SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
		set forth in the appropriate SBC TEXAS federal or applicable state tariff(s), apply to local exchange lines resold to MCIm by SBC TEXAS?		
14	SBC Texas GT&C Issue 17 [MCI] 9 **RESOLVED**	SBC Texas GT&C Issue 17 [MCI] 9 **SBC: What notice and cure requirements should apply in the event MCIm is in violation of Appendix Resale?** **MCIm: Should the Commission adopt SBC TEXAS additional breach of contract language for Appendix Resale in addition to that contained in GTC?**	SBC Texas GT&C Issue 17 [MCI] 9 4.13 **[MCIm]** 4.13	**RESOLVED** **RESOLVED**
17	[Birch/Ionex] 7 (Resale Att. 1)	**SBC Texas:** **Is it reasonable to group selection charges into one, easy to reference, Pricing Appendix?** **Birch/ionex:** **Is it appropriate to move and revise the existing language in the T2A about the Primary Local Exchange Carrier Selection Charge?**	Att. 1 - §§ 3.0 – 3.5 [Birch/Ionex] 7 (Resale Att) Sections 3.0 - 3.4 (existing T2A sections)	The commission finds that it is reasonable to consolidate all terms, conditions and prices into one Pricing Index. All existing provisions as they appear in the T2A, unless otherwise noted, should be maintained in the consolidated Pricing Index. Additional language should be added to the Pricing Index indicating that "the service order functions provided by SWBT in processing electronic service orders are properly viewed as UNE functions", consistent with the Commission Decision in Docket Number 24547. The prices approved or acknowledged in that proceeding for the various type of service orders should be incorporated into the index. In order to avoid confusion, language should be incorporated into the Pricing Index indicating that any service order submitted manually would not be considered a UNE for pricing purposes consistent with the Commission decision in Docket

248

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
				No. 28600 at DPL Issue No. 207 and would be subject to the retail service order charge and/or non-recurring charges for the service requested less the avoided cost discount. The commission determines that no evidence in this proceeding supports a change to the T2A language referenced in Section 3.0 through 3.5. It is however appropriate to move the language in the T2A about the Primary Local Exchange Carrier Selection Charge to one consolidated index. The Commission adopts the Birch/Ionex proposal to retain the existing language
	[Birch/Ionex] Issue 2 -- Att. 2 – Ordering and Provisioning - Resale	**Birch/Ionex:** **Is it appropriate to change the existing definition of simple and complex orders?**	1.9 [Birch/Ionex] Issue 2 Ordering Attachment 2, Section 1.9	The Commission determines that there is no compelling reason to modify the existing language in paragraph 1.9 just because an electronically processed service order may require manual intervention.
17	[CJP] 2	[CJP] 2 **What should the Resale Attachment state as the prices for (1) manual and (2) electronic service orders (including, but not limited to, feature change orders, conversion orders, new connect orders, and suspension/restorals); and should there be a prohibition on the assessment of any additional charge based on an SBC tariff?**	Attach. 1, §§ 20-24	The Commission finds that the $25 charge for the underlying service for suspension/restoration of basic local telephone service, as reflected in the tariff, less the 21.6% avoided cost discount shall apply to CLECs utilizing such service. No other charges, including electronic service order charges, shall apply for a CLEC's utilization of this tariffed service. Prices for electronic service orders, excluding suspension/restoration orders, should be as established in Docket No. 24547. Prices for manual service orders should be based on the retail non-recurring charge less the appropriate avoided cost discount. The price for suspension/restoration of service, if processed manually or electronically,

249

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
				should be the retail price appearing in the tariff less the avoided cost discount, if service is restored. The Commission adopts the contract language proposed by SBC Texas, but modifies the language of the interconnection agreement to exclude Suspension Services /Restoration Services from paragraph 1.14 and include suspension/restoration within the appendix service pricing index of services available for resale with a wholesale discount applicable. The Commission finds that suspension/restoration service is a part and parcel of basic local telecommunications service subject to an avoidable cost discount.
	[CJP] 3	[CJP] 3 **Should the Appendix Services/Pricing specify that service order charges for resold services are UNEs?**	[CJP] 3 Resale – Appendix Services/ Pricing § 2.2	The commission finds that the Appendix Services/Pricing should include language specifying that service order charges for resold services handled on an electronic flow-through basis are priced as UNE elements, whereas, service order charges for resold services handled on a manual basis are priced according to the tariff rate less the applicable avoided cost discount.
19	[Birch/Ionex] Issue 3 – Att. 1 - Resale	**SBC Texas:** **Should AIN service levels, features and function components be addressed as a resale service?** **Birch/ionex:** **Is it appropriate to maintain the existing requirements in the T2A for SBC to resell AIN services?**	Att. 1 – Resale - § 9.3 [Birch/Ionex] Appendix Services Pricing Issue 3 Sections 9.0 – 9.3	RESOLVED as to Sections 9.1 and 9.2. The Commission determines that, to the extent any advanced intelligent network service and its features and functions are available as retail tariffed items, the services, features and functions should also be available for resale under the same terms and conditions as offered to the ILECs subscribers.
22	[CJP] 1	[CJP] 1 **Should SBC be required to provide pay phone**	[CJP] 1 § 19	The commission finds that no compelling evidence has been submitted that would suggest the necessity

250

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
		service for resale to Petitioners without requiring future amendment?		to change the existing T2A language concerning payphone service. The Commission adopts the existing T2A language without change. Payphone lines are recognized as a telecommunications service available to a CLEC for resale at the appropriate avoided cost discount.
24	[Coalition] 1	*SBC*: See GT&C Issue 3 *CLEC Coalition*: See CLEC Coalition GT&C Issue 2 **End User/Customer**	[Coalition] 1 Universal	See Commission Decision at SBC GT&C Issue 3 and CLEC GT& C Issue 2 concerning end user/customer
26	[Coalition] 1 (Resale Appendix Services)	[Coalition] 1 (Resale Appendix Services) **Should Order Processing charges for Resale Services be applied only per the SBC General Exchange Tariff?**	[Coalition] 1 (Resale Appendix Services) 2.2	The Commission clarifies that DPL No. 207 addressed in Docket No. 28600 relates to the manual processing of service orders, including those orders for the suspension, restoral of service, if applicable. All service orders processed electronically, including suspend/restore orders for resold service shall be treated as established under the Commission decision at Resale DPL No. 17.
30	[Coalition] 1 (Maint. Resale) **[Sent to GT&C]**	*SBC*: See GT&C Issue 3 [Coalition] 1 (Maint. Resale) End User/Customer *CLEC Coalition*: See CLEC Coalition GT&C Issue 2 End User/Customer	[Coalition] 1 (Maint. Resale) Universal	
38 **settled**	[Birch/Ionex] 4 (Att. 1 – Resale)	Is it appropriate to change the existing language in the T2A that addresses the services that SBC will make available to CLECs for resale?	Att. 1, § 1.3	**SETTLED**

251

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
39 **settled**	[Birch/Ionex] 1 (Att. 4 – Resale)	SBC: Is it reasonable and efficient to address Directory Assistance and Operator Services available for resale in separate appendices? Birch/ionex: Is it appropriate to delete the Appendix Directory Assistance/ Operator Services and Appendix White Pages (WP)-Resale from the existing T2A?	Entire Appendix [Birch/Ionex] 5 (Resale Att) Sections 1.8 and 1.9 (existing T2A sections) Sections 2.0 to 2.3.6.8 (as renumbered by SBC)	**SETTLED**
40	[Birch/Ionex] 8 (Att. 1–Resale)	SBC Texas: **Should this language be included here when it is already discussed in GT&C?** **Should this language be consolidated with similar language addressing the same subject?** Birch/ionex: **Is it appropriate to move and revise the existing language in the T2A about changes, billing, testing, and OSS for resold services?**	Att. 1, §§ 8.0, 8.1, 9.0, 9.1 [Birch/Ionex] 8 (Resale Att) Sections 8 and 9 (existing T2A sections)	Consistent with the commission decisions at GT& C on related matters, the commission determines that it is appropriate to retain GT&C language within the body of the resale appendix as the language can be construed as resale specific and should be provided as part of a resale only contract.
41 **settled**	[Birch/Ionex] 2 (Appendix Services/Pricing - Resale)	SBC Texas: Should the language point to the correct appendix? Birch/ionex: Is it appropriate to change the ordering appendix from the existing T2A?	App. – Services/Pricing – Resale) §§ 3.1, 4.1, 6.1, 8.2 [Birch/Ionex] 2 (Appendix Services/Pricing) Sections 3.1, 4.1, 6.1, 8.2	**SETTLED**
56	[Birch/ionex] 4	Is it appropriate to include language that properly	Att. 2, §§ 4.1-4.4	**SETTLED**

252

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
settled	(Att. 2 – Ordering & Provisioning – Resale)	addresses disconnections, intercept referral messages, FOCs, order completion notices, and jeopardy notices?	and 4.6-4.7 [Birch/Ionex] 4 (Att 2: Ordering & Provisioning) Attachment 2; Sections 4.1-4.4, 4.6-4.7	
59 **settled**	[Birch/Ionex] 1 (Att. 1 – Resale)	SBC Texas: Is it reasonable to make the terms and conditions for providing resale services reciprocal? Birch/ionex: Is it appropriate to change the existing T2A language to impose additional resale requirements on CLECs?	Att. 1 – throughout Attachment	**SETTLED**
Not Listed By SBC	[Birch/ionex] 1 Att. 5 – Provision of Customer Usage Data	**Should SBC provide Birch/ionex with notice of changes to the Daily Usage File User's Guide at least 30 days prior to implementing changes?**	Att. 5 - §§ 2.2, 4.1, 5.5	The commission finds that it is appropriate to adopt "advanced notification of changes language" as suggested by CLECs. The Commission adopts the contract language proposed by Birch/ionex

253

28821-Joint Space License -Jt. DPL-Final

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name And Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
		Space License	**Attachment 11, Part G**	
1	AT&T-1 Xspedius-1 Birch/Ion-1[1]	A.What rates should apply to SBC for its use of AT&T's Space? B.Is AT&T entitled to charge SBC for multiplexers it leases from AT&T associated with its Space requests? C.Is AT&T entitled to charge SBC non-recurring installation and engineering fees for work that AT&T performs for SBC associated with its space requests?	6.0	It appears that this issue is moot because the Commission determined that two-way trunking is more efficient than one-way trunking. See Albright Direct pp.46-48.
4	AT&T-4 Xspedius-4 Birch/Ion-4	What responsibilities for SBC's cable requests does AT&T have in third party buildings?	23.7	

1 Birch/Ionex adopted AT&T's agreed upon language, disputes, and dispute rationale for Attachment 11: Part G: Space Licensing (also see fn.1 *supra*).

254

28821-SS7 Network Attachment 11 Part D-Jt. DPL-Final

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue#	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
		SS7	**Part D Attachment 11**	
2	Xspedius-1	Xspedius Issue: Should SBC's language "separate from CLEC or IXC ISUP," in reference to this Attachment be included in the ICA? SBC Issue : If the AT&T CLEC purchases SS7 services from SBC TEXAS, should AT&T's Long Distance or other AT&T non-CLEC entities be able use of such services?	2.1.1	This issue appears to be resolved. AT&T – 2 **Resolved** Advantex 2 **Withdrawn** Xspedius-1 **Resolved** Birch/Ionex – 1 **Resolved**
3	Xspedius-2	ATT Issues: A. Should the parties share in the provisioning of signaling links between each other, or should AT&T provide the complete signaling link? B. What terms should apply to SBC TEXAS for its connection to AT&T's SS7 network? SBC Issues: A. Do the AT&T CLECs purchase and maintain SS7 signaling links or any other SS7 services from SBC. B. Does SBC TEXAS maintain SS7 connectivity to the AT&T CLECs?	2.4, 4.5, 4.6	This issue appears to be resolved. AT&T – 3 **Resolved** Xspedius – 2 **Resolved** Birch/Ionex -2 **Resolved** Advantex – 3 **Withdrawn**
4	MCIm-1	Under what circumstances should SBC TEXAS be required to provide signaling to MCIm as an unbundled	Appendix XXII: MCIm: Appendix SS7 (all sections)	The Commission finds that SBC is required to provide SS7 services used in conjunction with ULS/UNE-P. This finding is consistent with the FCC's Triennial Review Order ("TRO") that determined that an ILEC no longer

255

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue#	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
		Network Element?	SBC: Appendix UNE	has to provide unbundled access to SS7 services at TELRIC pricing unless it is providing unbundled local switching (ULS) to a CLEC. Chapman Direct at 78-79, SBC Tex. Ex. 6. However, all carriers may continue to purchase SBC SS7 services from the SBC Texas access tariff. Novak Rebuttal at 9-11, SBC Tex Ex. 31. In addition, the Commission finds no compelling reasons to create a separate appendix for SS7 signaling. Therefore, the Commission adopts the ICA language proposed by SBC Texas without modification.
5	MCIm- 2	SBC: If MCIm purchases SS7 links and ports from SBC TEXAS, what should be the price of those items? MCIm: See SS7 1	Pricing Schedule lines 755 *et. seq.*	The Commission adopts the ICA language proposed by SBC Texas without modification. See issue number 4 above
6	MCIm-3	SBC: If MCIm purchases SS7 links and ports from SBC TEXAS, what terms and conditions should govern the provisioning of those items? MCIm: See SS7 1	FCC Tariff 73 Section 23	The Commission adopts the ICA language proposed by SBC Texas without modification. See issue number 4 above
7	Xspedius-3	Is SBC's language in section 5.1 requiring XSPEDIUS to provision signaling links in a diverse manner redundant to the parties agreed to language in section 2.8.4?	5.1	This issue has been resolved.

256

28821-Transit -Jt. DPL-Final

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Section	COMMISSION DECISION
1	Birch/ ionex-1	SBC Texas' Overarching Issue: a. Should non 251/252 services such as Transit Services be negotiated separately? Birch/Ionex: Is it appropriate to replace the Commission-approved language for compensation of transit traffic with a new attachment that contains market-based rates?	Att. 28 in its entirety	The Commission finds that SBC is required to provide transit services at TELRIC rates as part of the interconnection agreement. The issue of transit services for Birch/ionex is addressed in Intercarrier Compensation – SBC Issue 17/Birch/ionex-6. The Commission adopts the rationale and decision in SBC issue-17/Birch/ionex-6.

257

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
		Collocation	**Attachment 13: Appendix Collocation**	Issues surrounding the collocation tariff are properly considered before the Commission in an FTA § 252 arbitration proceeding. FTA § 251(c)(6) specifically addresses the obligation of an ILEC to provide collocation. Therefore, to the extent language needs to be clarified or additional terms and conditions are needed, the Commission may rule on the disputes either in this arbitration or in a post interconnection dispute resolution proceeding.
1	[AT&T] 1 [Advantex, CJP, CLEC Coalition] 1 Identical	SBC Overarching Can a CLEC choose to utilize an existing approved tariff and attempt to add, change or "freeze in place" the existing tariff terms and conditions? [AT&T] Should the Collocation Appendix, in addition to incorporating the requirements of the Collocation Tariffs, contain additional contract language addressing situations on which the Tariff is silent?		For the reasons discussed above, the Commission directs the parties to modify the tariff based on the ruling on the disputed issues in this proceeding.
	[MCI]1/56	[MCI] Should a change in SBC Texas' collocation tariff be made in this contract by way of amendment?	Appendix IV: Collocation 1	The Commission finds SBC should not be allowed to make changes to the tariff unilaterally. Instead, either party can petition the Commission to make modifications to the tariff in a proceeding conducted in accordance with the post-interconnection dispute resolution process pursuant to FTA § 252. Therefore, the Commission adopts MCIm's proposed language.
2	[AT&T] 2 [Advantex, CJP] 2 Identical See SBC Issue 6	Should AT&T, at its option, be allowed to implement power metering in its collocation space in SBC-T's locations?	3.0-3.7	The Commission does not agree with SBC's assertion that power metering constitutes change to the cost model considered in setting the collocation rates. Currently, Currently, Section 20.5 of the collocation tariff defines Power Consumption rate element as the "use of the DC power plant system,", and is on a per-amp basis. Docket No.27559, the Commission ruled that SBC can bill for the power consumption by using one of the options noted below: 1) Total DC power consumption in terms of ampere draw of all equipment collocated by the CLEC based on the information obtained from the CLEC through its collocation application form; or

238

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
				2.) The maximum current carrying capacity of either A or B feed; or 3.) Based on the establishment of a mutually-agreeable metering arrangement. Based on the testimony in this proceeding, the Commission agrees with AT&T that the first two options may overstate the power usage rate and thus result in higher charges. *See* Sullivan Direct Testimony at 18-19, AT&T Ex. 10. However, the parties have not presented a workable solution or arrangement for establishing the meters. The metering arrangement as proposed by AT&T does not provide specifics on the types of meters to be used, installation methodologies, and the cost recovery mechanisms for such installation. Thus, the Commission directs parties to work collaboratively to establish the metering arrangement and present a solution within 60 days from the final order in this proceeding. The Commission encourages the parties to explore measuring the consumption in terms of watt hours on a monthly basis. If watt-hour measurement is proposed as a feasible method, the current per ampere rate set in the tariff may need to be modified. Any such modification to the rate structure must ensure that the TELRIC costs, approved as the basis for setting the per amp rate in Docket No. 21333, are recovered. The Commission notes that the SBC may use any of the first two options ordered in Docket No. 27559 for billing DC power consumption on an interim basis, until the metering methodology is fully developed and established through a collaborative process or in accordance with the post interconnection dispute resolution process.
	[MCI] 3/58 See SBC Issue 6	[SBC Texas] Should MCIm be charged on a metered basis for power in collocation spaces? [MCI] Should the Commission's recent decision in Docket Nos. 27559, 27730, 27738, 27739, and 27882 govern charges for power	Collo 3	

259

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
		consumption?		
3	[AT&T] 3 [Advantex, CJP] Identical [CLEC Coalition] 4 Identical	Should the ICA delineate specific requirements for partial collocation space decommissioning and removal of unneeded cables and equipment?	4.0-4.25	The Commission notes that the existing language in section 5.4 of the collocation tariff addresses the terms and conditions for the removal of the equipment in the collocated space. The parties' proposed section numbers conflict with the language in the tariff under the same sections. The current language in section 4 is related to SBC's responsibilities, not the terms for removal or decommissioning of the equipment in the collocated space. The Commission finds that the language contained in section 5.4 is adequate for both complete and partial removal of equipment in the collocated space. As such, no change is required.
4	[AT&T] 5 [Advantex, CJP] Identical	Should the ICA include requirements that SBC-Texas provide to AT&T, at AT&T's request, various collocation reports necessary for AT&T to perform its ongoing activities?	6.0-6.4	This issue resolved as to AT&T.
	[CLEC Coalition]5	Identical to [AT&T] 5	5.1	The Commission finds that SBC should not be required to maintain a database containing a CLEC's specific arrangement within the collocation space. However, SBC should provide on-line information on the facilities and equipment it has installed in accordance with the tariff. In addition to the language contained under issue 4 above, the following language is adopted: **6.5 SBC Texas shall make available to CLEC at no charge an enhancement to the APOT verification tool in TOOLBAR to permit CLEC to enter a range of APOTS. Until such time as the enhancement is available, SBC Texas shall allow CLEC to view the online TIRKS Reports at any time without charge.**
5	[AT&T] 6 [Advantex and CJP] Identical	Should SBC Texas be required to include USOCs on its collocation price quotes to AT&T?	7.0-7.1 [CLEC Coalition] 6 6.0	This issue has been resolved.

260

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
	CLEC Coalition] 6 Identical SETTLED			
6	[CLEC Coalition] 2 See also MCI Issue 3/58 under SBC Issue #2 above	Should a CLEC be allowed, at its option, to place its own BDFB in its physical collocation space?	3.1	The Commission finds that the power equipment is necessary to operate the network components in the collocation space. Although SBC provides the required power from a centralized location, CLECs are requesting to allow installation of their own power distribution equipment in the collocation space in order to effectively manage the distribution of power. This capability is necessary to manage additions and changes to its network equipment, without relying on SBC to extend the power from a centralized location for each addition and/or modification to its network equipment. The Commission finds that a CLEC should be allowed to install its own power distribution equipment in its collocation space provided that such placement does not affect the structural integrity of the building. If SBC is required to provide additional floor support as needed, CLECs should compensate SBC for all costs incurred on a time and material basis. The Commission adopts CLEC proposed language with the following modifications: **3.1 CLEC shall be permitted, at its option, to place its own BDFB in its physical collocation space, however, SBC may reject such installation if the structural integrity of the collocated space is jeopardized.**
7	[Sage]1	[SBC Texas] Under what circumstances may Sage obtain virtual collocation or adjacent on-site collocation? [Sage] Is SBC required to provide collocation for adjacent spaces for on-site collocation?	2.0	This issue has been resolved.

28821-Collocation-Jt. DPL-Final

SBC Issue #	CLEC Name and Issue #	SBC Overarching Issue Statement CLEC Specific Issue Statement	Attachment & Sections	COMMISSION DECISION
		SETTLED		
8	[MCI]2/57	What augment interval should apply for DS0s?	Collocation 2	Staff concurs with SBC. Currently, the collocation tariff addresses the augment intervals applicable to all CLECs. SBC may not shorten those intervals for MCI.

262