

**ORIGINAL**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JUL 30 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Implementation of the Local )  
Competition Provisions of the )  
Telecommunications Act of 1996 )  
 )  
Petition for Expedited Rulemaking to )  
Establish Reporting Requirements and )  
Performance and Technical Standards for )  
Operations Support Systems )  
 )

CC Docket No. 96-98

RM 9101

**REPLY COMMENTS OF WORLDCOM, INC.**  
**ON**  
**PETITION FOR EXPEDITED RULEMAKING**

Catherine R. Sloan  
Richard L. Fruchterman  
Richard S. Whitt  
WorldCom, Inc.  
1120 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
202/776-1550

July 30, 1996

202/776-1550  
D-4

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....	1
II. THE COMMISSION HAS AMPLE JURISDICTION TO ADOPT RULES REGARDING THE PROVISION OF NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO OSS .....	3
III. THE ILEC ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO THE INITIATION OF A RULEMAKING PROCEEDING TO ADDRESS NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO OSS ARE WITHOUT BASIS .....	4
IV. SOME INCUMBENT LECS ARE OPEN TO OSS PERFORMANCE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO OSS .....	9
V. THE COMMISSION SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE INDUSTRY TO ACCELERATE THE ADOPTION OF UNIFORM NATIONAL TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR THE PROVISION OF OSS .....	10
VI. CONCLUSION .....	11

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Implementation of the Local	)	CC Docket No. 96-98
Competition Provisions of the	)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	
	)	
Petition for Expedited Rulemaking to	)	RM 9101
Establish Reporting Requirements and	)	
Performance and Technical Standards for	)	
Operations Support Systems	)	
	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS OF WORLDCOM, INC.**  
**ON**  
**PETITION FOR EXPEDITED RULEMAKING**

WorldCom, Inc. ("WorldCom") hereby files the following reply comments in support of the petition of LCI International, Inc. ("LCI") and the Competitive Telecommunications Association ("CompTel") for an expedited rulemaking to establish reporting requirements and performance and technical standards for the provision of operations support systems ("OSS") by incumbent local exchange carriers ("LECs", "ILECs" or "incumbents") to competitive local exchange carriers ("CLECs").

**I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

Perhaps US West says it best when it acknowledges that "[c]learly there must be some method by which a determination can be made that ILECs are meeting their obligations under the

Commission's First Report and Order."<sup>1</sup> Establishing a method to determine whether an incumbent LEC is providing its local competitors with non-discriminatory access to OSS is at the heart of the LCI/CompTel petition and provides ample reason for the Commission to initiate the requested rulemaking.

Not surprisingly, all parties that are seeking to compete with the incumbent LECs are sympathetic to the LCI/CompTel request. Significantly, the state commissions that filed comments also note the critical nature of OSS to the development of local competition and urge the Commission to begin the requested rulemaking.<sup>2</sup>

Predictably, the incumbent LECs, seeking to protect their monopoly positions, oppose the LCI/CompTel petition. Their opposition, however, appears largely to be predicated on a misunderstanding of the relief requested in the petition and urged by other CLECs in their comments. The incumbents object most loudly to the imposition of national OSS performance standards, when what the petitioners are really requesting is simply a way to determine whether they are receiving non-discriminatory access to OSS through the comprehensive reporting of OSS performance. National performance benchmarks would only be applied as a default surrogate to determine parity in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Opposition of US West at 2.

<sup>2</sup> See, Comments of the People of the State of California and the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("California Comments") and Comments of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin ("Wisconsin Comments").

absence of data from an incumbent regarding the provision of OSS to itself.

The Commission should initiate a rulemaking to require each incumbent LEC to report the OSS performance levels that it provides to itself and to its competitors in each of the measurement categories set out in the Local Competition Users Group's ("LCUG") Service Quality Measurements that was included with the LCI/CompTel petition. Moreover, to ensure consistent and comparable measurements, the Commission should adopt the measurement methodologies proposed the LCUG. Finally, to determine if an incumbent LEC is providing non-discriminatory access to its OSS in the event an incumbent fails to provide data regarding its provision of OSS to itself, the Commission should adopt the default performance benchmarks proposed by LCUG as a surrogate for the missing information.

With respect to technical standards, WorldCom would prefer that the appropriate industry bodies continue to develop those standards but with strong encouragement from the Commission that they do so quickly. So that competitors can obtain the full benefit of the technical standards developed by these industry bodies, the Commission should require incumbent LECs to implement any technical standards within a reasonable period of time.

## **II. THE COMMISSION HAS AMPLE JURISDICTION TO ADOPT RULES REGARDING THE PROVISION OF NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO OSS**

In its comments, GTE urges the Commission to "defer action on the Petition pending the decision by the U.S. Court of

Appeals [for the Eighth Circuit] on the agency's jurisdiction over unbundled network elements generally, as well as the agency's discretion in adopting requirements for OSSs specifically. These issues have been squarely raised on appeal."<sup>3</sup> The Eighth Circuit rendered its decision on July 18. Despite GTE's desires to the contrary, the Court upheld the Commission's jurisdiction over unbundled network elements generally<sup>4</sup> and over OSS specifically.<sup>5</sup>

The Commission has already found that non-discriminatory access to OSS is critical to the success of local competition. The Commission should now exercise its recently affirmed jurisdiction to adopt rules to help ensure that non-discriminatory access to OSS becomes a reality.

### **III. THE ILEC ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO THE INITIATION OF A RULEMAKING PROCEEDING TO ADDRESS NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO OSS ARE WITHOUT BASIS**

All of the incumbent LECs who filed comments in this proceeding opposed the Commission initiating a rulemaking in response to the LCI/CompTel petition. For the most part, the incumbents oppose such a rulemaking because they do not want national performance standards for OSS to be imposed by the Commission. The incumbent LECs variously argue that such national standards would not be able to take into account local

---

<sup>3</sup> GTE Comments at ii.

<sup>4</sup> Iowa Utilities Board v. Federal Communications Commission, No. 3321 (8th Cir. decided July 18, 1997) at n. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Id. at 130, 132.

differences,<sup>6</sup> that performance standards should be negotiated or arbitrated in the interconnection process,<sup>7</sup> that setting performance levels is appropriately the role of state commissions,<sup>8</sup> that national performance standards would result in preferential treatment for CLECs,<sup>9</sup> and that the adoption of national performance standards would be an unlawful addition to the Telecommunications Act's Section 271 competitive checklist.<sup>10</sup>

The incumbents' opposition to the LCI/CompTel Petition is misplaced. The petitioners, and the CLECs who filed comments, are not seeking the adoption of national performance standards. We are seeking non-discriminatory access to the incumbent's OSS as required by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the Commission's First Report and Order. To accomplish this, we are asking the Commission to require the incumbent LECs to report to the appropriate regulatory bodies the level of OSS performance that they provide to themselves and the level that they provide to their competitors. Such reports should include all of the relevant measurement categories and, so accurate comparisons can be made, should use a consistent measurement methodology. Only in this manner can the Commission, the state commissions and the

---

<sup>6</sup> USTA Comments at 1.

<sup>7</sup> Ameritech Comments at 6; Bell Atlantic Comments at 3; GTE Comments at 3; Southwestern Bell Comments at 10.

<sup>8</sup> Bell Atlantic Comments at 4; Southerwestern Bell Comments at 11; US West Comments at 13.

<sup>9</sup> Southwestern Bell Comments at 9; US West Comments at 11.

<sup>10</sup> Bell Atlantic at 3.

CLECs know whether an incumbent is providing non-discriminatory access to its OSS.

National performance standards do have a very limited role and only to the degree that a LEC itself chooses. WorldCom believes that the Commission should adopt national default performance benchmarks that can be applied as surrogates for the incumbent's OSS performance to itself if the incumbent chooses not to produce the data. If the incumbent refuses to provide data, regulatory bodies and competitors still need a method to determine whether an incumbent is providing parity access to its OSS. The default national benchmarks provide the yardstick against which to measure in the absence of data provided by the incumbent LEC. If an incumbent does not like the benchmark, it can simply measure its performance and provide the data -- the application of the benchmark is completely within the hands of the incumbent.

Against the petitioners' actual request for OSS performance measurements and reporting, and default performance benchmarks, the complaints of the incumbent LECs regarding the imposition of national OSS performance standards fall away. There should no longer be a concern about application of single performance standard for all incumbent LECs in all areas of the country. Instead, all that would be required is for the LEC to measure and report its own OSS performance. The default performance benchmarks may be out of reach for some incumbents

but will only apply if the ILEC chooses not to measure and report its performance data.

Similarly, the incumbent LEC argument that performance standards should be negotiated between the parties or arbitrated before a state commission in the context of obtaining an interconnection agreement, has little bearing on the question of whether the Commission should require the incumbent LECs to provide measurements regarding the quality of OSS access that it provides to itself and to its competitors. First, non-discriminatory access to OSS is a requirement of Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; it is entirely appropriate for the Commission to establish a method to determine whether such non-discriminatory access is being provided.

Second, as Charlotte Terkuerst of the Illinois Commerce Commission staff attested to during the Commission's OSS forum in March, it is difficult for state commissions to impose performance or reporting requirements in the context of a two party arbitration because of the inefficiencies that will be created when subsequent parties seek different requirements in later arbitrations.<sup>11</sup> The implication of her comments is that it would be better to adopt industry wide reporting and performance requirements than to rely on the state commissions to do so in the context of an arbitration.

---

<sup>11</sup> Transcripts of Proceedings, In re: Common Carrier Bureau Operations Support Systems Forum, May 28, 1997 at 210.

Third, the limited performance standards that have come from negotiations or arbitrations are minimum performance level standards that have little or nothing to do with the attainment of parity that is at issue here.

Significantly, there would remain a very large role for the state commissions in determining whether the reported level of OSS performance is sufficient for the competitors and citizens of their state. The measurements and reporting that is at issue in the context of this proceeding will be used to determine whether parity exists between the incumbent LEC and its competitors. An incumbent LEC may be able to achieve parity in the provision of OSS with quality at a very low level. It would be left to the several state commissions to determine, separate and apart from the parity question, whether the level of quality is adequate.

Adoption of OSS measurement and reporting requirements, along with default performance benchmarks, will result in non-discriminatory treatment of CLECs, not in the preferential treatment alleged by the ILECs. We do not seek preferential treatment; we do seek equal treatment.

Finally, non-discriminatory access to OSS is required by section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act. Therefore, it is already a requirement of the competitive checklist which, inter alia, requires "non-discriminatory access to network elements in accordance with requirements of section[]

251(c)(3)."<sup>12</sup> Clearly, a method for determining whether such non-discriminatory access is being provided is not an addition to the competitive checklist, but, in fact, is already contemplated within the checklist.

The incumbent LECs' objections to the initiation of a proceeding to address the non-discriminatory provision of OSS flow from a misunderstanding regarding the application of national performance standards. Since what is being asked for is simply the adoption of OSS performance measurements and reporting requirements, with default performance benchmarks, the incumbent LEC objections miss the mark.

**IV. SOME INCUMBENT LECs ARE OPEN TO OSS PERFORMANCE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO OSS**

Some incumbent LECs appear willing to accept OSS performance reporting requirements. In fact, US West seems to propose such reporting as an alternative to the national performance standards that it perceives LCI and CompTel to be seeking when it says

One way some State Commissions are addressing this matter is through actual reporting of ILEC performance associated with OSS access. This allows comparisons and analyses to determine whether there is any discrimination and, if so, whether it is either material or adverse. This is a far more direct and superior method of detecting discrimination than the establishment of national performance standards.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ii).

<sup>13</sup> US West at 3.

Although US West would prefer to have the reporting requirements subject to state jurisdiction, WorldCom believes that it is essential for the Commission to adopt the appropriate measurement categories, measurement methodologies and default performance benchmarks to ensure consistency and comparability throughout the country.

In addition, Bell Atlantic and NYNEX appear not to be adverse to the reporting of OSS performance. Bell Atlantic and NYNEX have recently proposed to accept such a reporting requirement as a condition to the Commission's approval of the merger of Bell Atlantic and NYNEX.<sup>14</sup> Although WorldCom has misgivings about the absence of some measurement categories that it feels are necessary and the has some concerns regarding the proposed measurement methodologies, the Bell Atlantic and NYNEX proposal represents an acknowledgement of the need to measure and report on OSS performance and a willingness to do so.

**V. THE COMMISSION SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE INDUSTRY TO ACCELERATE THE ADOPTION OF UNIFORM NATIONAL TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR THE PROVISION OF OSS**

WorldCom continues to prefer that the existing industry bodies charged with developing the technical standards for the provision of OSS continue their work. WorldCom also believes, however, that strong encouragement from the Commission for those

---

<sup>14</sup> See, Ex parte letter from Thomas J. Tauke and Edward D. Young, III to Ms. Kathleen Levitz, In the Matter of the Application of Bell Atlantic Corporation and NYNEX Corporation for Consent to Transfer, NSD-L-96-10 (Tracking No., 96-0221), July 19, 1997.

bodies to complete their work quickly would be helpful. This can be accomplished by 1) requiring monthly updates on status of national technical standards and 2) establishing a deadline for industry action after which the Commission may act on its own.

Moreover, as noted in WorldCom's Comments, there is a need for the Commission to take action to ensure that the technical standards that are adopted by the industry bodies are deployed by the incumbent LECs within a reasonable time.<sup>15</sup> It will do no good for the industry to come to consensus on technical standards if the incumbent LECs do not then adopt and implement those standards.

#### **VI. CONCLUSION**

For the reasons expressed above, and its original comments, WorldCom urges the Commission to initiate a rulemaking regarding the non-discriminatory access to incumbent LEC OSS.

Respectfully submitted,

July 30, 1997

---

Catherine R. Sloan  
Richard L. Fruchterman  
Richard S. Whitt  
WorldCom, Inc.  
1120 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
202/776-1550

---

<sup>15</sup> WorldCom Comments at 15.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Cecelia Y. Johnson, hereby certify that I have this 30th day of July, 1997, sent a copy of the foregoing "Reply Comments of WorldCom, Inc. Petition For Expedited Rulemaking" to the following:

William F. Caton (original and 4 copies)\*  
Acting Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 222  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Janice M. Myles (2 copies plus diskette w/cover)\*  
Common Carrier Bureau  
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 544  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Regina Keeney\*  
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 500  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Kalpak Gude\*  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20544

Jake Jennings\*  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 544  
Washington, D.C. 20544

International Transcription Service\*  
2100 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 140  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Anne K. Bingaman/Douglas W. Kinkopf  
LCI International Telecom. Corp.  
8180 Greensboro Drive - Suite 800  
McLean, VA 22102

Rocky Unruh  
Morgenstein & Jubelirer  
Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Eugene D. Cohen  
Bailey Campbell PLC  
649 North Second Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

David Alan Nall  
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey LLP  
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20044-0407

Genevieve Morelli  
Vice President/General Counsel  
CompTel  
1900 M Street, N.W. - Ste. 800  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Jerome L. Epstein/Jodie L. Kelly  
Jenner & Block  
601 13th Street, N.W. - 12th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Lisa B. Smith  
MCI Telecommunications Corp.  
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Leon M. Kestenbaum/Jay C. Keithley  
H. Richard Juhnke  
1850 M Street, N.W. - 11th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Public Service Commission of Wisconsin  
610 North Way  
P. O. Box 7854  
Madison, WI 53707-7854

Peter Arth Jr./Lionel B. Wilson  
Mary Mack Adu  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Robert W. Lynch/Durward D. Dupre  
Michael J. Zpevak  
One Bell Center  
Room 3518  
St. Louis, MO 63101

Marlin D. Ard  
John W. Bogy  
140 New Montgomery Street - Room 1530A  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Leslie A. Vial  
1320 North Court House Road - 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201

Jack M. Farris  
1095 Avenue of the Americas - 38th Floor  
New York, NY 10036

William B. Barfield  
Jim O. Llewellyn  
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E. - Ste. 1800  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Michael K. Kellogg/Austin C. Schlick  
Kevin J. Cameron  
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans, PLLC  
1301 K Street, N.W. - Ste. 1000 West  
Washington, D.C. 20005

R. Michael Senkowski/Gregory J. Vogt  
Suzanne Yelen/Robert J. Butler  
Scott D. Delacourt  
Wiley, Rein & Fielding  
1776 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Teresa Marrero  
Senior Regulatory Counsel - Federal  
Two Teleport Drive  
Staten Island, NY 10311

Charles C. Hunter  
Catherine M. Hannan  
Hunter Communications Law Group  
1620 I Street, N.W. - Ste. 701  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Robert V. Zener/Richard M. Rindler  
Tamar E. Haverty/Morton J. Posner  
Joel Van Over/Dana Frix  
Michael R. Romano/Eric J. Branfman  
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered  
3000 K Street, N.W. - Ste. 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007

Bryan Rachlin  
Telco Communications Group, Inc.  
4219 Lafayette Center Drive  
Chantilly, VA 20151

J. Jeffrey Mayhook  
General Counsel  
GST Telecom  
4317 NE Thurston Way  
Vancouver, WA 98662

Timothy R. Graham/Robert G. Berger  
Joseph Sandri  
WinStar Communications, Inc.  
1146 19th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

James C. Falvey  
Vice President  
American Communications Services, Inc.  
131 National Business Parkway - Ste. 100  
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Brad E. Mutschelknaus  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
1200 19th Street, N.W. - Ste. 500  
Washington, D.C. 20036

J. Christopher Dance  
Robbin Johnson  
Excel Communications, Inc.  
8750 North Central Expressway  
Dallas, TX 75231

Willkie Farr & Gallagher  
Three Lafayette Centre  
1155 21st Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Richard J. Metzger  
ALTS  
1200 19th Street, N.W. - Ste. 560  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Emily C. Hewitt/George N. Barclay  
Michael J. Ettner  
General Services Administration  
1800 F Street, N.W. - Room 4002  
Washington, D.C. 20405

Ronald J. Binz, President and Policy Director  
Debra R. Berlyn, Executive Director  
John Windhausen Jr., General Counsel  
Competition Policy Institute  
1156 15th Street, N.W. - Suite 310  
Washington, D.C. 20005

David W. Zesiger  
Independent Telephone & Telecom. Alliance  
1300 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Wendy S. Bluemling  
Director, Regulatory Affairs  
227 Church Street  
New Haven, CT 06510

Ronald W. Gavillet  
Executive Vice President  
USN Communications, Inc.  
10 S. Riverside Plaza - Ste. 401  
Chicago, IL 60606

James T. Hannon  
Kathryn Marie Krause  
1020 19th Street, N.W. - Ste. 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert A. Mazer  
Albert Shuldiner  
Vinson & Elkins, LLP  
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1008

Michael J. Karson  
Attorney for Ameritech  
Room 4H88  
2000 W. Ameritech Center Drive  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Mary McDermott/Linda Kent  
Keith Townsend  
Hance Haney  
USTA  
1401 H Street, N.W. - Ste. 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005

  
Cecelia Y. Johnson

\* by hand delivery