

BellSouth Corporation
Suite 900
1133 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3351

mary.henze@bellsouth.com

Mary L. Henze
Assistant Vice President
Federal Regulatory

202 463 4109
Fax 202 463 4631

June 4, 2004

Ms. Marlene Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

***Re: Pick & Choose NPRM; CC Dkts 01-338, 96-98, and 98-147; Review of
Sec. 251 Unbundling obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers.***

Dear Ms. Dortch,

On June 4, 2004, the undersigned, Parkey Jordan, and Jon Banks of BellSouth met with William Maher, Jeff Carlisle, Robert Tanner, and Jeremy Miller of the Wireline Competition Bureau. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the FCC's current Pick and Choose rules and how they affect interconnection negotiations in inefficient and non-productive ways. All material used during the meeting is attached.

This notice is being filed pursuant to Sec. 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules. If you have any questions regarding this filing please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Mary L. Henze

cc: W. Maher
J. Carlisle
R. Tanner
J. Miller

- Current Pick and Choose rules affect interconnection negotiations in inefficient and non-productive ways (see BellSouth affidavit, May 11, 2004).
 - Risks associated with pick and choose impact **every** negotiation
 - Attempting to mitigate risks adds costs and time to contract process
 - Requests from CLECs for creative or customized solutions often cannot be accommodated
- Modifying and clarifying FCC rules implementing 252(i) will help to foster more productive negotiations.
- SGAT proposal in NPRM is potentially workable if clarified as proposed by BellSouth (see BellSouth April 27, 2004 ex parte).
 - However, SGAT proposal will fail if SGATs are allowed to be arbitrated
 - Lengthy contested proceedings will stall approval process and prevent meaningful pick and choose relief
- FCC should modify rules to limit 252(i) adoption of interconnection agreements to “adopt in its entirety.”
 - Supreme Court found this interpretation to be “eminently fair” and within FCC's authority to determine
 - Experience with negotiations since rules were adopted require FCC to modify its original findings
- In addition, FCC needs to further clarify “entirety” consistent with 252(i) to encompass only “interconnection arrangements, services and network elements, and terms and conditions related thereto.” (see BellSouth April 27, 2004 ex parte, p.2)
 - Per Qwest Declaratory Ruling (WC Docket No. 02-89), agreements addressing general terms, such as dispute resolution and escalation provision, are not interconnection agreements if this information is generally available to carriers, such as via a web site posting.
 - Further, general terms are not within the scope of Section 251/252.

BellSouth Corporation
Suite 900
1133 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3351

mary.henze@bellsouth.com

Mary L. Henze
Assistant Vice President
Federal Regulatory

202 463 4109
Fax 202 463 4631

April 27, 2004

Ms. Marlene Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554


Re: Pick and Choose NPRM; CC Dkts 01-338, 96-98, and 98-147; Review of Sec. 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers.

Dear Ms. Dortch,

On April 26, 2004 the undersigned, Parkey Jordan, Michael Willis, and Lisa Brooks of BellSouth met with Jon Minkoff and Christi Shewman of the Wireline Competition Bureau. The purpose of the meeting was to present a BellSouth proposal for meeting the requirements of Sec. 252(i) that the company believes would foster more meaningful negotiations, absent forbearance. BellSouth reiterated its concern that the current pick and choose rules allow "gaming" that harms the market, and noted that its proposal is specifically designed to address some of the most common problems. In addition, BellSouth provided answers to a number of staff questions regarding issues raised in this proceeding. All material provided during the meeting is attached.

This notice is being filed pursuant to Sec. 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules. If you have any questions regarding this filing please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Mary L. Henze

Attachments

cc: J. Minkoff
C. Shewman

BellSouth's 252(i) Proposal Absent Forbearance

If an ILEC has a state approved SGAT or similar "Foundation Agreement"¹ then the following rules apply with respect to Section 252(i) adoption requests.² A CLEC may choose **one** of the following two adoption options:

A. Purchase services from the SGAT/Foundation Agreement (i.e., "adopt" the SGAT).

- (i) The CLEC would utilize the ILEC's SGAT for any interconnection arrangements, services or network elements it wishes to purchase from the ILEC.
- (ii) The CLEC could not select individual interconnection arrangements, services or network elements from the SGAT for incorporation in another interconnection agreement.
- (iii) The general terms and conditions and administrative provisions of the SGAT would apply to any services purchased from the SGAT.
- (iv) Timelines should be imposed so that states review and approve updates to SGATs regularly and in a timely manner. For example, states should have in place an expedited process to ensure updates to the SGATs are approved within thirty (30) to sixty (60) days after submission of the updates to the state commission.

¹ A "Foundation Agreement" is an interconnection agreement which could be designated by any ILEC (BOC or non-BOC) as their SGAT-equivalent and filed with their state for approval.

² A CLEC may also opt to negotiate an agreement "whole cloth" instead of adopting the SGAT/Foundation Agreement or an existing agreement.

B. Adopt all interconnection arrangements, services and network elements from an existing filed and approved interconnection agreement (i.e., adopt the agreement "in its entirety," subject to the limitations of Section 252(i)).

- (i) Per Section 252(i) of the Act, only interconnection arrangements, services and network elements, and terms and conditions related thereto, are available for adoption. Thus, the adopting CLEC would adopt all interconnection, services and network elements available in the requested agreement.
- (ii) Per the express language of Section 252(i), general contract terms and administrative provisions (including but not limited to billing dispute procedures, deposits, and dispute escalation) are not available for adoption but are available in the ILEC's standard agreement, or may be negotiated.
- (iii) Consistent with the FCC's current rules regarding Section 252 (i), any agreement being adopted must be adopted within a reasonable period of time after it has been approved by the applicable state commission. Such a rule is necessary to avoid gaming and arbitrage in the adoption process. As such, BellSouth proposes that:
 - agreements remain available for adoption for one year following the date approved by the state commission.
 - in the event of a change of law during the time period in which an agreement is otherwise available for adoption, the adopting CLEC may not adopt the agreement until it has been amended to take into account changes in the law, or, alternatively, the CLEC must, at the time of adoption, execute an amendment to take into account changes in the law. An adoption cannot be deemed to have occurred within a reasonable period of time if the law has changed since the agreement was approved.
- (iv) Agreements may be modified simultaneously with the adoption to the extent any provisions are inapplicable to the adopting CLEC (e.g., ISP compensation).

BellSouth's Responses to FCC's Questions Regarding Pick and Choose NPRM

1. SGATS

In how many states does BellSouth have filed SGATs? When were they filed? And how often are they updated?

BellSouth currently has SGATs filed in seven out of the nine states in our region. These SGATs were all filed in early 2004 (see dates below) and will be updated on a quarterly basis.

State	Filed
AL	1/28/04
FL	TBD ¹
GA	1/29/04
KY	1/23/04
LA	1/29/04
MS	1/22/04
NC	TBD ²
SC	1/16/04
TN	TBD ³

2. Standard Interconnection Agreement

Does BellSouth have an internal "standard interconnection agreement" that serves as a starting point for negotiations with CLECs? If so, how often is the standard agreement updated?

BellSouth has a standard Interconnection Agreement that is offered to CLECs as a starting point for negotiations. The BellSouth standard Interconnection Agreement is posted on BellSouth's web site and updated quarterly to ensure it is consistent with state and federal laws; this includes making updates to UNE ordered rates, product and services offerings, business rules and procedures, and industry standards. The SGATs recently filed by BellSouth were identical to BellSouth's standard Interconnection Agreement at the time of filing.

¹ The Florida SGAT was filed on 1/15/04, but was subsequently pulled down pending inclusion of language effectuating the D.C. Circuit Court's Opinion, once the stay is lifted.

² Because the NC SGAT had not been filed when the D.C. Circuit Court's Opinion issued, decision was made to not file it until the appropriate language could be included to reflect the Circuit Court's Opinion.

³ *Ibid.*

3. Data on Existing Interconnection Agreements (ICA)

On a company-wide basis, how many ICAs does BellSouth enter into using: A. pick and choose; B. opting wholly into another agreement; C. negotiating from "whole cloth"; and D. arbitration

Total Number of ICAs as of April 1, 2004 = 545

- Total Number of current ICAs that were negotiated = 360
 - Total Number of current ICAs that were negotiated from BellSouth's standard agreement with no changes (this includes minor non-substantive changes) = 236
 - Total Number of current ICAs that were negotiated from BellSouth's standard agreement with changes = 124
 - Of the 360 negotiated ICAs, 12 were the result of arbitration. Of these 11 arbitrations, 10 began negotiations with BellSouth's standard Agreement
- Total Number of current ICAs that resulted from adoptions of existing agreements = 185
 - Total Number of Adoptions of existing agreements without any substantive changes = 61
 - Total Number of Adoptions of existing agreements with substantive changes = 124
- Prior to adoption of an existing agreement, the following are typical changes:
 - ISP reciprocal compensation provisions removed if the carrier does not meet the guideline outlined in the FCC's Reciprocal Compensation Order
 - Ensure the collocation intervals are consistent with the most recent collocation orders
 - Some CLECs attach their BAPCO agreement as an exhibit to their interconnection agreement. If there is a BAPCO agreement attached, the agreement must be removed as it is a separate agreement that is negotiated by the parties with another BellSouth entity

- Deposit provisions based on the original parties financial standing or referencing their financial reports
 - Notice Provisions
 - Add ODUF and EODUF to the resale attachment
 - Update with changes in law, i.e. TRO, state UNE rate orders
- CLECs that currently have arbitrated agreements:

AT&T
MCI
DeltaCom
Cinergy
XO
Covad
Allegiance
Supra
Birch
FDN
Sprint
Alltel

4. Facilities-based CLECs vs. UNE-P CLECs

What is BellSouth's experience with facilities-based carriers in terms of whether those carriers want more highly specialized and tailored ICAs versus the experience with UNE-P carriers?

First, BellSouth notes that many CLECs that might traditionally be thought of as true facilities-based carriers (i.e., self-provide some portion of the network (such as switching) used to provide local service to end users) are also using UNE-P to serve some end users. Consequently, there are few ICAs that can be termed as either "facilities-based" or "UNE-P." BellSouth's experience with CLECs who use both methods to provision local service has been that BellSouth is able to successfully negotiate ICAs with some CLECs without going to arbitration, while others go to arbitration for some number of issues. Historically, these CLECs have not relied on section 252(i) to adopt existing agreements or portions of agreements, choosing instead to negotiate and sometimes arbitrate.

5. California Procedural Rule

What does BellSouth think about the CLEC proposal that the FCC adopt California's procedural rule?

In its ex parte on December 17, 2003, MCI proposed that the FCC consider adopting the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC's) October 5, 2000, ruling on pick and choose. BellSouth is opposed to this proposal.

BellSouth believes that the CPUC's procedural rule creates undue risk for the ILEC in that it enables a CLEC to quickly adopt an existing ICA (or portions of an existing ICA) without any regard for whether the terms of that agreement comport with current law. BellSouth's standard Interconnection Agreement is available for "quick" adoption, and the standard agreement is kept up-to-date.

MCI stated in its ex parte that the FCC's current pick and choose rules are not broken and, thus, do not need to be fixed. Interestingly, at least in BellSouth's region, MCI (the parent company) has never used section 252(i) to adopt either an entire existing agreement, or portion(s) of existing agreements. BellSouth and MCI have gone through two cycles of ICAs, both of which were arbitrated. Currently, negotiations are under way for the 3rd ICA between BellSouth and MCI, and we appear headed to arbitration with many unresolved issues. Of the 545 current ICAs BellSouth has, MCI is the only CLEC that refused to start negotiations with BellSouth's standard Interconnection Agreement, insisting instead on beginning with MCI's current agreement. The inherent difficulty in proceeding in this manner is that MCI's current agreement did not reflect the current state of the law. Section 252(i) has been used by MCI affiliates to adopt MCI's arbitrated agreements.

BellSouth Corporation
Suite 900
1133 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3351

mary.henze@bellsouth.com

Mary L. Henze
Assistant Vice President
Federal Regulatory

202 463 4109
Fax 202 463 4631

May 11, 2004

Ms. Marlene Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

***Re: Pick & Choose NPRM; CC Dkts 01-338, 96-98, and 98-147; Review of
Sec. 251 Unbundling obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers***

Dear Ms. Dortch,

BellSouth is submitting for the record in the above proceedings the attached affidavit of Jerry D. Hendrix, Assistant Vice President-Interconnection Services Marketing for BellSouth. Mr. Hendrix describes in detail how the FCC's current pick and choose rules affect interconnection negotiations in inefficient and non-productive ways.

This notice is being filed pursuant to Sec. 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules. If you have any questions regarding this filing please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Mary L. Henze

cc: J. Minkoff
C. Shewman

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D. C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers)	CC Docket No. 01-338
)	
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act Of 1996)	CC Docket No. 96-98
)	
Deployment of Wireline Services of Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability)	CC Docket No. 98-147
)	

**AFFIDAVIT OF JERRY D. HENDRIX
ON BEHALF OF BELL SOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS INC. ("BELL SOUTH")**

The undersigned being of lawful age and duly sworn, does hereby state as follows:

QUALIFICATIONS

1. My name is Jerry D. Hendrix. My business address is 675 West Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30375. My title is Assistant Vice President - Interconnection Services Marketing for BellSouth. I am responsible for overseeing the negotiation of Interconnection Agreements between BellSouth and Competitive Local Exchange Carriers ("CLECs"). Prior to assuming my present position, I held various positions in the Network Distribution Department and then joined the BellSouth Headquarters Pricing and Regulatory Organizations. I have been employed with BellSouth since 1979.

PURPOSE OF AFFIDAVIT

2. The purpose of this affidavit is to follow up on questions raised by the Commission during a recent BellSouth *ex parte* presentation, notice of which was subsequently filed in this proceeding, Letter from Mary L. Henze to Marlene Dortch (April 27, 2004), and to specifically provide additional record evidence that the current pick and choose rules affect interconnection negotiations in inefficient and non-productive ways.

THE PICK AND CHOOSE RULES AFFECT INTERCONNECTION NEGOTIATIONS IN INEFFICIENT AND NON-PRODUCTIVE WAYS:

3. For example, in an effort to incorporate into its existing Interconnection Agreements (“IAs”) the changes of law that resulted from the FCC’s *Triennial Review Order* (“TRO”), BellSouth forwarded to each CLEC an amendment to its specific IA. The amendment contained all changes that the *TRO* specified, regardless of whether BellSouth viewed the change as beneficial to BellSouth or to the CLEC. Also, in the majority of its states, BellSouth filed new SGATs reflecting the current state of the law, which included the changes from the *TRO*. Before BellSouth could get the new SGAT filed in the remainder of its states, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals issued its Opinion and stayed significant sections of the *TRO*; therefore, BellSouth chose not to proceed with the rest of its SGAT filings until the situation stabilized. In one of the states where BellSouth filed a new SGAT, CLEC A submitted to that state commission a request to adopt only the commingling language from the SGAT. Apparently, CLEC A was attempting to avoid incorporating into its IA the remaining provisions of the *TRO*, wanting instead to incorporate into its IA only those provisions from the *TRO* that CLEC A deemed beneficial to it.
4. CLEC B, apparently in an effort to eliminate specific provisions of its negotiated IA that it now views as not being beneficial, has requested to adopt specific provisions from another carrier’s agreement, even though the other carrier’s agreement is actually silent on the provisions at issue. In other words, CLEC B seeks to adopt the absence of a provision.
5. A CLEC affiliate of a large, established CLEC has requested to adopt the established CLEC’s IA (and, where the established CLEC has no adoptable agreement, the CLEC affiliate has requested to adopt the IA of another large, unaffiliated CLEC). The requested IAs, in most cases, were filed with and approved by the state commissions more than two years ago and do not reflect changes in law that have occurred since the agreements were signed and approved. Further, the CLEC affiliate did not request the adoption until a matter of days before the DC Circuit Court of Appeals released its March 2, 2004, Opinion regarding the *TRO*. The CLEC affiliate is new, has no customers, and has not even completed the certification process in at least one of BellSouth’s states in which the CLEC affiliate has requested adoption of an existing IA. Nonetheless, the CLEC affiliate is requesting to adopt agreements that are no longer compliant with law, presumably in an attempt to perpetuate those portions of the agreement that it finds beneficial but that are not compliant with law. BellSouth’s response to the CLEC affiliate was that it could adopt the requested IAs, but only if it agreed to amend the IAs so that they would be compliant with current law. The CLEC affiliate has, thus far, refused to amend the IAs as a condition of adoption.

6. CLEC C has a very specific business plan and customer base, and seeks certain bill and keep arrangements in connection with its interconnection with BellSouth. In this specific instance, both parties would benefit from such an arrangement. However, in other circumstances, this particular arrangement would be extremely costly to BellSouth. Rather than being able simply to agree to the arrangement with CLEC C, BellSouth's negotiator and the negotiating attorney have spent many hours consulting with BellSouth's network engineers, sales teams and billing personnel to attempt to identify and discuss all potential risks. Due to the pick and choose option, such caution is necessary in order to craft the language addressing the specific interconnection arrangement so that another CLEC cannot adopt it unless that CLEC also meets the same qualifications as CLEC C. Under the specter of pick and choose, what should be a simple negotiation that could be handled in a matter of days turns into a series of meetings with numerous people, and takes significantly longer to negotiate. Furthermore, even if BellSouth agrees to CLEC C's request and does its best to construct contract language specific to this situation, there is still the risk that CLECs who are not similarly situated will argue that they should be allowed to adopt the language, or parts thereof. Most likely, protracted litigation would occur, and if the CLEC prevailed, the result would be financial harm to BellSouth.
7. The pick and choose rules cause BellSouth to incur costs in litigation not only to defend against adoption where BellSouth believes the adopting CLEC is not similarly situated, but also to arbitrate issues with a particular carrier that could be successfully negotiated if the pick and choose rules did not exist. In a true negotiation, unrelated contract provisions left to be resolved are often "horse-traded." For example, BellSouth may agree to a CLEC's requested provision in exchange for the CLEC's agreement to an unrelated provision. Two problems can occur where BellSouth agrees to such exchanges. First, in situations where such trades are made, it is difficult, if not impossible, to track the exchanges. Thus, adopting CLECs can pick and choose certain language that includes the beneficial provision without taking the other provision that was part of the bargain (and that was beneficial to BellSouth). Second, if BellSouth insists that the CLEC also adopt the other provision that was part of the exchange, the CLEC will likely consider the other provision as being unrelated to the provision the CLEC wants to adopt, and the parties may spend months attempting to resolve the issue. Where BellSouth does not agree to the exchange for the reasons discussed above, the parties are forced to arbitrate issues that neither party truly has the inclination to fight.
8. Larger CLECs often request specialized services, such as downloads of databases, development of specialized systems or other costly endeavors, and these CLECs often want to negotiate those requests in connection with an IA. In some cases, BellSouth may be willing to agree to the request, provided that it can collect appropriate compensation. Because most of these negotiated items are not actually developed unless and until the CLEC makes a request, some such items are never actually developed and implemented. The large requesting CLEC


prefers to make a request, obtain the specialized service, system or database from BellSouth, and then reimburse BellSouth for the costs incurred. However, BellSouth cannot agree to anything other than advance payment. Otherwise, a CLEC without the financial means to pay for the development of the service could adopt the language, request development, obtain the benefit of the service and then be unable to pay for it. The large CLEC may ultimately arbitrate the issue in an effort to avoid advance payment or other terms that, for that particular CLEC and its financial capability and business plan, may actually be acceptable to BellSouth, but that BellSouth cannot agree to because the terms would then be available for adoption by other CLECs.

9. A CLEC may have a novel approach to a particular problem that BellSouth has not operationalized. That CLEC desires to include the terms and conditions of this proposed solution in its IA, and BellSouth generally would be willing to do so in order to test the concept on a small scale with that one CLEC or with a small subset of CLECs. Obviously, if the concept were successful, BellSouth would be willing to offer the same arrangement to additional CLECs. BellSouth, however, is unable to include such untested concepts in an IA, because if the solution proves to be operationally problematic, too costly or otherwise unworkable for BellSouth, adoption perpetuates the problem and causes it to grow. Thus, BellSouth generally cannot agree to incorporate innovative but untested solutions for a single carrier into an IA.
10. During 1998 and 1999, BellSouth participated in multiple arbitrations relating to the treatment of ISP-bound traffic in each of the nine states in which it provides local exchange and exchange access services. BellSouth considered attempting to settle these disputes with some CLECs with a going-forward remedy proposal. The settlement decision would have been based on each arbitrating CLEC's specific situation. Due to the uncertainty caused by the current pick and choose rules, however, BellSouth was unable to proceed in a timely manner with these settlement proposals due to the risk that CLECs that were not similarly situated to the arbitrating CLECs would attempt to obtain, and would indeed ultimately obtain, the same provisions.
11. Generally, BellSouth's Interconnection Services contract negotiators, product managers and upper management, along with BellSouth's network and billing personnel and its counsel, expend substantial resources in assessing risk of adoption, trying to develop contract language that limits adoption to similarly situated CLECs, and handling disputes involving adoption requests. Each and every issue must be considered carefully in regards to pick and choose and the potential results of including provisions in the agreement that can be adopted by other carriers. While BellSouth can attempt to craft language that would restrict the provisions only to similarly situated CLECs, such an exercise is time consuming, and often the CLEC has no inclination to expend time and resources to negotiate or agree to such language, even if the language is not problematic for the negotiating CLEC. Further, BellSouth has no assurance of prevailing at the


state commissions if the CLEC argues that it should not be required to adopt all of the restrictions along with the language it desires to adopt. The following are examples of adoption requests that BellSouth has received from multiple CLECs that impede negotiations and require a great amount of time and resources to resolve:

- Requests to adopt provisions that are beyond the scope of 252(i), such as requests to adopt dispute resolution provisions, governing law provisions, and deposit provisions that are based on the original negotiating CLEC's financial status.
- Requests to adopt specific provisions without accepting other legitimately related provisions, such as a request to adopt a "bill and keep" provision without accepting the associated network interconnection arrangements provision.
- Requests to adopt provisions to which the CLEC is not legally entitled, such as a request to adopt reciprocal compensation for ISP traffic provisions from an existing IA when the adopting CLEC did not exchange traffic with BellSouth in 2001, as is required by law to entitle that CLEC to compensation for ISP traffic.
- Requests to adopt a specific provision in order to avoid change of law provisions, such as a request to adopt specific provisions from the *TRO*, but refusing to accept all of the provisions, especially those that are more beneficial to the ILEC.

12. This concludes my affidavit.


Jerry D. Hendrix

Sworn to and subscribed before me
A Notary Public, this 10th
day of May, 2004.


Notary Public

RUDINE J. DAVIS
Notary Public, Fulton County, Georgia
My Commission Expires May 16, 2006