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

RECEIVED
JUL 21 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ORIGINAL

VIA HAND DELIVERY

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

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, Amee 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

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.
Amee Meacham
Nancy Vizer

Commercial Internet eXchange Association
Ex Parte Presentation
July 20, 1998

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 Plesser, 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 Belguim
    PSInet Germany
    PSInet Europe
    PSInet Japan
    Calvacom SA
  Internet Prolink SA
  iStar Internet
Puerto Rico Telephone
Qwest Communications
    EUNet BV
Racal-Integralis (QUZA)
RACSAnet
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 Belguim
Wyoming.com

Vendor Members

Digital Equipment Corporation
Dimension Enterprises
Globalink
Global Networking & Computing
Hewlett Packard
i-Pass
Red Creek Communications
Sun Microsystems