISHMENT	47
XXIII.	<u>TERM</u>	47
XXIV.	<u>EFFECTIVE DATE</u>	47
XXV.	<u>FORCE MAJEURE</u>	47
XXVI.	<u>COMMISSION DECISION</u>	47
XXVII.	<u>REGULATORY APPROVAL</u>	48
XXVIII.	<u>INTEGRATION</u>	48
XXIX.	<u>LIMITATION OF LIABILITY</u>	48
XXX.	<u>INDEMNITY</u>	48

I.	SLAMMING RULE APPLICABILITY.....	46
J.	E-911 LISTING RESPONSIBILITY	46
K.	COX/PACIFIC INTER-ACTION.....	46
L.	BILATERAL AGREEMENTS	46
M.	BILLING CONTACT NUMBERS.....	46
N.	FRAUD MINIMIZATION.....	46
O.	UNIQUE RATE CENTER ESTABLISHMENT	47
XXIII.	<u>TERM</u>	47
XXIV.	<u>EFFECTIVE DATE</u>	47
XXV.	<u>FORCE MAJEURE</u>	47
XXVI.	<u>COMMISSION DECISION</u>	47
XXVII.	<u>REGULATORY APPROVAL</u>	48
XXVIII.	<u>INTEGRATION</u>	48
XXIX.	<u>LIMITATION OF LIABILITY</u>	48
XXX.	<u>INDEMNITY</u>	48
XXXI.	<u>ASSIGNMENT</u>	49
XXXII.	<u>DEFAULT</u>	49
XXXIII.	<u>NONDISCLOSURE</u>	49
XXXIV.	<u>DISPUTE RESOLUTION</u>	50
XXXV.	<u>MOST FAVORABLE TERMS AND TREATMENT</u>	51
XXXVI.	<u>EXECUTION IN DUPLICATE</u>	51
XXXVII.	<u>NOTICES</u>	51
XXXVIII.	<u>AMENDMENT</u>	51

MP

XXXIX. <u>CHOICE OF LAWS</u>	51
XXXX. <u>ENTIRE AGREEMENT</u>	51

XI. TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES RESALE

The Parties agree that Pacific will provide telecommunications services to Cox for resale in accordance with requirements of Sections 251(c)(4) and 252(d)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Pacific's prices charged to Cox for resold services will be the resale rates determined by the Commission.

XII. DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE AND WHITE PAGES LISTINGS

- A. Pacific will accord Cox's directory listings information the same level of confidentiality which Pacific accords its own directory listing information, and Pacific shall ensure that access to Cox's customer proprietary confidential directory information will be limited solely to those Pacific and Pacific Bell Directory ("PBD") employees who immediately supervise or are directly involved in the provision of Directory Assistance service, and the processing and publishing of listings and directory delivery. Pacific will not use Cox directory listings provided under the provisions of this paragraph for marketing of any kind.
- B. Pacific publishes and distributes white pages directories through its wholly owned subsidiary PBD, as its agent for the white pages. PBD also publishes and distributes yellow pages directories. With respect to these directories (including electronic and hard copy) Pacific will include a standard, basic listing of Cox's residence customers in the appropriate white pages directory and, for business customers, Pacific will provide a standard, basic listing of Cox's customers to PBD for inclusion in the appropriate white pages and yellow pages directories pursuant to Pacific's Schedule Cal. P.U.C. Tariff No. 175-T, Section 9.3 (currently provided at no charge). Additionally, Cox's customers each will have delivered to them at no charge one copy of appropriate white and yellow page directories.
- C. In addition, Cox will be assured of the following:
1. Cox will be provided with the opportunity to obtain additional listings, for its customers at the same prices that Pacific charges its end user customers, pursuant to Pacific's Schedule Cal. P.U.C. Tariff No. 175-T, Section 9.3.
 2. Pacific will not discriminate against subscribers of Cox who seek additional listings in the white pages. Pacific will use the same criteria in determining whether to publish listings in the white pages for Cox's customers as it uses for its own or potential customers.
 3. Pacific will ensure that its Statewide Marketing Directory Unit will coordinate merged-caption white page listings for Cox's subscribers as it does for its own customers.
 4. Pacific will alphabetically commingle the directory listings of Cox's customers with those of other customers in the directory.
- D. Pacific will work cooperatively with Cox to ensure that existing listings for