



ORIGINAL
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

1401 H Street NW
Suite 600
Washington DC
20005-2164

Tel (202) 326-7300
Fax (202) 326-7333
www.usta.org

WRITTEN EX PARTE PRESENTATION

May 19, 2000

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445-12th Street, SW - Room TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED
MAY 19 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RE: CC Docket No. 98-147
CC Docket No. 96-98
CC Docket No. 98-141
NSD File No. L-00-48
DA File No. 00-891

Dear Ms. Roman Salas:

On May 19, 2000, Roy Neel, Chief Executive Officer and President of the United States Telecom Association, sent a letter to Chairman William Kennard regarding The Association for Local Telecommunications Services' recently submitted proposal to the FCC that would add additional unbundling and provisioning burdens to ILECs.

In accordance with FCC rule 1.1206(b)(1), enclosed are ten copies of the letter to Chairman Kennard, two for each proceeding. Please file copies of the letter in the above-referenced proceedings. If you have questions, please contact me at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Sarjeant
VP Regulatory Affairs and
General Counsel

Attachment
cc w/o att: Chairman W. Kennard



1401 H Street NW

Tel (202) 326-7300

Suite 600

Fax (202) 326-7333

Washington DC

www.usta.org

20005-2164

Chairman William E. Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St. SW
Washington DC 20554

May 19, 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard:

The Association for Local Telecommunications Services (ALTS) recently submitted a proposal to the FCC that would add additional unbundling and provisioning burdens to ILECs as they increase investments in their broadband networks. For instance, ALTS has asked that ILECs be required to provision UNE loops within 3 days. This is clearly beyond the scope of the 1996 Act, which requires only that an ILEC provide service that is "at least equal" to the service it provides itself. If an ILEC cannot provision its own loops in 3 days, it cannot and should not be expected to do so for a competitor. That is simply unreasonable.

A key element of ALTS' new campaign is the group's assertion that current ILEC investment plans, such as SBC's Project Pronto, will have a negative impact on CLECs' ability to interconnect with an ILEC's advanced network. CLECs cannot have it both ways, criticizing the ILECs for not investing in new technologies for their customers—and at the same time for pursuing investment plans for advanced services that may not mesh 100% with CLEC plans.

ILECs are investing billions in new technology to serve their customers and provide a return to their investors. These customers must be the ILECs' top priority, not the business convenience of CLECs who may be unwilling to similarly invest in facilities. CLECs have never shown that they plan to serve residential consumers. In fact, they are not being "kept" – technologically or otherwise – from offering residential services. They simply don't want to.

I hope you will put the ALTS demands in perspective, especially in light of the clarity of the 1996 Act.

Sincerely,

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Roy Neel".

Roy Neel



1401 H Street NW
Suite 600
Washington DC
20005-2164

Tel (202) 326-7300
Fax (202) 326-7333
www.usta.org

Chairman William E. Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St. SW
Washington DC 20554

May 19, 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard:

The Association for Local Telecommunications Services (ALTS) recently submitted a proposal to the FCC that would add additional unbundling and provisioning burdens to ILECs as they increase investments in their broadband networks. For instance, ALTS has asked that ILECs be required to provision UNE loops within 3 days. This is clearly beyond the scope of the 1996 Act, which requires only that an ILEC provide service that is "at least equal" to the service it provides itself. If an ILEC cannot provision its own loops in 3 days, it cannot and should not be expected to do so for a competitor. That is simply unreasonable.

A key element of ALTS' new campaign is the group's assertion that current ILEC investment plans, such as SBC's Project Pronto, will have a negative impact on CLECs' ability to interconnect with an ILEC's advanced network. CLECs cannot have it both ways, criticizing the ILECs for not investing in new technologies for their customers—and at the same time for pursuing investment plans for advanced services that may not mesh 100% with CLEC plans.

ILECs are investing billions in new technology to serve their customers and provide a return to their investors. These customers must be the ILECs' top priority, not the business convenience of CLECs who may be unwilling to similarly invest in facilities. CLECs have never shown that they plan to serve residential consumers. In fact, they are not being "kept" – technologically or otherwise – from offering residential services. They simply don't want to.

I hope you will put the ALTS demands in perspective, especially in light of the clarity of the 1996 Act.

Sincerely,

A stylized, handwritten signature in black ink that appears to be "RN".

Roy Neel