determine whether competitive carriers are able to combine network elements as required by the Act and the Commission's regulations.[142]

3. Pricing of Network Elements

45. Checklist item 2 of section 271 states that a BOC must provide "nondiscriminatory access to network elements in accordance with sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1)" of the Act.[143] Section 251(c)(3) requires incumbent LECs to provide "nondiscriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory."[144] Section 252(d)(1) requires that a state commission's determination of the just and reasonable rates for network elements shall be based on the cost of providing the network elements, shall be nondiscriminatory, and may include a reasonable profit.[145] Pursuant to this statutory mandate, the Commission has determined that prices for UNEs must be based on the total element long run incremental cost (TELRIC) of providing those elements.[146] The Commission also promulgated rule 51.315(b), which prohibits incumbent LECs from separating already combined elements before providing them to competing carriers, except on request.[147] The Commission has previously held that it will not conduct a *de novo* review of a state's pricing determinations and will reject an application only if "basic TELRIC principles are violated or the state commission

---

[142] *Id. In Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC*, 219 F.3d 744 (8th Cir. 2000), the Eighth Circuit had vacated the Commission's "additional combinations" rules (47 C.F.R. Sections 51-315(c)-(f)). However, on May 13, 2002, the Supreme Court reversed the Eighth Circuit with respect to those rules and remanded the case to the court of appeals "for further proceedings consistent with this opinion." *Verizon Communications Inc. v FCC*, 535 U.S. 467, 539. *See also id.* at 1683-87. In response, the Eighth Circuit, on August 21, 2002, vacated its prior opinion insofar as it had vacated the pertinent combinations rules and denied the petitions for review with respect to those rules. *Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC*, 8th Circuit Nos. 96-3321, *et al.*, Judgment, filed August 21, 2002.). *See also Competitive Telecommunications Association v. FCC*, 309 F. 3d 8 (2002) (affirming the Commission's interim decision to limit the ability of competitive local exchange carriers to gain access to a network element combination known as the enhanced extended link).

[143] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ii).

[144] *Id.* § 251(c)(3).

[145] 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(1).

[146] *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15844-46, paras. 674-79; 47 C.F.R. §§ 51.501 *et seq.*; *see also 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*, Third Report and Order and Fourth Report and Order, 14 FCC Rcd 20912, 20974, para. 135 (*Line Sharing Order*) (concluding that states should set the prices for line sharing as a new network element in the same manner as the state sets prices for other UNEs).

[147] *See* 47 C.F.R. § 51.315(b).

makes clear errors in factual findings on matters so substantial that the end result falls outside the range that the reasonable application of TELRIC principles would produce."[148]

46. Although the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit stayed the Commission's pricing rules in 1996,[149] the Supreme Court restored the Commission's pricing authority on January 25, 1999, and remanded to the Eighth Circuit for consideration of the merits of the challenged rules.[150] On remand from the Supreme Court, the Eighth Circuit concluded that while TELRIC is an acceptable method for determining costs, certain specific requirements contained within the Commission's pricing rules were contrary to Congressional intent.[151] The Eighth Circuit stayed the issuance of its mandate pending review by the Supreme Court.[152] The Supreme Court, on May 13, 2002, upheld the Commission's forward-looking pricing methodology in determining costs of UNEs and "reverse[d] the Eighth Circuit's judgment insofar as it invalidated TELRIC as a method for setting rates under the Act."[153] Accordingly, the Commission's pricing rules remain in effect.

C. Checklist Item 3 – Poles, Ducts, Conduits and Rights of Way

47. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iii) requires BOCs to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the [BOC] at just and reasonable rates in accordance with the requirements of section 224."[154] Section 224(f)(1) states

---

[148] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4084, para. 244; *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6266, para. 59.

[149] *Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, 120 F.3d 753, 800, 804, 805-06 (8th Cir. 1997).

[150] *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999). In reaching its decision, the Court acknowledged that section 201(b) "explicitly grants the FCC jurisdiction to make rules governing matters to which the 1996 Act applies." *Id.* at 380. Furthermore, the Court determined that section 251(d) also provides evidence of an express jurisdictional grant by requiring that "the Commission [shall] complete all actions necessary to establish regulations to implement the requirements of this section." *Id.* at 382. The Court also held that the pricing provisions implemented under the Commission's rulemaking authority do not inhibit the establishment of rates by the states. The Court concluded that the Commission has jurisdiction to design a pricing methodology to facilitate local competition under the 1996 Act, including pricing for interconnection and unbundled access, as "it is the States that will apply those standards and implement that methodology, determining the concrete result." *Id.*

[151] *Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, 219 F.3d 744 (8th Cir. 2000), *petition for cert. granted sub nom. Verizon Communications v. FCC*, 121 S. Ct. 877 (2001).

[152] *Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, No. 96-3321 *et al.* (8th Cir. Sept. 25, 2000).

[153] *Verizon v. FCC*, 535 U.S. 467, 523. On August 21, 2002, the Eighth Circuit implemented the Supreme Court's mandate with respect to the Commission's TELRIC pricing rule by vacating its prior opinion insofar as it had invalidated that rule and by denying the petitions for review of that rule. *Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC*, 8th Circuit Nos. 96-3321, et al., Judgment, filed August 21, 2002.

[154] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(iii). As originally enacted, section 224 was intended to address obstacles that cable operators encountered in obtaining access to poles, ducts, conduits, or rights-of-way owned or controlled by utilities. The 1996 Act amended section 224 in several important respects to ensure that telecommunications carriers (continued....)

that "[a] utility shall provide a cable television system or any telecommunications carrier with nondiscriminatory access to any pole, duct, conduit, or right-of-way owned or controlled by it."[155] Notwithstanding this requirement, section 224(f)(2) permits a utility providing electric service to deny access to its poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way, on a nondiscriminatory basis, "where there is insufficient capacity and for reasons of safety, reliability and generally applicable engineering purposes."[156] Section 224 also contains two separate provisions governing the maximum rates that a utility may charge for "pole attachments."[157] Section 224(b)(1) states that the Commission shall regulate the rates, terms, and conditions governing pole attachments to ensure that they are "just and reasonable."[158] Notwithstanding this general grant of authority, section 224(c)(1) states that "[n]othing in [section 224] shall be construed to apply to, or to give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to the rates, terms, and conditions, or access to poles, ducts, conduits and rights-of-way as provided in [section 224(f)], for pole attachments in any case where such matters are regulated by a State."[159] As of 1992, nineteen states, including Connecticut, had certified to the Commission that they regulated the rates, terms, and conditions for pole attachments.[160]

(Continued from previous page)
as well as cable operators have access to poles, ducts, conduits, or rights-of-way owned or controlled by utility companies, including LECs. *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20706, n.574.

[155] 47 U.S.C. § 224(f)(1). Section 224(a)(1) defines "utility" to include any entity, including a LEC, that controls "poles, ducts, conduits, or rights-of-way used, in whole or in part, for any wire communications." 47 U.S.C. § 224(a)(1).

[156] 47 U.S.C. § 224(f)(2). In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission concluded that, although the statutory exception enunciated in section 224(f)(2) appears to be limited to utilities providing electrical service, LECs should also be permitted to deny access to their poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way because of insufficient capacity and for reasons of safety, reliability and generally applicable engineering purposes, provided the assessment of such factors is done in a nondiscriminatory manner. *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 16080-81, paras. 1175-77.

[157] Section 224(a)(4) defines "pole attachment" as "any attachment by a cable television system or provider of telecommunications service to a pole, duct, conduit, or right-of-way owned or controlled by a utility." 47 U.S.C. § 224(a)(4).

[158] 47 U.S.C. § 224(b)(1).

[159] *Id.* § 224(c)(1). The 1996 Act extended the Commission's authority to include not just rates, terms, and conditions, but also the authority to regulate nondiscriminatory access to poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way. *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 16104, para. 1232; 47 U.S.C. § 224(f). Absent state regulation of terms and conditions of nondiscriminatory attachment access, the Commission retains jurisdiction. *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 16104, para. 1232; 47 U.S.C. § 224(c)(1); *see also Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4093, para. 264.

[160] *See States That Have Certified That They Regulate Pole Attachments*, Public Notice, 7 FCC Rcd 1498 (1992); 47 U.S.C. § 224(f).

D. Checklist Item 4 – Unbundled Local Loops

48. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act, item 4 of the competitive checklist, requires that a BOC provide "[l]ocal loop transmission from the central office to the customer's premises, unbundled from local switching or other services."[161] The Commission has defined the loop as a transmission facility between a distribution frame, or its equivalent, in an incumbent LEC central office, and the demarcation point at the customer premises. This definition includes different types of loops, including two-wire and four-wire analog voice-grade loops, and two-wire and four-wire loops that are conditioned to transmit the digital signals needed to provide service such as ISDN, ADSL, HDSL, and DS1-level signals.[162]

49. In order to establish that it is "providing" unbundled local loops in compliance with checklist item 4, a BOC must demonstrate that it has a concrete and specific legal obligation to furnish loops and that it is currently doing so in the quantities that competitors demand and at an acceptable level of quality. A BOC must also demonstrate that it provides nondiscriminatory access to unbundled loops.[163] Specifically, the BOC must provide access to any functionality of the loop requested by a competing carrier unless it is not technically feasible to condition the loop facility to support the particular functionality requested. In order to provide the requested loop functionality, such as the ability to deliver xDSL services, the BOC may be required to take affirmative steps to condition existing loop facilities to enable competing carriers to provide services not currently provided over the facilities. The BOC must provide competitors with access to unbundled loops regardless of whether the BOC uses digital loop carrier (DLC) technology or similar remote concentration devices for the particular loops sought by the competitor.

50. On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the *Line Sharing Order*, which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL).[164] HFPL is defined as "the frequency above the voiceband on a copper loop facility that is being used to carry traditional POTS analog circuit-switched voiceband transmissions." This definition applies whether a BOC's voice customers are served by cooper or by digital loop carrier equipment. Competing carriers should have

---

[161] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(iv).

[162] *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15691, para. 380; *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3772-73, paras. 166-67, n.301 (retaining definition of the local loop from the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, but replacing the phrase "network interconnection device" with "demarcation point," and making explicit that dark fiber and loop conditioning are among the features, functions and capabilities of the loop).

[163] *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18481-81, para. 248; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4095, para. 269; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20637, para. 185.

[164] *See Line Sharing Order*, 14 FCC Rcd at 20924-27, paras. 20-27; *see also* n.63 at C-12 *supra*.

access to the HFPL at either a central office or at a remote terminal. However, the HFPL network element is *only* available on a copper loop facility.[165]

51. To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the *Line Sharing Order*, the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the *Bell Atlantic New York* and *SWBT Texas Orders*. Specifically, a successful BOC applicant could provide evidence of BOC-caused missed installation due dates, average installation intervals, trouble reports within 30 days of installation, mean time to repair, trouble report rates, and repeat trouble report rates. In addition, a successful BOC applicant should provide evidence that its central offices are operationally ready to handle commercial volumes of line sharing and that it provides competing carriers with nondiscriminatory access to the pre-ordering and ordering OSS functions associated with the provision of line shared loops, including access to loop qualification information and databases.

52. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iv) also requires that a BOC demonstrate that it makes line splitting available to competing carriers so that competing carriers may provide voice and data service over a single loop.[166] In addition, a BOC must demonstrate that a competing carrier, either alone or in conjunction with another carrier, is able to replace an existing UNE-P configuration used to provide voice service with an arrangement that enables it to provide voice and data service to a customer. To make such a showing, a BOC must show that it has a legal obligation to provide line splitting through rates, terms, and conditions in interconnection agreements and that it offers competing carriers the ability to order an unbundled xDSL-capable loop terminated to a collocated splitter and DSLAM equipment, and combine it with unbundled switching and shared transport.[167]

E. Checklist Item 5 – Unbundled Local Transport

53. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(v) of the competitive checklist requires a BOC to provide "[l]ocal transport from the trunk side of a wireline local exchange carrier switch unbundled from switching or other services."[168] The Commission has required that BOCs provide both dedicated and shared transport to requesting carriers.[169] Dedicated transport consists of BOC transmission

---

[165] *See Deployment of Wireline Services offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Third Report and Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 98-147, Fourth Report and Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-98, 16 FCC Rcd 2101, 2106-07, para. 10 (2001).

[166] *See generally SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18515-17, paras. 323-329 (describing line splitting); 47 C.F.R. § 51.703(c) (requiring that incumbent LECs provide competing carriers with access to unbundled loops in a manner that allows competing carriers "to provide any telecommunications service that can be offered by means of that network element").

[167] *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6348, para. 220.

[168] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(v).

[169] *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20719, para. 201.

facilities dedicated to a particular customer or carrier that provide telecommunications between wire centers owned by BOCs or requesting telecommunications carriers, or between switches owned by BOCs or requesting telecommunications carriers.[170] Shared transport consists of transmission facilities shared by more than one carrier, including the BOC, between end office switches, between end office switches and tandem switches, and between tandem switches, in the BOC's network.[171]

F. Checklist Item 6 – Unbundled Local Switching

54. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vi) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to provide "[l]ocal switching unbundled from transport, local loop transmission, or other services."[172] In the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission required BellSouth to provide unbundled local switching that included line-side and trunk-side facilities, plus the features, functions, and capabilities of the switch.[173] The features, functions, and capabilities of the switch include the basic switching function as well as the same basic capabilities that are available to the incumbent LEC's customers.[174] Additionally, local switching includes all vertical features that the switch is capable of providing, as well as any technically feasible customized routing functions.[175]

---

[170] *Id.* A BOC has the following obligations with respect to dedicated transport: (a) provide unbundled access to dedicated transmission facilities between BOC central offices or between such offices and serving wire centers (SWCs); between SWCs and interexchange carriers points of presence (POPs); between tandem switches and SWCs, end offices or tandems of the BOC, and the wire centers of BOCs and requesting carriers; (b) provide all technically feasible transmission capabilities such as DS1, DS3, and Optical Carrier levels that the competing carrier could use to provide telecommunications; (c) not limit the facilities to which dedicated interoffice transport facilities are connected, provided such interconnections are technically feasible, or restrict the use of unbundled transport facilities; and (d) to the extent technically feasible, provide requesting carriers with access to digital cross-connect system functionality in the same manner that the BOC offers such capabilities to interexchange carriers that purchase transport services. *Id.* at 20719.

[171] *Id.* at 20719, n.650. The Commission also found that a BOC has the following obligations with respect to shared transport: (a) provide shared transport in a way that enables the traffic of requesting carriers to be carried on the same transport facilities that a BOC uses for its own traffic; (b) provide shared transport transmission facilities between end office switches, between its end office and tandem switches, and between tandem switches in its network; (c) permit requesting carriers that purchase unbundled shared transport and unbundled switching to use the same routing table that is resident in the BOC's switch; and (d) permit requesting carriers to use shared (or dedicated) transport as an unbundled element to carry originating access traffic from, and terminating traffic to, customers to whom the requesting carrier is also providing local exchange service. *Id.* at 20720, n.652.

[172] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vi); *see also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20722. A switch connects end user lines to other end user lines, and connects end user lines to trunks used for transporting a call to another central office or to a long-distance carrier. Switches can also provide end users with "vertical features" such as call waiting, call forwarding, and caller ID, and can direct a call to a specific trunk, such as to a competing carrier's operator services.

[173] *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20722, para. 207.

[174] *Id.*

[175] *Id.* at 20722-23, para. 207.

55. Moreover, in the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission required BellSouth to permit competing carriers to purchase UNEs, including unbundled switching, in a manner that permits a competing carrier to offer, and bill for, exchange access and the termination of local traffic.[176] The Commission also stated that measuring daily customer usage for billing purposes requires essentially the same OSS functions for both competing carriers and incumbent LECs, and that a BOC must demonstrate that it is providing equivalent access to billing information.[177] Therefore, the ability of a BOC to provide billing information necessary for a competitive LEC to bill for exchange access and termination of local traffic is an aspect of unbundled local switching.[178] Thus, there is an overlap between the provision of unbundled local switching and the provision of the OSS billing function.[179]

56. To comply with the requirements of unbundled local switching, a BOC must also make available trunk ports on a shared basis and routing tables resident in the BOC's switch, as necessary to provide access to shared transport functionality.[180] In addition, a BOC may not limit the ability of competitors to use unbundled local switching to provide exchange access by requiring competing carriers to purchase a dedicated trunk from an interexchange carrier's point of presence to a dedicated trunk port on the local switch.[181]

G. Checklist Item 7 – 911/E911 Access and Directory Assistance/Operator Services

57. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act requires a BOC to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to – (I) 911 and E911 services."[182] In the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, the Commission found that "section 271 requires a BOC to provide competitors access to its 911 and E911 services in the same manner that a BOC obtains such access, *i.e.*, at parity."[183] Specifically, the Commission found that a BOC "must maintain the 911 database entries for competing LECs with the same accuracy and reliability that it maintains the database entries for its own customers."[184] For facilities-based carriers, the BOC must provide "unbundled access to

---

176 *Id.* at 20723, para. 208.

177 *Id.* at 20723, para. 208 (citing *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20619, para. 140).

178 *Id.*

179 *Id.*

180 *Id.* at 20723, para. 209 (citing the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20705, para. 306).

181 *Id.* (citing the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20714-15, paras. 324-25).

182 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vii). 911 and E911 services transmit calls from end users to emergency personnel. It is critical that a BOC provide competing carriers with accurate and nondiscriminatory access to 911/E911 services so that these carriers' customers are able to reach emergency assistance. Customers use directory assistance and operator services to obtain customer listing information and other call completion services.

183 *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20679, para. 256.

184 *Id.*

[its] 911 database and 911 interconnection, including the provision of dedicated trunks from the requesting carrier's switching facilities to the 911 control office at parity with what [the BOC] provides to itself."[185] Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II) and section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III) require a BOC to provide nondiscriminatory access to "directory assistance services to allow the other carrier's customers to obtain telephone numbers" and "operator call completion services," respectively.[186] Section 251(b)(3) of the Act imposes on each LEC "the duty to permit all [competing providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service] to have nondiscriminatory access to . . . operator services, directory assistance, and directory listing, with no unreasonable dialing delays."[187] The Commission concluded in the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order* that a BOC must be in compliance with the regulations implementing section 251(b)(3) to satisfy the requirements of sections 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II) and 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III).[188] In the *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, the Commission held that the phrase "nondiscriminatory access to directory assistance and directory listings" means that "the customers of all telecommunications service providers should be able to access each LEC's directory assistance service and obtain a directory listing on a nondiscriminatory basis, notwithstanding: (1) the identity of a requesting customer's local telephone service provider; or (2) the identity of the telephone service provider for a customer whose directory

[185] *Id.*

[186] 47 U.S.C. §§ 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II), (III).

[187] *Id.* § 251(b)(3). The Commission implemented section 251(b)(3) in the *Local Competition Second Report and Order*. 47 C.F.R. § 51.217; *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Second Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 19392 (1996) (*Local Competition Second Report and Order*) *vacated in part sub nom. People of the State of California v. FCC*, 124 F.3d 934 (8th Cir. 1997), *overruled in part, AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999); *see also Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Provision of Directory Listings Information under the Telecommunications Act of 1934*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 14 FCC Rcd 15550 (1999) (*Directory Listings Information NPRM*).

[188] While both sections 251(b)(3) and 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II) refer to nondiscriminatory access to "directory assistance," section 251(b)(3) refers to nondiscriminatory access to "operator services," while section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III) refers to nondiscriminatory access to "operator call completion services." 47 U.S.C. §§ 251(b)(3), 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III). The term "operator call completion services" is not defined in the Act, nor has the Commission previously defined the term. However, for section 251(b)(3) purposes, the term "operator services" was defined as meaning "any automatic or live assistance to a consumer to arrange for billing or completion, or both, of a telephone call." *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19448, para. 110. In the same order the Commission concluded that busy line verification, emergency interrupt, and operator-assisted directory assistance are forms of "operator services," because they assist customers in arranging for the billing or completion (or both) of a telephone call. *Id.* at 19449, para. 111. All of these services may be needed or used to place a call. For example, if a customer tries to direct dial a telephone number and constantly receives a busy signal, the customer may contact the operator to attempt to complete the call. Since billing is a necessary part of call completion, and busy line verification, emergency interrupt, and operator-assisted directory assistance can all be used when an operator completes a call, the Commission concluded in the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order* that for checklist compliance purposes, "operator call completion services" is a subset of or equivalent to "operator service." *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20740, n.763. As a result, the Commission uses the nondiscriminatory standards established for operator services to determine whether nondiscriminatory access is provided.

listing is requested."[189] The Commission concluded that nondiscriminatory access to the dialing patterns of 4-1-1 and 5-5-5-1-2-1-2 to access directory assistance were technically feasible, and would continue.[190] The Commission specifically held that the phrase "nondiscriminatory access to operator services" means that "a telephone service customer, regardless of the identity of his or her local telephone service provider, must be able to connect to a local operator by dialing '0,' or '0 plus' the desired telephone number."[191]

58. Competing carriers may provide operator services and directory assistance by reselling the BOC's services, outsourcing service provision to a third-party provider, or using their own personnel and facilities. The Commission's rules require BOCs to permit competitive LECs wishing to resell the BOC's operator services and directory assistance to request the BOC to brand their calls.[192] Competing carriers wishing to provide operator services or directory assistance using their own or a third party provider's facilities and personnel must be able to obtain directory listings either by obtaining directory information on a "read only" or "per dip" basis from the BOC's directory assistance database, or by creating their own directory assistance database by obtaining the subscriber listing information in the BOC's database.[193] Although the Commission originally concluded that BOCs must provide directory assistance and operator

[189] 47 C.F.R. § 51.217(c)(3); *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19456-58, paras. 130-35. The *Local Competition Second Report and Order's* interpretation of section 251(b)(3) is limited "to access to each LEC's directory assistance service." *Id.* at 19456, para. 135. However, section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii) is not limited to the LEC's systems but requires "nondiscriminatory access to . . . directory assistance to allow the other carrier's customers to obtain telephone numbers." 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vii). Combined with the Commission's conclusion that "incumbent LECs must unbundle the facilities and functionalities providing operator services and directory assistance from resold services and other unbundled network elements to the extent technically feasible," *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15772-73, paras. 535-37, section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)'s requirement should be understood to require the BOCs to provide nondiscriminatory access to the directory assistance service provider selected by the customer's local service provider, regardless of whether the competitor; provides such services itself; selects the BOC to provide such services; or chooses a third party to provide such services. *See Directory Listings Information NPRM.*

[190] *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19464, para. 151.

[191] *Id.* at 19464, para. 151.

[192] 47 C.F.R. § 51.217(d); *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19463, para. 148. For example, when customers call the operator or calls for directory assistance, they typically hear a message, such as "thank you for using XYZ Telephone Company." Competing carriers may use the BOC's brand, request the BOC to brand the call with the competitive carriers name or request that the BOC not brand the call at all. 47 C.F.R. § 51.217(d).

[193] 47 C.F.R. § 51.217(C)(3)(ii); *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19460-61, paras. 141-44; *Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary Network Information and Other Customer Information, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Provision of Directory Listing Information Under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, Third Report and Order, Second Order on Reconsideration, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 14 FCC Rcd 15550, 15630-31, paras. 152-54 (1999); *Provision of Directory Listing Information Under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, First Report and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 2736, 2743-51 (2001).

services on an unbundled basis pursuant to sections 251 and 252, the Commission removed directory assistance and operator services from the list of required UNEs in the *UNE Remand Order*.[194] Checklist item obligations that do not fall within a BOC's obligations under section 251(c)(3) are not subject to the requirements of sections 251 and 252 that rates be based on forward-looking economic costs.[195] Checklist item obligations that do not fall within a BOC's UNE obligations, however, still must be provided in accordance with sections 201(b) and 202(a), which require that rates and conditions be just and reasonable, and not unreasonably discriminatory.[196]

H. Checklist Item 8 – White Pages Directory Listings

59. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(viii) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to provide "[w]hite pages directory listings for customers of the other carrier's telephone exchange service."[197] Section 251(b)(3) of the 1996 Act obligates all LECs to permit competitive providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service to have nondiscriminatory access to directory listing.[198]

60. In the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission concluded that, "consistent with the Commission's interpretation of 'directory listing' as used in section 251(b)(3), the term 'white pages' in section 271(c)(2)(B)(viii) refers to the local alphabetical directory that includes the residential and business listings of the customers of the local exchange provider."[199] The Commission further concluded, "the term 'directory listing,' as used in this section, includes, at a minimum, the subscriber's name, address, telephone number, or any combination thereof."[200] The Commission's *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order* also held that a

---

[194] *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3891-92, paras. 441-42.

[195] *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3905, para. 470; *see generally* 47 U.S.C. §§ 251-52; *see also* 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(1)(A)(i) (requiring UNE rates to be "based on the cost (determined without reference to a rate-of-return or other rate-based proceeding) of providing the ... network element").

[196] *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3905-06, paras. 470-73; *see also* 47 U.S.C. §§ 201(b), 202(a).

[197] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(viii).

[198] *Id.* § 251(b)(3).

[199] *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20748, para. 255.

[200] *Id.* In the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission stated that the definition of "directory listing" was synonymous with the definition of "subscriber list information." *Id.* at 20747 (citing the *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19458-59). However, the Commission's decision in a later proceeding obviates this comparison, and supports the definition of directory listing delineated above. *See Implementation of the Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary Network Information and Other Customer Information*, CC Docket No. 96-115, Third Report and Order; *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, CC Docket No. 96-98, Second Order on Reconsideration; *Provision of Directory Listing Information under the Telecommunications Act of 1934, As Amended*, CC Docket No. 99-273, FCC 99-227, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, para. 160 (rel. Sept. 9, 1999).

BOC satisfies the requirements of checklist item 8 by demonstrating that it: (1) provided nondiscriminatory appearance and integration of white page directory listings to competitive LECs' customers; and (2) provided white page listings for competitors' customers with the same accuracy and reliability that it provides its own customers.[201]

I. Checklist Item 9 – Numbering Administration

61. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ix) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to provide "nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers for assignment to the other carrier's telephone exchange service customers," until "the date by which telecommunications numbering administration, guidelines, plan, or rules are established."[202] The checklist mandates compliance with "such guidelines, plan, or rules" after they have been established.[203] A BOC must demonstrate that it adheres to industry numbering administration guidelines and Commission rules.[204]

J. Checklist Item 10 – Databases and Associated Signaling

62. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(x) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to provide "nondiscriminatory access to databases and associated signaling necessary for call routing and completion."[205] In the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission required BellSouth to demonstrate that it provided requesting carriers with nondiscriminatory access to: "(1) signaling networks, including signaling links and signaling transfer points; (2) certain call-related databases necessary for call routing and completion, or in the alternative, a means of physical access to the signaling transfer point linked to the unbundled database; and (3) Service Management Systems (SMS)."[206] The Commission also required BellSouth to design, create, test, and deploy Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN) based services at the SMS through a Service Creation Environment (SCE).[207] In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission defined call-related databases as databases, other than operations support systems, that are used in signaling networks for billing and collection or the transmission, routing, or

---

201 *Id.*

202 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ix).

203 *Id.*

204 *See Second Bell South Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20752; *see also Numbering Resource Optimization*, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 15 FCC Rcd 7574 (2000); *Numbering Resource Optimization*, Second Report and Order, Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 99-200 and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 99-200, CC Docket Nos. 96-98; 99-200 (rel. Dec. 29, 2000); *Numbering Resource Optimization*, Third Report and Order and Second Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-98 and CC Docket No. 99-200 (rel. Dec. 28, 2001).

205 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(x).

206 *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20753, para. 267.

207 *Id.* at 20755-56, para. 272.

other provision of telecommunications service.[208] At that time the Commission required incumbent LECs to provide unbundled access to their call-related databases, including but not limited to: the Line Information Database (LIDB), the Toll Free Calling database, the Local Number Portability database, and Advanced Intelligent Network databases.[209] In the *UNE Remand Order*, the Commission clarified that the definition of call-related databases "includes, but is not limited to, the calling name (CNAM) database, as well as the 911 and E911 databases."[210]

K. Checklist Item 11 – Number Portability

63. Section 271(c)(2)(B) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to comply with the number portability regulations adopted by the Commission pursuant to section 251.[211] Section 251(b)(2) requires all LECs "to provide, to the extent technically feasible, number portability in accordance with requirements prescribed by the Commission."[212] The 1996 Act defines number portability as "the ability of users of telecommunications services to retain, at the same location, existing telecommunications numbers without impairment of quality, reliability, or convenience when switching from one telecommunications carrier to another."[213] In order to prevent the cost of number portability from thwarting local competition, Congress enacted section 251(e)(2), which requires that "[t]he cost of establishing telecommunications numbering administration arrangements and number portability shall be borne by all telecommunications carriers on a competitively neutral basis as determined by the Commission."[214] Pursuant to these statutory provisions, the Commission requires LECs to offer interim number portability "to the extent technically feasible."[215] The Commission also requires LECs to gradually replace interim number portability with permanent number portability.[216] The Commission has established

---

[208] *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15741, n.1126; *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3875, para. 403.

[209] *Id.* at 15741-42, para. 484.

[210] *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3875, para. 403.

[211] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xii).

[212] *Id.* at § 251(b)(2).

[213] *Id.* at § 153(30).

[214] *Id.* at § 251(e)(2); *see also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20757, para. 274; *In the Matter of Telephone Number Portability*, Third Report and Order, 13 FCC Rcd 11701, 11702-04 (1998) (*Third Number Portability Order*); *In the Matter of Telephone Number Portability*, Fourth Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration, 15 FCC Rcd 16459, 16460, 16462-65, paras. 1, 6-9 (1999) (*Fourth Number Portability Order*).

[215] *Fourth Number Portability Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 16465, para. 10; *Telephone Number Portability*, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 8352, 8409-12, paras. 110-16 (1996) (*First Number Portability Order*); *see also* 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(2).

[216] *See* 47 C.F.R. §§ 52.3(b)-(f); *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20758, para. 275; *First Number Portability Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 8355, 8399-8404, paras. 3, 91; *Third Number Portability Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 11708-12, paras. 12-16.

guidelines for states to follow in mandating a competitively neutral cost-recovery mechanism for interim number portability,[217] and created a competitively neural cost-recovery mechanism for long-term number portability.[218]

L. Checklist Item 12 – Local Dialing Parity

64. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xii) requires a BOC to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to such services or information as are necessary to allow the requesting carrier to implement local dialing parity in accordance with the requirements of section 251(b)(3)."[219] Section 251(b)(3) imposes upon all LECs "[t]he duty to provide dialing parity to competing providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service with no unreasonable dialing delays."[220] Section 153(15) of the Act defines "dialing parity" as follows:

> [A] person that is not an affiliate of a local exchange carrier is able to provide telecommunications services in such a manner that customers have the ability to route automatically, without the use of any access code, their telecommunications to the telecommunications services provider of the customer's designation.[221]

65. The rules implementing section 251(b)(3) provide that customers of competing carriers must be able to dial the same number of digits the BOC's customers dial to complete a local telephone call.[222] Moreover, customers of competing carriers must not otherwise suffer inferior quality service, such as unreasonable dialing delays. compared to the BOC's customers.[223]

---

[217] *See* 47 C.F.R. § 52.29; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20758, para. 275; *First Number Portability Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 8417-24, paras. 127-40.

[218] *See* 47 C.F.R. §§ 52.32, 52.33; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20758, para. 275; *Third Number Portability Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 11706-07, para. 8; *Fourth Number Portability Order* at 16464-65, para. 9.

[219] Based on the Commission's view that section 251(b)(3) does not limit the duty to provide dialing parity to any particular form of dialing parity (*i.e.*, international, interstate, intrastate, or local), the Commission adopted rules in August 1996 to implement broad guidelines and minimum nationwide standards for dialing parity. *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19407; *Interconnection Between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers*, CC Docket No 95-185, Further Order On Reconsideration, FCC 99-170 (rel. July 19, 1999).

[220] 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(3).

[221] *Id.* § 153(15).

[222] 47 C.F.R §§ 51.205, 51.207.

[223] *See* 47 C.F.R. § 51.207 (requiring same number of digits to be dialed); *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19400, 19403.

M. Checklist Item 13 – Reciprocal Compensation

66. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii) of the Act requires that a BOC enter into "[r]eciprocal compensation arrangements in accordance with the requirements of section 252(d)(2)."[224] In turn, pursuant to section 252(d)(2)(A), "a state commission shall not consider the terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation to be just and reasonable unless (i) such terms and conditions provide for the mutual and reciprocal recovery by each carrier of costs associated with the transport and termination on each carrier's network facilities of calls that originate on the network facilities of the other carrier; and (ii) such terms and conditions determine such costs on the basis of a reasonable approximation of the additional costs of terminating such calls."[225]

N. Checklist Item 14 – Resale

67. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv) of the Act requires a BOC to make "telecommunications services . . . available for resale in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(4) and 252(d)(3)."[226] Section 251(c)(4)(A) requires incumbent LECs "to offer for resale at wholesale rates any telecommunications service that the carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not telecommunications carriers."[227] Section 252(d)(3) requires state commissions to "determine wholesale rates on the basis of retail rates charged to subscribers for the telecommunications service requested, excluding the portion thereof attributable to any marketing, billing, collection, and other costs that will be avoided by the local exchange carrier."[228] Section 251(c)(4)(B) prohibits "unreasonable or discriminatory conditions or limitations" on service resold under section 251(c)(4)(A).[229] Consequently, the Commission concluded in the *Local Competition First Report and Order* that resale restrictions are presumed to be unreasonable unless the LEC proves to the state commission that the restriction is reasonable and nondiscriminatory.[230] If an incumbent LEC makes a service available only to a specific category of retail subscribers, however, a state commission may prohibit a carrier that obtains the service pursuant to section 251(c)(4)(A) from offering the service to a different category of subscribers.[231] If a state creates such a limitation, it must do so consistent with

---

[224] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii).

[225] *Id.* § 252(d)(2)(A).

[226] *Id.* § 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv).

[227] *Id.* § 251(c)(4)(A).

[228] *Id.* § 252(d)(3).

[229] *Id.* § 251(c)(4)(B).

[230] *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15966, para. 939; 47 C.F.R. § 51.613(b). The Eighth Circuit acknowledged the Commission's authority to promulgate such rules, and specifically upheld the sections of the Commission's rules concerning resale of promotions and discounts in *Iowa Utilities Board. Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, 120 F.3d at 818-19, *aff'd in part and remanded on other grounds, AT&T v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999). *See also* 47 C.F.R. §§ 51.613-51.617.

[231] 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(4)(B).

requirements established by the Federal Communications Commission.[232] In accordance with sections 271(c)(2)(B)(ii) and 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv), a BOC must also demonstrate that it provides nondiscriminatory access to operations support systems for the resale of its retail telecommunications services.[233] The obligations of section 251(c)(4) apply to the retail telecommunications services offered by a BOC's advanced services affiliate.[234]

V. COMPLIANCE WITH SEPARATE AFFILIATE REQUIREMENTS – SECTION 272

68. Section 271(d)(3)(B) requires that the Commission shall not approve a BOC's application to provide interLATA services unless the BOC demonstrates that the "requested authorization will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of section 272."[235] The Commission set standards for compliance with section 272 in the *Accounting Safeguards Order* and the *Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*.[236] Together, these safeguards discourage and facilitate the detection of improper cost allocation and cross-subsidization between the BOC and its section 272 affiliate.[237] In addition, these safeguards ensure that BOCs do not discriminate in favor of their section 272 affiliates.[238]

69. As the Commission stated in the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, compliance with section 272 is "of crucial importance" because the structural, transactional, and nondiscrimination safeguards of section 272 seek to ensure that BOCs compete on a level

---

[232] *Id.*

[233] *See, e.g.*, *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4046-48, paras. 178-81 (Bell Atlantic provides nondiscriminatory access to its OSS ordering functions for resale services and therefore provides efficient competitors a meaningful opportunity to compete).

[234] *See Verizon Connecticut Order*, 16 FCC Rcd 14147, 14160-63, paras. 27-33 (2001); *Association of Communications Enterprises v. FCC*, 235 F.3d 662 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

[235] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(B).

[236] *See Implementation of the Accounting Safeguards Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, CC Docket No. 96-150, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 17539 (1996) (*Accounting Safeguards Order*), Second Order On Reconsideration, FCC 00-9 (rel. Jan. 18, 2000); *Implementation of the Non-Accounting Safeguards of Sections 271 and 272 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, CC Docket No. 96-149, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 21905 (1996) (*Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*), *petition for review pending sub nom. SBC Communications v. FCC*, No. 97-1118 (filed D.C. Cir. Mar. 6, 1997) (held in abeyance May 7, 1997), First Order on Reconsideration, 12 FCC Rcd 2297 (1997) (*First Order on Reconsideration*), Second Order on Reconsideration, 12 FCC Rcd 8653 (1997) (*Second Order on Reconsideration*), *aff'd sub nom. Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies v. FCC*, 131 F.3d 1044 (D.C. Cir. 1997), Third Order on Reconsideration, FCC 99-242 (rel. Oct. 4, 1999) (*Third Order on Reconsideration*).

[237] *Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 21914; *Accounting Safeguards Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 17550; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20725.

[238] *Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 21914, paras. 15-16; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20725, para. 346.

playing field.[239] The Commission's findings regarding section 272 compliance constitute independent grounds for denying an application.[240] Past and present behavior of the BOC applicant provides "the best indicator of whether [the applicant] will carry out the requested authorization in compliance with section 272."[241]

VI. COMPLIANCE WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST – SECTION 271(D)(3)(C)

70. In addition to determining whether a BOC satisfies the competitive checklist and will comply with section 272, Congress directed the Commission to assess whether the requested authorization would be consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.[242] Compliance with the competitive checklist is itself a strong indicator that long distance entry is consistent with the public interest. This approach reflects the Commission's many years of experience with the consumer benefits that flow from competition in telecommunications markets.

71. Nonetheless, the public interest analysis is an independent element of the statutory checklist and, under normal canons of statutory construction, requires an independent determination.[243] Thus, the Commission views the public interest requirement as an opportunity to review the circumstances presented by the application to ensure that no other relevant factors exist that would frustrate the congressional intent that markets be open, as required by the competitive checklist, and that entry will therefore serve the public interest as Congress expected. Among other things, the Commission may review the local and long distance markets to ensure that there are not unusual circumstances that would make entry contrary to the public interest under the particular circumstances of the application at issue.[244] Another factor that could be relevant to the analysis is whether the Commission has sufficient assurance that markets will remain open after grant of the application. While no one factor is dispositive in this analysis, the overriding goal is to ensure that nothing undermines the conclusion, based on the Commission's analysis of checklist compliance, that markets are open to competition.

---

239 *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20725, para. 346; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4153, para. 402.

240 *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20785-86, para. 322; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4153, para. 402.

241 *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4153, para. 402.

242 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(C).

243 In addition, Congress specifically rejected an amendment that would have stipulated that full implementation of the checklist necessarily satisfies the public interest criterion. *See Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20747 at para. 360-66; *see also* 141 Cong. Rec. S7971, S8043 (June. 8, 1995).

244 *See Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20805-06, para. 360 (the public interest analysis may include consideration of "whether approval . . . will foster competition in all relevant telecommunications markets").

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL J. COPPS

Re: *Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Indiana Bell Telephone Company Incorporated, the Ohio Bell Telephone Company, Wisconsin Bell, Inc., and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin*

With today's grant of its application to provide long-distance service in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin, SBC has received long-distance authorization for all its States. I commend the company for this achievement. I also commend the Illinois Commerce Commission, Indiana Regulatory Utility Commission, Ohio Public Utilities Commission and Wisconsin Public Service Commission. Without the hard work of these four State Commissions to ensure that their markets are open to local competition, SBC would not be able to cross this threshold in the Section 271 process.

The real challenge lies ahead. The intense efforts leading up to today's decision are merely a prologue to our actions to ensure continued compliance. We will fail our statutory charge and render today's milestone meaningless unless we put in place a rigorous and sustained monitoring and enforcement process following the grant of long-distance authority. Through such a process, we can ensure that consumers can continue to reap the benefits of competition envisioned by Congress in the 1996 Act—greater choice, lower prices and better services. I look forward to working cooperatively with our counterparts in the States to ensure that this happens.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER KEVIN J. MARTIN

Re: Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Indiana Bell Telephone Company Incorporated, the Ohio Bell Telephone Company, Wisconsin Bell, Inc., and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin

Today's decision accepts SBC's late-filed, revised collocation power rates. We note that we approved this rate in the Order granting SBC's Michigan 271 application.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER JONATHAN S. ADELSTEIN

Re: Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Indiana Bell Telephone Company Incorporated, the Ohio bell Telephone Company, Wisconsin Bell, Inc. and Southwestern Bell Communications Services Inc. for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin

Today, we grant SBC authority to provide in-region, interLATA service originating in the states of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin. With this achievement, SBC has now received authorization to provide long distance services throughout its entire region. I congratulate SBC for opening its operations to competition and also extend my appreciation to my colleagues at the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Indiana Regulatory Utility Commission, the Ohio Public Utilities Commission and the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. I would also like to thank the Wireline Competition Bureau for its hard work and guidance in moving this item to a successful resolution.

The satisfaction of today's achievement comes with a continuing commitment to keep local markets open to competition. Indeed, Congress has made clear through Section 271(d)(6) that the market-opening provisions of Section 271 are an on-going obligation. To that end, I shared concerns raised by commenters during the course of the Michigan Section 271 proceeding about SBC's provision of wholesale billing to its competitive LEC customers and line splitting, a method by which competitive carriers may offer both voice and DSL services over the same local loop. I based my support for the Michigan Section 271 Order in part on the commitment of SBC and my state commission colleagues to continue to develop and enhance the billing and line splitting processes. Thus, I was particularly pleased to see that the Michigan Public Service Commission announced on September 30, 2003 that they will restart their line sharing/line splitting collaborative process. The Order that we adopt today addresses these issues in a similar manner and so I once again encourage my state commission colleagues in the Ameritech region to continue their diligent efforts to ensure that Congress' high standard continues to be met.