

# PIPER & MARBURY

L.L.P.

1200 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-2430

202-861-3900

FAX: 202-223-2085

WRITER'S DIRECT NUMBER  
202-861-6471

BALTIMORE  
NEW YORK  
PHILADELPHIA  
EASTON

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

July 21, 1998

## VIA HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 222  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED  
JUL 21 1998  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ORIGINAL

Re: Ex Parte Presentation  
CC Dkt. Nos. 98-11, 98-26, 98-32, 98-91, 98-78, RM 9244

Dear Ms. Salas:

In accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules, this letter is to notify you that the Commercial Internet eXchange Association ("CIX"), met on Monday, July 20, 1998 with several Commission staff to discuss the implementation of Section 706 of the 1996 Act. CIX met with: Kathryn Brown, Jason Oxman, and Blaise Scinto of the Commission's Common Carrier Bureau; Kyle Dixon of Commissioner Powell's office; and Paul Misener, Kevin Martin, Ameer Meacham, and Nancy Vizor of Commissioner Furchgott-Roth's office. Attending the meetings for CIX were Ronald Plesser and myself of Piper & Marbury, L.L.P., Glee Harrah Cady of NETCOM On-Line, and Nathaniel Clark of IBM.


During these meetings, CIX urged the Commission to consider several issues affecting the ISP industry as it makes decisions on Section 706 implementation. CIX is concerned that incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs") have failed to explain how independent ISPs would be offered equal access to customers (or resale), and how customers can obtain the ISP of their choice, as the ILECs deploy advanced telecommunications services, including xDSL services. This is critically important because, while the ILECs maintain their "bottleneck" on local telecommunications, the vibrant ISP industry has made Internet access a reality for the vast majority of American

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
July 21, 1998  
Page 2

consumers. CIX believes that ILECs can and should promote advanced service offerings that encourage a competitive ISP industry. CIX also expressed its concern that data transport services offered to ISPs should be provided on a competitive basis. The discussion generally focused on the issues raised in the attached talking points, a copy of which was distributed at each meeting.

Please find attached 11 copies of this letter for inclusion in each of the above-referenced dockets. Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Mark J. O'Connor  
Counsel for the Commercial Internet  
eXchange Association

MJO/cce

cc: Kathryn Brown, Esq.  
Kyle Dixon, Esq.  
Paul Misener, Esq.  
Kevin Martin, Esq.  
Jason Oxman, Esq.  
Blaise Scinto, Esq.  
Amea Meacham  
Nancy Vizer

## **Internet Service Providers ("ISPs") And Implementation of Section 706 of the 1996 Act**

Independent ISPs seek competitive and efficient access to advanced telecommunications services in order to continue to promote the Internet. As the nation's local telecommunications for data evolves and transitions towards broadband services, it is appropriate for the FCC to ensure the transition keeps the competitive ISP market intact, in the following ways:

### **Structural/Transactional Issues:**

Incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs") provide both in-region ISP services and sell the essential telecommunications inputs to competing ISPs. The deployment of new ILEC broadband services raises the potential for monopoly abuse against independent ISPs and other end users. The FCC should consider:

- *ISP Safeguards:* stronger regulatory safeguards/enforcement ensuring that all independent ISPs have at least equal pricing, terms, and conditions of service that are provided by the ILEC to its affiliated ISP; and
- *Separating Retail from Wholesale Incentives:* ILECs that participate in the retail ISP market also supply ISP competitors with essential telecommunications inputs, which invariably leads to abuse. The FCC should explore ways to separate ILEC's retail and wholesale functions. A data separate subsidiary under the same corporate parent retains the economic incentives for ILEC to "cheat" on regulatory objectives.
- *End User Choice:* A right of end users to choose among competing ISPs and CPE for the provision of advanced telecommunications services; ILEC networks should support end user choice. In this way, a choice of competitive services are available to consumers.

### **Transport/Interconnection Issues:**

ILEC services (e.g., ATM, Frame Relay) connect the ILEC's advanced network to the ISP. The ILEC's terms of service to ISPs have a significant impact on ISP access and the cost of

providing Internet service. Non-discriminatory, efficient, and competitive provision of such ILEC services must be encouraged with:

- clarification that interconnection obligation applies to ILECs' data networks;
- encouraging data competitive access providers (DCAPs) by unbundling the ILEC's ADSL service from the metropolitan area data transport. ISPs may choose among competing transport carriers to gain access to the ILEC offices.
- Independent ISP access to ILEC data networks on same price, terms, conditions as ILEC ISP affiliate.

### **CLEC Competition Issues:**

ISPs will need CLEC-based advanced telecommunications competition to: obtain cost-based telecommunications; encourage ILEC's to serve ISPs better; and to encourage telecommunications innovation for additional Internet-based communications. CLEC competition can help sustain a competitive Internet industry only with:

- *Collocation* at ILEC offices on terms that are more efficient and flexible;
- *Interconnection* at points of aggregation, including remote terminal units of a DLC system;
- *UNE Access to Conditioned Loops* in a timely and cost-based manner;
- *UNE access to electronics* used by ILEC to provide advanced services;
- ILEC collocation/unbundling must permit CLECs to deploy a range of equipment/technologies demanded by end-users; and,
- Swift and effective enforcement of these rights.

For further information, please contact:

Ronald Plessner, Piper & Marbury, LLP (861-3969)

Mark O'Connor, Piper & Marbury, LLP (861-6471)

Commercial Internet eXchange Association Members  
June 1998

@ Home

a2i Communications  
AboveNet  
Aliant Communications  
Apex Global Information Services  
Asociados Espada  
AT&T  
AT&T Jens Corporation  
Atson, Inc.  
Bekkoame Internet, Inc.  
Bell Atlantic Internet Solutions  
British Telecom  
Cable & Wireless Internet  
Exchange  
CERFnet  
Comnexo  
CRL Network Services  
Crocker Communications  
CTS Network Services  
Data Research Associates, Inc.  
DataXchange  
Datanet Communications Ltd.  
Demon Internet Limited  
Easynet Group Plc  
Electronic Systems of Richmond  
EPIX  
Epoch Networks Inc  
e.spire Communications  
Cybergate, Inc.  
EuroNet Internet BV  
Exodus Communications  
Fiber Network Solutions, Inc  
Fujitsu Limited  
GetNet International  
Global Center  
GST Internet, Inc.  
GTE Internetworking  
BBN Planet  
Genuity, Inc.  
Nap.Net  
Hitachi  
Hurricane Electric  
IBM Global Network  
Icon CMT  
ICG Communications, Inc.  
Netcom Online

Communications

Netcom Canada  
Netcom Internet Ltd.  
Inet, Inc.  
InfoCom Research Inc.  
Intermedia Communications Inc.  
Digital Express Group  
Internet Exchange Europe  
Internet Initiative Japan (IIJ)  
Interpath  
IPF.Net International  
ITnet Spa  
JTNET Research Institute  
Kokusai Denshin Denwa, (KDD)  
Korea Telecom  
LDS I-America  
Logic Communications  
Logic Telecom S.A.  
MediaOne  
MIND (Mitsubishi Electric  
Network Information Co.)  
NEC Corporation  
NetDirect Internet  
netINS, Inc.  
NETRAIL  
NetVision  
Netway Communications  
Network Solutions  
Octacon Ltd.  
Osaka Media Port Corporation  
OTSUKA SHOKAI Co.,Ltd  
Pilot Net Services  
Planet Online Ltd.  
PSINet  
PSINet UK  
PSINet Netherlands  
PSINet Belgium  
PSINet Germany  
PSINet Europe  
PSINet Japan  
Calvacom SA  
Internet ProLink SA  
iStar Internet  
Puerto Rico Telephone  
Qwest Communications  
EUNet BV

Racal-Integralis (QUZA)

RACSA.net  
Renater  
Sprint  
Southwestern Bell Internet  
Pacific Bell Internet  
Telecom Finland  
Teleglobe, Inc  
Telewest Communications, Ltd.  
The Internet Mainstreet (TIMS)  
The OnRamp Group, Inc.  
TogetherNet  
Tokai Internetwork Council  
Tokyo Internet Corporation  
Toyama Regional Internet  
Organization  
U-NET Ltd.  
VBCnet (GB) Ltd  
Verio  
Verio Northwest  
Verio Northern CA  
Verio Southern CA  
Verio Colorado  
Verio Texas/Gulf South  
Verio Midwest  
Verio Mid-Atlantic  
Verio Northeast  
Verio Washington DC  
VoiceNet  
Voyager Networks, Inc.  
Web Professionals  
WebSecure  
Winstar Goodnet  
WorldCom  
ANS CO+RE Systems  
Compuserve  
Fibrcom, Inc.  
GridNet International  
UUNET Technologies  
UUNET UK  
UUNET Canada  
UUNET Deutschland  
UUNET Belgium  
Wyoming.com

---

Vendor Members

Digital Equipment Corporation  
Dimension Enterprises  
Globalink

Global Networking & Computing  
Hewlett Packard  
i-Pass

Red Creek Communications  
Sun Microsystems