Witness Scheye asserts that BellSouth will provide ALECs with the proper format for submitting subscriber listings. The procedures for submitting subscriber listings are provided to each ALEC in the ALEC ordering guidelines. In addition, BellSouth states that the directory listing information "will be accorded the same level of confidentiality provided to BellSouth's own directory listing information."

BellSouth states that all agreements negotiated with resellers and facilities-based carriers have included arrangements for the provision of directory listings in the White Pages. Forty-five of these agreements include a separate signed agreement with BAPCO. As of July 11, 1997, ALECs in Florida have submitted over 17,800 directory listings to BellSouth for inclusion in the appropriate white page directories.

In addition, BellSouth states that it has provided the appropriate database format for ALECs to submit directory listing information, and enhanced listings are being made available to ALEC customers at the same terms and conditions offered to BellSouth customers. Witness Scheye also states that since BellSouth's SGAT includes these provisions, it is in compliance with the Act's checklist requirement.

Upon consideration, it appears that BellSouth has corrected the directory listing problems raised by the parties. The problems identified by the parties, for the most part, do not address why BellSouth has not met the requirements of Checklist item viii, but instead address compliance with the directory assistance database which is covered in Checklist item vii, and unbundled network elements which are covered in Checklist item ii. Further, it does not appear that any party has taken issue with BellSouth's SGAT provisions for white page directory listings.

To date, the FCC has not made a determination on whether any Bell Operating Company has met the requirements for white page directory listings, pursuant to Section 271 of the Act. The FCC, however, has established rules regarding white page directory listings which appear to be consistent with the Act. Our review of the record in this proceeding reveals that BellSouth has met the applicable FCC rule requirements.

47 C.F.R. § 51.319 requires incumbent LECs to provide nondiscriminatory access to white page directory listings on an unbundled basis to any requesting telecommunications carrier for the provision of a telecommunications service. We believe BellSouth has met this requirement. As of July 11, 1997, BellSouth had processed almost 18,000 white page directory listings for ALECs in Florida. As stated earlier, MCI, ICI and Sprint have all submitted white page directory listings to BellSouth for publication. Further, ICI and MCI affirmatively state that all of their white page directory listings have been included in the appropriate white pages. MCI and ICI also state that their white page directory listings have been published by BAPCO. For example, MCI's white page directory listings have been published by BAPCO in Boca Raton, Coral Springs, Fort Lauderdale, Homestead, Miami Beach, Miami, Pompano Beach, and Orlando. MCI further states that BellSouth does not distinguish MCI listings in its directories or when MCI listings are provided to a third party.

47 C.F.R. § 51.311 states that the quality of a UNE, as well as the quality of the access to the UNE, that an incumbent LEC provides to a requesting telecommunications carrier shall be the same for all telecommunications carriers requesting access to that network element, and that the quality provided to the ALEC shall be at least equal in quality to that which the incumbent LEC provides to itself. We find that BellSouth has met this requirement. BellSouth has arranged with its publishing affiliate, BAPCO, to publish ALEC subscriber listings according to the same standards as BellSouth's subscribers. This includes the same lead time, timeliness, confidential treatment, format, and content of listings. According to BellSouth, its arrangement with BAPCO is for ALEC subscriber listings to be incorporated and published in the same manner and interfiled with BellSouth's subscriber listings. In addition, neither BellSouth nor BAPCO distinguishes an ALEC's subscriber listings from BellSouth's subscriber listings in their directories. Listings are identified by carrier within BellSouth's directory database. BellSouth states that the reason for identifying the listings by carrier is so BAPCO can provide the ALEC with review pages of subscriber listings upon request. The intervenors have not disputed that BellSouth is providing white page directory listings in the same quality to them, as it provides to itself.

Based on the evidence in the record, we find that BellSouth has provided, and can generally offer, white page directory listings for customers of other carriers' telephone exchange service. We find that BellSouth has demonstrated that it is providing nondiscriminatory access to white page directory listings, in accordance with 47 C.F.R. §51.319 and §51.311. Further, the subscriber listings provided to other carriers have met the definition of "directory listings" as defined in 47 C.F.R. § 51.5. Our determination on this checklist item, however, does not include an analysis on whether BellSouth is providing nondiscriminatory access to the ordering of UNEs and resold services that include white page directory listings, nor do we decide here whether the rates for additional and optional white page directory listings are cost-based. We address these issues in our analysis of checklist items 2 and 14.

I. Nondiscriminatory Access to Telephone Numbers for Assignment to the Other Telecommunications Carrier's Telephone Exchange Service Customers, Pursuant to Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ix).

Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ix), Section 251(b)(3), and 47 C.F.R. § 51.217 require BellSouth as the North American Numbering Plan administrator for its territory to provide nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers to competing telecommunications carriers that is at least equal in quality to the access the LEC provides itself.

Several intervenors indicate that BellSouth has not provided nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers as required by the Act and the FCC rules. AT&T and Sprint point out that as the administrator of telephone numbers in its service area, BellSouth must implement methods and procedures to assure that telephone number assignments are made in a nondiscriminatory fashion. AT&T witness Hamman asserts that these methods and procedures do not exist today. Witness Hamman states that the methods and procedures that BellSouth provides as evidence are the industry standards. The witness states that BellSouth, however, needs to provide the methods and procedures that BellSouth uses for the assignment of telephone numbers.

MCI contends that BellSouth has failed to activate MCI's NXX codes in a timely manner, thereby precluding MCI customers from

reaching BellSouth customers. MCI's witness Gulino asserts that on October 30, 1996, MCI informed BellSouth of the problems with the MCI NXXs. Witness Gulino states that the problem left MCI's customers isolated. Witness Gulino also states that the isolation lasted until November 5, 1996, before BellSouth corrected the problem. Furthermore, witness Gulino maintains that in June of 1997, BellSouth did not load MCI's NXXs into its local switch in Miami causing incoming calls to MCI's customers to receive an all circuits busy recording. MCI notes that BellSouth did correct the problems.

We note that the intervenors raise a number of concerns about the OSS functional capabilities of LENS regarding searches, assignment, reservation, ordering, and selection of telephone numbers. For example, ALECs without an NXX code can only reserve six numbers per order and 100 numbers total, or five percent of the available numbers in any given central office. MCI also states that ALECs do not have access to the ATLAS database used by BellSouth to manage available vanity numbers.

BellSouth witness Milner contends that as the North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator for its territory, BellSouth ensures that ALECs have nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers for assignment to their customers. Witness Scheye states that BellSouth provides numbering resources pursuant to the BellCore Guidelines regarding telephone number assignment. Witness Scheye also states that as the current code administrator, BellSouth has developed over 266 pages of procedures for the assignment of telephone numbers, NXX codes. Furthermore, AT&T witness Hamman confirms that there are methods and procedures for the assignment of telephone numbers that apply equally to all LECs, including BellSouth. Witness Milner asserts that within the procedures it instructs ALECs on how to request assignment of NXX Codes. The witness also asserts that BellSouth processes ALECs' requests for NXX codes in the same manner as it does for its own NXX code requests. Essentially, BellSouth contends that the 140 NXX codes that it has assigned ALECs in Florida clearly demonstrates that it provides nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers pursuant to the industry established procedures. Witness Scheye points out that nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers has not been disputed in the arbitration proceedings. Additionally, several intervenors indicate that BellSouth

adequately fulfilled their NXX code requests. ICI believes that it is receiving nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers.

BellSouth states that in Orlando an MCI NXX code was not activated in a particular switch for some reason. BellSouth witness Scheye asserts that NXX code activation is not an ongoing problem or something that happens often. Witness Scheye states that this was an isolated incident. Witness Scheye indicates that BellSouth has procedures in place to ensure that NXX codes are activated in a timely manner. The witness notes that this is evident because BellSouth has activated almost 500 codes across the region with very few complaints. The witness also states that this proves that BellSouth's procedures are working. BellSouth maintains that MCI attempts to create a dialing parity issue when none exists.

The SGAT indicates that BellSouth provides numbering resources pursuant to the BellCore Guidelines regarding number assignment as discussed above. It also states that an ALEC will be required to complete the NXX code application in accordance with the Industry Carriers Compatibility Forum, Central Office Codes Assignment Guidelines, ICCF 93-0729-010. BellSouth contends that the procedures for providing access to telephone numbers in Florida have been filed with the Commission in Exhibit 32 (Volume 9-1). Additionally, the SGAT specifies that at such time as BellSouth is no longer the NANP Administrator, BellSouth will comply with the final non-appealable guidelines, plan or rules adopted pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 251(e), which addresses the creation or designation by the FCC of the numbering administrator.

Upon consideration, we find that BellSouth as the Numbering Administrator for its territory, ensures that ALECs have nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers for assignment to their customers. BellSouth provides numbering resources pursuant to the BellCore guidelines regarding numbering assignment which are the industry standards. BellSouth filed these guidelines and procedures with us. Furthermore, AT&T witness Hamman asserts that there are methods and procedures for the assignment of telephone numbers that apply equally to all LECs, including BellSouth. Additionally, several intervenors indicate that BellSouth adequately fulfilled their NXX code requests. ICI also notes that BellSouth has provided nondiscriminatory access to telephone

numbers to ICI. We acknowledge MCI's arguments regarding BellSouth's failures to activate NXX codes in a timely manner. We do not believe, based on the evidence in the record, however, that this is an ongoing problem because BellSouth has activated 140 NXX codes in Florida, with very few isolated incidents of NXX code failure. Therefore, based on the testimony, we find that BellSouth has met checklist the requirements of Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ix).

We note that the intervenors do not identify concerns with the proposed SGAT regarding nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers. The proposed SGAT notes that BellSouth filed procedures for providing nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers with the Commission, and within the procedures it discusses the numbering assignment guidelines. Upon consideration, we believe that the proposed SGAT would be sufficient to satisfy checklist item ix.

J. Nondiscriminatory Access to Databases and Associated Signaling Necessary for Call Routing and Completion, Pursuant to Section 271(c)(2)(B)(x).

Section 271(c)(2)(B)(x) of the Act states that RBOCs must, through either access or interconnection, provide or generally offer "nondiscriminatory access to databases and associated signaling necessary for call routing and completion." We find that the scope of this checklist item is limited to access to those databases necessary for call routing and completion, and associated signaling necessary for call routing and completion. Such databases include Line Information Database (LIDB), Toll-Free Number database, Automatic Location Identification/Data Management System (ALI/DMS), AIN database, and selective routing through AIN. Other databases, such as directory assistance databases, while falling into the broader category defined in Section 51.319(e)(2)(i), are not necessary to meet this checklist item.

1. Description of Services

Signaling refers to the service provided by the BellSouth Signaling System 7 (SS7) signaling network. This network is separate from the network that carries voice messages. The signaling network complements the voice network in that it provides for call set-up, call status, call disconnection, and Transaction

Capability Application Part (TCAP) query messaging to databases and AIN services.

Signal Transfer Points (STPs) are signaling message switches that interconnect Signaling Links to route signaling messages between switches and databases. STPs enable the exchange of SS7 messages between switching elements, database elements, and STPs. STPs provide access to various BellSouth network elements, such as local switching, databases, and third-party provided services.

Signaling Links are dedicated transmission paths carrying signaling messages between carrier switches and signaling networks. BellSouth provides connections between a switch or service switching point and a home STP and connections between two STP pairs in different company networks.

Service Control Points (SCPs) are databases that store, provide access, and the ability to manipulate, information required to offer particular services.

The LIDB is a SCP transaction-oriented database that contains records associated with subscriber line numbers and special billing numbers. ALECs can query BellSouth's LIDB for validation of customer calling cards, billed-to-third-number and collect call acceptance. This service is available to ALECs in the same manner as it is currently available to IXCs. Common channel SS7 formats are employed to convey TCAP messages from the customer's network to BellSouth's regional STP. Responses from the LIDB are returned to the same interface with SS7 signaling.

The Toll-Free Number database is a SCP that provides functionality necessary for toll-free number service. This service is provided under two situations: one in which the ALEC has its own switch and only requires access to the SCP database to obtain routing information; and, one in which the customer does not have its own switch and therefore requires both routing information and subsequent routing of the call.

Under the first scenario, BellSouth receives the query and sends it to the SCP, which responds with the appropriate routing information. Call completion is carried out by the ALEC's network. Under the second scenario, the BellSouth network receives the call,

typically over a Feature Group D trunk group, and launches a query to the SCP, which responds with routing information. The BellSouth network then routes the call to the appropriate carrier or telephone number. SS7 signaling is required.

ALI/DMS contains subscriber information used to route calls to the appropriate Public Safety Answering Point. It is based on the Emergency Service Number Code that has been assigned to the caller's address. This service is automatically provided when E911 service is provided for the ALEC, and there is no associated charge in the SGAT.

BellSouth offers ALECs access to its SCP-based AIN through BellSouth's Service Creation Environment (SCE) and Service Management System (SMS). SCE/SMS access allows ALECs to provide AIN services from either BellSouth's switches or their own. It also allows ALECs to create service applications using BellSouth's service creation toolkit, and to deploy those services using BellSouth's service management tools. ALECs will have the same access to SCE/SMS as BellSouth.

AIN Toolkit 1.0 will allow subscribers to access SS7 call information and AIN processing capabilities to create customized telephone services to meet the needs of end users. AIN Toolkit 1.0 will support these major classes of applications; routing, incoming call screening, outbound call screening, routing, call analysis reports, or a combination of these.

The BellSouth-provided SCE resides in the BellSouth AIN SMS. AIN SMS Access 1.0 provides the interface that allows ALEC personnel to access the SCE to create or modify AIN service applications. AIN SMS Access 1.0 also provides the capability for the ALEC to add or modify service subscription information, view service related information, and access reports. AIN SMS Access 1.0 is required in conjunction with AIN Toolkit 1.0.

Selective routing allows ALECs to identify and selectively route subscriber calls from BellSouth's switch and services to an ALEC's switch and services. This would be accomplished using the same digits dialed by BellSouth subscribers.

In addition, calls may be selectively routed to BellSouth platforms allowing BellSouth to provide ALEC-branded services on behalf of the ALEC. Such services include operator assistance, directory assistance or repair services. Selective routing is provided through the use of line class codes, which are subject to exhaustion.

There are two methods that an ILEC can use to perform selective routing. The first method is through line class codes. This is the method this Commission has directed BellSouth to use to provide selective routing to ALECs. Line class codes are a resource within the switch itself and limited in number. BellSouth's witness Milner notes that the quantity of these line class codes can be expanded with vendor participation. The second method is still in development and is considered to be the long-term solution for selective routing by BellSouth. It relies on the Advanced Intelligent Network. Because the two methods rely on different elements within the network, it appears that they fall under different checklist items. Selective routing provided through line class codes is based on a feature, function or capability of the switch and is addressed in our analysis of checklist item 7. MCI witness Martinez also noted that he "normally" would not categorize selective routing as a database in testimony before this Commission. On the other hand, selective routing provided through the Advanced Intelligent Network is based on a database to provide routing functions, and therefore we address it here.

2. Status of Provision of Services

Signaling

As of June 1, 1997, one ALEC has interconnected to BellSouth's signaling network (SS7) directly. Seven other ALECs have accessed the signaling network through a hub provider.

LIDB

BellSouth has indicated that the number of validation calls from outside its network from January through April 1997 totaled approximately 129 million. These queries include all queries from customers other than BellSouth's end users. BellSouth witness

Scheye noted that while BellSouth has LIDB agreements in place with several ALECs, no ALEC has requested access. He suggests that ALECs may be gaining access through an IXC or a third-party hub provider.

800 Database

BellSouth noted that the quantity of non-BellSouth queries to its Toll-Free Number databases totaled 8 million from January through April 1997. This value is for BellSouth's entire nine state service territory. BellSouth witness Scheye notes, however, that as of August 15, 1997, no ALEC had requested SS7 access to its 800 database. This would suggest that the source of access is through a third-party provider.

ALI/DMS

ALI/DMS is part of the E911 database that routes emergency calls to the proper Public Safety Answering Point. Seven ALECs are sending mechanized updates to BellSouth's E911 Database in Florida. Eighty-eight E911 trunks were in service as of June 1, 1997.

AIN

BellSouth's open AIN had not been accessed by any ALEC throughout its entire service territory as of July 1, 1997. BellSouth noted, however, that there are two market trials underway in Florida.

Selective Routing

Only one ALEC has requested selective routing using line class codes in BellSouth switches in Georgia. BellSouth witness Milner noted that testing of selective routing using AIN will likely begin in the first quarter of 1998 in Louisiana.

AT&T witness Hamman states that the methods and procedures in place are not sufficient to show that BellSouth is providing nondiscriminatory access to databases and signaling necessary for call routing and completion. AT&T argues that specified testing has not been conducted to determine how AIN access will be provided. Specifically, AT&T contends that the issue of mediated access has not been resolved. Additionally, AT&T objects to the

prices for databases and signaling because they have not been approved by this Commission.

ICI witness Strow states that the AIN Toolkit BellSouth has made available does not contain the functions to allow ALECs to create two specific AIN services that BellSouth currently provides. She also states that customer service numbers that were used to connect BellSouth's customers to BellSouth's customer service representatives were blocked from ICI's customers. Finally, she asserts that because BellSouth has not yet provided ICI the UNEs it requested, BellSouth has effectively not provided the databases and associated signaling necessary for call routing and completion.

Both MCI witnesses Gulino and Martinez argue that BellSouth has not meet the requirements of this checklist item for several reasons. MCI witness Gulino asserts that ALECs cannot get access to BellSouth's AIN database, or create programs via BellSouth's SCE/SMS. MCI states that it had looked into the requirements for BellSouth's AIN Toolkit approximately two years ago and had an AIN service on BellSouth's platform. Because of the reluctance of other RBOCs to provide this kind of access, MCI discontinued discussions relating to the AIN Toolkit. Another area of contention relates to the data necessary for Directory Services listings for independent telephone companies and other ALECs. MCI points out that page 27 of the SGAT states that BellSouth will provide LEC-to-LEC Common Channel Signaling (CCS) to an ALEC, except for call return. MCI believes that this restriction is in violation of the Act.

MCI witness Martinez's primary complaint, however, relates to access to BellSouth's Toll-Free Number database. Witness Martinez describes three possible scenarios and their associated concerns. In the first scenario, the ALEC switch does not have the necessary functionality to be a signal point (SP) on the SS7 network. Martinez complains that BellSouth requires that the ALEC purchase the SS7 network element to access the database. He notes that there is a tariffed service offered to IXCs that provides access to this database. In the second scenario, the ALEC is SS7-capable, and the ALEC makes a query through the ILEC's STP/SCP. In the SGAT, however, BellSouth indicated that for 800 Access Screening, ALECs will not use switched access Feature Group D Service. This is an issue because MCI witness Martinez notes that to complete calls in

this scenario, Feature Group D signaling must be used. In the third case, the ALEC is SS7-capable and makes the query through a third-party hub provider's STP/SCP. Here, the routing of the call would be virtually the same as the second scenario. The only difference is that the database query charge is levied by the third-party provider.

TCG witness Hoffmann mentions, in the context of the first checklist item, that BellSouth had failed to confirm SS7 point code translations. Specifically, BellSouth needs to load this information into its switches so that the SS7 messages know where to go to connect to TCG's SS7 network. Witness Hoffmann contends that without this confirmation, there is no assurance that services marketed and provided by TCG will function properly when customers are connected.

BellSouth responds to the concerns of AT&T and MCI, relating to AIN access, by pointing to books 10-1 through 10-5 which contain ordering, provisioning and maintenance procedures, as well as performance and reliability standards. In relation to performance measurements, AT&T has only requested measurements for LIDB. BellSouth has provided two performance measurements and is in the process of developing two additional measurements.

BellSouth determined that it did not need to conduct tests for LIDB and toll-free number databases because they have been available on an interconnection basis for IXCs. BellSouth provides several reasons for not testing SS7. Its primary concern was that the existing SS7 network is a real-time signaling network and cannot be used to simulate testing. Testing could result in "crashing" the network, affecting all interconnected customers. BellSouth notes that ordering and provisioning of unbundled signaling for ALECs is no different than the process for an IXC. The only difference is in the billing. Surrogate usage billing is applicable in all of the ALEC contracts. The surrogate usage billing will be accomplished by adding a Universal Service Order Code (USOC) to the accounts and the rate file. Except for the new USOC, the unbundled signaling process will not change.

BellSouth has provided summary test results documenting end-to-end test results for both AIN SMS access and AIN Toolkit. In both cases, test calls were completed and billing records were

generated. The billing data that was generated reflected rates expected from the contract file. Test call results were also provided by BellSouth for selective call routing.

BellSouth's position relating to blocking of calls to customer service numbers raised by ICI was that these calls were being billed on a pay per call basis. The customer making the call would receive the bill from BellSouth. ICI customers would have to contact ICI service representatives through an ICI number. ICI sought interconnection from BellSouth in a manner that would allow its end users to dial and complete calls to these numbers. This capability was requested by ICI's business customers who wanted to allow their employees to be able to make contact with BellSouth regarding their residential service while at work.

BellSouth witnesses Milner and Scheye state that they were unaware of any AIN Toolkit functions that BellSouth uses itself that are not made available to ALECs. BellSouth witness Milner expresses the position that the intent of open AIN architecture was to encourage other companies to create AIN services that would run on BellSouth's platform. Once the services were created, BellSouth could purchase a license for the service, as opposed to developing a similar service itself. Hence, it would be illogical not to provide a full range of tools for other companies to develop services for the BellSouth network. One company in Florida has already used the toolkit to develop an AIN service.

In relation to MCI's concern about access to BellSouth's Toll-Free Number database, BellSouth reiterates that SS7 is a requirement to gain access. The service that is offered to IXCs is the exact same service with identical requirements.

The concerns relating to the SGAT that MCI had expressed have been addressed. With respect to 800 Access Screening, BellSouth witness Scheye contends that the wording in the SGAT was meant to indicate that ALECs are not required to use feature group D service. The other SGAT issue that MCI noted related to BellSouth's statement that Common Channel Signaling would not be made available for call return. BellSouth witness Milner indicates that the intent was to show that Common Channel Signaling was not required on a call return activation. Specifically, call return is a switch based feature. The calling telephone number is stored in the

switch's memory, and when a certain sequence of digits is entered, the switch returns the call. It does not require Common Channel Signaling for the execution of call return.

AT&T's experience relating to this issue was limited to the concept testing AT&T conducted with BellSouth. AT&T witness Hamman readily admits that the test calls that were conducted were completed, but complained that the call details were not provided. AT&T noted that it did not test for access to the related databases that are required for this checklist item. AT&T witness Hamman indicated in deposition that the test calls completed were very basic and did not test these advanced features. Because BellSouth did not provide the call details, AT&T did not feel compelled to continue the testing process.

AT&T's complaint relating to the unavailability of call details is not relevant to this issue. While the call details would be required to verify proper billing, it is not a requirement for this checklist item. We address billing and the associated prices in the context of checklist item ii. Only access is required to meet the requirements found in this issue. Because access to the signaling necessary to complete a call was provided, BellSouth would appear to meet this portion of this checklist item.

AT&T indicated that BellSouth has not resolved the issue of mediated access to its AIN. This assertion can only be found in AT&T's post hearing brief. MCI witness Martinez, however, correctly notes that the "... tool kit is a form of accessing through a mediated device into a foreign SCP." Moreover, MCI indicated that mediated access is necessary to protect both parties from damaging the other party's network. By Order No. PSC-96-1579-FOF-TP, we found that mediated access to the SCP may be necessary in some circumstances. Furthermore, there is evidence in the record indicating that testing of the AIN Toolkit and AIN SMS Access were successfully conducted.

ICI's experience relating to this checklist item is limited to interconnection of its own switch. In those instances, ICI contends that it has not experienced any problems with respect to access to BellSouth's databases necessary for call routing and completion. ICI admits it has had only limited discussions with BellSouth regarding local switching. While ICI has requested local

switching, ICI has not received it in the manner it had requested from BellSouth. Hence, ICI claims it has had no opportunity to access BellSouth's databases and signaling resources. ICI's complaint relating to databases and signaling is only based on its dissatisfaction with purchasing local switching from BellSouth, not on its access to databases and signaling necessary for call routing and completion. We address UNEs in Section VI.B. of this Order.

We note that ICI confirmed that its concern that BellSouth customer service numbers were being blocked to ICI customers has been resolved. Accordingly, since this is no longer an issue, we will not consider it in determining whether BellSouth has met this checklist item.

BellSouth did note that some AIN services were in place before the existence of the toolkit, and that an ALEC can create an AIN service without using an AIN Toolkit. Furthermore, BellSouth's witness Milner testified that he is unaware of any software creation method that is available to BellSouth that is not available through the toolkit. Even if an ALEC chooses not to develop its own AIN services, it could enter into a licensing agreement to purchase AIN services or simply resell the services. BellSouth indicated that Davel Communications has already created an AIN service with its AIN Toolkit. Furthermore, MCI has, at one point in time, created an AIN service and placed it on BellSouth's platform. Based on the evidence presented here, we cannot conclude that access has been denied for ALECs to create and provide AIN service to their customers.

BellSouth's explanation that access to its toll-free number database requires SS7 compatibility is sound. BellSouth has explained that because the database is an extension of the SS7 signaling network, any firm wanting to use it must have SS7 capability. These requirements are the same for IXCs or ALECs. MCI currently gains access to a toll-free number database through a third-party provider.

BellSouth's explanations relating to the issues addressed by MCI about the SGAT appear reasonable. For clarity, however, BellSouth has changed its SGAT to reflect that ALECs are not required to use Feature Group D service. BellSouth witness Milner's reasoning about why call return would not be provided in

conjunction with Common Channel Signaling also appears reasonable. He explained that because call return is a switch based feature, Common Channel Signaling is not required to activate the feature.

While MCI has had some experience with BellSouth's AIN structure, its experience is two years old. Whether this still reflects the same tools available now is unknown. What is known is that MCI was successful in creating an AIN service. Furthermore, MCI has not recently requested direct access to BellSouth's AIN. MCI states that it does not appear that an ALEC can get access to BellSouth's AIN database today, or create programs via its SCE/SMS. Witness Gulino concludes this because many carriers have barely implemented these features within their own networks, much less interconnected to others' AIN networks. There is no indication, however, that he has any personal knowledge of BellSouth's AIN database or its capabilities.

MCI witness Martinez indicated in his deposition that MCI had requested and received LIDB. This access was tested by both parties when they established connection. MCI had also requested and received signaling network elements such as STPs and SCPs.

Within the context of interconnection, TCG's witness Hoffmann indicates that, despite numerous requests, BellSouth has not confirmed that TCG's point codes have been loaded into BellSouth's switches and SS7 signaling transfer points. We believe that while BellSouth would be required to load the point codes into its switches and STPs, BellSouth is not required to indicate to TCG every switch and STP in BellSouth's territory where the data has been loaded. If TCG orders SS7 from BellSouth and provides the point codes for the area in which it wants to compete, BellSouth is required to load that data into its switches and STPs for that area. That must be done before BellSouth indicates that it has filled TCG's order for SS7. Otherwise the switch or STP will not have the information to know where to route the signal to TCG's STP. Only in this instance would BellSouth fail this checklist item.

BellSouth describes ALI/DMS in its SGAT as the system that contains subscriber information used to route calls to the appropriate Public Safety Answering Point. Because this portion of the E911 system is a database that services the function of routing

calls, ALI/DMS is incorporated in this checklist item. BellSouth did not provide a separate binder for this portion of the E911 system in Exhibit 32, WKM-1. Information relating to how access is provided to the database that provides this function, however, can be found within binder 7-7, which addresses 911 and E911 in general. None of the intervenors expressed concern relating to access to this database.

3. Conclusion

Only ACSI, AT&T, ICI, and MCI provided testimony or witnesses to address the issues relating to these databases and associated signaling necessary for call routing and completion. In ACSI's summary of its position on this issue, ACSI reiterated that it does not have any experience in Florida. While TCG's witness Hoffmann briefly discussed TCG's concerns about SS7 point codes, it was in the context of interconnection. Thus, we conclude that access to the signaling necessary for call routing and completion has been provided. While some intervenors have complained that they have not received the call details or that they have not received other network elements, they have received access, as evidenced in their ability to send and receive calls through BellSouth's network.

While the amount of information available in the record regarding ALI/DMS was limited, none of the intervenors expressed any concerns about this database. There was also limited evidence in the record on Selective routing through AIN. Selective routing through AIN is not currently offered and is only in the developmental stages. BellSouth is required by this Commission to provide selective routing using attributes of the switch (line class codes). We address this in our analysis of checklist item vii. Only MCI and ICI requested LIDB. Both companies indicate that access has been provided. Two intervenors indicate that they are using third-party hub providers for access to databases associated with this checklist item. MCI indicated it has access to a Toll-Free Number database through a third-party provider, and ACSI specified it had ordered AIN through a third-party. Evidence in the record indicates that none of the intervenors have requested access to BellSouth's SMS.

Based on the evidence presented in the record of this proceeding, we find that BellSouth has met the requirements of Section 271(c)(2)(B)(x).

K. Provision of Number Portability Pursuant to Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xi).

Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xi) requires that until the date the Commission issues regulations pursuant to Section 251 to require permanent number portability, the Bell operating company (BOC) must provide interim telecommunications number portability through remote call forwarding (RCF), direct inward dialing trunks (DID), or other comparable arrangements, with as little impairment of functioning, quality, reliability, and convenience as possible. After that date, the BOC must be in full compliance with such regulations.

Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xi), Section 251(b)(2), 47 C.F.R. § 52.7, and FCC-Order No. 96-286 require the BOC to provide interim number portability through remote call forwarding, direct inward dialing, or other comparable methods. We note that by Order No. PSC-96-1579-FOF-TP, we required BellSouth to provide RCF, DID, RI-PH, and LERG, if requested.

AT&T and MCI contend that BellSouth does not have the necessary methods and procedures in place to provide any requesting ALEC with number portability. AT&T witness Hamman asserts that AT&T must have the confidence that number portability will work and will be implemented with as little impairment of features, functioning, quality, and inconvenience as possible. Witness Hamman states that the effectiveness of the methods and procedures are important because AT&T will rely on BellSouth's network to provide interim number portability for its customers until the industry solution for permanent number portability is available. Witness Hamman further states that the methods and procedures should encompass testing, operational experience, and performance measurement. The witness also notes that these factors are essential for number portability to function capably.

AT&T maintains that number portability that is nondiscriminatory is not currently available because RCF and DID are not sufficient to address the needs of large customers.

Witness Hamman asserts that in its interconnection agreement with BellSouth, AT&T requested interim number portability via Route Indexing-Portability Hub (RI-PH) for its large customers. Witness Hamman contends that this method will permit conservation of telephone numbers to avoid an area code split. Witness Hamman argues that AT&T ordered RI-PH in Georgia, but BellSouth has yet to provide the service. Witness Hamman states that AT&T has not formally requested RI-PH in Florida because BellSouth has not provided it in Georgia. Witness Hamman points out that if RI-PH does not work in Georgia, AT&T does not expect it to work in Florida. The witness, however, notes that AT&T and BellSouth are working to establish methods for ordering and implementing of RI-PH. He contends that the provisioning of RI-PH will require significant coordination between AT&T and BellSouth. Witness Hamman states that in Georgia the parties are scheduled to perform operational testing of RI-PH in October. Witness Hamman indicates that RI-PH will not be suitable for use by AT&T's high volume customers until all operational testing is complete.

MCI contends that it has experienced numerous problems with the interim number portability cutovers. For example, BellSouth disconnected a customer's DID circuits two weeks prior to a cutover scheduled for August 8, 1997. Also, BellSouth disconnected a customer's DID circuits at 4:30 p.m. when it was scheduled for 2:00 a.m. the following morning. Witness Gulino asserts that MCI must have the ability to postpone or stop scheduled cutovers, for any reason. Witness Gulino notes that the cutover conversion process is the main contributing factor to number portability problems. The witness maintains that the errors in the conversion process sometimes cause BellSouth to ignore a postponement request and make the cutover. He states that completing the cutover causes BellSouth to forward the customer's working BellSouth number to an MCI number that is nonoperational. Consequently, Witness Gulino contends that a cutover conversion process without manual intervention would eliminate the majority of the problems.

Sprint contends that during a three week period from May 19 to June 6, 1997, its customers encountered three significant service interruptions related to receiving calls directly through BellSouth's network. Sprint's witness Closz indicates that translation errors made by BellSouth interrupted local number portability functionality. Sprint notes that in each case its

customers could receive calls directly to their Sprint numbers, but calls being call-forwarded through the BellSouth network could not be completed. For instance, in the first occurrence, on May 19, 1997, an all circuit busy condition was created when interoffice traffic was reversed in error by BellSouth in conjunction with the installation of additional trunks. Sprint's customers had their service interrupted for three hours. The second occurrence, on May 30, 1997, exposed a translation problem in BellSouth's local switch which caused routed calls to encounter "no longer in service" or "can't be completed as dialed" messages. This service interruption occurred for seven hours before BellSouth corrected the problem. More recently, on June 6, 1997, the simulated facilities group was removed from translation in error by BellSouth, resulting in calls to Sprint's customers being blocked for over two hours. Witness Closz asserts that all of the problems are documented in Exhibit 88. Sprint states that these errors by BellSouth have resulted in service deficiencies that have damaged its relationships with its customers. Sprint further states that the interruptions impede its ability to establish itself as a local service competitor in Florida. Additionally, witness Closz notes that the translation errors have been corrected, but the underlying permanent process is still being addressed. Witness Closz also notes that the source of the translation errors that interrupted the number portability functions was human error.

AT&T notes that BellSouth agreed to provide RI-PH in their interconnection agreement, but this number portability arrangement is not available in the SGAT. AT&T further notes that an ALEC ordering from the SGAT could only obtain RI-PH through the bona fide request process. Therefore, AT&T contends that since BellSouth agreed to provide RI-PH, there is no reason for BellSouth to not make it generally available in the SGAT.

BellSouth states that it provides number portability through RCF or DID, at the election of the ALEC. RCF is an existing switch-based service that redirects calls within the telephone network. DID allows calls to be routed over a dedicated facility to the ALEC switch that serves the subscriber. BellSouth asserts, however, that any party that wants a form of interim number portability that differs from the methods included in the SGAT may request it via the bona fide request process.

BellSouth witness Milner states that BellSouth has provided technical service descriptions outlining RCF and DID. Witness Milner also states that BellSouth has procedures for ordering, provisioning, and maintaining these services. Witness Milner asserts that these methods and procedures are located in Exhibit 32, Volume 11-1. Witness Milner contends that the methods and procedures ensure that interim number portability is functionally available from BellSouth. The witness notes that this is evident because as of June 10, 1997, BellSouth has ported 2,484 business directory numbers and 14 residence directory numbers in Florida using interim number portability.

BellSouth states that the Act does not require multiple forms of interim number portability to meet the checklist. BellSouth contends that ALECs using the SGAT would utilize RCF and DID because these are the only methods that have been included in the Statement. BellSouth witness Scheye asserts that any party that wants a different form of interim number portability from the methods included in the SGAT may request them via the Bona Fide Request Process. Witness Scheye, however, notes that in its negotiated agreement with AT&T, BellSouth agreed to provide multiple forms of interim number portability, which include RI-PH and LERG. BellSouth witness Milner points out that RI-PH is a form of number portability where the intercompany traffic is delivered from a "hub" location, typically the access tandem, rather than delivered from each local switching office. Witness Milner maintains that the technical feasibility of RI-PH was confirmed in BellSouth's lab in November 1996. Consequently, witness Milner indicates that BellSouth does not understand why AT&T has raised RI-PH as an issue when BellSouth has indicated its willingness and capability to provide RI-PH upon AT&T's request or any other ALEC. Thus, witness Milner contends that AT&T is not convinced that BellSouth can provide RI-PH, which is difficult for BellSouth to demonstrate since AT&T has not formally requested it. Additionally, witness Milner states that RI-PH is functionally available if the ALEC has its own switches; however, BellSouth is not aware of any switches in Florida that AT&T operates.

BellSouth's witness Milner maintains that BellSouth will coordinate implementation of number portability with loop installation. Witness Milner states that the coordination requires that BellSouth make a switch translation change, referred to as a

"recent change" to the customer's line. Witness Milner notes that the recent change places RCF on the customer's telephone number. Witness Milner contends that when the BellSouth technician enters the recent change request into the system, that request is queued with other changes that are routinely made to the switch's memory. The witness asserts that should MCI request a postponement too late in the process, BellSouth will complete the recent change transaction, which forwards calls to the non-working MCI number. Witness Milner indicates that the problem is caused by a situation in which MCI notifies BellSouth too late in the cutover process to prevent disruption of the customer's service. Consequently, witness Milner notes that the solution to the problem is closer coordination between BellSouth and MCI when MCI wants to postpone or cancel a number portability cutover.

BellSouth contends that on three separate occasions translation errors it made interrupted local number portability functionality so that Sprint's customers could not receive calls call-forwarded through the BellSouth network. Witness Milner asserts that the problem occurs when the translation field referred to as a simulated facilities group (SFG) value is set too low. Witness Milner states that the incorrect value causes some forwarded calls to be blocked. Witness Milner further states that the SFG is a numeric value that indicates the number of calls that can be ported simultaneously from the BellSouth switch to the ALEC switch. Witness Milner, however, notes that since the interruptions occurred, BellSouth's translation technicians have taken additional training to ensure that the translations for SFGs are made correctly. Thus, the witness maintains that the problem has been totally rectified given the procedural changes that BellSouth instituted.

The SGAT defines Service Provider Number Portability (SPNP) as an arrangement which allows an end user customer who switches service providers to keep the same telephone number. SPNP is available only within the same serving wire center. The SGAT further states that SPNP is available through RCF or DID, at the election of the ALEC. The SGAT states that BellSouth will provide number portability with minimum impairment of functionality, quality, reliability and convenience. The SGAT also notes that the

guidelines for ordering and provisioning are set out in the Local Interconnection and Facility Based Ordering Guide, Section XV.

We note that WorldCom raised arguments regarding the sharing of terminating access charges paid by the IXCs on calls forwarded as a result of RCF or other comparable number portability arrangements. To date, we have not delineated a specific distribution methodology for the sharing of terminating access charges with the use of interim number portability. We have stated that parties should negotiate the methodology, and if unsuccessful, request arbitration. Thus, we find that this issue is not ripe for decision at this time.

As discussed above, the intervenors argue that BellSouth does not have the necessary methods and procedures in place to satisfy all ALEC requests for number portability. AT&T witness Hamman asserted that the methods and procedures are important because AT&T will rely on BellSouth's network to provide number portability to its customers. Witness Hamman further stated that the methods and procedures should include testing, operational experience, and performance measurements. Conversely, BellSouth asserts that it does provide the necessary methods and procedures for ordering, provisioning, and maintaining number portability. Based on our review of the evidence, we find that the intervenors' arguments are insufficient for us to conclude that BellSouth is not providing the necessary methods and procedures for requesting ALECs to obtain number portability.

MCI argues that it has experienced a number of problems with number portability cutovers. MCI points out its customers have experienced several service interruptions because of cutover scheduling conflicts with BellSouth. BellSouth states that service interruption occurs when MCI notifies BellSouth too late in the cutover conversion process. BellSouth also states that closer coordination between BellSouth and MCI should solve the underlying problem. We believe both MCI and BellSouth present valid arguments regarding number portability cutovers. Consequently, we find that the solution to the ongoing problem is closer coordination of number portability cutover postponements and cancellations between the parties.

Sprint notes that on three separate occasions translation errors made by BellSouth interrupted its local number portability functionality. BellSouth confirms that the service interruptions did occur. BellSouth states that the service interruptions were caused by its technicians setting the SFG value too low, which blocked calls being forwarded through its network. BellSouth maintains that it has corrected the problem by requiring its technicians to take additional training. We acknowledge Sprint's arguments regarding the service interruption problems; however, we do not believe that this is an ongoing problem.

AT&T states that it ordered RI-PH in Georgia, but that BellSouth has not yet provided the service. AT&T asserts that if RI-PH does not work in Georgia, that it does not expect the service to work in Florida. BellSouth states that it provides interim number portability primarily through RCF and DID, the arrangements that the Act and the FCC endorse. BellSouth also notes that AT&T has not requested RI-PH in Florida. We note that the Act states that BOCs shall provide interim number portability through RCF, DID or other comparable arrangements. By Order No. PSC-96-1579-FOF-TP, we determined that LERG and RI-PH are technically feasible and required BellSouth to provide these methods and RCF and DID upon request. There is no mention of LERG in this record, and RI-PH has not been requested to date in Florida. Thus, we cannot conclude that BellSouth is unable to provide these interim number portability solutions at this time.

Upon consideration, we find that as of the hearing in this docket, BellSouth has provided interim number portability upon request. Although there have been problems associated with the provisioning of interim number portability, it appears that those problems have been addressed. Accordingly, we find that BellSouth has met the requirements of Section 271(c)(2)(b)(xi).

L. Provision of Local Dialing Parity Pursuant to Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xii).

Section 271(c)(2)(B) of the Act states that access or interconnection provided or generally offered by a Bell operating company to other telecommunications carriers meets the requirements of this subparagraph if such access and interconnection includes all of the checklist items (i)- (xiv). Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xii)

requires a BOC to provide "nondiscriminatory access to such services or information as necessary to allow the requesting carrier to implement local dialing parity in accordance with the requirements of section 251(b)(3)."

Section 251 (b)(3), in turn, imposes on all LECs the duty to provide dialing parity to competing providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service with "nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance, and directory listing, with no unreasonable dialing delays."

Dialing parity is defined in Section 3 (15) of the Act as:

> The term 'dialing parity' means that a person that is not an affiliate of a local exchange carrier is able to provide telecommunications services in such a manner that customers have the ability to route automatically, without the use of any access code, their telecommunications to the telecommunications services provider of the customer's designation from among 2 or more telecommunications services providers (including such local exchange carrier).

Section 251(b)(3) of the Act requires that BellSouth provide dialing parity to ALECs and nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance, and directory listing with no unreasonable dialing delays. We, however, address dialing parity as it is defined in Section 3 (15) of the Act for purposes of checklist item xii.

The "local dialing parity" addressed in this checklist item requires BOCs to provide subscribers the ability to dial the same number of digits to place a local call, without the use of an access code, regardless of their choice of local service provider. BellSouth's witness Scheye explained that the ALECs' customers will be able to dial a 7 or 10-digit number to make a local call, just as a customer located in BellSouth's local calling area. While the ALEC's switch determines how the ALEC's end users dial specific calls, BellSouth asserts that it will interconnect with the ALEC so that identical 7 and 10-digit dialing is possible.