

ORIGINAL



Robert W. Quinn, Jr.
Vice President
Federal Government Affairs

Suite 1000
1120 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202 457-3851
FAX 202 263-2655
WIRELESS 202 256-7503
EMAIL rwquinn@att.com

RECEIVED

APR 6 2001

April 6, 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW, Room TWB-204
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation:
Access Charge Reform, CC Docket No. 96-262; Request for Emergency Relief of the Minnesota CLEC Consortium and the Rural Independent Competitive alliance, DA-1067; Mandatory Detariffing of CLEC Interstate Access Services, DA 00-1268

Dear Ms. Salas:

On Thursday April 5, 2001, I had a conversation with Jordan Goldstein, Legal Adviser to Commissioner Ness, to discuss AT&T's position in the above referenced proceeding. Specifically, I stated that the Commission should adopt the proposal submitted by AT&T and supported by New South Communications on March 16, 2001 which recommends that if the Commission is not inclined to order competitive local carriers to reduce their interstate access rates to the access rate assessed by the incumbent local exchange carrier immediately, then the Commission should order CLECs to lower interstate access rates to 1.2 cents/minute immediately and ramp those rates down to the prevailing incumbent rate within twelve months.

I reiterated AT&T's position that permitting CLECs to charge access rates above the ILEC rate would foster an inefficient market and distort competition. I defended AT&T's twelve month ramp down as a reasonable time in which to bring CLECs in line with the prevailing market structure. I identified that one of the many problems associated with the extended ramp down proposed by the ALTS's companies was that it gave inefficient carriers (who enter the market charging more than incumbent) an advantage in the marketplace for an extended period of time over other more efficient

No. of Copies rec'd 014
List A B C D E

competitive carriers (who charge less than the incumbent) by enabling those carriers to have access to an additional revenue stream.

I explained that the perverse impact such a message would send to the market – encouraging carriers to raise their rates to those charged by the inefficient carrier – would be devastating to the development of competition. My statements were consistent the positions previously articulated by AT&T in filings in the above referenced proceedings.

I have submitted two copies of this Notice in accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Levine / PKA

cc: J. Goldstein