



December 3, 2003

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W., Room 1-A836
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation in CC Docket Nos. 96-262, 01-338, 96-98, 98-147

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's Rules, this letter is to provide notice in the above-captioned docketed proceedings of ex parte meetings on December 3, 2003, by John Windhausen, Jr., and Jonathan Askin of the Association for Local Telecommunications Services (ALTS), Jim Geiger of Cbeyond, Ray Russenberger of Network Telephone, Steve Dubnick of ChoiceOne, Brad Evans of Cavalier, Jim Butman of TDS METROCOM, Roscoe Young and Marva Johnson of KMC, Brent Johnson of OneEighty Communications, and Penny Bewick of NewEdge. In a series of meetings, the parties met with Commissioner Abernathy and Matt Brill, Commissioner Coppins and Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner Adelstein and Lisa Zaina, and Commissioner Martin and Dan Gonzalez. The parties focused on BellSouth's attempt to redo the loop access conclusions set forth in the *Triennial Review Order* and on possible FCC action to further reduce the ability of facilities-based CLECs to obtain revenue for originating and terminating long distance traffic.

The parties discussed their grave concerns and the dramatic, anticompetitive consequences that would result if the FCC were to grant further protection to the ILECs, by further curtailing competitor access to the paradigmatic, bottleneck facility – the local loop. The parties focused primarily on BellSouth's request to alter the substantive fiber loop conclusions reached in the *Triennial Review Order*, including rewriting of the fiber-to-the-home rule to relieve the ILECs of their current obligations to unbundle fiber-to-the-curb loops and fiber used to serve multiple dwelling units. The parties' positions are considered below, but these issues are more fully addressed in the parties' comments in opposition to BellSouth's Recon Petition in CC Docket 01-338.

The parties noted that BellSouth is asking for a radical departure from the Commission's conclusions set forth in the *Triennial Review Order*. Adopting BellSouth's Petition for Reconsideration would add layers of confusion to loop unbundling and access rules, could derail the nascent facilities-based competitive telecommunications industry, would open the door to ILEC *de facto* dismantling of the loop unbundling rules, and would allow the ILECs to wield monopoly control over captive consumers, denying consumers the benefits of telecom competition.

While the parties disagree with the Commission's fiber-to-the-home conclusions and rule, the parties contended that the Commission must not rewrite the current fiber-to-the-home rule and must not further curtail competitor access to loops. While BellSouth treats its proposal as little more than a minor clarification and extension of the existing rules just adopted in the *Triennial Review Order*, BellSouth, in fact, is proposing a brand new rule. BellSouth is attempting through its petition to move, then blur, then erase the bright-line established by the Commission to determine what must be unbundled and what need not be unbundled. Without a bright-line FTTH rule, there is no way for anyone but BellSouth to determine which loops are FTTC loops free of unbundling obligations and which are merely hybrid or copper loops subject to unbundling obligations.

The parties also noted that the ILECs have already begun violating the *Triennial Review Order*, most notably in their failure to abide by their obligation to perform routine functions to provision DS-1 UNE loops. The Commission ruled, in no uncertain terms, that ILECs may no longer rely on the argument that they have “no facilities” and therefore are not obligated to provision UNE loops when, when all that is required are routine functions that the ILEC would otherwise perform to provision a special access circuit or serve a retail customer. Verizon, in particular, has determined that it has the authority to tack on an additional \$500 to \$2000 fee to attach the electronics needed to provision a DS-1 UNE loop, thereby sabotaging the CLEC’s ability to compete for a customer using the ILEC-controlled bottleneck.

The parties also discussed the consequences that would result from possible revisions to the rules governing CLEC access charges currently under consideration in CC Docket 96-262. The parties noted that new rules would undoubtedly increase uncertainty over a CLEC’s ability to obtain reasonable compensation for originating and terminating long distance traffic. The parties questioned the need for the FCC to revisit the CLEC access charge issue at this time. The parties noted that the issue was resolved to the extreme financial detriment of the facilities-based CLECs two years ago and resulted in immediate and continuing dramatic reduction to CLEC access rates.

The parties stressed that there is no reason to single out facilities-based CLECs with their own switches as the only parties that should be further burdened by immediate changes to the intercarrier compensation regime. Any additional changes are better achieved by the FCC adoption of a unified intercarrier compensation regime that fairly considers the needs of all industry players. To single out facilities-based CLECs, who have made the effort to deploy their own switching facilities, would serve only to further destabilize the most vulnerable players in the industry. Any revisions to the CLEC access conclusions set forth two years ago would open the door to endless contests, allegations and second guessing over how much revenue a CLEC should be entitled to for originating and terminating long distance traffic. The dramatic rate reductions in CLEC access charges, which are set to reach the lowest ILEC rates within a few months, would do nothing but add unnecessary confusion and the inevitable withholding of payments to CLECs for the services they provide to long distance carriers.

If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me at 202-969-2587.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Jonathan Askin

FROM THE DESK OF:
Jonathan Askin
General Counsel
(202) 969-2587
E-mail jaskin@alts.org