

LAWLER, METZGER & MILKMAN, LLC

2001 K STREET, NW
SUITE 802
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

A. RENEE CALLAHAN
PHONE (202) 777-7723

PHONE (202) 777-7700
FACSIMILE (202) 777-7763

October 2, 2003

BY ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

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

Ex Parte

Re: CC Docket No. 02-200 (Verizon 1+/Payphone Petition for Forbearance)
CC Docket No. 01-338 (Verizon 271/251 Petition for Forbearance)
CC Docket No. 96-149 (Verizon OI&M Petition for Forbearance)

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On October 1, 2003, Christopher Wright of Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis, counsel for Z-Tel Communications, Lori Wright of MCI, and A. Richard Metzger, Jr. of Lawler, Metzger & Milkman, counsel for MCI, met with Lisa Zaina, Senior Legal Advisor, and Scott Bergmann, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein. Later that same day, Tom Koutsy of Z-Tel, Richard Whitt and Alan Buzacott of MCI, Messrs. Metzger and Wright, and the undersigned met with Ann Bushmiller, Jeff Dygert, Linda Kinney, John Rogovin, Paula Silberthau, John Stanley, and Debra Weiner of the Office of General Counsel and Christi Shewman of the Competition Policy Division of the Wireline Competition Bureau. The meetings focused on Verizon's pending petitions seeking forbearance from sections 271 and 272 (captioned above).

During those meetings, representatives for Z-Tel and MCI urged the Commission to decide all three pending petitions without reaching issues relating to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Act. In particular, Z-Tel and MCI pointed out that the Commission had rejected the basis for Verizon's 271/251 petition in the recent *Triennial Review Order* when it concluded that section 271 establishes unbundling obligations on the BOCs that are independent of the requirements imposed on all incumbent LECs by section 251. It also was noted that, in its OI&M petition, Verizon had focused on arguing that section 10(d) did not incorporate section 272, and thus had failed to demonstrate adequately that the requirements of section 10(d) had been met. MCI and Z-Tel also observed that the 1+/Payphone petition had been unopposed, and thus there was no need for the Commission to decide issues that had not been raised – and were not briefed – in that proceeding.

To the extent that the Commission were to determine it necessary to reach issues related to section 10(d) in connection with the above-captioned forbearance petitions, Z-Tel and MCI urged the FCC to reject the suggestion that section 10(d) is fully implemented upon grant of section 271 authorization. Representatives of Z-Tel and MCI further indicated that their most recent discussion of the statutory provision is set forth in their oppositions to Verizon's TELRIC Petition for Forbearance, filed on August 18, 2003 in WC Docket No. 03-157. Copies of MCI's opposition in that docket were distributed to FCC staff. That filing is attached.

Pursuant to the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206(b)(2), this letter is being provided to you for inclusion in the public record of the above-referenced proceeding.

Sincerely,

/s/ A. Renée Callahan

A. Renée Callahan

Attachment

cc: Scott Bergmann
Ann Bushmiller
Jeff Dygert
Linda Kinney
John Rogovin
Christi Shewman
Paula Silberthau
John Stanley
Debra Weiner
Lisa Zaina