

ATTACHMENT A

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matters of	)	
	)	
Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability	)	CC Docket No. 98-147
	)	
and	)	
	)	
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	CC Docket No. 96-98
	)	

**PETITION OF QWEST CORPORATION FOR  
CLARIFICATION OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, RECONSIDERATION**

Qwest Corporation (“Qwest”) respectfully requests clarification of the Commission’s order establishing a default interval of 90 days for incumbent LECs’ provisioning of collocation space.<sup>1</sup> Qwest does not object to the Commission’s imposition of a default national rule, provided mechanisms exist to take account of certain context-specific issues that may make provisioning collocation space within the default interval impossible. The *Order* generally appears to recognize the need for such mechanisms, as it makes the default rule applicable only where alternative intervals have not been established through the statutory negotiation and arbitration processes.

But the Commission’s discussion of the interplay between its default rule and incumbent LECs’ statements of generally available terms and conditions (“SGATs”) is subject to varying

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Order on Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 98-147 and Fifth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 00-297, CC Docket Nos. 98-147 and 96-98 (rel. Aug. 10, 2000) (“*Order or Collocation Provisioning Order*”).

interpretations.<sup>2</sup> The Commission should clarify that, where an incumbent LEC files an amendment to its SGAT that proposes a provisioning interval longer than 90 days, and the relevant state commission permits the amended SGAT to take effect by refraining from taking action within the statutory deadline,<sup>3</sup> the incumbent's proposed interval — rather than the Commission's default rule — will apply unless and until the state commission rules otherwise. Qwest submits that this interpretation is the most reasonable reading of paragraph 36 of the *Order*.

If the Commission instead intended that the *Order* require compliance with the 90-day default rule *notwithstanding* a state commission's effective approval (by operation of law) of an amended SGAT, Qwest respectfully requests reconsideration of that decision. Requiring compliance with the federal default rule in lieu of the interval specified in the SGAT would be inconsistent with section 252 of the Act. Moreover, the Commission's apparent assumption that 90 days is nearly always a reasonable period for provisioning collocation space appears to be founded in large part on an incorrect understanding of Qwest's own provisioning policy. Far from agreeing invariably to provision cageless collocation space within 90 days,<sup>4</sup> Qwest has made clear to requesting carriers and state commissions that, absent adequate forecasts of the demand for collocation space, Qwest *cannot* provision space within 90 days in many circumstances. As the attached declaration of Georganne Weidenbach demonstrates, where demand forecasts are inadequate, or where a CLEC request necessitates substantial reconditioning or adjacent collocation, a 90-day maximum provisioning interval is unreasonable.

---

<sup>2</sup> See *id.* ¶ 36.

<sup>3</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 252(f)(3)(B).

<sup>4</sup> See *Collocation Provisioning Order* ¶ 27 (stating that Qwest has "committed itself" to provisioning cageless collocation space within 90 days).

Qwest wishes to emphasize that it does not seek to establish that an incumbent LEC may delay the provisioning of collocation space for no good reason. Qwest is not only a seller of collocation space, but a major purchaser as well. Qwest agrees that it is appropriate for the Commission to adopt rules that encourage incumbents to satisfy collocation requests on a timely basis. Qwest is filing this petition because the Commission's rules could be read to create a situation where mandatory collocation intervals simply cannot be met. As a general principle, allowing 90 days for collocation provisioning is a reasonable and attainable goal, assuming proper forecasting of demand. But if forecasting is not provided, or is not accurate, incumbent LECs will not be able to plan their own floor-space needs and those of CLECs, making 90 days an unreasonable standard. In addition, when an incumbent must construct or condition space to satisfy a collocation request, the provisioning process often will take more than 90 days, regardless of whether forecasting has been provided. This petition seeks to establish a regulatory structure in which these circumstances can be properly addressed. It does not seek a retrenchment of the Commission's collocation commitment or rules.

### **BACKGROUND**

In its *Local Competition Order*<sup>5</sup> and *Advanced Services First Report and Order*,<sup>6</sup> the Commission imposed a series of stringent collocation requirements on incumbent LECs. On reconsideration, in response to petitions asserting that additional requirements were necessary to promote vigorous competition, the Commission adopted the default 90-day provisioning rule,

---

<sup>5</sup> See *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, First Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 15499 (1996).

<sup>6</sup> See *Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability*, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 14 FCC Rcd 4761 (1999).

among other measures, in the *Collocation Provisioning Order*.<sup>7</sup> The *Order* purports to continue the Act's primary reliance on carriers and state commissions to establish the particular terms of interconnection agreements. Accordingly, it imposes a 90-day maximum provisioning interval *only* where (a) a requesting party and incumbent LEC have failed to agree on an appropriate provisioning interval, or (b) a state has not set its own provisioning interval.<sup>8</sup>

Where a collocation provisioning interval will be implemented through a new or amended interconnection agreement, the effect of the Commission's default rule is relatively straightforward: It will apply failing the adoption of a different interval through the negotiation or arbitration processes described in section 252.<sup>9</sup> Where an SGAT or tariff is involved, however, implementation of this rule is less clear. Paragraph 36 of the *Order* addresses these circumstances:

In some instances, a state tariff sets forth the rates, terms, and conditions under which an incumbent LEC provides physical collocation to requesting carriers. An incumbent LEC also may have filed with the state commission a statement of generally available terms and conditions (SGAT) under which it offers to provide physical collocation to requesting carriers. Because of the critical importance of timely collocation provisioning, we conclude that, within 30 days after the effective date of this Order, the incumbent LEC must file with the state commission any amendments necessary to bring a tariff or SGAT into compliance with the national standards. At the time it files these amendments, the incumbent must also file its request, if any, that the state set intervals longer than the national standards as well as all supporting information. For a SGAT, the national standards shall take effect within 60 days after the amendment's filing except to the extent the state commission specifies other application processing or provisioning intervals for a particular type of collocation arrangements, such as cageless collocation. Where a tariff must be amended to reflect the national standards, those standards shall take effect at the earliest time permissible under applicable state requirements.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See *Collocation Provisioning Order* ¶¶ 14-69.

<sup>8</sup> See *id.* ¶ 22.

<sup>9</sup> See *id.* ¶¶ 33-35.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* ¶ 36.

The need for clarification arises from the fact that amendments to an SGAT become effective within 60 days of the incumbent LEC's submission *regardless* of whether the state commission has completed its review of the amendment. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 252(f)(3).

Notwithstanding this statutory provision, the *Order* arguably could be read to require an *affirmative ruling* by a state commission before an SGAT that contains some provisioning interval other than the Commission's 90-day default interval becomes effective.<sup>11</sup>

### ARGUMENT

#### **I. THE COMMISSION SHOULD CLARIFY THAT AN INCUMBENT LEC MAY RELY ON THE PROVISIONING INTERVAL SPECIFIED IN AN AMENDED SGAT REGARDLESS OF WHETHER A STATE COMMISSION AFFIRMATIVELY APPROVES THE AMENDMENT OR INSTEAD ALLOWS IT TO TAKE EFFECT BY OPERATION OF LAW.**

As the Commission has recognized, while a 90-day provisioning interval for collocation space may be appropriate in some situations, circumstances inevitably will exist in which a longer interval is necessary.<sup>12</sup> For example, "conditioning space in a premises [may be] particularly difficult,"<sup>13</sup> and forecasts of demand by CLECs may be inadequate for the incumbent to plan for the necessary construction.<sup>14</sup> As a general matter, the *Order* appropriately recognizes the need to rely on the negotiation and arbitration processes established in section 252 of the Act to tailor provisioning intervals to particular circumstances.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> *See id.* ("national standards shall take effect within 60 days after the amendment's filing except to the extent the state commission *specifies* other application or provisioning intervals for a particular type of collocation arrangement, such as cageless collocation") (emphasis added). Similarly, where a tariff amendment that proposes an interval longer than 90 days takes effect without affirmative action by a state commission, it is unclear whether the Commission would require the incumbent LEC subject to the default 90-day rule.

<sup>12</sup> *See, e.g., id.* ¶ 22.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *See id.* ¶ 16 (citing comments of Bell Atlantic at 10-11).

<sup>15</sup> *See id.* ¶ 22; *see also id.* ¶ 37 ("States will continue to have flexibility to adopt different intervals and additional collocation requirements, consistent with the Act.").

With respect to tailoring intervals through the SGAT process, however, the *Order* is ambiguous. On the one hand, the Commission has acknowledged that incumbents' amendments to their SGATs may include "intervals *longer* than the national standards," provided the incumbent provides supporting information.<sup>16</sup> Read in light of section 252(f)(3) of the Act, this acknowledgment should mean that, where (a) an incumbent has a good-faith basis for establishing a provisioning interval of longer than 90 days, (b) the incumbent includes such an interval within its amended SGAT and provides supporting information, and (c) the relevant state commission approves the amended SGAT by failing to take any contrary action within 60 days of the submission, the incumbent may rely on the longer provisioning interval.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, the *Order* includes some language that could be read to provide that a longer provisioning interval will be effective only if a state commission makes an *affirmative* ruling to that effect.<sup>18</sup>

The Commission should clarify that the former reading is the correct one. Applying the default 90-day interval after a state commission has declined to reject an amended SGAT would be inconsistent with section 252(f)(3), as well as with the Act's primary reliance on carriers and state commissions to establish specific interconnection provisions.<sup>19</sup> Such an interpretation also would be inconsistent with the general recognition in the *Order* that the national default will

---

<sup>16</sup> See *id.* ¶ 36 (emphasis added).

<sup>17</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 252(f)(3)(B). By this filing, Qwest does not suggest that a state order extending the provisioning interval for reasons other than forecasting deficiencies or construction requirements would be reasonable.

<sup>18</sup> *Collocation Provisioning Order* ¶ 36 ("national standards shall take effect within 60 days after the amendment's filing except to the extent the state commission *specifies* other application or provisioning intervals for a particular type of collocation arrangement, such as cageless collocation") (emphasis added).

<sup>19</sup> See generally 47 U.S.C. § 252.

apply *only* “when the state does *not* set its own standards.”<sup>20</sup> A state may “set” standards by declining to take action with respect to an SGAT, just as it can by issuing an affirmative ruling.

Moreover, as explained more fully in the following section, requiring compliance with the 90-day default interval when an incumbent LEC has documented its inability to comply with that deadline — simply because the state commission chose not to rule affirmatively on an amended SGAT, or lacked sufficient time to act — would unfairly penalize incumbents. Qwest has now filed SGATs in 11 of the 14 states in which it provides service as an incumbent LEC. All of these SGATs contain collocation provisions, and all have been the subject of extensive debate and revision at the Section 271 workshops in which Qwest has been participating over the last year. By the November 9 deadline, Qwest plans to have filed SGAT amendments in these 11 states and original SGATs in the remaining three states. These revised and new SGATs all will contain detailed language dealing with collocation issues, including documentation of the manner in which collocation requests that cannot be fulfilled within 90 days should be handled. While Qwest intends to prosecute these SGAT filings vigorously, and will work to secure affirmative state approvals of the amended collocation language under Section 252(f)(3)(A) within 60 days of filing, Qwest cannot assure that all such approvals will be obtained within that time frame. It would be unreasonable to make the availability of an exception to the 90-day provisioning interval — for which the need is fully documented — hinge on circumstances entirely beyond the incumbent LEC’s control.

**II. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE COMMISSION SHOULD RECONSIDER THE IMPOSITION OF THE 90-DAY DEFAULT RULE IN CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE A STATE COMMISSION HAS DECLINED TO RULE ON AN AMENDED SGAT WITHIN 60 DAYS.**

---

<sup>20</sup> *Collocation Provisioning Order* ¶ 22 (emphasis added).



If the Commission denies Qwest's request for clarification and determines that the *Order* intended to impose the 90-day default provisioning interval in the absence of an affirmative ruling on an SGAT amendment, Qwest requests reconsideration of that aspect of the *Order*.

As discussed above, section 252(f)(3) makes an incumbent's SGAT effective after 60 days, regardless of whether the state commission has issued an affirmative ruling or instead simply let the SGAT take effect automatically.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, treating an amended SGAT as *ineffective* in the absence of an affirmative ruling would be inconsistent with the statute. In addition, section 252's establishment of negotiation and arbitration processes precludes the Commission from imposing any interconnection obligation as an absolute requirement.<sup>22</sup> But if the *Order* imposed the 90-day provisioning interval irrespective of an incumbent's submission of an SGAT documenting the need for an alternative interval, it would render the negotiation and arbitration processes moot. Reading the *Order* to allow an incumbent to adhere to a longer provisioning schedule after filing an adequately supported SGAT therefore is necessary under section 252.

Moreover, if the *Order* were read to assert that a 90-day provisioning interval *invariably* can be met, there is no support in the record for such an assertion. As the attached declaration of Georganne Weidenbach demonstrates, Qwest's ability to provision collocation space within 90 days depends on accurate demand forecasts and is dramatically affected when a CLEC request necessitates extensive conditioning of space or construction of an adjacent vault.

---

<sup>21</sup> See 47 U.S.C. 252(f)(3).

<sup>22</sup> See *id.* §§ 252(a), (b).

The statement in the *Order* that the default 90-day interval “exceeds the interval U S WEST [now Qwest] has committed itself to achieve for cageless physical collocation”<sup>23</sup> is based on an incorrect understanding of Qwest’s internal policy. Qwest has entered into *some* agreements with CLECs that commit Qwest to provision space within 45 or 90 days, because those agreements also require CLECs to provide Qwest with long-term forecasts of demand. Such forecasting requirements are critical to Qwest’s willingness to commit to short provisioning intervals. Absent such forecasts, Qwest cannot make advance preparations for provisioning collocation space and therefore cannot ensure compliance with a 90-day provisioning commitment. Thus, an absolute requirement to provision collocation space within 90 days — which the *Order* would impose if not read as Qwest suggests in section I above — cannot be based on the assertion that Qwest already has adopted such a requirement for itself.

Finally, if the Commission interprets the *Order* as imposing a requirement to comply with the 90-day default interval even where an incumbent has already filed an SGAT justifying a longer interval, the Commission should create exceptions for situations where CLECs have not sufficiently forecast demand, or where extensive space reconditioning or construction of adjacent vaults are required. As the attached declaration of Georganne Weidenbach demonstrates, Qwest cannot comply with a 90-day deadline in such circumstances. It would be patently unreasonable for the Commission to penalize an incumbent LEC for failing to comply with the 90-day provisioning interval when the LEC (a) has taken all steps within its power to have an amended SGAT approved by the state commission, and (b) cannot possibly meet a CLEC’s requirements within 90 days because of extensive construction requirements or other factors that it could not reasonably anticipate.

---

<sup>23</sup> *Collocation Provisioning Order* ¶ 27.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should clarify the Order by stating that an incumbent LEC that has filed an adequately documented SGAT amendment that includes a provisioning interval longer than 90 days may comply with that interval if the state commission declines to issue any ruling within 60 days of the filing of the amendment. In the alternative, the Commission should reconsider the decision to apply the 90-day interval in this circumstance.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. McKenna  
QWEST CORPORATION  
1801 California Street, Ste. 5100  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 672-2861

---

William T. Lake  
Matthew A. Brill  
WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING  
2445 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
(202) 663-6000

*Counsel for Qwest Corporation*

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matters of	)	
	)	
Deployment of Wireline Services Offering	)	CC Docket No. 98-147
Advanced Telecommunications Capability	)	
	)	
and	)	
	)	
Implementation of the Local Competition	)	CC Docket No. 96-98
Provisions of the Telecommunications	)	
Act of 1996	)	

**Declaration of Georganne Weidenbach**

1. My name is Georganne Weidenbach. I am employed by Qwest Communications International as a Network Planner, Strategist and Negotiator in the Technical Regulatory Interconnection Planning group. From 1996 to 1998, I served as the Lead Project Manager for Collocation and Interconnection for U S WEST, Inc., before the merger of Qwest and U S WEST.

2. I have held numerous positions with Qwest and U S WEST, including managing the Design Services installation and repair dispatch center for the Local Network Organization. I have extensive Marketing, Public Policy and Engineering background, including the development of written methods and procedures for Design Services and Collocation applications.

3. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in business from Regis University at Denver.

4. I have reviewed the FCC's recent Collocation Order, and believe that the Order is deficient in three important respects:

1) **Forecasting** — The Order fails to require CLECs to provide, or to permit ILECs to require CLECs to provide, timely and accurate forecasts of their collocation requirements. It instead leaves the issue of forecasting to each individual state. Forecasts are absolutely crucial in orderly administration of collocation provisioning.

2) **Adjacent Collocation** — The Order, in rule §51.323(l), establishes a 90-day interval for Adjacent Collocation. Such a requirement is not supported by record evidence or the text of the Order, nor is a 90-day interval a reasonable requirement, given the work required.

3) **Reconditioning of Space** — The Order requires incumbent LECs to complete the reconditioning of space as a part of the 90 day interval. This is an unreasonable requirement, given the amount of work required to recondition space, particularly since the FCC has not required CLECs to provide a forecast of their collocation requirements.

I will address each of the above issues in the following sections of this affidavit.

5. **Forecasting.** To achieve the 90-day intervals established in the Order for caged or cageless physical collocation, it is critical that incumbent LECs obtain accurate and timely forecasts from CLECs. Such forecasts are required to determine if sufficient space is available, and to pre-provision such infrastructure as power, air conditioning, lighting, and to recondition office space or remove unused, obsolete equipment if required. Such pre-provisioning is necessary, since such infrastructure cannot be completed within the 90-day interval between the receipt of an application by a CLEC and the turnover of space by Qwest.

6. For example, Qwest has approximately 1,400 central office locations, but more than two-thirds of these central offices have no collocation. Without forecasts, Qwest cannot reasonably be expected to predict when and if a request for collocation will arrive at one of the more than 900 central offices where no collocation has yet been requested. Nor can Qwest be expected to accurately predict the specific power, space,

and air conditioning needs for the collocation request of such a future CLEC application. As a result, it is unreasonable to require Qwest to pre-provision the space, power, air-conditioning, and other infrastructure in these locations for the possible arrival of a collocator at some point in time in the future.

7. Forecasts are also an important tool in the hiring, training, and deployment of work force engaged in the various stages of collocation – including feasibility studies, quotation development, and construction.

8. **Adjacent Collocation.** Adjacent collocation is required when space for physical collocation has been exhausted at a particular premise. In the context of an exhausted central office building, it is unreasonable to expect the construction of an adjacent structure (such as a building addition, controlled environmental vault, or other structure) within the 90-day interval. Because the Order grants CLECs the right to construct the adjacent structure, a typical process will involve first determining the amount of space required by the CLEC, a review of the plans for the site, including future construction plans, parking requirements, hoisting areas, existing cable vaults and cable runs. Once a general design has been established, a more detailed design must be prepared, and often bids will be required from multiple general contractors. Building permits may also be required from the local governmental agency. Actual construction of the adjacent structure, once permits have been obtained and a contractor is selected will also often require several months for excavation, drainage, construction of the structure, and the supporting infrastructure (power, lighting, etc.). Completion of all of this work, as well as the work required to permit the incumbent LEC to terminate the associated DC Power, and tie cables to the network, cannot generally be completed in a 90-day interval.

This is particularly unreasonable, as the FCC has granted to the CLEC the right to complete the majority of this work for adjacent collocation.

9. **Reconditioning of Space.** Reconditioning of space is required when a central office building has exhausted space, but the same central office has available administrative space that may be converted to central office space. Such conversion of administrative space to central office space is referred to as reconditioning space. A typical administrative space contains carpeted floors, desks, suspended ceilings, and associated lighting fixtures. Conversion of this space typically involves the hiring of an architect, who prepares drawings and detailed specifications, for the removal of the carpeting, ceiling, lighting fixtures, etc. as well as the construction of the new floor, the installation of new lighting fixtures, the installation of new electrical outlets, and the construction of new air conditioning venting (and cooling capacity, if required).

10. Once the specifications are completed, the drawings and specifications are submitted to general contractors through a request for bids, depending on the size of the job. Once the contractor is selected, the construction can begin.

11. All of the above generally require substantially more than 90 days for completion.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this \_\_\_ day of October, 2000.

---

Georganne Weidenbach

**The FCC Acknowledges Receipt of Comments From ...  
Qwest Corporation  
...and Thank You for Your Comments**

<b>Your Confirmation Number is: '20001010036777' 1</b>		
<b>Date Received: Oct 10 2000</b>		
<b>Docket: 98-147</b>		
<b>Number of Files Transmitted: 1</b>		
<b>File Name</b>	<b>File Type</b>	<b>File Size (bytes)</b>
<b>PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION</b>	<b>Microsoft Word</b>	<b>53761</b>

[Initiate a Submission](#) | [Search ECFS](#) | [Return to ECFS Home Page](#)

ATTACHMENT B

---

<b>Intervals</b>						
Forecast / Requirements	Application	Space Feasibility	Quote issuance	Quote Acceptance	Delivery of Equipment	Completion
with annual forecast, updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance		Within 90 calendar days of application
with annual forecast, updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	If written acceptance and 50% down payment <u>is not received within 7 calendar days</u> of quote issuance, and is less than 30 calendar days from quote issuance		Within 90 calendar days <u>from receipt of written acceptance and 50% down payment</u>
no forecast	day 1	Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance		Within 120 calendar days of application + additional days* if HVAC &/or DC power is required
no forecast	day 1	Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	If written acceptance and 50% down payment <u>is not received</u> within 7 calendar days of quote issuance, and is less than 30 calendar days from quote issuance		Within 120 calendar days from receipt of written acceptance and 50% down payment + additional days* if HVAC &/or DC power is required.
with annual forecast updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance	All CLEC equipment delivered to collocation site within 45 days from date of application	Within 90 calendar days of application
with annual forecast updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance	CLEC equipment <u>not delivered</u> to collocation site within 45 days from date of application	45 calendar days from date of receipt of CLEC's equipment.
with annual forecast updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	If written acceptance and 50% down payment <u>is not received</u> within 7 calendar days of quote issuance, and is less than 30 calendar days from quote issuance	All CLEC equipment delivered to collocation site <u>within</u> 45 days from date of application	Within 90 calendar days from receipt of written acceptance and 50% down payment.
with annual forecast updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	If written acceptance and 50% down payment <u>is not received</u> within 7 calendar days of quote issuance, and is less than 30 calendar days from quote issuance	CLEC equipment <u>not delivered</u> to collocation site within 45 days from date of application	45 calendar days from date of receipt of CLEC's equipment.
no forecast	day 1	Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance	All CLEC equipment delivered to collocation site <u>within</u> 45 days from date of application	Within 120 calendar days of application + additional days* if HVAC &/or DC power is required
no forecast	day 1	Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance	CLEC equipment <u>not delivered</u> to collocation site within 45 days from date of application	75 calendar days from date of receipt of CLEC's equipment + additional days* if HVAC &/or DC power is required

Type of Collocation	Forecast / Requirements	Application	Space Feasibility	Quote Issuance	Quote Acceptance	Delivery of Equipment	Completion
Virtual	If no forecast	day 1	Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	If written acceptance and 50% down payment <u>is not received</u> within 7 calendar days of quote issuance, and is less than 30 calendar days from quote issuance	All CLEC equipment delivered to collocation site <u>within</u> 45 days from date of application	Within 120 calendar days of written acceptance and 50% down payment + additional days* if HVAC &/or DC power is required
Virtual	If no forecast	day 1	Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	If written acceptance and 50% down payment <u>is not received</u> within 7 calendar days of quote issuance, and is less than 30 calendar days from quote issuance	CLEC equipment <u>not</u> delivered to collocation site within 45 days from date of application	75 calendar days from date of receipt of CLEC's equipment + additional days* if HVAC &/or DC power is required
Virtual Augment	With annual forecast updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 10 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance		Within 30 calendar days upon receipt of acceptance and 50% down payment
ICDF	With annual forecast updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance		Within 45 calendar days of application
ICDF	With annual forecast updated quarterly, with forecast to be received a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to submission of application	day 1	Within 10 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	If written acceptance and 50% down payment <u>is not received</u> within 7 calendar days of quote issuance, and is less than 30 calendar days from quote issuance		Within 45 calendar days <u>from receipt of written acceptance and 50% down payment.</u>
ICDF	If no forecast	day 1	Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	Written acceptance and 50% payment <u>within</u> 7 calendar days of quote issuance		Within 90 calendar days of application
ICDF	If no forecast	day 1	Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an acceptable application	Within 25 Calendar days from issuance of feasibility	If written acceptance and 50% down payment <u>is not received</u> within 7 calendar days of quote issuance, and is less than 30 calendar days from quote issuance		Within 90 calendar days <u>from receipt of written acceptance and 50% down payment.</u>

\* Additional Days:

1. To install a power plant requires an additional 60 days (total 180 day interval).
2. To install diesel generators requires an additional 120 days (total 240 day interval).
3. If an HVAC job is needed, it could require an additional 30 to 90 days (total 150 to 210 day interval).

NOTE: Intervals are contingent upon outside vendor availability and material lead times.

If CLEC does not respond with both written acceptance and 50% down payment within 30 calendar days of quote issuance, the application will be canceled.

An application, if containing deficiencies, must be returned to the CLEC noting all deficiencies within 10 calendar days of receipt of the application, and a 10 calendar days exists for the CLEC to resubmit the application or lose its place in the 1st-come, 1st-served queue.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Ross Dino, do hereby certify that I have caused the foregoing **PETITION FOR CONDITIONAL WAIVER** to be filed electronically with the FCC by using its Electronic Comment Filing System, and a courtesy paper copy of the **PETITION** to be served, via hand delivery, upon the persons listed on the attached service list.

Ross Dino  
Ross Dino

October 18, 2000

---

William E. Kennard  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Gloria Tristani  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Michael K. Powell  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Harold Furchtgott-Roth  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Susan P. Ness  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Dorothy T. Attwood, Chief  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Michelle Carey, Chief  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Kathy Farroba, Deputy Chief  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Janice Myles  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Glenn Reynolds, Deputy Chief  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

---

International Transcription  
Services, Inc.  
1231 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

CC98-147a-el.doc  
Last Update: 10/18/2000

---

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Richard Grozier, do hereby certify that I have caused 1) the foregoing **REPLY COMMENTS OF QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC.** to be filed electronically with the FCC by using its Electronic Comment Filing System, 2) a paper and diskette copy of the **REPLY COMMENTS** to be served, via hand delivery, upon the entity (marked with a number sign) listed on the attached service list, 3) a courtesy copy of the **REPLY COMMENTS** to be served, via hand delivery, upon the persons (marked with an asterisk) listed on the attached service list, and 4) a copy of the **REPLY COMMENTS** to be served, via first class United States mail, postage prepaid, upon all other persons listed on the attached service list.

Richard Grozier  
Richard Grozier

November 14, 2000

\*William E. Kennard  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Gloria Tristani  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Michael K. Powell  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Harold Furchtgott-Roth  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Susan P. Ness  
Federal Communications Commission  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Dorothy T. Attwood, Chief  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Michelle Carey, Chief  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Kathy Farroba, Deputy Chief  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Janice Myles  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

\*Glenn Reynolds, Deputy Chief  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

#International Transcription  
Services, Inc.  
1231 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Mark P. Trincherro  
James S. Blitz  
Holly Rachel Smith  
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP  
Suite 450  
1500 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

ATG

James J. Gunther, Jr.  
Alcatel USA, Inc.  
Suite 800  
1909 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Robert J. Mille  
Gardere & Wynne, LLP  
1601 Elm Street  
Dallas, TX 75201

Alcatel

Robert W. McCausland  
Allegiance Telecom, Inc.  
Suite 3026  
1950 Stemmons Freeway  
Dallas, TX 75207-3118

Andrew D. Lipman  
Robin F. Cohn  
Michael P. Donahue  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman LLP  
Suite 300  
3000 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007  
(two copies)

Allegiance Telecom  
Connectiv

Eric Branfman  
Kathleen L. Greenan  
Harisha J. Bastiampillai  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman LLP  
Suite 300  
3000 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007  
(three copies)

CoreComm  
CTSI  
DSLnet

James N. Moskowitz  
Emily M. Williams  
Helen E. Disenhaus  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
Suite 300  
3000 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007  
(three copies)

FT/LB  
@Link  
MPower

Michael W. Fleming  
Russell M. Blau  
Kevin Hawley  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman LLP  
Suite 300  
3000 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007  
(two copies)

PF.Net  
RCN

Richard M. Rindler  
D. Anthony Mastando  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman LLP  
Suite 300  
3000 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007

Telergy/Adelphia

Mark C. Rosenblum  
Roy E. Hoffinger  
Stephen C. Garavito  
Richard H. Rubin  
Teresa Marrero  
AT&T Corp.  
295 North Maple Avenue  
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Peter D. Keisler  
David L. Lawson  
Thomas P. Van Wazer  
James P. Young  
Michael J. Hunseder  
Sidley & Austin  
1722 Eye Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

AT&T

James L. Casserly  
James J. Valentino  
Lisa N. Anderson  
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky & Popeo  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004

AT&T

M. Robert Sutherland  
Jonathan B. Banks  
BellSouth Corporation  
Suite 1800  
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Atlanta, GA 30309

Gary Bolton  
Catena Networks, Inc.  
6004 Atkins Farm Court  
Raleigh, NC 27606

Scott Blake Harris  
William M. Wiltshire  
Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis LLP  
1200 Eighteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Cisco Systems, Inc.

Carol Ann Bischoff  
Jonathan Lee  
Competitive Telecommunications  
Association  
Suite 800  
1900 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Robert J. Aamoth  
Jennifer M. Kashatus  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
Suite 500  
1200 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

CTA

Brad E. Mutschelknaus  
Jonathan E. Canis  
Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr.  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
Suite 500  
1200 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
(two copies)

Joint Commenters  
Metromedia

Ross A. Buntrock  
David Kirschner  
David Konuch  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
Suite 500  
1200 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
(two copies)

Joint Commenters  
Metromedia

John Citrolo  
Conectiv Communications, Inc.  
POB 6066  
Newark, DE 19174

Jason D. Oxman  
Thomas M. Koutsky  
Covad Communications Company  
Suite 750  
600 14<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Wendy Bluemling  
DSLnet Communications, LLC  
Fifth Floor  
545 Long Wharf Drive  
New Haven, CT 06511

Richard Metzger  
Pamela Arluk  
Focal Communications Corporation  
Suite 850 North  
7799 Leesburg Pike  
Falls Church, VA 22043

Gale Kalitsi  
Focal Communications Corporation  
Suite 1100  
200 N. LaSalle  
Chicago, IL 60601

George N. Barclay  
Michael J. Ettner  
General Services Administration  
Room 4002  
1800 F Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20405

Snavelly King Majoros O'Connor  
& Lee, Inc.  
Suite 410  
1220 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

S. Blake Ashby  
IntraSpan Communications, Inc.  
6609 Clemens, 1W  
St. Louis, MO 63130

Howard Siegel  
IP Communications Corporation  
Suite 300  
17300 Preston Road  
Dallas TX 75252

Peter A. Batacan  
LightBonding.Com, Inc.  
Suite 305  
4100 Lafayette Center Drive  
Chantilly, VA 20151

Constance L. Kirkendall  
@Link Networks, Inc.  
Suite 110  
2220 Campbell Creek Blvd.  
Richardson, TX 75082

David R. Conn  
McLeodUSA Telecommunications  
Services, Inc.  
6400 C Street, S.W.  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52406-3177

Kent F. Heyman  
Francis D.R. Coleman  
Mpower Communications Corp.  
Suite 300  
175 Sully's Trail  
Pittsford, NY 14534

Donald H. Sussman  
Network Access Solutions Corporation  
13650 Dulles Technology Drive  
Herndon, VA 20171

Rodney L. Joyce  
J. Thomas Nolan  
Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP  
Suite 800  
600 14<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-2004

Network Access

Joseph A. McGlothlin  
McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin,  
Davidson, Decker, Kaufman,  
Arnold & Steen, P.A.  
117 South Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Network Telephone

Lawrence G. Malone  
Public Service Commission of the  
State of New York  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223-1352

John G. Lamb, Jr.  
Nortel Networks Inc.  
2100 Lakeside Boulevard  
Richardson, TX 75081-1599

Stephen L. Goodman  
William F. Maher, Jr.  
Halprin, Temple, Goodman & Maher  
Suite 950, North Tower  
555 12<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004

Nortel

Michael E. Olsen  
William J. Bailey, III  
Lori Anne Dolqueist  
NorthPoint Communications, Inc.  
303 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107



Lawrence E. Sarjeant  
Linda L. Kent  
Keith Townsend  
John W. Hunter  
United States Telecom Association  
Suite 600  
1401 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Lawrence W. Katz  
Joseph DiBella  
Michael E. Glover  
Edward Shakin  
Verizon Telephone Companies  
Eighth Floor  
1320 North Court House Road  
Arlington, VA 22201

Russell C. Merbeth  
Michael Carowitz  
Larry Walke  
Winstar Communications, Inc.  
Suite 1260  
1615 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Richard S. Whitt  
Cristin L. Flynn  
WorldCom, Inc.  
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Mark D. Schneider  
Jenner & Block  
12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
601 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

WorldCom

CC96-98uurev-el.doc  
Last Update: 11/14/2000