

ORIGINAL

February 22, 2000

Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**Re: *In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; CC Docket No. 96-98***

Dear Ms. Salas:

Attached please find Appendix A of MCI WorldCom's Petition for Reconsideration of the Commission's Third Report and Order in the above-referenced proceeding (filed on February 17, 2000). Appendix A, referenced on page 20, n.39 of the Petition for Reconsideration, was inadvertently omitted from the document. MCI WorldCom requests that the Commission include as part of MCI WorldCom's Petition for Reconsideration the attached Appendix A.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,



Richard S. Whitt

No. of Copies rec'd 014  
List ABCDE

**APPENDIX A**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** MOORE, KAREN M (SWBT)  
**Sent:** Friday, December 10, 1999 3:11 PM  
**To:** [Stuart.H.Miller@wcom.com](mailto:Stuart.H.Miller@wcom.com)  
**Cc:** MOIR, CARYN D (SBC-MSI); LOWRANCE, NANCY J (SBC-MSI); CAIN, NELSON (SWBT)  
**Subject:**

Stuart,

This is to confirm our conversation on Friday, December 3, 1999 regarding the provision of bulk listings.

Independent Listings in California- As I stated in our call, we are prepared to comply with the FCC order regarding the handling of non-local in-region DA calls. Additionally, we offered some time ago to discuss a joint CPUC contact to address their order which precludes Pacific from releasing the listings of other companies without permission. To date, our attorney in California has yet not heard from Richard Severy regarding that contact. If MCI is still interested in approaching the CPUC then I would suggest that Mr. Severy contact Ed Kolto-Wininger as previously discussed. Pricing for DA listings - We do not agree with your interpretation of the FCC UNE Remand Order. MCI continues to incorrectly characterize access to DA listing information in bulk format as a UNE. Paragraphs 438-464 of the order, however, make it clear that OS, DA and DA listings do not have to be unbundled under 251(c)(3). SBC remains obligated, however, under the non-discrimination requirements of section 251(b)(3) to provide daily updates to DA listings in electronic format. Therefore, a market based price should prevail for OS, DA and DA listings as opposed to a regulated rate as described in paragraph 473 of the order. Despite this fundamental disagreement between our companies, SBC is prepared to offer the following listing options to MCI:

1. Usage Charge - Full Company (excluding SNET)
  - \$.02 - per listing for the initial load
  - \$.03 - per listing update
  - \$.01 - usage charge
  
2. No Usage Charge - Full Company (excluding SNET)
  - \$.04 - per listing for the initial load
  - \$.06 - per update

Under Option 1, MCI would be required to provide a usage report on a monthly basis. Usage would be defined as a successful search and report by an operator or an automated system.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Karen

Karen Moore (SWBT)  
Tel# 214-464-2758  
Pager # 1-888-561-9384