

Sections 251(a) and (b) establish certain “minimum requirements” that must be honored by the LECs without further negotiation, mediation or arbitration. The requirement that LECs cease charging for the delivery of LEC-originated traffic falls into this category.

Moreover, Section 51.703(b) of the rules was upheld by the Eighth Circuit under Section 332 of the Communications Act, which means that this rule can and should be given effect outside of the negotiation, arbitration and mediation provisions of Sections 251 and 252.

- 28. By requiring LECs to bear the costs of delivering LEC-originated traffic to CMRS carriers for local termination, and establishing the local area as the MTA for CMRS traffic, was the Commission lifting the limitation on the RBOCs to haul traffic over LATA boundaries?**

No. The Local Competition First Report did not alter the interLATA restrictions to which the RBOCs are subject.

- 29. Do paging carriers expect RBOCs to deliver intra-MTA calls across LATA boundaries?**

No. Paging companies are willing to establish a meet point at the LATA boundary. However, if a paging company is deemed to pick up a call at this point, then the terminating compensation it receives should be calculated to allow the paging company to recover the costs of transporting and terminating the call from that point.

- 30. Are paging service providers entitled to be relieved of all charges for the facilities used to deliver paging traffic from the LEC, and to be paid terminating compensation for every completed page?**

No. Under the FCC’s rulings, paging carriers only are relieved of facilities charges, and only receive terminating compensation, with respect to that portion of the traffic they receive which qualifies as “local LEC-originated traffic.” To the extent that traffic delivered to paging companies (i) originates outside of the local area; (ii) terminates outside of the local area; or (iii) originates on the facilities of a carrier other than the LEC who delivers it to the paging carrier, then it does not qualify as “local LEC-originated traffic,” and paging companies are prepared to bear a pro-rated portion of the facility charges associated with this traffic and to forego local terminating compensation associated with this traffic.

## VII. Reciprocal Compensation

31. **Has the Commission specifically ruled whether paging companies are entitled to “reciprocal compensation?”**

Yes. The Local Competition First Report specifically holds that one-way paging carriers are entitled to reciprocal compensation.<sup>34</sup>

32. **Can a terminating compensation arrangement between a LEC and a paging service provider properly be deemed “reciprocal” when all the traffic (and hence all the payments) flow in only one direction?**

Yes. Under the 1996 Act, a “reciprocal” compensation arrangement is one which provides for the “recovery by each carrier of costs associated with the transport and termination on each carrier’s network facilities of calls that originate on the network facilities of the other carrier.”<sup>35</sup> Thus, the statute requires a mutuality of obligation only to the extent that traffic is delivered and costs are incurred. If a paging carrier delivers no traffic to the LEC, then the LEC incurs no costs of transport or termination, and is entitled to no compensation under a fully reciprocal arrangement. Notably, several state public utility commissions have concurred with the FCC in the conclusion that one-way traffic is compensable.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>Local Competition First Report, paras. 1008, 1093.

<sup>35</sup>47 U.S.C. § 252(c)(2)(A)(i).

<sup>36</sup>Application of Cook Telecom, Inc. for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an Interconnection Arrangement with Pacific Bell, Application No. 97-02-003 (Cal. PUC 1997) (Interim Decision); Petition of AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. for the Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement with US WEST Communications pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252, Docket ARB16, Order No. 97-290 (Aug. 4, 1997); Petition of AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement with US WEST Communications, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 OAH Docket No. 3-2500-11080-20, MPUC Docket No. P-421/EM-97-371 (MN PUC 1997) (Recommended Arbitration Decision). Were the FCC now to change its determination that paging traffic is compensable, it would seriously discourage states in the future from giving deference to FCC rulings under the 1996 Act.

- 33. Is it fair to the LECs to impose the payment obligation on the originator of the traffic when there is a complete imbalance in the traffic flow?**

Yes. The mix of traffic does not alter the fact that it is appropriate to have the originator of traffic, who is the cost causer, deliver the traffic to the terminating carrier. The LECs have themselves been proponents of assigning payment obligations in proportion to traffic origination in LEC/CMRS interconnection arrangements. For example, LECs succeeded in convincing the Commission to abandon its "bill & keep" proposal for two-way CMRS providers by arguing that the vast majority of traffic was mobile-to-land traffic and that therefore the LECs should get a proportionately higher percentage of the terminating compensation. The same equitable principle justifies having LECs pay paging companies termination compensation in proportion to the traffic flow.

- 34. Was the determination that paging service providers qualify for reciprocal compensation challenged in the appeal to the Eighth Circuit of the Local Competition First Report?**

Yes, and the Court rejected the challenge. An appellant group calling itself the Mid-Sized Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers specifically challenged the ruling that paging companies were entitled to compensation. The appeal claimed that the one-way nature of paging traffic prevented the arrangement from being "reciprocal." An opposing brief was filed by the wireless intervenors, including PCIA. Based on this record, the Eighth Circuit upheld the LEC/CMRS interconnection rules without singling the paging companies out for separate, disparate treatment.

- 35. Is the entitlement of paging carriers to receive reciprocal compensation still at issue at the Commission?**

Yes, but the Commission should not disturb the prior rulings which have been upheld on appeal. When the Local Competition First Report was adopted, some parties filed petitions for reconsideration at the FCC challenging the entitlement of paging carriers to receive reciprocal compensation.<sup>37</sup> The Mid-Sized Incumbent LECs raised the same issue in a court challenge. The reconsideration petitions remained pending before the Commission without action while the court challenges were adjudicated

---

<sup>37</sup>See, e.g., Petitions for Reconsideration of Kalida Telephone Company and the Local Exchange Carrier Coalition in CC Docket No. 96-98 as listed at 61 Fed. Reg. 53, 922 (1996).

in the Eighth Circuit. Since the Eighth Circuit did not disturb the finding that paging carriers are entitled to compensation, the Commission may affirm this conclusion on reconsideration with confidence that its ruling will be upheld. In contrast, altering the decision risks snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

**36. Are paging companies seeking terminating compensation payments sufficient to recover the costs of their entire radio frequency (“RF”) network?**

No. The Commission has ruled that terminating compensation payments should be calculated to enable the terminating carrier to recoup its usage-sensitive network costs. Fixed-costs associated with the terminating carrier’s “local loop” are to be recovered from the terminating carrier’s customers through basic service access fees.

Two parties benefit from the completion of a page: (1) the person who initiates the page and (2) the person who receives it. It is therefore appropriate to have each pay a portion of the costs associated with a paging communication. The originator pays to deliver the call to the terminating carrier, and the called party pays for the “local loop” (in this case the paging RF system) to terminate the call. Notably, most of the network costs are tied up in the local loop, which means that the paging customer is paying the vast majority of the total expenses associated with the completion of a page.

**37. Who should be the arbiter of the terminating compensation rates charged to LECs by paging service providers; the FCC or state PUCs?**

The FCC. Section 332(c)(3) of the Communications Act provides that “no state or local government shall have any authority to regulate...the rates charged by any commercial mobile service” provider. A paging terminating compensation rate is a rate charged by a CMRS provider, and should be deemed within the exclusive jurisdiction of the FCC.

**38. Should a paging service provider be obligated to file a formal request for a new or modified interconnection agreement pursuant to Section 251 of the Communications Act, and be subject to the negotiation, mediation and arbitration procedures of Section 252, as a precondition to being paid terminating compensation?**

No. The obligation of LECs to interconnect with paging carriers arise not just out of Sections 251 and 252, but also out of Sections 201 and 202 of the

Communications Act, and Section 332. Notably, the Commission adopted rule Section 20.11(b)(1), which requires LECs to pay reasonable compensation to a CMRS provider which terminates LEC-originated traffic, prior to the adoption of Sections 251 and 252 of the 1996 Act. Thus, formal negotiations under Sections 251 and 252 should be viewed as one avenue a paging company can pursue, but not the exclusive avenue.

### **VIII. Point of Interface Between the LEC and Paging Networks**

- 39. How is the point of connection (“POC”) or point of interface (“POI”) between a LEC and a paging company determined?**

Historically, LECs dictated the location of the POC or POI, and generally required that it be located at the paging company switch, while insisting that the paging company pay for the connecting facilities utilized to deliver the traffic all the way to that location.<sup>38</sup> Under the new interconnection paradigm, the paging company should be able to select the POI or POC at any technically feasible location, including at the paging company switch if desired.

- 40. If LECs are obligated to deliver their paging traffic to the POI with the paging service provider without charge, doesn't this mean that paging companies are getting “free” service?**

No. It is commonplace for the originator of a communication to pay the costs associated with delivering the call to the terminating carrier. When a telephone customer picks up a landline telephone to initiate a page, that person is the originator of the call, and is properly charged (through the local access phone rate) for delivering the call to the paging company which will terminate it to the appropriate paging unit. The paging company is not getting “free” service, but rather is being relieved of the unfair burden of paying charges that are properly borne by the customer of the originating carrier.

---

<sup>38</sup>Standard Bellcore interconnection schematic drawings confirm that the POC or POI is considered by the LECs to be at the paging company switch.

41. **Assuming no other changes in the interconnection arrangement, what is the financial consequence of moving the POI from one location to another (e.g. from the paging switch to the LEC end office)?**

In a perfect world, there would be no practical difference. With the POI at the paging switch, the LEC would be obligated to pick up the cost of the connecting facility used to deliver local LEC-originated traffic to the paging company. With the POI at the LEC end office, the paging carrier would be obligated to pick up the cost of the connecting facility to the paging switch but would be entitled to recoup this cost through terminating compensation payments.

42. **If the POI is located at the paging carrier's switch, should compensation be denied because the paging carrier is performing termination functions, but no transport functions?**

No. Telecommunications carriers are entitled to be compensated for transport and termination, but there is no requirement and no compelling reason that a particular call must be both transported and terminated by the terminating carrier in order for the entitlement to compensation to arise.<sup>39</sup> Indeed, Section 20.11(a)(1) of the rules makes clear that CMRS carriers are entitled to compensation for terminating traffic and makes no reference at all to transport. Whether the POI is located one mile from the paging switch or at the paging switch may properly affect the amount of compensation that is due, but does not affect the basic entitlement to payment.

---

<sup>39</sup>In the Cook Telecom proceeding, the California Public Utilities Commission found that Cook (a paging service provider) was not entitled to compensation for transport because it did not provide the facilities used to deliver LEC-originated traffic to its paging switch, but nor should Cook be charged for that transport. In that same order, the PUC also found that Cook is entitled to compensation for the termination of local LEC-originated telecommunications. See Application of Cook Telecom, Inc. for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an Interconnection Arrangement with Pacific Bell, Application No. 97-02-003, Decision 97-05-095, (Cal. PUC 1997) (Interim Order).

43. **Should an end-to-end paging message be considered, for regulatory purposes, as two distinct calls: one call originating at the landline phone which initiates the page and terminating at the paging switch, and a second call originating at the paging switch and terminating at the paging unit?**

No. An end-to-end communication path is established when the paging message is accepted. While the message may be placed in storage for delivery in sequence with other pages, this is not done unless and until the page is validated and the availability of the transmission path to the paging customer's service area is verified. And the storage is an automated call processing function the sole purpose of which is to facilitate completion of the transmission, not to provide any enhanced service. In other similar contexts, the FCC properly has recognized that call processing mechanisms used in connection with basic services are properly viewed as "adjunct to basic" services that are not deemed to alter the character of the service.<sup>40</sup>

The fact that a call must be classified based upon the nature of the end-to-end communication has been upheld in other contexts as well. For example, the FCC specifically rejected the "two-call" theory when it ruled that calls placed using debit calling cards which originate and terminate in the same state are intrastate calls, even though such calls had two components: one interstate communication via an 800 number to a remote switch and a second communication back to the state from the remote switch location.<sup>41</sup>

Moreover, a paging network could be configured to establish a real-time, end-to-end connection between the calling party and the paging unit. However, this configuration would be much less efficient than using the sophisticated store and forward switching techniques that are now available. The Commission should not adopt regulatory treatments that discourage the use of state-of-the-art technology. Rather, the Commission should recognize the equivalence of a modern page to other end-to-end calls.

---

<sup>40</sup>NATA Centrex Order, 101 FCC 2d 349 (1985), recon., 3 FCC Rcd. 4385 (1988).

<sup>41</sup>Time Machine, Inc., Request for Declaratory Ruling Concerning Preemption of State Regulations of Interstate 800-Access Debit Card Telecommunications Services, 11 FCC Rcd. 1186 (CCB 1995).

44. **Is a real-time connection between the calling party and the called party necessary in order for the terminating carrier to be deemed to have performed a “switching” function?**

No. While some definitions of switching refer to making a “connection” between the calling and called party, there is no requirement that this connection be instantaneous or be accomplished in real time. Nor is there any reason to consider a real time connection as a necessary component of switching.

### **IX. Competitive Neutrality Between One-Way and Two-Way Service Providers**

45. **Are paging companies entitled to the same terminating compensation payments as two-way service providers who are providing paging as an integrated component of their service offerings?**

They should be, but unfortunately the Commission’s rulings have not achieved this result. In the Local Competition First Report, the Commission tentatively concluded that paging network architecture was sufficiently different from LEC network architecture to disallow paging companies from relying upon the LECs’ cost-based termination rates as a surrogate.<sup>42</sup> In contrast, two-way CMRS providers were granted the right to be paid a rate symmetrical to the rate charged them by the LEC. Ultimately, the FCC rule that singled paging companies out for disparate treatment was vacated by the Eighth Circuit,<sup>43</sup> but most LECs are, nonetheless, declining to offer one-way carriers the same symmetrical rate offered to two-way carriers.

---

<sup>42</sup>47 C.F.R. § 51.711(c).

<sup>43</sup>Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC, 120 F.3d 753, 800.

46. **Was the Commission correct in determining that paging company networks are sufficiently different from the networks of two-way CMRS and other telecommunications carriers to warrant separate consideration in terms of the basis for determining compensation?**<sup>44</sup>

No. Paging networks consist of similar components, perform similar functions and have similar architectures to other telecommunications networks.

47. **Are there any negative competitive implications of treating paging terminating compensation differently from other CMRS terminating compensation?**

Yes. Paging companies are unable to compete on a level playing field since CMRS carriers who offer paging service over their two-way networks are able to receive higher terminating compensation payments for the paging traffic they terminate, and, due to the symmetry requirement, are in a position to reach agreement on the rate at an earlier date. This disparity cannot be solved by having the two-way CMRS carriers be paid less for a call that terminates as a page than a call that terminates as a mobile call since the network cannot distinguish between these two types of communications. Singling paging companies out for disparate treatment also deters voluntary negotiations between LECs and paging companies.

### **X. Types of Interconnection Arrangements**

48. **What are the differences between so-called "Type 1" and "Type 2" interconnection arrangements in the LEC/paging context?**

Type 1 provides an interconnection to the telephone company's end office ("EO"). The telephone numbers reside at the EO. Type 2 provides an interconnection to the telephone company's Access Tandem. In this configuration, the telephone numbers reside at the paging company's switch.

49. **Does the paging carrier perform any switching functions in a Type 1/End Office interconnection arrangement?**

---

<sup>44</sup>Local Competition First Report, para. 1093.

Yes. The paging switch provides answer supervision, matches the direct inward dialing ("DID") number to the cap code of the destination pager, validates the call, outputs the paging signal and provides tone or voice prompts to the calling party, all of which are equivalent to end office switching functions.

**50. Why would a paging company opt for Type 1/End Office interconnection as compared to Type 2/Tandem interconnection?**

Historically, the nature of the interconnection arrangement was dictated by LEC policies over which the paging company had no control. Many End Office arrangements were established when LECs simply refused to offer Tandem level interconnection<sup>45</sup> to paging companies. Even when Tandem interconnection was offered, the terms often made it prohibitively expensive. A paging carrier establishing a Tandem level interconnection must use a complete NXX code (10,000 numbers), and it was commonplace for LECs to charge exorbitant one-time and monthly recurring charges for each number in this large block.<sup>46</sup> In contrast, numbers in End Office arrangements could be purchased in blocks of 100, thereby reducing (but not eliminating) the paging companies' obligation. Also, the shortage of telephone numbers in some areas can mean that the full NXX codes necessary to implement Tandem connections are not available.

**51. Now that number charges have been eliminated or reduced by the Local Competition Second Report, why don't paging companies convert all existing interconnection arrangements to Type 2/Tandem level?**

Not all LECs have reduced their number-related charges as they are obligated to do under the FCC rulings. Even more important, converting existing services from an End Office to a Tandem level arrangement would require that each paging customer relinquish its existing telephone number and substitute a number within the range of the new dedicated NXX assigned to the paging carrier. Like other telecommunications customers, paging customers generally do not want to relinquish a paging number that has been distributed, published or advertised to callers and

---

<sup>45/</sup>The recent decision in William G. Bowles Jr. PE v. United Telephone Company of Missouri, DA 97-1441, 1997 FCC LEXIS 3662, released July 11, 1997 indicates that these restrictive policies still exist.

<sup>46/</sup>For example, a one-time charge of \$36,000 per NXX was imposed in some instances.

become familiar to those who seek to initiate pages. While many paging companies are negotiating transition plans with LECs that will replace End Office connections with Tandem connections over time, it will take some time to effect these transitions without disrupting existing services. In the meantime, paging carriers should not be required to pay for the LEC facilities used to deliver local, LEC-originated traffic and denied terminating compensation payments to which they are entitled.

- 52. Should the Commission rules governing the financial relationship between paging service providers and LECs depend upon whether the interconnection is Type 1/End Office or Type 2/Tandem?**

No. Because paging companies became locked into End Office arrangements by now-discredited LEC policies, and altering them would disrupt service to the public, the paging companies should not be forced to pay for the LEC's connecting facilities or relinquish the right to terminating compensation in order to maintain existing arrangements.

- 53. Is a "reverse billing" arrangement by which a paging carrier agrees to pay certain charges to the LEC so that the paging carrier's end users will not incur toll charges properly considered a form of interconnection which is subject to statutory protections?**

Yes. Though often characterized by LECs as a mere "billing option," a reverse billing arrangement has direct consequences in terms of the manner in which physical interconnections are configured, and the alteration or withdrawal by a LEC of reverse billing options can have direct adverse consequences on interconnection arrangements. As a result, actions taken by LECs with regard to reverse billing offerings are so inextricably tied to the interconnection arrangement as to be subject to the same standards.

- 54. Are there any Commission precedents that require Type 1/End Office interconnections to be treated less favorably than Type 2/Tandem interconnections?**

No. There is language in a couple of pre-1996 Act decisions that equates a Type 1/End Office interconnection to a connection with a private branch exchange ("PBX"), which has been seized upon by certain LECs to argue that paging companies should be treated as end users to the extent that they utilize Type 1

arrangements. These isolated references do not overcome the long line of holdings indicating that paging carriers are entitled to co-carrier treatment. Considerations of functionality, fairness and proper statutory interpretation prevent the Commission from treating a paging carrier like a PBX.

### **XI. Dedicated Transport Facilities Between Serving Areas**

**55. What is a foreign exchange or "FX" line?**

An FX line is a dedicated facility that allows a call in one calling area to be transported to another calling area.

**56. Do paging companies use FX lines?**

In the past, LECs refused to treat paging companies as co-carriers and forced them to order FX lines out of end-user tariffs whenever the paging company wanted to draw telephone numbers out of an exchange other than the exchange where the paging switch (and POI) was located. For example, if a paging system expanded to cover multiple calling areas, situations would arise in which calls to pagers which originated and terminated in the same local calling area would give rise to intrastate toll charges if the customer's numbers were rated elsewhere. To overcome this anomaly, some paging carriers ordered FX lines to enable them to draw telephone numbers out of other exchanges, and to assign a telephone number to the paging customer that correlates to the area where most of the calls to that customer will originate and terminate.

Under the new interconnection paradigm, paging carriers are to be considered co-carriers, not end-users. Rather than being forced to order FX lines under end-user tariffs, they must be allowed to utilize dedicated co-carrier transport facilities.

**57. Does the use of dedicated transport facilities between a LEC and a paging carrier unfairly prevent the LEC from collecting intraLATA toll charges to which it is entitled?**

No. As noted above, the typical effect of the use of a dedicated connecting facility is to avoid the imposition of a toll charge when a paging communication in fact originates and terminates in the same local serving area. This is equitable. For

example, if a paging carrier which interconnects in San Francisco uses a dedicated facility to draw numbers out of a Eureka exchange and assigns a Eureka number to a Eureka-based paging customer, no toll would be incurred if a Eureka landline customer calls that number. However, a San Francisco area landline customer who calls the Eureka number would pay a toll. As such, toll charges would be paid to the LEC only when the call originated and terminated in different local calling areas, which is the way it should be.

**58. Are LECs obligated to bear the costs of dedicated facilities used to deliver traffic to paging carriers in other exchanges within the MTA?**

In some instances, yes. If a paging company were to install a dedicated switch in the foreign exchange and interconnect there, the LEC would be obligated to make terminating compensation payments sufficient to allow the paging carrier to recoup the resulting switching costs. If it is more cost-effective to provide an equivalent service in the foreign exchange by using a dedicated connecting facility, then it is to the benefit of both the paging carrier and the LEC to do so. At this point, the cost of the dedicated facility becomes a substitute for the switching cost, which is properly charged to the LEC. Thus, it is appropriate for the LEC to bear the cost of the connecting facility provided that the lines represent an economically efficient means of serving the foreign exchange area.

**59. Are there alternatives to the use of dedicated transport facilities between carriers?**

Yes. LECs can provide a Tandem level interconnection arrangement by which calls to certain designated blocks of numbers are all routed via the tandem to the paging company switch but are rated out of a different LEC end office which subtends the tandem. This separation of rating and routing would allow the paging company to assign a customer a number rated out of the nearest end office without the use of a dedicated transport facility. Instead the call would be routed over the LEC's common inter-office transport facilities.

**60. Is the separation of rating and routing in this fashion new?**

No. LECs have long had the ability to rate and route calls separately, and many existing interconnection agreements explicitly recognize the right of the requesting carrier to select a rating point for a particular telephone number that is different from the routing location, provided that they are in the same LATA.

## **XII. Future Regulatory Rulings**

- 61. Does the fact that both paging carriers and ISPs generally receive traffic but do not originate traffic require that the traffic directed to each be treated the same for compensation purposes?**

No. There are significant differences between paging carriers and ISPs that may properly result in different treatment of the traffic to each. Paging service providers are telecommunications carriers and exchange co-carriers with all of the regulatory obligations that attend those classifications. In contrast, ISPs have been specifically exempted from classification as telecommunications carriers,<sup>47</sup> and the FCC repeatedly has ruled that ISPs are to be treated as “end-users” for regulatory purposes. This distinction can serve to alter rights to compensation.<sup>48</sup> Additionally, a paging message terminates at a specific location which can be characterized as being either local or non-local. A call to an ISP enters the “Internet cloud” which means that the point of termination of the communication defies easy categorization in terms of locality. In light of these significant differences, the Commission need not treat traffic to paging companies and ISPs in identical fashion.

- 62. What should the Commission do on reconsideration in the paging interconnection proceeding?**

The Commission should: (a) affirm its prior rulings regarding the basic entitlement of paging carriers to reciprocal compensation; (b) confirm the obligation of LECs to bear the usage sensitive and non-usage sensitive costs associated with the delivery of LEC-originated traffic to paging companies for local termination; and (c) abandon forevermore the vacated rule which singled paging companies out as the only CMRS carriers obligated to perform their own Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost (“TELRIC”) studies in order to receive terminating compensation.

---

<sup>47/</sup>Local Competition First Report at para. 995.

<sup>48/</sup>For example, when a call involves a pager, the paging company is the terminating carrier. When a call involves an Internet user, the LEC or CLEC serving the ISP, not the ISP, is the terminating carrier.

- 63. What other actions should the Commission take to resolve paging/LEC interconnection issues?**

The Commission should exercise the full limit of its jurisdiction under Section 332 of the Communications Act and establish a federal forum for setting the rates that CMRS carriers charge LECs for terminating traffic. Since the states are preempted under Section 332 of the Communications Act from regulating CMRS rates, and since the charge imposed by a paging carrier on a LEC for termination service is a CMRS rate, it should be deemed within the exclusive domain of the FCC.

**Index**

- A-**
- Arbitration**  
- Under Section 252 of the Act . . . . Q.27
- Appeal**  
- of the Local Competition First Report to  
the Eighth Circuit . . . . . Q.34,Q.35  
- of the Local Competition First Report to  
the Supreme Court . . . . . Q.17
- B-**
- Benefits**  
- to LECs of serving paging  
carriers . . . . . Q.26
- Bill and Keep**  
- opposed by the LECs . . . . . Q.33
- C-**
- Chilling effect**  
- of requiring cost studies . . . . . Q.45
- Commercial Mobile Radio Service  
(CMRS)**  
- as a Telecommunications Service . . . Q.4  
- paging service as . . . . . Q.4
- Co-Carriers**  
- paging service providers  
as . . . . . Q.5,Q.25,Q.54
- Competition**  
- between one-way and two-way  
companies . . . . . Q.45,Q.46,Q.47
- Cost studies**  
- as a prerequisite to compensation . . Q.45
- Customer Proprietary Network  
Information (CPNI)**  
- obligation of paging carriers to  
protect . . . . . Q.3
- D-**
- Dedicated Facilities**  
- cost of . . . . . Q.57  
- FX lines as . . . . . Q.55  
- use of . . . . . Q.56
- Definitions**  
- of Commercial Mobile Radio  
Service . . . . . Q.3  
- of CPNI . . . . . Q.3  
- of End Office interconnection . . . . Q.48  
- of FX lines . . . . . Q.55  
- of LEC-originated traffic . . . . . Q.30  
- of local traffic . . . . . Q.18,Q.19  
- of one way messaging . . . . . Q.1  
- of paging service provider . . . . . Q.1  
- of point of connection (POC) or  
point of interface (POI) . . . . . Q.39  
- of reciprocal compensation . . . . . Q.32  
- of Tandem level interconnection . . . Q.48  
- of telecommunications carrier . . . . Q.2  
- of telephone exchange service . . . . Q.5  
- of Type 1 interconnection . . . . . Q.48  
- of Type 2 interconnection . . . . . Q.48
- Discrimination**  
- between payments to one-way and  
two-way providers . . . . . Q.47  
- by LECs against paging carriers . . . . Q.9
- E-**
- End Office (Type 1) Interconnection**  
- defined . . . . . Q.48  
- effect of numbering charges on . . . Q.50  
- reasons for continuing . . . . . Q.51  
- converting to Type 2 . . . . . Q.51

**-F-**

**Facilities Charges**

- entitlement of paging carriers to relief from . . . . . Q.21
- extent of relief . . . . . Q.22,Q.30

**Federal Communications Commission**

- as arbiter of terminating compensation . . . . . Q.14,Q.62
- jurisdiction over intrastate charges . . . . . Q.10,Q.13
- preemptive authority of . . . . . Q.12

**Fixed Costs**

- recovery of . . . . . Q.36

**Foreign Exchange (FX) Lines**

- defined . . . . . Q.55
- purpose of . . . . . Q.56
- replacement of . . . . . Q.57

**-G-**

**Good Faith Estimate**

- as a basis for ascertaining local traffic . . . . . Q.19

**Good Faith Negotiations**

- Section 252 request as a prerequisite to . . . . . Q.27,Q.38

**-H-**

**Historical Reasons**

- for selecting Type 1 interconnection . . . . . Q.50

**Historical Relationship**

- between LECs and paging carriers . . . . . Q.21

**-I-**

**Incentive**

- to configure efficient network . . . . Q.24

**Interconnection**

- End Office (Type 1) . . . . . Q.48
- obligations of paging carriers . . . . . Q.3
- rights of paging carriers to . . . . Q.7,Q.8
- rights prior to the 1996 Act . . . . . Q.7
- tandem level (Type 2) . . . . . Q.48,Q.51
- type 1 (end office) . . . . . Q.48
- type 2 (tandem level) . . . . . Q.48,Q.51
- under Sections 201/202 of the Act . . Q.7
- under Sections 251/252 of the Act . . Q.8
- under Section 332 of the Act . . . . . Q.7

**Internet Service Providers (ISPs)**

- compared to paging service providers . . . . . Q.61
- ISP traffic distinguished from paging traffic . . . . . Q.20

**-J-**

**Jurisdiction**

- of FCC over intrastate interconnection . . . . . Q.10
- of states preempted . . . . . Q.13

**-K-**

**-L-**

**LATAs**

- inter-LATA interconnection restrictions . . . . . Q.28,Q.29

**LEC-Originated Traffic**

- defined . . . . . Q.30
- local . . . . . Q.13,Q.18
- obligation of paging carriers regarding . . . . . Q.24

**Local Competition First Report**

- appeals of the . . . . . Q.34
- citation . . . . . Q.2
- effective date of . . . . . Q.15
- preemptive effect of . . . . . Q.13

- statutory basis of . . . . . Q.12
- upheld on appeal . . . . . Q.16
- Local Exchange Carriers (LECs)**
- ability to assess charges for facilities . . . . . Q.13
- obligation to interconnect . . . . . Q.7,Q.8,Q.11
- obligation to pay compensation . . . . . Q.7,Q.31
- record of compliance . . . . . Q.9
- Local Service**
- defined . . . . . Q.18
- Local Traffic**
- ascertaining the extent of . . . . . Q.19
- defined . . . . . Q.13

**-M-**

- Mediation**
- Under Section 251/252 of the Act . . . . . Q.27
- Metzger Letter**
- cited . . . . . Q.22
- effect of the . . . . . Q.22
- Mid-Sized Incumbent LECs**
- appeal of the Local Competition First Report by . . . . . Q.35
- Minimum Requirements**
- under sections 251/252 of the Act . . . . . Q.27
- Modification of Final Judgment (MFJ)**
- effect on LEC obligations . . . . . Q.5
- Mutual compensation**
- entitlement of paging carriers to receive . . . . . Q.31

**-N-**

- Negotiations**
- good faith obligation . . . . . Q.11
- formal request as a prerequisite

- to . . . . . Q.27,Q.38
- Network Architecture**
- of one-way and two-way carriers compared . . . . . Q.46
- right of LEC to alter . . . . . Q.25
- right of LEC to dictate . . . . . Q.25
- Non-Traffic Sensitive Facility Costs**
- relief of paging carriers from paying . . . . . Q.22
- Numbering Charges**
- impact on interconnection type . . . . . Q.50
- reduction by federal mandate . . . . . Q.13

**-O-**

- One-Way Messaging**
- as telephone exchange service . . . . . Q.5
- as local service . . . . . Q.18
- compared to Internet service . . . . . Q.20,Q.60
- defined . . . . . Q.1
- entitlement to reciprocal compensation . . . . . Q.31,Q.34,Q.35
- Originating Carrier**
- obligation to pay for facilities . . . . . Q.23
- obligation to pay compensation . . . . . Q.21

**-P-**

- Paging Service**
- as CMRS . . . . . Q.4
- defined . . . . . Q.1
- one call versus two calls . . . . . Q.43
- Point of Connection (POC) or Point of Interface (POI)**
- defined . . . . . Q.39
- location of . . . . . Q.39
- effect of relocating . . . . . Q.41
- effect on transport . . . . . Q.42
- Preemption**
- of conflicting state tariffs . . . . . Q.12,Q.13

- under the Supremacy Clause . . . . .	Q.12	- preemption under the . . . . .	Q.12
<b>Private Branch Exchange (PBX)</b>		<b>Supreme Court</b>	
- comparison of paging carrier to . . .	Q.54	- review of the Local Competition First Report . . . . .	Q.17
-Q-		<b>Switching Functions</b>	
-R-		- in an end office (Type 1) interconnection . . . . .	Q.49
<b>Radio Frequency (RF) Network</b>		- in a tandem (Type 2) interconnection . . . . .	Q.44
- as the wireless local loop . . . . .	Q.36	-T-	
- entitlement to recover costs for . . .	Q.36	<b>Tandem Level (Type 2) Interconnection</b>	
<b>Rating and Routing</b>		- defined . . . . .	Q.48
- distinguished . . . . .	Q.59	- separation of rating and routing with . . . . .	Q.59
- separation of . . . . .	Q.60	- effect of converting from Type 1 . .	Q.51
<b>Reciprocal Compensation</b>		<b>Telecommunications Act</b>	
- defined . . . . .	Q.32	- citation . . . . .	Q.1
- entitlement of paging carriers to receive . . . . .	Q.31	- of 1996 . . . . .	Q.5
<b>Reconsideration</b>		<b>Telecommunications Carrier</b>	
- by the FCC of the First Report . . .	Q.62	- obligations of . . . . .	Q.3
<b>Reverse Billing</b>		- defined . . . . .	Q.2
- as an interconnection arrangement .	Q.53	- paging carrier as . . . . .	Q.2
- defined . . . . .	Q.53	<b>Telecommunications Service</b>	
-S-		- defined . . . . .	Q.2
<b>Sections 201/202 of the Act</b>		<b>Telephone Exchange Service</b>	
- interconnection rights created by . . .	Q.7	- paging carriers as providers of . . . . .	Q.5
<b>Sections 251/252 of the Act</b>		- defined . . . . .	Q.5
- interconnection rights created by . . .	Q.8	<b>Terminating Compensation</b>	
<b>Sections 332 of the Act</b>		- entitlement of paging carrier to receive . . . . .	Q.7
- interconnection rights created by . . .	Q.7	- request to negotiate as a prerequisite . . . . .	Q.38
<b>Section 51.703 of the FCC Rules</b>		- reciprocal/mutual defined . . . . .	Q.32
- effective date . . . . .	Q.15	<b>Toll Revenues</b>	
- interconnection rights created by . .	Q.13	- impact of FX lines on . . . . .	Q.56
<b>State Regulation</b>		- LEC entitlement to intra-LATA toll . . . . .	Q.56
- of CMRS rates and entry . . . . .	Q.63		
- preempted . . . . .	Q.13, Q.14		
<b>Supremacy Clause</b>			

**Traffic Flow**

- effect of imbalance on compensation ..... Q.33

**Traffic Sensitive Facility Costs**

- relief of paging carriers from paying ..... Q.22

**Type 1 (End Office) Interconnection**

- defined ..... Q.48
- effect of numbering charges on ... Q.50
- reasons for continuing ..... Q.51
- converting to Type 2 ..... Q.51

**Type 2(Tandem Level) Interconnection**

- defined ..... Q.48
- separation of rating and routing with ..... Q.62
- effect of converting from Type 1 .. Q.51

-U-

**Unbundling**

- rating and routing separation ..... Q.62

**Uneven Traffic Flow**

- effect on compensation ..... Q.33

**Universal Service Fund**

- obligation of paging carriers to contribute ..... Q.3

-V-

-W-

**Wide Area Systems**

- local service over ..... Q.18

-X-

-Y-

-Z-