

slightly favorable to cellular carrier, relative ship similar to BOC/independent telephone company arrangements

agreement technology- ing reciprocal compensation obligations

to see Philadelphia for Bill of PA proposal

PAI-type arrangement under contract

type 2

Tentative terms agreement on Type 2

Type 1, Type 2 to be provided in 1986

Eric Wiles (212/319-7400)

Eric Wiles (212/319-7400)

Eric Wiles (212/319-7400)

Mountain Bell

Mountain Bell

Mountain Bell

Providence (401)

Providence (401)

Providence (401)

Patridge (711)

Patridge (711)

Patridge (711)

Richmond (55)

Richmond (55)

Richmond (55)

Sacramento (915)

Sacramento (915)

Sacramento (915)

Physical Interconnection

Non-Wireline Contract

Comments

New England Telephone initially realigns request to Type 2

negotiations just getting underway

SA has proposed PBI-type arrangement, currently being challenged in State PUC proceeding

Type 1, Type 2 request rejected

Currently under negotiation; cellular carrier has proposed reciprocal arrangement

SA rejecting reciprocal compensation concept

Cap initially resistant to Type 2 request

Currently under negotiation; cellular carrier has proposed reciprocal arrangement

Currently under negotiation; cellular carrier has proposed reciprocal arrangement

Eric Wiles (212/319-7400)

Market	Leadline Telephone Co.	Non-Wireline Contact	Physical Interconnection	Cooperation Arrangement	Comments
Philadelphia	Bell of Pennsylvania	Don Glass (215/466-0050)	Type 2 will be provided	Bell of PA and New Jersey Bell have proposed Feature Group B-type of access charge arrangement, including carrier common line charges currently under negotiation	Proposed schedule reciprocity on compensation
Phoenix	Mountain Bell	Chris Witte (212/319-7440)	Type 2	Co-carrier agreement scheduled including reciprocity obligations	Highly favorable to cellular carrier, relationship similar to NYC/Independent telephone company arrangements
Pittsburgh	Bell of Pennsylvania	Kurt Mease (206/451-9217)	Tentative agreement on Type 2	See Philadelphia for Bell of PA proposal	
Portland	Pacific Northwest Bell	Kurt Mease (206/451-9217)	Type 1; Type 2 (to be provided in 1986)	P&T-type arrangement under contract	

license has been sold to Newvector, subject to regulatory and court approvals

San Diego  
 Pacific Bell  
 From Executive (314/969-1977)  
 According to Pacific Bell  
 James Blinn (415/571-1515)  
 Type 2 request to Pacific Bell response to date  
 James Blinn (415/571-1515)  
 Type 2 request to Pacific Bell response to date  
 James Blinn (415/571-1515)  
 Type 2 request to Pacific Bell response to date

Comments

Cooperation Arrangement

Physical Information

Non-Wireline Contact

Landline Telephone Co.

City

City	Landline Telephone Co.	Non-Wireline Contact	Physical Information	Cooperation Arrangement	Comments
Seattle (206)	Pacific Northwest Bell	Kurt Meese (206/451-9317)	Type 1; conversion to Type 2 expected in 1986	PSE-type arrangement under contract	Pacific Northwest Bell positive on reciprocity uncertainty
Springfield (417)	New England Telephone	Chris Witze (313/319-7466)	New England Telephone reluctant to Type 2 request	Negotiations just underway	
St. Louis (314)	Southwestern Bell	Steve Shinner (314/466-4666)	Type 1; non-cooperative regarding Type 2	Currently in negotiations regionally with SBC, which does not reciprocate also reciprocity and has proposed PSE-type arrangement	
Syracuse (315)	New York Telephone	Ken Moravits (607/272-0300)			
Toronto (416)	Pacific Northwest Bell	Kurt Meese (206/451-9317)			See Seattle

<u>Market</u>	<u>Landline Telephone Co.</u>	<u>Non-Wireline Contact</u>	<u>Physical Interconnection</u>	<u>Compensation Arrangement</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Salt Lake City (19)	Mountain Bell	Hurt Mease (206/451-9217)	No activity to date	No activity to date	
San Antonio (13)	Southwestern Bell	Hurt Mease (206/451-9217)	No activity to date	San Antonio market encompassed in regional negotiations with SBB, which has proposed PRR-type arrangement	
San Diego (10)	Pacific Bell	Fran Hopkins (214/940-1977)	Type 2 "trial," according to Pacific Bell	Unknown	Non-wireline license has been sold to NewVector, subject to regulatory and court approvals.
San Francisco (7)	Pacific Bell	James Dixon (415/571-1515)	Type 2 requested; Pacific Bell response unclear to date		
San Jose (22)	Pacific Bell	James Dixon (415/571-1515)	Type 2 requested; Pacific Bell response unclear to date		

1080

<u>Market</u>	<u>Landline Telephone Co.</u>	<u>Non-Wireline Contact</u>	<u>Physical Interconnection</u>	<u>Compensation Arrangement</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Seattle (20)	Pacific Northwest Bell	Hurt Mease (206/451-9217)	Type 1; conversion to Type 2 expected in 1985	PRR-type arrangement under contract	Pacific Northwest Bell position on reciprocity uncertain; may gain with buy-back; date 1985; jobs 10
Springfield (43)	New England Telephone Co.	Chris Witso (212/319-7444)	New England Telephone resistant to Type 2 request	Negotiations just underway	

Company	Address	Phone	Type	Comments
Southwestern Bell	Bill Bobb	(810/586-2663)	PRI-type arrangement	Negotiations in progress over Type 2 availability and reciprocal compensation arrangement
Cap	Kathryn Condellio	(301/586-6833)	Type 1	
Southwestern Bell	Mont Melanore	(202/793-1500)	Type 2 will be requested (Southern Bell appears to be reluctant)	Preliminary contacts with Southern Bell regarding non-reciprocal tariff
Landline Telephone Co.	Non-Wireline Carriers		Physical Interconnection	Compensation Arrangement
Southwestern Bell	Earl Meese	(210/451-2177)	SMB uncooperative regarding Type 2 request	Included in negotiations regionally with SMB, which has proposed PRI-type arrangement
Diamond State	Michael Schwartz	(609/388-1008)	Type 2 to be provided pursuant to contract	Co-carrier agreement reached in compensation
New England Telephone	Paul Rubin	(617/888-1555)	Integrated with Anacon system Type 2 will reportedly be available in 1986	PRI-type arrangement; carrier intends at some future date to seek reciprocity
Youngstown	Ohio Bell United Telephone	Earl Pharis	Type 2 from United	PRI-type contract; tariff request reciprocity request
Wilmington	Diamond State			Carrier accepted one-way compensation contract in order to commence negotiations

Physical	Landline Telephone Co.	Non-Wireline Contact	Physical Interconnecting	Compensation Arrangement	Comments
Verizon (212) 771-1111 Telcord (609) 426-1111	OTS Ohio Bell	Chuck Cooper (303/422-6370) (u) Jim Biehn (303/423-8200)	Ohio Bell re-jecting Type 2 request	Ohio Bell has proposed P2E-type arrangement, refuses to recognize reciprocity	
Thurston (773) 444-1111	Mountain Bell	Chris Witz (212/310-7444)	Type 2	Co-carrier, reciprocal agreement in place	Highly favorable in cellular carrier, resembling independent telephone company relationship
Tulsa (577) 444-1111 Washington (800) 444-1111	Southwestern Bell CAP	Bill Babb (810/506-2663) Bathya Condellio (301/504-6033)	Type 1	P2E-type arrangement	Negotiations in progress over Type 2 availability and reciprocal compensation arrangement
West Palm Beach (373) 444-1111	Southern Bell	Kent Nakamura (202/703-1500)	Type 3 will be requested, Southern Bell appears to be reluctant	Preliminary contacts with Southern Bell regarding usage-sensitive tariff	



**Post-merger Examples of the Spread of Degraded Practices  
in the Acquired BOC's Territory and  
Worsening Conditions in the Acquiring BOC's Territory**

April 1, 1999

The anticompetitive effects of a merger between BOCs can be demonstrated by comparing pre-merger and post-merger practices. For example, one can compare the *acquired* BOC's business practices pre-merger to its practices post-merger. To the extent that the acquiring BOC imposes its business, regulatory, and legal positions on the acquired BOC, a spread of degraded practices may result. In addition, one can examine the *acquiring* BOC's business practices pre- and post-merger. Given that the acquiring BOC has an increased incentive to protect its larger monopoly footprint, one would expect to see its business, regulatory, and legal positions worsen post-merger. The following anecdotes demonstrate that both of these effects occurred after the SBC/Pacific Telesis and Bell Atlantic/NYNEX mergers.

- Prior to its merger with SBC, Pacific Bell ("PacBell") "used a billing format that was designed for carrier-to-carrier transactions for billing on services that MCI obtained from Pacific Bell. Following the merger and at the behest of SBC, Pacific Bell unilaterally substituted another billing format that SBC uses for *retail* sales -- a format significantly less useful to another carrier." Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations, CC Dkt. 98-141, MCI Comments at 23 (FCC Oct. 15, 1998). PacBell previously employed CABS, which "provides extensive information that a carrier can use both for its own billing and to verify the accuracy of the ILEC's bills." Id., Beach-Fauerbach Aff. ¶ 11. Under CABS, MCI would receive two bills, due on the same date. Id. SBC switched PacBell to CRIS, which not only provides "substantially less information than does CABS," but also makes it harder to verify and reformat the bills and generates 38 bills due on 19 different dates. Id. ¶ 12.
- AirTouch attempted to implement a "Calling Party Pays" ("CPP") plan, which would require AirTouch to negotiate a billing and collection agreement with the ILEC. Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations, CC Dkt. 98-141, KMC Comments at 18 (FCC Oct. 15, 1998) ("KMC Comments"). AirTouch had set up a market trial with PacBell; after its sale to SBC, PacBell informed AirTouch that it was not interested in pursuing the trial. Id. at 19. SBC later told AirTouch that it could not use PacBell's tariffed billing and collection services to provide CPP. Id. AirTouch has filed a complaint to force

PacBell to honor its tariff. Id. (On a related note, AirTouch currently has billing and collection agreements with Ameritech that allow provision of CPP.)

- In New York and other NYNEX states, NYNEX had allowed assignment of existing customer contracts to resellers without treating the assignments as contract terminations and without triggering termination penalties. Bell Atlantic has reversed that position since the merger, refusing to honor assignment requests submitted by resellers. "Since large business customers typically have multiple contracts with varying termination dates, a prohibition on an assignment of such contracts to resellers seriously injures the resale market for such customers, since few are willing to incur the often hefty termination penalties." Joint Application for Approval of the Reorganization of Illinois Bell Telephone Co. d/b/a Ameritech Illinois, and the Reorganization of Ameritech Illinois Metro, Inc., Dkt. 98-0555, Direct Test. of Charlotte F. Terkeurst on Behalf of the Government and Consumer Intervenors, GCI Ex. 2.0, at 50 (ICC Oct. 28, 1998).<sup>1</sup> (On a related note, Ameritech allows contract assignments without termination fees. SBC charges termination fees and other related liabilities. Id. at 51.)
- Complaints against Bell Atlantic-Vermont have increased 9% since the Bell Atlantic/NYNEX merger (from August 1996 to July 1998).
- In its Reply in the Local Competition docket, Bell Atlantic rejected the FCC's "pick-and-choose" interpretation of Section 252(i), but nonetheless recognized that the provision "gives all potential new entrants the right to the same agreement that any other local competitor reaches with the incumbent." Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Dkt. No. 96-98, Bell Atlantic Reply at 4 (FCC May 30, 1996) ("Bell Atlantic Reply"). Since its merger with NYNEX, however, Bell Atlantic has refused to allow carriers to elect another agreement, even when the carrier agreed to accept the same agreement in its entirety.

For example, Focal reports that it attempted in March 1998 to exercise its 252(i) rights by electing Bell Atlantic's agreement with MFS in Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Applications of GTE Corp., Transferor, and Bell Atlantic Corp., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations, CC Dkt. 98-184, Focal Comments at 12 (FCC Nov. 23, 1998). "Bell Atlantic responded by submitting to Focal versions of the MFS Agreements containing completely revised rate schedules and certain other minor changes." Id. Although the MFS contract "contained express language stating that certain rates were fixed for the term of the agreements, Bell Atlantic took the position that the rates . . . were superseded by subsequent state commission approval of its SGAT in

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Complaint & Request of CTC Communications, Inc., Case No. 98-C-0426, Order Granting Petition (N.Y. Pub. Serv. Comm'n Sept. 14, 1998) (discussing Bell Atlantic-NY's post-merger change in position regarding termination penalties).

Delaware, and rate decision in New Jersey and Pennsylvania in which the respective state commissions established permanent rates." Id. at 13. Bell Atlantic refused to sign absent such changes. Id. Focal has since filed complaints in each state, including one in Delaware, in which Focal prevailed after a seven month delay. Id.

On August 7, 1998, when Hyperion informed Bell Atlantic of Hyperion's decision to elect an existing agreement in Vermont under 252(i), Bell Atlantic responded with preconditions, including requiring Hyperion to agree to: "(1) provide extensive service to residential customers in urban, suburban and rural areas and 'diverse locations' of Vermont, and (2) within 60 days of execution of the Agreement, to file amended tariffs to 'provide residence local exchange service' in Vermont."

Applications of GTE Corp., Transferor, and Bell Atlantic Corp., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations, CC Dkt. 98-184, Hyperion Comments at 19-20 (FCC Nov. 23, 1998) ("Hyperion Comments"). Neither condition is required by Vermont law. Id. at 20. Moreover, Hyperion's election request was delayed, forcing it to twice extend its existing contract with Bell Atlantic. Id.

On March 26, 1999, when Sprint informed Bell Atlantic of Sprint's decision to elect an existing agreement in the District of Columbia under Section 252(i), Bell Atlantic attempted to modify the contract's definition of "Dedicated Transport." Section 252(i) permits carriers to adopt interconnection contracts without such unilateral changes to the underlying agreement. Bell Atlantic dropped its request after Sprint refused Bell Atlantic's requested modification.

Bell Atlantic has also unilaterally modified its interconnection contracts with other carriers in Rhode Island and New Hampshire, which Sprint had elected to adopt under Section 252(i), to reflect Bell Atlantic's position that ISP traffic is ineligible for reciprocal compensation. Bell Atlantic also attempted to unilaterally change the terms of its approved SGAT in Vermont (again, such that ISP traffic is interstate and not subject to reciprocal compensation). On January 25, 1999, the New Hampshire Commission rejected Bell Atlantic's position and reaffirmed Sprint's right to elect an existing agreement "as is." On February 8, 1999, Bell Atlantic changed its tactics again and informed Sprint that Bell Atlantic would not make the New Hampshire and Rhode Island agreements available because they were more than one year old. As support for its one year time limit, Bell Atlantic cited the Supreme Court's observation in Iowa Utilities Board that such contracts shall remain available for a "reasonable" period of time after the agreement is available for public inspection under Section 252(f) of the Act. Bell Atlantic has taken a similar position with Focal. Neither the Act, nor any court or regulatory agency, has imposed a one-year time limit for adopting interconnection contracts pursuant to Section 252(i).

- In May 1996, SBC expressed its willingness to provide CLECs the unbundled loop including 2- and 4-wire analog and 2- and 4-wire digital configurations. See, e.g., Interconnection Agreement between SWBT and Brooks Fiber Communications of Tulsa, Inc., § VIII & App. UNE at 3-4 (Aug. 29, 1996) (expressly identifying

HDSL as an example of a supported service); Interconnection Agreement between SWBT and Cox Oklahoma Telcom, Inc., § 11.0 & App. UNE, § V (Apr. 10, 1997) (identifying 2- and 4-wire digital and analog loops as UNEs); Interconnection Agreement between SWBT and ICG Telecom Group, Inc., § 9.1 (Nov. 6, 1996) (same). However, SBC has since denied competitor's requests for digital loops, including TCG's initial request for HDSL in April 1998 after SBC had expanded its footprint by acquiring Pacific Telesis. Joint Application for Approval of the Reorganization of Illinois Bell Telephone Co. d/b/a Ameritech Illinois, and the Reorganization of Ameritech Illinois Metro, Inc., Dkt. 98-0555, Direct Test. of Kathleen L. Whiteaker on Behalf of AT&T, AT&T Ex. 3.0, at 19 (ICC Oct. 28, 1998) ("Whiteaker Direct Test."). "Recently, I have been told by SBC that HDSL compatible loops may be ordered, but in each instance TCG must go through a BFR process to determine availability and intervals for provisioning." Id.<sup>2</sup>

Similarly, on August 28, 1998 in the state Section 271 proceeding, the Arkansas PSC found that SWBT had failed to unbundle IDLC loops, as required by the FCC's Local Competition Order, and thus had failed to comply with checklist item (iv). Application of SWBT Seeking Verification That it Has Fully Complied With and Satisfied the Requirements of Sec. 271(c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Docket No. 98-048-U, Consultation Report to the FCC at 18 (Ark. Pub. Serv. Comm'n Aug. 28, 1998).

- Although it initially opposed a "pick-and-choose" interpretation of Section 252(i), in May 1996, SBC at least acknowledged that CLECs had the right to elect an entire interconnection agreement, including "all the same terms and conditions to which the previous competitor agreed." Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Dkt. No. 96-98, SBC Comments at 24 (FCC May 16, 1996) ("SBC Comments"). As the company has expanded its territory, however, SBC has failed to abide by its own cramped interpretation of Section 252(i). It has refused to allow carriers to elect another agreement, as SBC acknowledged the statute required.

For example, Level 3 reports that SBC tried to force Level 3 to agree with SBC's position on compensation for ISP traffic before allowing Level 3 to elect. Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations, CC Dkt. 98-141, Level 3 Comments at 14 (FCC Oct. 15, 1998). Similarly, since SBC's takeover, PacBell has adopted several of SBC's anticompetitive policies. Id. at 19. For example, PacBell refused to allow Level 3 to opt into PacBell's agreement with MFS, arguing that the reciprocal compensation rate was too high. Id. at 19-20. At the same time, PacBell continued to operate with MFS under the agreement. Id. at 20.

---

<sup>2</sup> SBC has apparently made "overtures" in the 271 context that it will provide ADSL by late first quarter 1999. Whiteaker Direct Test. at 19.

- Sprint's existing interconnection agreement with PacBell provides for an unbundled, conditioned xDSL loop:

§ 3.2.3 2-Wire Digital (ISDN/xDSL Capable) Link: This PACIFIC unbundled Network Element (2-wire) is an ISDN capable Link, which is an upgrade to the Basic Link for the transmission of digital services having no greater loss than 38db end-to-end, measured at 40,000 HZ with 135 ohms at the central office POI and 135 ohms at the MPOE; without loop repeaters, midspan repeaters may be required. This Link will not have any load coils or bridge taps within limits defined by the specification applicable to the ISDN/xDSL Links. In addition, the ISDN capable Link, without midspan repeaters, will be used for Link requests to support xDSL type transmission rates.

The pricing provisions of the agreement do not include any incremental charges for conditioning the line. Sprint's contract with PacBell expires February 7, 2000. SBC has made it clear to Sprint personnel in charge of negotiating the new contract that PacBell will not agree to provide xDSL without charging a conditioning fee. In comparison to Sprint's current contract with PacBell, SWBT's new proposed ADSL contract language provides for loop conditioning charges more than twice the amount SWBT charges end users (\$950.00).<sup>3</sup> This charge is also documented in recently filed interconnection agreements between SWBT and other carriers.<sup>4</sup>

Other differences also arise between PacBell's and SBC's provision of information regarding xDSL availability. For example, PacBell does not assess a charge for DSL loop qualification. Eighty-seven of PacBell's serving wire centers are pre-qualified for ADSL deployment. For the remaining central offices, PacBell will check for DSL availability -- again, free of charge -- even though PacBell is not deploying DSL from that central office. SBC proposes to charge CLECs to determine DSL availability.

- Bell Atlantic has proposed restrictions on provision of the UNE-platform ("UNE-P") in its Section 271 pre-filing statements in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. These restrictions were first filed in newly-acquired New York, and then spread rapidly to Bell Atlantic's existing states of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

In New York, for example, Bell Atlantic offered to provide UNE-P with the following restrictions: (1) for residence and business POTS and ISDN only; (2) availability limited to a 4 year (Zone 1) or 6 year (Zone 2) period; and (3) as to

---

<sup>3</sup> PacBell recently advertised two new ADSL services to existing DSL customers. One package offered a low-speed (128 Kbps upstream) option for \$59 month-to-month, or \$39 for 1- to 3-year terms; the other offered a high-speed (384 Kbps upstream) option for \$149 month-to-month, or \$129 for 1- to 3-year terms.

<sup>4</sup> Sprint does not dispute that conditioned loops should be priced at TELRIC rates.

business customers in New York City, UNE-P would not be available for those central offices in which more than one CLEC was collocated. Petition of New York Tel. Co. for Approval of: Its SGAT and Conditions pursuant to Section 252 and Draft Filing of Petition for InterLATA Entry pursuant to Section 271, Docket No. 97-C-0271, Bell Atlantic-New York Prefiling Statement at 9 & n.10 (N.Y. Pub. Serv. Comm'n Apr. 6, 1998). Moreover, where "CLECs do not choose to assemble the platform for themselves, Bell Atlantic-NY may begin to assess an increasing additional recurring charge(s) that would, over the course of two years, raise the price of the unbundled platform to the CLEC to substantially the cost of similar resold lines." Id. at 9.

In New Jersey and Pennsylvania, Bell Atlantic offered an even more restrictive UNE-P in its prefiling statements: (1) for residential POTS and ISDN only; (2) availability limited to a 2 year period; and (3) where one collocator was present, UNE-P would not be available. Investigation Regarding Local Exchange Competition for Telecommunications Services, Docket No. TX98010010, Bell Atlantic-New Jersey Proposed Prefiling Statement at 2-4 (N.J. Bd. Pub. Utils. Nov. 16, 1998) ("BA-NJ Statement"); Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania's Entry into In-Region InterLATA Services under Section 271, Docket No. M-00960840, Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania Comments at 9-10 (Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n June 11, 1998) ("BA-PA Comments"). Again, the price would increase over the course of two years, until it mirrored the price of similar resold lines. BA-NJ Statement at 3; BA-PA Comments at 9.<sup>5</sup>

Pre-Bell Atlantic/NYNEX merger, New York Telephone's restrictive policies would not likely have spread as fast or as efficiently to a different state of another BOC.

- In August 1997, "just days before the [Bell Atlantic]/NYNEX merger received final approval," then-NYNEX executed an interconnection agreement with Lightpath, which included "incident-based liquidated damages for poor performance, Extended Link at a fair blended provisional rate and a procompetitive interconnection architecture." Applications of GTE Corp., Transferor, and Bell Atlantic Corp., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations, CC Dkt. 98-184, Cablevision Lightpath Comments, Attach. at 2 (FCC Nov. 23, 1998). "The ink was barely dry on the merger before it became clear that the 'new' Bell Atlantic would adopt a considerably different and more litigious approach towards interconnection

---

<sup>5</sup> Bell Atlantic's position has changed yet again. Bell Atlantic now refuses to provide UNE-P at all, and instead argues that it cannot be required to do so pending the FCC's determination on remand of the "necessary" and "impair" standard. This is in spite of the Supreme Court's reinstatement of Rule 51.315(b) and in direct contradiction to its commitment to the FCC to continue to provide access to the current list of UNEs pending the FCC's order on remand.

agreements." Id. For example -- even though the agreement had been signed by NYNEX after the Iowa Utilities Board decision and with full knowledge of it, Bell Atlantic notified Lightpath that Bell Atlantic would no longer honor those contractual provisions that it considered to be in violation of the 8th Circuit's decision. Id. at 2-3.

- PacBell had agreed that any change to its OSS interfaces would require joint management, maintenance and operation with AT&T. Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations, CC Dkt. 98-141, AT&T Petition at 20-21 (FCC Oct. 15, 1998); see also id., Aff. of A. Lee Blich on behalf of AT&T. Prior to the merger, PacBell proposed a system change to the Resale Mechanized Interface. Id., Blich Aff. ¶ 18. PacBell assured AT&T that this change would not require programming work or systems modifications. Id. PacBell asserted "A major issue that needs to be understood is that there are no changes to the existing NDM specifications from a CLEC perspective." Id.

After the merger, PacBell "changed course and proposed a major system change that would have greatly impaired the ability of AT&T to use these interfaces." Id., AT&T Comments at 21. PacBell ignored the joint implementation requirements and refused to enter into a Joint Implementation Agreement with AT&T. Id., Blich Aff. ¶ 19. AT&T had to re-arbitrate the issue, adding delay. Id. ¶ 20. In addition, the merged entity "took the peculiar position that JIA obligations were only triggered by testing of new or changed systems, not implementation of these systems." Id. Under this theory, PacBell could "unilaterally implement untested changes to the interface without notice or agreement" by CLECs. Id. After one day of hearings, the parties agreed to a Change Management Process to manage future changes to the OSS interfaces. "It is my belief that had SBC not taken over Pacific, the development of a JIA and a Change Management Process would have been significantly faster and more efficient, and would not have required AT&T to institute arbitration proceedings." Id. ¶ 21.

- The Illinois Commerce Commission ("ICC") staff has identified several examples of Ameritech Illinois' worsening behavior since the parties' merger announcement. For example:
  1. Ameritech failed to comply with an ICC order "reclassifying Bands B and C business rates and operator assistance/credit card charges as noncompetitive and [requiring Ameritech to] fil[e] new tariffs within 5 days of the order to refund the prior rate increases." Joint Application for Approval of the Reorganization of Illinois Bell Telephone Co. d/b/a Ameritech Illinois, and the Reorganization of Ameritech Illinois Metro, Inc., Dkt. 98-0555, Staff Initial Brief at 123 (ICC Feb. 23, 1999).
  2. Ameritech has been lax in complying with ICC orders regarding reciprocal compensation, even after the Illinois federal district court's stay of the ICC's order expired. Id. at 124.

3. Ameritech has failed to comply with those provisions of the ICC's TELRIC order regarding common transport. Id.
4. Ameritech is currently in non-compliance with the state's Infrastructure Maintenance Fee ("IMF") Act. Id. at 124-25. Although Ameritech filed a request for further variance from the IMF, that request was filed six weeks after expiration of the prior granted variance. Id. at 125.

This delay in implementation has resulted in all Ameritech customers being overcharged for a period that will exceed one year. Although Ameritech Illinois will be required to refund these overcharges with interest, this example serves to illustrate Ameritech Illinois' failure to act in a timely manner. All other Illinois telecommunications carriers have complied with this change in statute in a timely manner, and did not find it necessary to request even one waiver of the [ICC's] Order.

Id.

5. The ICC has identified eight specific instances where information supporting Ameritech's cost studies filed in support of its tariff "was either inaccurate, incomplete or in violation of the [ICC's] rules, regulations, or Orders." Id.

The ICC staff stated that it expects this pattern of non-compliance to grow even worse if the merger is allowed to be consummated. Id. at 126.

- Bell Atlantic conceded in the Local Competition docket that inter-carrier compensation, as opposed to access charges, applied to ISP-bound traffic:

[T]he notion that bill and keep is necessary to prevent LECs from demanding too high a rate reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the market. If these rates are set too high, the result will be that new entrants, who are in a much better position to selectively market their services, will sign up customers whose calls are predominantly inbound, such as credit card authorization centers and Internet access providers. The LEC would find itself writing large monthly checks to the new entrant.

Bell Atlantic Reply at 21. However, Bell Atlantic -- *after* its concession in the Local Competition docket but *prior to* the FCC's recent declaratory ruling -- has nonetheless refused to execute any agreement with Sprint that does not state that Internet traffic is not local and not subject to reciprocal compensation. Sprint was forced to file pleadings in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia regarding its right to adopt these agreements in the form in which they were originally executed.

Hyperion has also experienced problems regarding Bell Atlantic's refusal to remove language excluding local traffic to ISPs from reciprocal compensation. Hyperion Comments at 17. While Bell Atlantic-NY's initial drafts did not discriminate against

the payment of reciprocal compensation for these calls, "as negotiations were drawing to a close, without alerting Hyperion, and notwithstanding the Commission's July 17, 1997 interim ruling, [Bell Atlantic]-NY unilaterally added new contrary language to a September 26, 1997 draft of the agreement." Id. at 17-18.<sup>6</sup> In order to receive the compensation, Hyperion had to give up the progress it had made with previously negotiated terms and opt into another carrier's agreement under 252(i). Id. at 18. While the adopted contract clearly required Bell Atlantic to pay reciprocal compensation for these calls, Bell Atlantic continued to refuse to pay. Id.<sup>7</sup> Hyperion was forced to file a complaint and finally, in a January 15, 1998 letter, Bell Atlantic-NY agreed to compensate Hyperion for calls terminated to ISPs. Id. at 18 n.33.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Commission approved Bell Atlantic's acquisition of NYNEX on August 14, 1997.

<sup>7</sup> More recently, Bell Atlantic has attempted to require a CLEC electing an agreement pursuant to Section 252(i) "to adopt prospectively any subsequent modifications to the agreement that the original parties subsequently negotiate." Hyperion Comments at 19.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Trisha McLean, do hereby certify that on this 2nd day of April 1999, copies of "An Empirical Analysis of the Footprint Effects of Mergers Between Large ILECS" with attachments were served by first class mail, postage prepaid, or hand delivered as indicated, on the following parties:

**Chief\***

Policy and Program Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW, Room 544  
Washington, DC 20554

Steve E. Weingarten, Chief\*  
Commercial Wireless Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
2100 M Street, NW, Room 7023  
Washington, DC 20554

**Chief\***

(two copies)  
International Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 M Street, NW, Room 800  
Washington, DC 20554

Janice Myles\*  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW, Room 544  
Washington, DC 20554

**Jeanine Poltronieri\***

Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, NW, Room 502  
Washington, DC 20554

Michael Kende\*  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW, Room 544  
Washington, DC 20554

**Radhika Karmarkar\***

Policy and Program Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW, Room 544  
Washington, DC 20554

William Dever\*  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW, Room 544  
Washington, DC 20554

**To-Quyen Truong\***

Policy and Program Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW, Room 544  
Washington, DC 20554

International Transcription Service\*  
1231 20th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

\* Delivered by hand

James R. Young  
Executive Vice President-General Counsel  
Bell Atlantic Corporation  
1095 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036

Kerry Bruce  
City of Toledo  
Department of Public Utilities  
420 Madison Avenue, Suite 100  
Toledo, Ohio 43604-1219

Martha Hogerty  
Missouri Office of the Public Counsel  
P.O. Box 7800  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Michigan Attorney General  
Frank J. Kelley, Attorney General  
Orjiakor N. Isiogu, Assistant  
Attorney General  
525 West Ottawa Street  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Indiana Office of Utility  
Consumer Counselor  
John Cook, Assistant Consumer Counselor  
100 North Senate Avenue, Room N501  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2208

Texas Office of the Public Utility Counsel  
Rick Guzman, Assistant Public  
Utility Counsel  
P.O. Box 12397  
Austin, Texas 78711-2397

Thomas J. Long, Esq.  
Senior Telecommunications Attorney  
The Utility Reform Network  
711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350  
San Francisco, California 94102

Ellis Jacobs, Esq.  
Dayton Legal Aid Society  
333 West 1st Street, Suite 500  
Dayton, Ohio 45402  
Counsel for Edgemont  
Neighborhood Coalition

Philip W. Horton, Esq.  
Arnold & Porter  
555 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1206  
Counsel for SBC Communications Inc.

Antoinette Cook Bush  
Skadden Arps Slate Meagher  
& Flom LLP  
1440 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20005-2111  
Counsel for Ameritech Corporation

Anna Montana, Mayor  
Village of Schiller Park  
9526 West Irving Park Road  
Schiller Park, IL 60176

Mavis Pizella  
Manager, Network Services  
Levi Strauss & Co.  
Levis Plaza  
P.O. Box 7215  
San Francisco, CA 94120

Anthony C. Epstein  
Jenner & Block  
601 Thirteenth Street, N.W., 12th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Michael Kellogg  
Kellogg Huber Hansen Todd & Evans  
1301 K Street, NW  
Suite 1000 West  
Washington, DC 20005

Mary Carol Kelley  
Director, Worldwide Communications  
Compaq Computer Corporation  
20555 Tomball Parkway  
Houston, TX 77070

Robert N. Tatum  
Director-Network Services  
Edward Jones  
201 Progress Parkway  
Maryland Heights, MO 63043-3042

Allen Parker, Village Manager  
Village of Maywood  
115 South Fifth Avenue  
Maywood, IL 60153

Nina Holland  
AMOCO  
501 Westlake Park Boulevard  
Post Office Box 3092  
Houston, TX 77253-3092

Guy T. Gray  
VP Telecommunications  
Cendant Corporation  
6 Sylvan Way  
Parsippany, NJ 07054

G. Nichols Simonds  
Vice President & Chief Information Officer  
Emmerson Electric Co.  
8000 West Florissant Avenue  
St. Louis, MO 63136

William P. Barr  
Executive Vice President-Government and  
Regulatory Advocacy and General Counsel  
GTE Corporation  
One Stamford Forum  
Stamford, CT 06904

John Vitale  
Bear, Stearns & Co., Inc.  
245 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10167

CTC Communications Group  
William L. Fishman  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 2007-5116

Cablevision Lightpath, Inc.  
Cherie R. Kiser  
William A. Davis  
Mintz Leven Cohen Ferris Glovsky and  
Popeo, PC  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-2608

Consumer Union and The Consumer  
Federation of America  
Gene Kimmelman  
Consumers Union  
1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20009

Corecomm LTD.  
Eric Branfman  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Dr. Mark Cooper  
Consumer Federation of America  
1424 16th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Communications Workers of America  
Debbie Goldman  
George Kohl  
501 Third Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001

e.spire Communications Inc.  
Brad E. Mutchelknaus  
Andrea Pruitt  
Kelley, Drye & Warren, LLP  
1200 19th Street, NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands  
Thomas K. Crowe  
Elizabeth Holowinski  
Law Offices of Thomas K. Crowe, P.C.  
2300 M Street, NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20037

Barry Pineles  
GST Telecom Inc.  
4001 Main Street  
Vancouver, WA 98663

James L. Gattuso  
Competitive Enterprise Institute  
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1250  
Washington, DC 20037

EMC Corp.  
Martin O'Riordan  
171 South Street  
Hookinton, MA 01748-9013

Consumer Groups  
Patricia A. Stowell  
Public Advocate  
Division of the Public Advocate  
820 N. French St., 4th Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801

Focal Communications  
Russell M. Blau  
Robert V. Zener  
Swidler Berlin Sheereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Competitive Telecommunications Association  
Robert J. Aamoeth  
Melissa Smith  
Kelley, Drye & Warren, LLP  
1200 19th Street, NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Network Plus, Inc.  
Russell M. Blau  
Kathleen L. Greenan  
Swidler Berlin Sheereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Debra Berlyn  
Executive Director  
CPI - Competition Policy Institute  
1156 15th Street, NW, Suite 520  
Washington, DC 20005

Freedom Ring Communications  
Morton J. Posner  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Hyperion Telecommunications, Inc.  
Douglas G. Bonner  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Todd McCracken  
National Small Business United  
1156 15th Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

J. J. Barry  
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers  
1125 15th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

USDA  
Christopher A. McLean  
Deputy Admin,  
Rural Utilities Service  
Washington, DC 20250

Angela D. Ledford  
Keep America Connected  
P. O. Box 27911  
Washington, DC 20005

PaeTaec Communications, Inc.  
Eric Branfman  
Eric Einhorn  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

KMC Telecom Inc.  
Mary C. Albert  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Pilgrim Telephone, Inc.  
Scott Blake Harris  
Jonathan B. Mirksy  
Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis, LLP  
1200 18th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

William McCarty  
Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission  
302 West Washington Street  
Suite E306  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Pam Whittington  
Public Utility Commission of Texas  
1701 N. Congress Avenue.  
P. O. Box 13326  
Austin, TX 78711-3326

Terence Ferguson  
Level 3 Communications, Inc.  
3555 Farnam Street  
Omaha, NE 68131

RCN Telecom Services, Inc.  
Russell M. Blau  
Anthony Richard Petrilla  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Lisa B. Smith  
R. Dale Dixon, Jr.  
MCI WorldCOM, Inc.  
1801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20006

David N. Porter  
Richard S. Whitt  
MCI WORLDCOM, Inc.  
112 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Linda F. Golodner  
National Consumers League  
1701 K Street, NW, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006

State Communications, Inc.  
Harry M. Malone  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Mark E. Buechele  
Supra Telecom & Information Systems Inc.  
2620 S.W. 27th Avenue  
Miami, FL 33133

WorldPath Internet Services  
Eric Branfman  
Morton J. Posner  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Telecommunications Resellers Association  
Charles C. Hunter  
Catherine M. Hannan  
Hunter Communications Law Group  
1620 I Street, NW, Suite 701  
Washington, DC 20006

Irvin W. Maloney  
Occidental Petroleum Corp.  
1640 Stonehedge Rd.  
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Walter Fields  
New Jersey Coalition for Local Telephone  
Competition  
P. O. Box 8127  
Trenton, NJ 08650

AT&T  
C. Frederick Beckner, III  
Sidley & Austin  
1722 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Triton PCS, Inc.  
Leonard J. Kennedy  
David E. Mills  
Laura H. Philips  
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, PLLC  
1200 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036-6802

TRICOM USA, Inc.  
Judith D. O'Neill  
Nancy J. Eskenazi  
Thelen Reid & Priest, LLP  
701 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20004

United Cellular Corporation  
Alan Y. Naftalin  
Peter M. Connolly  
Loteen & Naftalin, LLP  
1150 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20036

US Xchange, LLC  
Dana Frix  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Michael E. Glover  
Bell Atlantic Network Services, Inc.  
1320 North Court House Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201

Steven G. Bradbury  
Kirkland and Ellis  
655 15th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Dr. Marta Sotomayor, President  
National Hispanic Council on Aging  
2713 Ontario Road, NW  
Washington, DC 20009

Carmen Nieves, Director  
Child Health Foundation  
10630 Little Patuxent Parkway  
Suite 126  
Columbia, MD 21044

Sol Del Ande Eaton, President  
Latin American Women and Supporters  
4501 Havelock Road  
Lanham, MD 20706

Warner H. Session, President  
Telecommunications Advocacy Project  
1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20036

Carmen L. Nieves, President  
Federal of Hispanic Organizations of the  
Baltimore Metropolitan Area, Inc.  
15 Charles Street, Suite 1701  
Baltimore, MD 21201

Jeffrey A. Eisenach, Ph.D.  
President  
The Progress & Freedom Foundation  
1301 K Street, NW, Suite 550E  
Washington, DC 20005

Terry L. Etter  
Assistant Consumer's Counsel  
Ohio Consumer's Counsel  
77 South High Street, 15th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43266-0550

Charles B. Molster III  
Winston & Strawn  
1400 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Gerald F. Masoudi  
Kirkland & Ellis  
655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Trisha McLean

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Trisha A. McLean, do hereby certify that on this 31st day of January, 2000, copies of the foregoing Comments of Sprint Communications Company L.P. on Southwestern Bell Telephone's Section 271 Application, CC Docket No. 00-4, were mailed, first class postage prepaid, unless otherwise indicated, to the following parties:

Michael K. Kellogg  
Austin C. Schlick  
Jonathan Rabkin  
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd  
& Evans, P.L.L.C.  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1000 West  
Washington, D.C. 20005\*

Alfred G. Richter, Jr.  
175 E. Houston  
Room #1250  
San Antonio, TX 78205


James D. Ellis  
Paul M. Mancini  
Martine E. Grambow  
Kelly M. Murray  
175 E. Houston  
San Antonio, TX 78205

Katherine Farroba  
Public Utility Commission of Texas  
1701 N. Congress Avenue  
P.O. Box 13326  
Austin, TX 78711-3326

Jamie Heisler  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Telecommunications Task Force  
Antitrust Division  
1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 8000  
Washington, D.C. 20005\*

Janice Myles  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Room 5-C-327  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554\*

ITS, Inc.  
1231 20th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036\*



Trisha A. McLean

\* By hand delivery