

ment of advanced telecommunications services.<sup>45</sup> Under this separate affiliate scheme, any affiliate providing DSL services will have to buy UNEs and collocate under the same terms that competing providers currently operate, thus forcing the ILECs to participate on a level playing field. In such a situation, the DSL solutions offered by the affiliates will be more likely to derive from the same wholesale input costs as competing providers.<sup>46</sup>

ACI and FirstWorld do caution that the affiliate option will not reduce and or eliminate the opportunity for imposing price squeezes. An ILEC, even in an affiliate situation, would still have the opportunity to blur the lines between ILEC and affiliate on UNE and collocation costs, thus offering their affiliates prices that are lower than those offered to competitors. Since the effectiveness of the affiliate scheme as a check against price squeezes depends on affiliate safeguard that the Commission has yet to determine, any action by the Commission to defer its authority over Respondents' DSL tariffs to the states, as such action would be premature.

### **III. CLASSIFYING RESPONDENTS' SERVICES AS INTERSTATE NEITHER INVOKES MUTUAL COMPENSATION CONCERNS NOR DIMINISHES ILECS' OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE UNEs, INCLUDING DSL-CAPABLE LOOPS, UNDER THE ACT**

Some parties have erroneously argued that classifying and tariffing Respondents' services as interstate would allow ILECs to avoid their obligations to pay mutual or reciprocal compensation<sup>47</sup> to CLECs for the origination and termination of "dial-up" calls from end users to ISPs.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Advanced Services NPRM ¶83-88.

<sup>46</sup> Implementation of the Non-Accounting Safeguards of Sections 271 and 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and Regulatory Treatment of LEC Provision of Interexchange Services Originating in the LEC's Local Exchange Area, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 18877 (1996). "If a BOC charges its competitors prices for inputs that are higher than the prices charges, or effectively charged, to the BOC's affiliate, then the BOC can create a 'price squeeze.' In that circumstance, the BOC affiliate could lower its retail price to reflect its unfair cost advantage, and competing providers would be forced either to match the price reduction and absorb profit margin reductions or main their retail prices at existing levels and accept reductions in their market shares. If the price squeeze was severe enough and continued long enough, the BOC affiliate's market share could become so large, and the competitors so weakened, that that affiliate could unilaterally raise and sustain a price above competitive levels by restricting its output."

<sup>47</sup> Section 251 of the 1996 Act requires that LECs "establish reciprocal compensation arrangements for the transport and termination of telecommunication services." 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(5).

This is simply not the case. Rather, as noted above DSL technology can be used to provide both interstate and intrastate services, and in the ILECs' application is used to provision a dedicated special access service. Thus, a finding that Respondents' DSL services are jurisdictionally interstate will not prevent CLECs from collecting mutual compensation in the instances where DSL technology is used in conjunction with UNEs to provide intrastate services. More importantly, a Commission decision to classify these DSL services as interstate special access will obviously have no impact on mutual compensation for switched, dial-up Internet traffic delivered to ISPs over the PSTN, to which the "10% rule" is plainly inapplicable. Consequently, as GTE observes, there is no conflict between classifying DSL services as interstate and the many state commission decisions requiring ILECs to pay mutual compensation on Internet traffic delivered to ISP on a switched basis over local exchange services.<sup>49</sup>

Nor is there any conflict between the classification of these DSL services as jurisdictionally interstate and the ability of CLECs to use unbundled loops and other UNEs for the provision of competing DSL services. The Commission has made clear that UNEs can be used for the provision of either interstate or intrastate services, for instance in the provision of interstate switched access services. At this sensitive point in the development of DSL competition, any ambiguity on this point could provide the ILECs with increased incentives to delay and obstruct interconnection by CLECs, because DSL requires access to unbundled loops, collocation and other UNEs. Therefore, ACI and FirstWorld urge that the Commission expressly reaffirm the obligation of ILECs to provide UNEs, including DSL-capable loops, for the provision of interstate DSL services<sup>50</sup> The Commission has already explained that ILECs must unbundle DSL-

---

<sup>48</sup> ALTS Petition on GTE's ADSL tariff at 9; e\*spire communications Petition on GTE's ADSL tariff at 2.

<sup>49</sup> GTE Direct Case at 7.

<sup>50</sup> Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, Memorandum and Order, CC Docket No. 98-147 (rel. Aug. 7, 1998).

compatible loops for use by CLECs in offering DSL services.<sup>51</sup> The final order in these investigations should reaffirm that this unbundling obligation exists regardless of the jurisdictional classification of the DSL services provided by the CLEC, including the use of DSL technology for offering interstate services.

---


<sup>51</sup> Advanced Services NPRM ¶ 53.

CONCLUSION

For all these reasons, the Commission should (i) classify the ILEC Respondents' DSL services as interstate special access; (ii) retain its tariffing authority over interstate DSL services, without deferring to state commissions; (iii) address ILEC DSL price squeezes by rejecting interstate DSL tariffs reflecting retail rates inconsistent with UNE inputs costs, allowing ILECs the choice of either lowering their UNE rates or eliminating the cross-subsidization of their retail DSL services; and (iv) expressly reaffirm the obligation of ILECs to provide UNEs, including DSL-capable loops, for the provision of interstate services.

Respectfully submitted,

ACI CORP. AND FIRSTWORLD  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

By: 


Kevin Timpane  
Esther H. Rosenthal  
FirstWorld Communications, Inc.  
9333 Genesee Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92121  
619.552.8010

Jeffrey Blumenfeld  
Glenn B. Manishin  
Lisa N. Anderson  
Stephanie A. Joyce  
Blumenfeld & Cohen—Technology Law Group  
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
202.955.6300

*Counsel for ACI Corp. and FirstWorld  
Communications, Inc.*

Dated: September 21, 1998

I, Amy E. Wallace, do hereby certify that on this 21st day of September, 1998, that I have served a copy of the foregoing document \*by hand delivery and U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, on the following persons:

  
Amy E. Wallace

\*Kathryn C. Brown  
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau  
FCC  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 500  
Washington, DC 20554

\*James D. Schlichting  
Chief, Competitive Pricing Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
FCC  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Judith A. Nitsche  
Chief, Tariff and Price Analysis Branch  
Common Carrier Bureau  
FCC  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Jane Jackson  
Chief, Competitive Pricing Division  
FCC  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518  
Washington, DC 20554

\*ITS  
1231 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

John F. Raposa  
GTE Service Corporation  
600 Hidden Ridge  
HQE03J27  
Irving, TX 75038

Gail L. Polivy  
GTE Service Corporation  
1850 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20036

R. Michael Senkowski  
Gregory J. Vogt  
Bryan N. Tramont  
Wiley, Rein & Fielding  
1776 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

J. Manning Lee  
Teleport Communications Group, Inc.  
Two Teleport Drive, Suite 300  
Staten Island, NY 10311

Donna M. Lampert  
Frank W. Lloyd  
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky & Popeo  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004-2608

Richard J. Metzger  
Association for Local Telecommunications Services  
888 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20006

Edward A. Yorkgitis  
Jonathan E. Canis  
Kelley Drye & Warren  
1200 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Fifth Floor  
Washington, DC 20036

Bernarad Chao  
Covad Communications Company  
3560 Bassett Street  
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Barbara A. Dooley  
Commercial Internet eXchange Association  
1041 Sterling Road, Suite 104A  
Herndon, VA 20170

Alan Buzacott  
MCI Telecommunications Corporation  
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Michael T. Weirich  
Oregon Public Utility Commission  
1162 Court Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310

Richard M. Rindler  
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered  
3000 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007

Cheryl Callahan  
New York Public Service Commission  
2 Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223-1350

Rodney L. Joyce  
Shook, Hardy & Bacon  
1101 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20004-2615

Steven Gorosh  
Northpoint Communications  
222 Sutter Street  
San Francisco, CA 94108

Anatole Nagy  
ATU Telecommunications  
600 Telephone Avenue, MS 8  
Anchorage, AK 99503

Christine Jines  
Pacific Bell  
1401 I Street, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

Jill E. Morlock  
Pacific Bell  
Four Bell Plaza  
Room 1950.04  
Dallas, TX 75202

Robert M. Lynch  
Durward D. Dupre  
Darryl W. Howard  
SBC Communications, Inc.  
One Bell Plaza, Rm. 3703  
Dallas, TX 75202

Michael K. Kellogg  
Evan T. Leo  
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans, P.L.L.C.  
1301 K Street, N.W., Ste. 1000 West  
Washington, DC 20005

Jerry Yanowitz  
Jeffrey Sinsheimer  
Glenn Semow  
California Cable Television Association  
4341 Piedmont Avenue, P.O. Box 11080  
Oakland, CA 94611

Laura H. Phillips  
J.G. Harrington  
Christopher D. Libertelli  
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, PLLC  
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Leon M. Kestenbaum  
Jay C. Keithley  
Marybeth M. Banks  
Sprint Corporation  
1850 M Street, N.W., 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20036

James A. Kirkland  
James J. Valentino  
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and  
Popeo, P.C.  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Ste. 900  
Washington, DC 20004-2608

Thomas M. Koutsky  
Covad Communications Company  
6849 Old Dominion Drive, Suite 220  
McLean, VA 22101