



Frank S. Simone  
Government Affairs Director

ORIGINAL  
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Suite 1000  
1120 20th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
202 457-2321  
FAX 202 457-2545  
EMAIL fsimone@att.com

July 19, 2000

RECEIVED

JUL 19 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 Twelfth Street, S. W. – Room TWB-204  
Washington, D. C. 20554

Re: Ex parte, WT Docket No. 99-217, Promotion of Competitive Networks in Local Telecommunications Markets; CC Docket No. 96-98, Implementation of Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Salas:

On Tuesday, July 18, 2000, Douglas Brandon and the undersigned, of AT&T, met with Adam Krinsky, Legal Assistant to Commissioner Gloria Tristani. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the difficulties AT&T encounters when attempting to serve customers residing in multiple tenant environments. AT&T's views were consistent with its written comments and reply comments in the above-captioned proceeding. The attached outline describes the topics discussed during the course of our meeting.

Two copies of this Notice are being submitted to the Secretary of the FCC in accordance with Section 1.1206 (b) of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

ATTACHMENT

cc: A. Krinsky

No. of Copies rec'd 042  
List ABCDE

Promotion of Competitive Networks in Local Telecommunications Markets

Multiple Tenant Environments (MTEs)

Ownership of the “inside wire”

ILECs use ambiguity over who owns the inside wire to delay or limit CLEC use of the inside wire

- ILECs refuse to offer unbundled network elements (loops/sub-loops) because the ILEC claims no ownership or control
- Building owners refuse to permit interconnection to inside wire because they don't “believe” they own the wiring

Single Point of Interconnection (“SPOI”)

*“...we agree that the availability of a single point of interconnection will promote competition .... we encourage parties to cooperate in any reconfiguration of the network necessary to create one. If parties are unable to negotiate a reconfigured single point of interconnection at multi-unit premises, we require the incumbent to construct a single point of interconnection that will be fully accessible and suitable for use by multiple carriers.”* UNE Remand Order, ¶ 226.

ILECs propose SPOI arrangements that impose significant operational difficulties and unnecessary cost upon CLECs

- installation of duplicative and unnecessary “feeder” cross connect panel
- unnecessary use of and payment for ILEC technicians
- ILEC continued control of the first pair of wire to each unit

Rules Governing the Demarcation Point

The Commission should adopt a single demarcation point for all MTEs at the Minimum Point of Entry (“MPOE”) or 12 inches from an individual unit where the building owner has ceded control to the ILEC

ILEC Must Provide Nondiscriminatory Access To and Forward-Looking Pricing For All Network Elements and Support Related to the Use of Wiring Between the MPOE and the Demarcation Point

ILECs cannot rely upon tariffed rates or contractual arrangements as justification for UNE pricing

Commission should clarify that nondiscriminatory access required under Section 224 of the Act applies to utility-owned or controlled ducts, conduits and rights-of-way. Specifically, the CLECs must have the rights to use in-building/intra-premise ducts, conduits or rights-of-way employed by the ILEC:

- whether the facilities are owned or merely controlled by the ILEC
- regardless of whether the ILEC currently uses the facilities

The FCC should preempt restrictions on fixed wireless antennae

Rules similar to OTARD with the ability of local authorities to impose restrictions necessitated by safety or historic preservation concerns

# BELLSOUTH'S PROPOSED BUILDING ACCESS REQUIREMENTS

