

**K R A S K I N, L E S S E & C O S S O N, L L C**  
**A T T O R N E Y S A T L A W**  
**2120 L Street, N.W., Suite 520**  
**Washington, D.C. 20037**

**TELEPHONE (202) 296-8890**

**TELECOPIER (202) 296-8893**

May 2, 2003

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Notice of *Ex Parte* Presentation in CC Docket No. 01-92

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Thursday, May 1, 2003, Sylvia Lesse, Steven Watkins and I met with members of the Commission's Staff on behalf of the Alliance of Incumbent Rural Independent Telephone Companies (the "Alliance"), the Georgia Telephone Association, the Kentucky Independent Telephone Group, the Mississippi Rural Independent Telephone Company Group, and the Tennessee Rural Independent Coalition (all of which are collectively referred to herein as the "Independents"). The members of the Commission Staff in attendance were William Maher, Jane Jackson, Joshua Swift, Victoria Schlesinger, and Steven Morris of the Wireline Competition Bureau.

The purpose of our meeting was to discuss issues raised in the above-referenced proceeding in the specific context of *ex parte* communications on April 16 and 23, 2003 by Verizon Wireless. The positions we advocated, together with the underlying factual and legal analysis, have been fully set forth on the record in the Comments submitted on August 8, 2002 and October 18, 2002, on behalf of the Alliance.

In addition to our discussions regarding certain critical facts that have not been addressed by other parties in this proceeding, as reflected in our *ex parte* filing in this proceeding on April 29, 2003, we addressed some of the network architecture issues which provide a contextual background to current disagreements, including the legacy RBOC intraLATA toll common trunking arrangements, and the fact that the network of a rural independent telephone company typically ends at its exchange boundary. In addition, we discussed the fact that the terminating rights provided under Section 251(b) of the Act are (1) distinct from the provisions of Section 251(a), and (2) do not form any basis to support a claimed "right" to define or dictate originating traffic.

Because CMRS providers, and other carriers, have an array of choices with respect to methods of terminating traffic to the networks of the Independents, the attempt to depict every arrangement as an interconnection subject to Section 251(b)(5) of the Telecommunications Act is inaccurate. Nor does any federal law or regulation prescribe end user customer rates or rate design with respect to the treatment of traffic originating on the network of a rural local exchange carrier and destined to the network of a CMRS provider. Furthermore, there is no mandated method for interconnection with the public switched network, whether through an RBOC tandem or otherwise

The April 23, 2003 Verizon Wireless notice of *ex parte* communication attaches copies of extracts from the so-called industry “meet point billing” guidelines set forth in the “Multiple Exchange Carrier Access Billing (“MECAB”)” document published by the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (“ATIS”). These guidelines have been cited recently by BellSouth to support its unilateral decision to alter an existing interconnection arrangement with the Independents by substituting a so-called “meet-point billing.” Under existing arrangements, BellSouth brings traffic (including traffic of CMRS carriers) to the networks of the Independents for termination; until recently, BellSouth provided compensation to the Independents in accordance with established terms and conditions. The Independents’ objection to this attempted fiat, in the form of the various “Petitions for Emergency Relief” filed by the Independents before their respective state regulatory authorities, were brought to the Commission’s attention by Verizon Wireless and are attached to its *ex parte* notice of April 16, 2003.

With respect to these unilaterally imposed, so-called “meet point billing” arrangements, the Independents provided the members of the Commission Staff a copy of Section 2.1 of the ATIS MECAB document which is also attached hereto. This Section, captioned “Scope,” demonstrates that, contrary to the implication arising from its omission, it is not an industry standard to impose unilaterally a meet-point billing arrangement on any carrier. Although this fundamental principle has been overlooked by those who cite the MECAB guidelines, it is both a matter of common sense and clearly articulated in the guidelines that the determination of implementation of any meet-point billing arrangement is “based upon Provider-to-Provider negotiations where the regulatory environment permits. When all involved providers agree to a meet-point Billing arrangement, these guidelines are used” (emphasis added).

Based upon these facts, we explained that the application of the critical facts and analysis set forth support the rational resolution of several of the issues pending before the Commission:

1. The Independents have urged the Commission to grant the US LEC Petition. When any local exchange carrier receives any traffic delivered by an interexchange or toll carrier utilizing an established access interconnection arrangement to terminate the traffic, the local exchange carrier is entitled to access charges in accordance with applicable rules and regulation.

2. The Independents have urged the Commission to reject the T-Mobile Petition. The Independents should be permitted to establish statements of general terms and conditions that may be applicable to the provision of interconnection services. The establishment of such statements of generally available terms through the filing of a tariff is consistent with the intent and underlying purpose of Section 252(f) of the Telecommunications Act. Access to generally available terms and conditions provides an administratively efficient mechanism for the establishment of an interconnection arrangement between the requesting and providing parties. Moreover, the establishment of tariffs providing statements of generally available terms and conditions does not obviate the right of a requesting carrier to negotiate and arbitrate, if necessary, individually applicable terms and conditions with respect to the interconnection services requested by that carrier.

3. The Independents continue to urge the Commission to deny Sprint's Petition that seeks to dictate how the Independents would route and rate traffic destined to a CMRS provider. As demonstrated in the August 8, 2002 Comments of the Alliance, and further demonstrated by the facts set forth above, Sprint's proposal has no basis in fact or law. The result of Sprint's proposition would be: 1) to deny incumbent rural local exchange carriers their statutory rights regarding the treatment of traffic originating on their networks; and 2) to require incumbent rural local exchange carriers to take responsibility for the transport of traffic beyond their established networks and certificated service areas. The objectives sought by Sprint are matters for negotiation between two interconnecting carriers exercising their respective rights established by Section 251. The declaratory ruling sought by Sprint is contrary to fact and law.

Please direct any questions regarding this Notice to Sylvia Lesse, Steven Watkins or me at (202)296-8890.

Sincerely,

Stephen G. Kraskin

Attachment

cc: William Maher  
Jane Jackson  
Joshua Swift  
Victoria Schlesinger  
Steven Morris