

VOTE SHEET

DATE: April 16, 1996

RE: DOCKET NO. 950985-TP - Resolution of petition(s) to establish nondiscriminatory rates, terms, and conditions for interconnection involving local exchange companies and alternative local exchange companies pursuant to Section 364.162, F.S.

Issue 1: What are the appropriate rate structures, interconnection rates, or other compensation arrangements for the exchange of local and toll traffic between the respective ALECs and United/Centel and GTEFL?

GTEFL Primary Recommendation: For the termination of local traffic, GTEFL and MFS-FL should compensate each other by mutual traffic exchange. If at some point they agree that traffic is imbalanced to the point they are not receiving benefits comparable to those provided through mutual traffic exchange, then GTEFL and MFS-FL should compensate each other on a per-minute-of-use (MOU) basis for terminating local traffic on each other's network. The per-minute rate for interconnection should be \$.0025. While GTEFL's costs are a combination of estimated TSLRIC and LRIC costs, this rate level would be sufficient to cover the greater of TSLRIC or LRIC in addition to possibly providing some contribution to common costs. If GTEFL and MFS-FL cannot agree to a level of imbalanced traffic to trigger a per-MOU rate, then resolution of this issue should be made by the Commission. If resolution by the Commission is required, GTEFL and MFS-FL should present the following information to the Commission for evaluation:

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: Full Commission

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

Handwritten signatures in the majority column: [Signature], [Signature], Susan J. Clark, J. Terry Wease, [Signature]

Empty lines in the dissenting column.

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS: Commissioner Johnson dissented on Issue 1.

PSC/RAR33 (5/90)

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
04498 APR 19 96
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Issue 1: (Continued)

- GTEFL and MFS-FL should both provide monthly MOU data for terminating local traffic which will reflect the trends in the flow of traffic;
- GTEFL and MFS-FL should both provide the financial impact to their respective firms due to the traffic imbalance since the implementation of mutual traffic exchange;
- GTEFL and MFS-FL should both provide the estimated costs which would be incurred due to the additional processing and software required to measure usage.

For originating and terminating intrastate toll traffic, the Commission should require GTEFL and MFS-FL to pay each other GTEFL's tariffed intrastate switched network access service rates on a per-minute-of-use basis. This means that when a MFS-FL customer places a toll call to a GTEFL customer and MFS-FL serves as the toll carrier, GTEFL should charge the ALEC terminating network access service rates and vice versa. If MFS-FL is serving as a GTEFL customer's presubscribed long distance carrier, then GTEFL can charge the MFS-FL originating access charges and vice versa.

When it cannot be determined whether a call is local or toll, the local exchange provider should be assessed originating switched access charges for that call unless the local exchange provider originating the call can provide evidence that the call is actually a local call. GTEFL and MFS-FL are encouraged to negotiate alternative terms for compensating each other for exchanging toll traffic. If an agreement for such terms is negotiated, the agreement should be filed with the Commission before it becomes effective.

United/Centel Primary Recommendation: For the termination of local traffic, United/Centel and the respective ALECs should compensate each other by mutual traffic exchange. If at some point United/Centel and the respective ALECs mutually agree that traffic is imbalanced to the point they are not receiving benefits comparable to those provided through mutual traffic exchange, then United/Centel and the respective ALECs should compensate each other on a per minute of use basis for terminating local traffic on each other's network. However, based on the information provided in the record, no interconnection rate for the termination of local traffic by United/Centel can be accurately determined at this time. United/Centel should provide the appropriate cost support for the Commission's review 60 days from the issuance of the order in this proceeding. The information should include the specific switching and transport investments, along with all inputs and how they were derived in determining the interconnection cost for end office, local tandem and access tandem. The Company should also provide a detailed explanation of what the data represents (i.e., LRIC or TSLRIC), and a description of the methodology utilized in determining the provided costs.

Issue 1: (Continued)

If United/Centel and the respective ALECs cannot agree to a level of imbalanced traffic to trigger a per-MOU rate, then resolution of this issue should be made by the Commission. If resolution by the Commission is required, United/Centel and the respective ALECs should present the following information to the Commission for evaluation:

- United/Centel and the respective ALECs should both provide monthly MOU data for terminating local traffic which will reflect the trends in the flow of traffic;
- United/Centel and the respective ALECs should both provide the financial impact to their respective firms due to the traffic imbalance since the implementation of mutual traffic exchange;
- United/Centel and the respective ALECs should both provide the estimated costs which would be incurred due to the additional processing and software required to measure usage.

For originating and terminating intrastate toll traffic, the Commission should require United/Centel and the respective ALECs to pay each other United/Centel's tariffed intrastate switched network access service rates on a per minute of use basis. This means that when an ALEC customer places a toll call to a United/Centel customer and the ALEC serves as the toll carrier, United/Centel should charge the ALEC terminating network access service rates and vice versa. If the ALEC is serving as a United/Centel customer's presubscribed long distance carrier, then United/Centel can charge the ALEC originating access charges and vice versa.

When it cannot be determined whether a call is local or toll, the local exchange provider should be assessed originating switched access charges for that call unless the local exchange provider originating the call can provide evidence that the call is actually a local call. United/Centel and the respective ALECs are encouraged to negotiate alternative terms for compensating each other for exchanging toll traffic. If an agreement for such terms is negotiated, the agreement should be filed with the Commission before it becomes effective.

MODIFIED *Approved with the exception that a fall-back rate not be set. Conditions will be consistent with the Southern Bell decision.*

Commissioner Johnson dissented

GTEFL and United/Centel Alternative Recommendation: For the termination of local traffic, GTEFL and ALECs should compensate each other on a per-minute-of-use based rate. This interconnection rate should be equal to \$.0025. A permanent rate for interconnection between United/Centel and the ALECs cannot be recommended at this time. Therefore, an interim rate of \$.006 per minute should be applied until United/Centel files appropriate cost study information to establish a permanent rate. This cost information should be filed 60 days from the issuance of the order for this proceeding, as discussed in the alternative analysis portion of staff's memorandum dated April 5, 1996.

In order to ensure the LECs' and ALECs' measuring systems are in place to bill a per-minute-of-use rate, the Commission should allow a LEC or an ALEC to request a waiver of this requirement until their measuring and billing systems are in place. In no case should the waiver exceed 18 months from the issuance of a final order for this proceeding. During the requested waiver period, the LECs and ALECs should terminate local traffic on a mutual exchange basis.

Termination of toll traffic should be handled as discussed in the primary recommendation for this issue.

DENIED

Issue 2: If the Commission sets rates, terms, and conditions for interconnection between the respective ALECs and United/Centel and GTEFL, should United/Centel and GTEFL tariff the interconnection rate(s) or other arrangements?

GTEFL and United/Centel Recommendation: Yes. GTEFL and United/Centel should tariff their interconnection rate(s) and other arrangements set by the Commission.

MODIFIED Tariffs are to be filed 60 days after final order is issued.

Issue 3: What are the appropriate technical and financial arrangements which should govern interconnection between the respective ALECs and United/Centel and GTEFL for the delivery of calls originated and/or terminated from carriers not directly connected to the respective ALEC's network?

GTEFL and United/Centel Recommendation: For intermediary handling of local traffic where ALECs are not collocated in the same wire center, the appropriate rate for GTEFL should be \$.00075. An appropriate rate cannot be determined for United/Centel until reliable cost data is filed as recommended in Issue 1.

For intermediary handling of toll traffic, LECs providing tandem switching and other intermediary functions should collect only those access charges that apply to the functions they perform, specifically Local Switching and Intertoll Trunking at the approved tariffed rates.

In general, toll traffic should be handled under the same terms and conditions as contained in the Modified Access Based Compensation Plan. The LECs should establish meet-point billing arrangements with ALECs. Meet-points, for rating purposes, should be established at mutually agreeable locations. Terminating access charges should be paid to the carrier performing the terminating function, including the Residual Interconnection Charge.

ALECs collocated in the same LEC wire center should be permitted to cross-connect without transiting the LEC switch. LECs should charge the ordering ALEC the special access cross-connect rate. Any tariff provision that would restrict the ability of ALECs to cross-connect with each other in a LEC central office should be eliminated.

MODIFIED

*Approved with requirement
that cost data be filed.*

Issue 4: What are the appropriate technical and financial requirements for the exchange of intraLATA 800 traffic which originates from the respective ALEC's customer and terminates to an 800 number served by or through United/Centel and GTEFL?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102) Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

Issue 4: (Continued)

United/Centel Recommendation: United/Centel should compensate ALECs for the origination of 800 traffic terminated to United/Centel pursuant to the ALEC's originating switched access charges, including the database query. The ALEC should provide to United/Centel the appropriate records necessary for United/Centel to bill its customers. The records should be provided in a standard ASR/EMR industry format. United/Centel should compensate the ALECs per record based on United/Centel's current tariffed rate for this function. At such time as an ALEC elects to provide 800 services, the ALEC should reciprocate this arrangement.

APPROVED

Issue 5a: What are the appropriate technical arrangements for the interconnection of the respective ALEC's network to Sprint United/Centel and GTEFL's 911 provisioning network such that the respective ALEC's customers are ensured the same level of 911 service as they would receive as a customer of Sprint United/Centel and GTEFL?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102). Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: The Commission should require that:

- 1) United/Centel provide the respective ALECs with access to the appropriate 911 tandems/selective routers.
- 2) The respective ALECs should be responsible for providing the trunking, via leased or owned facilities, to the 911 tandems/selective routers.
- 3) All technical arrangements should conform with industry standards.
- 4) United/Centel should notify the respective ALECs 48 hours in advance of any scheduled testing or maintenance, and provide immediate notification of any unscheduled outage.
- 5) United/Centel should provide the respective ALECs with a list consisting of each municipality in Florida that subscribes to Basic 911 service, the E911 conversion date and a ten-digit directory number representing the appropriate emergency answering position for each municipality subscribing to 911 service.
- 6) Each ALEC should arrange to accept 911 calls from its customer and translate the 911 call, where appropriate, to the 10-digit directory number and route that call to United/Centel at the appropriate tandem or end office.
- 7) When a municipality converts to E911 service, the ALEC should discontinue the Basic 911 procedures and begin the E911 procedures.

APPROVED

Issue 5b: What procedures should be in place for the timely exchange and updating of the respective ALEC's customer information for inclusion in appropriate E911 databases?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102). Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

UNITED/CENDEL Recommendation: The Commission should require that:

- 1) United/Centel provide the respective ALECs with access to the appropriate United/Centel E911 tandems, including the designated secondary tandem.
- 2) If the primary tandem trunks are not available, the respective ALEC should alternate-route the call to the designated secondary E911 tandem. If the secondary tandem trunks are not available, the respective ALEC should alternate-route the call to the appropriate Traffic Operator Position System (TOPS) tandem.
- 3) The respective ALECs should be responsible for providing the trunking, via leased or owned facilities which are capable of carrying Automatic Number Identification, to the E911 tandems.
- 4) All technical arrangements should conform with industry standards.
- 5) United/Centel should notify the respective ALECs 48 hours in advance of any scheduled testing or maintenance, and provide immediate notification of any unscheduled outage.
- 6) United/Centel should provide the respective ALECs with mechanized access to any database used for provisioning E911 service. The respective ALECs and United/Centel should work together and file with this Commission, within 60 days from the date of this order, a comprehensive proposal for mechanized access to any database used for provisioning E911 service. The proposal should include cost and price support, and a list of operational procedures.
- 7) If a municipality has converted to E911 service, the ALEC should forward 911 calls to the appropriate E911 primary tandem along with the ANI, based upon the current E911 end-office-to-tandem homing arrangement as provided by United/Centel.

APPROVED

Issue 6: What are the appropriate technical and financial requirements for operator-handled traffic flowing between the respective ALECs and United/Centel and GTEFL, including busy-line verification and emergency-interrupt services?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102). Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: The technical arrangement proposed by United/Centel should be used to provide operator services. The technical arrangement is comprised of a dedicated trunk group from the ALEC's end office to the United/Centel Operator Service System. The trunk group can be the same as that used for Inward Operator Services (busy-line verification and emergency-interrupt services) and Operator Transfer Service. Busy-line verification and emergency-interrupt services should be purchased under United/Centel's tariffed rates.

APPROVED

Issue 7: What are the appropriate arrangements for the provision of directory assistance services and data between the respective ALECs and Sprint United/Centel and GTEFL?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102). Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

Issue 7: (Continued)

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: The Commission should require United/Centel to list the ALEC's customers in United/Centel's directory assistance database at no charge. United/Centel and the ALECs should work cooperatively on issues concerning timeliness, format and content of listing information. United/Centel should update its directory assistance database with ALEC data under the same time frames afforded itself. United/Centel should tariff branding, when available, upon a firm order for the service. United/Centel should tariff the directory assistance resale, database access, and purchase options discussed in the staff analysis when available.

APPROVED

Issue 8: Under what terms and conditions should Sprint United/Centel and GTEFL be required to list the respective ALEC's customers in its white and yellow pages directories and to publish and distribute these directories to the respective ALEC's customers?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102). Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: The Commission should require United/Centel to provide directory listings for ALEC customers in United/Centel's white page and yellow page directories at no charge. United/Centel should also publish and distribute these directories at no charge. To ensure compatibility with United/Centel's database, United/Centel should provide the ALECs with the appropriate database format in which to submit the necessary information. Enhanced listings should be provided to ALEC customers at the same rates, terms and conditions offered to United/Centel customers.

APPROVED

Issue 9: What are the appropriate arrangements for the provision of billing and collection services between the respective ALECs and United/Centel and GTEFL, including billing and clearing credit card, collect, third party and audiotext calls?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102) Therefore, this issue is resolved between MFS-FL and GTEFL.

APPROVED

UNITED/CENDEL Recommendation: ALECs should have access to United/Centel's tariffed billing services and access to databases such as Centralized Message Distribution Service (CMDS) and Line Identification Database (LIDB) in order to bill and clear credit card, collect, and third party calls. The ALECs should purchase the services and access to databases through United/Centel's tariff or by contract if it is not currently tariffed. If the billing and collection arrangement is set by contract, the arrangement should be filed with the Commission before it becomes effective.

APPROVED

Issue 10: What arrangements are necessary to ensure the provision of CLASS/LASS services between the respective ALECs and Sprint United/Centel and GTEFL's networks?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102). Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

Issue 10) (Continued)

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: ALECs and United/Centel should provide LEC-to-LEC Common Channel Signalling (CCS) to one another, where available, in conjunction with all POTS traffic, in order to enable full interoperability of CLASS/LASS features and functions. All privacy indicators should be honored, and ALECs and United/Centel should use industry standards for CCS signalling between their networks. Because CCS will be used cooperatively for the mutual handling of traffic, the ALECs and United/Centel should each be responsible for the costs associated with the installation and use of their respective CCS networks.

APPROVED

Issue 11: What are the appropriate arrangements for physical interconnection between the respective ALECs and Sprint United/Centel and GTEFL, including trunking and signalling arrangements?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102). Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: The Commission should require United/Centel to provide interconnection, trunking and signalling arrangements at the tandem and end office levels. United/Centel should also provide the respective ALECs with the option of interconnecting via one-way or two-way trunks. Mid-span meets should be permitted where technically and economically feasible.

APPROVED

Issue 12: To the extent not addressed in the number portability docket, Docket No. 950737-TP, what are the appropriate financial and operational arrangements for interexchange calls terminated to a number that has been "ported" to the respective ALECs?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102). Therefore, this issue is resolved.

APPROVED

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: Carriers providing any intermediary functions on calls routed through number portability solutions should collect only those access charges that apply to the functions they perform. The Residual Interconnection Charge should be billed and collected by the carrier terminating the call.

APPROVED

Issue 13: What arrangements, if any, are necessary to address other operational issues?

GTEFL Recommendation: GTEFL and MFS-FL should continue to negotiate as outlined in their partial co-carrier agreement. If an agreement is reached on these operational issues, it should be filed with the Commission before it becomes effective. If no agreement is reached, GTEFL and MFS-FL should adhere to the same operational arrangements that are ordered for United/Centel.

APPROVED

Issue 13: (Continued)

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: Mechanized intercompany operational procedures, similar to the ones between IXCs and LECs today, should be co-developed by the ALECs and United/Centel and should conform to national industry standards which are currently being developed. In addition, operational disputes that the respective ALECs and United/Centel are unable to resolve through negotiations should be handled by filing a petition or motion with the Commission. Further, the ALECs and United/Centel should adhere to the following requirements:

- 1) The respective ALECs and United/Centel should provide their respective repair contact numbers to one another on a reciprocal basis;
- 2) Misdirected repair calls should be referred to the proper company at no charge, and the end user should be provided the correct contact telephone number;
- 3) Extraneous communications beyond the direct referral to the correct repair telephone number should be prohibited;
- 4) United/Centel should provide operator reference database (ORDB) updates on a monthly basis at no charge to enable ALEC operators to respond in emergency situations; and
- 5) United/Centel should work with the respective ALECs to ensure that the appropriate ALEC data, such as calling areas, service installation, repair, and customer service, is included in the informational pages of United/Centel's directory.

APPROVED

Issue 14: What arrangements, if any, are appropriate for the assignment of NXX codes to the respective ALECs?

GTEFL Recommendation: This issue was stipulated by MFS-FL and GTEFL. The stipulation was approved at the March 11, 1996 hearing. (TR 102)
Therefore, this issue is resolved between MFS-FL and GTEFL.

APPROVED

UNITED/CENTEL Recommendation: To the extent that United/Centel has control over NXX codes in its territory, NXX assignments to the respective ALECs should be on the same basis that such assignments are made to United/Centel and other code holders today.

APPROVED

Vote Sheet
Docket No. 950985-TP
April 16, 1996

Issue 15: To what extent are the non-petitioning parties that actively participate in this proceeding bound by the Commission's decision in this docket as it relates to United/Centel?

Ruling: This issue was orally argued and ruled upon at the beginning of the March 11, 1996 hearing. The Commission ruled as follows:

Any intervenor ALEC who fully participates in this proceeding is bound by the resolution of the issues. Such ALEC is still free to negotiate its own interconnection rate. To the extent negotiations fail, the affected ALEC may petition the Commission to set interconnection rates.

No vote

Issue 16: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. It has been recommended that the parties file additional information in several of the issues. In addition, this docket should remain open to address the additional information to be filed in the Southern Bell portion of this docket.

APPROVED