FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

VOTE SHEET

APRIL 18, 2000

RE: DOCKET NO. 981834-TP - Petition of Competitive Carriers for Commission action to support local competition in BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s service territory. DOCKET NO. 990321-TP - Petition of ACI Corp. d/b/a Accelerated Connections, Inc. for generic investigation to ensure that BellSouth Telecommunications,

Inc., Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, and GTE Florida Incorporated comply with obligation to provide alternative local exchange carriers with flexible, timely, and cost-efficient physical collocation.

<u>Issue 1</u>: When should an ILEC be required to respond to a complete and correct application for collocation and what information should be included in that response? <u>Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends that ILECs be required to respond to a complete and correct application for collocation within 15 calendar days with all information necessary for an ALEC to place a firm order, including

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: DS CL JC

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY
Jusan & Clark
Jusan I llark
J. Jon Heart
A A

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE 04901 APR 208 FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

DISSENTING

PSC/RAR33 (5/90)

(Continued from previous page)

space availability and a price quote for the collocation requested. If an ALEC submits ten or more applications within ten calendar days, the ILEC should have additional time to respond. Staff recommends the following intervals:

Applications 1-9	15 calendar days from receipt of each application	
Applications 10-19	Within 25 calendar days from receipt of the first application	
Applications 20-29	Within 35 calendar days from receipt of the first application	
Each 10 additional applications, or fraction thereof	10 additional calendar days, from receipt of the first application	
	appen 3	5 day

MODIFIED Approved with noted modification.

<u>Issue 2</u>: If the information included in the ILEC's initial response is not sufficient to complete a firm order, when should the ILEC provide such information or should an alternative procedure be implemented?

<u>Recommendation</u>: If the Commission approves staff's recommendation in Issue 1, the initial response provided within 15 calendar days to a complete and correct application for collocation will contain sufficient information to complete a firm order for collocation.

(Continued from previous page)

VOTE SHEET

<u>Issue 3</u>: To what areas does the term "premises" apply, as it pertains to physical collocation and as it is used in the Act, the FCC's Orders, and FCC Rules?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends that the term "premises" should apply to ILEC-owned or leased central offices, serving wire centers, buildings or similar structures that house network facilities, including but not limited to ILEC network facilities on public rights-of-way or in controlled environmental vaults (CEVs).

APPROVED

<u>Issue 4</u>: What obligations, if any, does an ILEC have to interconnect with ALEC physical collocation equipment located "off-premises"?

<u>Recommendation</u>: The Telecommunications Act of 1996 requires ILECs to interconnect with ALECs for the mutual exchange of traffic regardless of whether the ALEC is located on or off "premises." Further, when space legitimately exhausts in an ILEC "premises," the FCC Advanced Services Order, FCC 99-48, obligates ILECs to provide power and physical collocation services and facilities to an ALEC located on an ILEC's property contiguous to an ILEC's "premises" to the extent technically feasible. Also, staff recommends that ALECs collocating "off-premises" should be allowed to use copper entrance cabling. However, ILECs may require an ALEC to use fiber entrance cabling after providing the ALEC with an opportunity to review evidence that demonstrates entrance capacity is near exhaustion at a particular central office.

(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 5</u>: What terms and conditions should apply to converting virtual collocation to physical collocation?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends that the Commission order the terms and conditions, together with the procedures, for converting virtual collocation to physical collocation as presented in the analysis portion of staff's April 6, 2000 memorandum.

APPROVED

<u>Issue 6</u>: What are the appropriate response and implementation intervals for ALEC requests for changes to existing collocation space?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Consistent with staff's recommendation in Issue 1, staff recommends that ILECs be required to respond to a complete and accurate request or application for changes to existing collocation space within 15 calendar days with all the information necessary for an ALEC to place a firm order. Staff also recommends that the implementation interval for changes to existing collocation space should be 45 days after receipt of a firm order or the change request has been accepted.

(Continued from previous page)

APPROVED

VOTE SHEET

<u>Issue 7</u>: What are the responsibilities of the ILEC and collocators when: A. a collocator shares space with, or subleases space to, another collocator; B. a collocator cross-connects with another collocator.

<u>Recommendation</u>: The FCC has provided sufficient guidance in its rules and orders on ILEC and ALEC responsibilities in shared and subleased collocation space and collocator cross-connects. Staff recommends that the ILECs and ALECs follow those rules and orders. Staff also recommends that, in a shared or subleased collocation space arrangement, each ALEC be allowed to submit its own request to the ILEC for equipment placement, unbundled network elements and other services, regardless of which ALEC was the original collocator.

MODIFIED it is not required.

<u>Issue 8</u>: What is the appropriate provisioning interval for cageless physical collocation?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends that the provisioning interval for cageless physical collocation be ninety (90) calendar days after an applicant carrier has submitted a firm order, the same as that for caged physical collocation.

(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 9</u>: What is the appropriate demarcation point between ILEC and ALEC facilities when the ALEC's equipment is connected directly to the ILEC's network without an intermediate point of interconnection? <u>Recommendation</u>: The appropriate demarcation point is an ILEC designated location at the perimeter of an ALEC's collocation space; however, parties may negotiate another demarcation point up to the conventional distribution frame (CDF).

APPROVED

<u>Issue 10</u>: What are reasonable parameters for reserving space for future ILEC and ALEC use?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Either an ILEC or ALEC should have the ability to reserve space for a period not to exceed 18 months. The reservation of space should be non-discriminatory allowing ALECs and ILECs to reserve space under the same terms and conditions.

(Continued from previous page)

APPROVED

<u>Issue 11</u>: Can generic parameters be established for the use of administrative space by an ILEC, when the ILEC maintains that there is insufficient space for physical collocation? If so, what are they? <u>Recommendation</u>: No. Generic parameters cannot be established due to the uniqueness of each central office. When an <u>ALEC</u> believes that no space exists for physical collocation, the Commission will follow the procedures outlined in PSC Order Nos. PSC-99-1744-PAA-TP and PSC-99-2393-FOF-TP to determine whether a waiver of the physical collocation requirements should be granted.

ILEC

MODIFIED Approved as modified.

<u>Issue 12</u>: What types of equipment are the ILECs obligated to allow in a physical collocation arrangement?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends that the Commission order ILECs to allow the types of equipment, in a physical collocation arrangement, that are consistent with FCC rules and orders. Further, if the ILEC objects to the collocation of equipment by a requesting telecommunications carrier, it must prove to the Commission that the equipment will not be used for interconnection or access to unbundled network elements. However, staff does recommend that the ALEC provide to the ILEC, upon request, any manufacturer specifications regarding the equipment in dispute. VOTE SHEET

APRIL 18, 2000

DOCKET NO. 981834-TP - Petition of Competitive Carriers for Commission action to support local competition in BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s service territory.

DOCKET NO. 990321-TP - Petition of ACI Corp. d/b/a Accelerated Connections, Inc. for generic investigation to ensure that BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, and GTE Florida Incorporated comply with obligation to provide alternative local exchange carriers with flexible, timely, and cost-efficient physical collocation.

(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 13</u>: If space is available, should the ILEC be required to provide price quotes to an ALEC prior to receiving a firm order for space in a central office (CO)?

A. If an ILEC should provide price quotes to an ALEC prior to receiving a firm order from that ALEC, when should the quote be provided?

B. If an ILEC should provide price quotes to an ALEC prior to receiving a firm order from that ALEC, should the quote provide detailed costs?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Yes. If collocation space is available, the ILEC should be required to provide price quotes to an ALEC prior to receiving a firm order for space in a central office.

A. The price quote should be provided within fifteen (15) calendar days from the date the ILEC receives the complete and accurate application.B. The price quote should provide detailed costs.

APPROVED

<u>Issue 14</u>: Should an ALEC have the option to participate in the development of the ILEC's price quote and, if so, what time frames should apply? <u>Recommendation</u>: No. The ALEC should not have the option to participate in the development of the ILEC's price quote for collocation space.

(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 15</u>: Should an ALEC be permitted to hire an ILEC certified contractor to perform space preparation, racking and cabling, and power work? <u>Recommendation</u>: Yes. The ALEC should be permitted to hire ILEC-certified contractors or utilize their own ILEC-certified employees, if any, to perform space preparation, racking, cabling, and power work for the construction of physical collocation arrangements, but only within their collocation space.

APPROVED

<u>Issue 16</u>: For what reasons, if any, should the provisioning intervals be extended without the need for an agreement by the applicant ALEC or filing by the ILEC of a request for an extension of time?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends that there are no reasons for the provisioning intervals to be unilaterally extended without the need for an agreement by the applicant ALEC or the filing by the ILEC of a request for an extension of time. If an ILEC cannot meet the established provisioning intervals for physical and virtual collocation, it must comply with the requirements of Order No. PSC-99-1744-PAA-TP regarding extensions of time for provisioning intervals.

(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 17</u>: How should the costs of security arrangements, site preparation, collocation space reports, and other costs necessary to the provisioning of collocation space, be allocated between multiple carriers? <u>Recommendation</u>: Costs associated with security arrangements, space preparation, and other costs necessary to the provisioning of collocation space should be allocated among those parties who will benefit from the costs incurred. The costs associated with a collocation report should be recovered through a non-recurring charge payable to the ILEC upon requesting a collocation space report.

APPROVED

Issue 18: If insufficient space is available to satisfy the

collocation request, should the ILEC be required to advise the ALEC as to what space is available?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Yes. If insufficient space is available to satisfy an ALEC's request, the Commission should require that the ILEC inform the ALEC of the amount of available collocation space in the central office (CO) within fifteen (15) calendar days, consistent with Issue 1, and that the ILEC provide the ALEC with sufficient information on the available collocation space to enable the ALEC to submit a firm order.

(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 19</u>: If an ILEC has been granted a waiver from the physical collocation requirements for a particular CO, and the ILEC later makes modifications that create space that would be appropriate for collocation, when should the ILEC be required to inform the Commission and any requesting ALECs of the availability of space in that office?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Sixty (60) calendar days before space will become available in a central office (CO) where the ILEC has been granted a waiver from the physical collocation requirements, the ILEC should inform the Commission and requesting ALECs by mail, in addition to posting the updates on its external website. In the event the ILEC's determination that space will be available does not allow for sixty (60) calendar days' notice, the ILEC should notify the Commission and requesting ALECs within two business days of this determination.

APPROVED

<u>Issue 20</u>: What process, if any, should be established for forecasting collocation demand for CO additions or expansions?

<u>Recommendation</u>: The Commission should not establish a specific process for forecasting collocation demand for central office (CO) additions or expansions. However, the Commission should require that the ILEC's forecasts of collocation demand be based on historical collocation data, CO characteristics, and ALEC forecasts of collocation space needs. The process of weighing these factors is inherently subjective; thus, the Commission should not prescribe a particular process.

VOTE SHEET

APRIL 18, 2000

DOCKET NO. 981834-TP - Petition of Competitive Carriers for Commission action to support local competition in BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s service territory. DOCKET NO. 990321-TP - Petition of ACI Corp. d/b/a Accelerated Connections,

Inc. for generic investigation to ensure that BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, and GTE Florida Incorporated comply with obligation to provide alternative local exchange carriers with flexible, timely, and cost-efficient physical collocation.

(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 21</u>: Applying the FCC's "first-come, first-served" rule, if space becomes available in a central office because a waiver is denied or a modification is made, who should be given priority?

<u>Recommendation</u>: When space becomes available in a central office due to a Commission denial of a waiver request or modifications are made that create space, staff recommends that priority be given to the first ALEC that was denied collocation space in that central office, and then to subsequent ALECs who were denied space until all such space is exhausted. Staff recommends that ILECs be required to maintain a waiting list of ALECs that were denied space, by order of the application denial date. Staff also recommends that ILECs be required to accept a letter of intent to collocate, in central offices where a waiver is granted and a waiting list already exists, as a means of securing an ALEC's place on the waiting list without having to file an application for space that does not exist.

APPROVED

Issue 22: Should this docket be closed?

<u>Recommendation</u>: No. Whether or not the Commission approves Issues 1 through 21, this docket should remain open pending further proceedings to set collocation rates.