

---

**BellSouth Interconnection Services**

675 West Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30375

**Carrier Notification  
SN91085132**

Date: June 16, 2005

To: Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLEC)

Subject: CLECs – (Product/Service) - Triennial Review Remand Amendment

In response to various Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and court orders, each state public service commission (PSC) in BellSouth's nine-state territory, either on its own motion or in response to a request that it do so, has established a generic docket to address unresolved issues that may exist between BellSouth and the CLECs regarding the implementation of the FCC's Triennial Review Order (TRO) and the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order (TRRO). While several state commissions have taken the affirmative step of requiring notice of such generic proceedings to all CLECs, others have not yet done so. BellSouth is requesting that the results of such generic proceedings be applicable to all CLECs that have not previously amended their Interconnection Agreements to be compliant with the TRO and TRRO.

To ensure that all CLECs are aware of the opportunity to raise TRO and TRRO issues in a timely manner, BellSouth is hereby providing notice of the open dockets in each state, the schedule that either has been adopted or proposed for each state, and the current list of issues that are pending in the generic proceedings. In addition, pursuant to Florida PSC Order No. PSC-05-0639-PCO-TP, dated June 14, 2005, and issued in Docket No. 041269-TP, each CLEC certificated in the state of Florida will be receiving a similar notice from the Florida PSC informing the CLECs of the open generic docket and inviting all CLECs to raise issues and otherwise participate in the proceeding.

The current issues list has been developed over the past several months as a result of negotiations between BellSouth and representatives of the CLEC community. BellSouth and the CLECs agreed that as the parties negotiated contract language to implement the TRRO and TRO, additional issues may arise that the parties failed to anticipate earlier in the negotiation process. Thus, BellSouth and the CLECs agreed that the parties are free to add TRO and TRRO issues to the generic docket. The parties engaged in these negotiations have agreed that all disputed issues must be identified and filed with the PSCs by June 29, 2005, and this deadline has been proposed to each state commission.

In March of 2005, BellSouth provided each CLEC with its proposed contract language to implement the TRRO and TRO, and BellSouth has been negotiating that language with CLECs, often quite successfully. Other CLECs have not negotiated such language. Despite these negotiations, it is clear that disputed issues remain, and the parties will require third party assistance to resolve them. The issues that BellSouth and the representatives of the CLEC community have identified in the generic proceedings are fairly extensive and comprehensive, and BellSouth believes that those issues will address most, if not all, of the open issues that BellSouth has with the various CLECs with which it is negotiating. However, if there are other issues related to the TRO or TRRO that any CLEC would like the state commissions to resolve, or if an individual CLEC simply wishes to be heard specifically on any issue that is already pending in the generic proceedings, the CLEC should take note of the proposed deadlines for raising issues resulting from the referenced FCC and court orders. It is BellSouth's

position that all TRO and TRRO issues must be addressed in the generic proceedings in order to comply with the FCC's mandate that Interconnection Agreements be amended promptly and without delay to implement the TRRO requirements.

Attached to this letter are (1) the current issues list in the generic dockets for the states of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee; and (2) the proposed generic docket procedural schedule for each of the nine states.

Again, BellSouth provides this notice simply to ensure that all CLECs have notice of these pending proceedings and have an opportunity to raise additional issues by the June 29, 2005 proposed deadline.

Should you have any questions concerning this notice, please contact your BellSouth contract negotiator.

Sincerely,

**ORIGINAL SIGNED BY PAM TIPTON FOR JERRY HENDRIX**

Jerry Hendrix – Assistant Vice President  
BellSouth Interconnection Services

Attachment

**CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET  
ISSUES MATRIX**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>ISSUE DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> The Section 252 process requires negotiations and to the extent parties may not be able to negotiate resolution of particular issues arising out of the Final Rules/TRRO or to the extent that new issues related to the Final Rules/TRRO arise, issues related to those matters will be added to this list.
<b>2</b>	<b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> What is the appropriate language to implement the FCC's transition plan for (1) switching, (2) high capacity loops and (3) dedicated transport as detailed in the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order ("TRRO"), issued February 4, 2005?
<b>3</b>	<b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> a) How should existing ICAs be modified to address BellSouth's obligation to provide network elements that the FCC has found are no longer Section 251(c)(3) obligations? b) What is the appropriate way to implement in new agreements pending in arbitration any modifications to BellSouth's obligations to provide network elements that the FCC has found are no longer Section 251(c)(3) obligations?
<b>4</b>	<b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> What is the appropriate language to implement BellSouth's obligation to provide Section 251 unbundled access to high capacity loops and dedicated transport?
<b>5</b>	<b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> a) Does the Commission have the authority to determine whether or not BellSouth's application of the FCC's Section 251 non-impairment criteria for high-capacity loops and transport is appropriate? b) What procedures should be used to identify those wire centers that satisfy the FCC's Section 251 non-impairment criteria for high-capacity loops and transport? c) What language should be included in agreements to reflect the procedures identified in (b)?
<b>6</b>	<b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> Are HDSL-capable copper loops the equivalent of DS1 loops for the purpose of evaluating impairment?
<b>7</b>	<b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> Once a determination is made that CLECs are not impaired without access to high capacity loops or dedicated transport pursuant to the FCC's rules, can changed circumstances reverse that conclusion, and if so, what process should be included in Interconnection Agreements to implement such changes?

**CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET  
ISSUES MATRIX**

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
8	<p><b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b></p> <p>(a) Does the Commission have the authority to require BellSouth to include in its interconnection agreements entered into pursuant to Section 252, network elements under either state law, or pursuant to Section 271 or any other federal law other than Section 251?</p> <p>(b) If the answer to part (a) is affirmative in any respect, does the Commission have the authority to establish rates for such elements?</p> <p>(c) If the answer to part (a) or (b) is affirmative in any respect, (i) what language, if any, should be included in the ICA with regard to the rates for such elements, and (ii) what language, if any, should be included in the ICA with regard to the terms and conditions for such elements?</p>
9	<p><b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> What conditions, if any, should be imposed on moving, adding, or changing orders to a CLEC's respective embedded bases of switching, high-capacity loops and dedicated transport, and what is the appropriate language to implement such conditions, if any?</p>
10	<p><b>TRRO/FINAL RULES:</b> What rates, terms, and conditions should govern the transition of existing network elements that BellSouth is no longer obligated to provide as Section 251 UNEs to non-Section 251 network elements and other services?</p>
11	<p><b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> What rates, terms and conditions, if any, should apply to UNEs that are not converted on or before March 11, 2006, and what impact, if any, should the conduct of the parties have upon the determination of the applicable rates, terms and conditions that apply in such circumstances?</p>
12	<p><b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> Should identifiable orders properly placed that should have been provisioned before March 11, 2005, but were not provisioned due to BellSouth errors in order processing or provisioning, be included in the "embedded base?"</p>
13	<p><b>TRRO / FINAL RULES:</b> Should network elements de-listed under section 251(c) (3) be removed from the SQM/PMA/SEEM?</p>
14	<p><b>TRO - COMMINGLING:</b> What is the scope of commingling allowed under the FCC's rules and orders and what language should be included in Interconnection Agreements to implement commingling (including rates)?</p>
15	<p><b>TRO - CONVERSIONS:</b> Is BellSouth required to provide conversion of special access circuits to UNE pricing, and, if so, at what rates, terms and conditions and during what timeframe should such new requests for such conversions be effectuated?</p>
16	<p><b>TRO – CONVERSIONS:</b> What are the appropriate rates, terms, conditions and effective dates, if any, for conversion requests that were pending on the effective date of the TRO?</p>
17	<p><b>TRO – LINE SHARING:</b> Is BellSouth obligated pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and FCC Orders to provide line sharing to new CLEC customers after October 1, 2004?</p>

**CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET  
ISSUES MATRIX**

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
18	<b>TRO – LINE SHARING – TRANSITION:</b> If the answer to foregoing issue is negative, what is the appropriate language for transitioning off a CLEC’s existing line sharing arrangements?
19	<b>TRO – LINE SPLITTING:</b> What is the appropriate ICA language to implement BellSouth’s obligations with regard to line splitting?
20	<b>TRO – SUB-LOOP CONCENTRATION:</b> What is the appropriate ICA language, if any, to address sub loop feeder or sub loop concentration?
21	<b>TRO – PACKET SWITCHING:</b> What is the appropriate ICA language, if any, to address packet switching?
22	<b>TRO – CALL-RELATED DATABASES:</b> What is the appropriate ICA language, if any, to address access to call related databases?
23	<b>TRO – GREENFIELD AREAS:</b> a) What is the appropriate definition of minimum point of entry (“MPOE”)? b) What is the appropriate language to implement BellSouth’s obligation, if any, to offer unbundled access to newly-deployed or ‘greenfield’ fiber loops, including fiber loops deployed to the minimum point of entry (“MPOE”) of a multiple dwelling unit that is predominantly residential, and what, if any, impact does the ownership of the inside wiring from the MPOE to each end user have on this obligation?
24	<b>TRO – HYBRID LOOPS:</b> What is the appropriate ICA language to implement BellSouth’s obligation to provide unbundled access to hybrid loops?
25	<b>TRO – END USER PREMISES:</b> Under the FCC’s definition of a loop found in 47 C.F.R. §51.319(a), is a mobile switching center or cell site an “end user customer’s premises”?
26	<b>TRO – ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATION:</b> What is the appropriate ICA language to implement BellSouth’s obligation to provide routine network modifications?
27	<b>TRO – ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATION:</b> What is the appropriate process for establishing a rate, if any, to allow for the cost of a routine network modification that is not already recovered in Commission-approved recurring or non-recurring rates? What is the appropriate language, if any, to incorporate into the ICAs?
28	<b>TRO – FIBER TO THE HOME:</b> What is the appropriate language, if any, to address access to overbuild deployments of fiber to the home and fiber to the curb facilities?
29	<b>TRO – EELS AUDITS:</b> What is the appropriate ICA language to implement BellSouth’s EEL audit rights, if any, under the TRO?
30	<b>252(i):</b> What is the appropriate language to implement the FCC’s “entire agreement” rule under Section 252(i)?
31	<b>ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order:</b> What language should be used to incorporate the FCC’s <i>ISP Remand Core Forbearance Order</i> into interconnection agreements?

**CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET  
ISSUES MATRIX**

---

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
32	<b>General Issue:</b> How should the determinations made in this proceeding be incorporated into existing § 252 interconnection agreements?

wk beginning	week	state 1 (GA)	state 2 (TN)	state 3 (NC)	state 4 (LA)	state 5 (AL)	state 6 (KY)	state 7 (SC)	state 8 (MS)	state 9 (FL)
27-Jun	1	Issues List (Wed)	Issues List (Wed)	Issues List (Wed)	Issues List (Wed)	Issues List (Wed)	Issues List (Wed)	Issues List (Wed)	Issues List (Wed)	Issues List (Wed)
4-Jul	2									
11-Jul	3									
18-Jul	4	Direct (Tue)								
25-Jul	5		Direct (Tue)							
1-Aug	6			Direct (Mon)						
8-Aug	7	Rebuttal (Tue)								
15-Aug	8		Rebuttal (Tue)		Direct (Tue)	Direct (Tue)	Direct (Tue)			
22-Aug	9							Direct (Tue)	Direct (Tue)	Direct (Tue)
29-Aug	10	Hearing (M-Th)		Rebuttal (Mon)						
5-Sep	11				Rebuttal (Thurs)	Rebuttal (Thurs)	Rebuttal (Thurs)			
12-Sep	12		Hearing (M-Th)							
19-Sep	13			Hearing (M-Th)						
26-Sep	14				Hearing (M-W)			Rebuttal (Thurs)	Rebuttal (Thurs)	Rebuttal (Thurs)
3-Oct	15					Hearing (Th-F)				
10-Oct	16						Hearing (M-W)			
17-Oct	17	Briefs (Fri)						Hearing (M-T)		
24-Oct	18		Briefs (Fri)	Briefs (Fri)					Hearing (M-T)	
31-Oct	19				Briefs (Fri)	Briefs (Fri)				Hearing (W-F)
7-Nov	20						Briefs (Fri)			
14-Nov	21							Briefs (Fri)		
21-Nov	22								Briefs (Wed)	
28-Nov	23									Briefs (Fri)
5-Dec	24									
12-Dec	25									
19-Dec	26									
26-Dec	27									
2-Jan	28									
9-Jan	29									
16-Jan	30									
23-Jan	31									
30-Jan	32									
6-Feb	33									
13-Feb	34									
20-Feb	35									
27-Feb	36									
<b>Decision date</b>	30-Jan									
<b>Notes</b>										
1. Yellow shading indicates Holiday week										
2. We are aware that the NCUC requires the filing of a proposed (d order and estimated cross-examination times (the latter is due 9/14).										