#### BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Investigation Into

Qwest Corporation's Compliance

with Section 271of the

Telecommunications Act of 1996

Docket No. UT-003022

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FOR CHECKLIST ITEMS 2 AND 5

OF

**KAREN A. STEWART** 

ON BEHALF OF

**QWEST CORPORATION** 

February 26, 2001

### **TESTIMONY INDEX**

		<u>Page</u>
I.	IDENTIFICATION OF WITNESS	1
II.	PURPOSE OF REBUTTAL TESTIMONY	1
III.	UNBUNDLED INTEROFFICE TRANSPORT	3
IV.	GENERAL CHECKLIST ITEM 2 ISSUES	10
V.	UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS COMBINATIONS (UNE C) GENERAL	23
VI.	ENHANCED EXTENDED LOOPS (EELS)	38

1		I. IDENTIFICATION OF WITNESS
2	Q.	PLEASE IDENTIFY YOURSELF.
3	A.	My name is Karen A. Stewart. I am a Director in the Qwest Corporation (Qwest), Regulatory Strategy organization.
<ul><li>5</li><li>6</li><li>7</li></ul>		My office is located at 421 SW Oak Street, Portland, Oregon. I filed testimony on December 12, 2000 providing direct testimony on checklist items 2, 5 and 6 in this docket.
8		
9		II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY
10	Q.	WHAT SUBJECTS DO YOU ADDRESS IN YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
11		In this testimony, I will address the following issues:
12		all issues regarding checklist item 5 (unbundled transport); and
13 14		<ul> <li>some, but not all, issues regarding checklist item 2 (unbundled network elements ("UNEs")):</li> </ul>
15		• general UNE issues,
16		general UNE-Combination issues, and
17		<ul> <li>issues regarding enhanced extended loops ("EELs").</li> </ul>
18		Qwest is also filing, concurrent with this testimony, the testimony of Ms.
19		Lori Simpson, who will address UNE-P issues (part of checklist item 2)
20		and all issues regarding checklist item 6 (unbundled switching).
21	Q.	WHAT ISSUES DO YOU ADDRESS WITHIN THOSE SUBJECTS?
22	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to the issues raised in
23		the testimony of five parties:

- the testimony of Dayna D. Garvin of WorldCom, Inc. ("WCom");
- the testimony of Michael Hydock and comments of AT&T
   Communications of the Pacific Northwest, Inc., TCG Seattle, and TCG
   Oregon (collectively "AT&T"),
- the testimony of Bruce Holdridge for YIPES Transmission, Inc.,
- the testimony of Rex Knowles on behalf of XO Washington, Inc., and
- the testimony of Timothy H. Peters on behalf of Electric Lightwave, Inc.
- I have attached as Exhibit KAS-24 the SGAT changes Qwest proposes to address the issues raised by other parties.

### 10 Q. ARE THERE SUBJECTS RAISED BY THE PARTIES THAT YOU DO 11 NOT ADDRESS?

- 12 A. Yes. AT&T provides comments on Network Interface Devices (NID)
  13 issues that will be addressed in the Unbundled Loop portion of Workshop
  14 4 scheduled for July 9 to 13, 2001 (pages 10 and 44-50). The Qwest
  15 unbundled loop witness, Ms. Jean Liston, will respond to the NID issues
  16 raised by AT&T in her Checklist item 4 Unbundled Loop rebuttal
  17 testimony.
- In addition, I will not cover issues covered in the Emerging Services workshop.

#### 20 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW YOUR TESTIMONY IS STRUCTURED.

A. I will first address all issues raised by the parties regarding checklist item
5, unbundled interoffice transport. To facilitate discussion in the
workshop, I have identified each transport issue with the prefix "TR." Then
I will address general checklist item 2 issues, which are identified with the
prefix "CL2." Next, I will address each issue raised regarding UNE-

Combinations, which are identified by the prefix "UNEC." Finally, I will 1 address EEL issues, which are identified with the prefix "EEL." 2 3 III. UNBUNDLED INTEROFFICE TRANSPORT 4 Q. TR-1. AT&T STATES THAT THE DEFINITION OF UNBUNDLED DEDICATED 5 TRANSPORT ("UDIT") FAILS TO PROVIDE FOR ALL FEASIBLE 6 TRANSMISSION CAPABILITIES (E.G. OC48 AND OC192). PLEASE 7 RESPOND. 8 Α. Qwest agreed and amended its SGAT language to reflect the FCC requirement: 9 "EUDITs and UDITs are available in DS1 through OC192 bandwidths and such 10 higher capacities as evolve over time where facilities are available." Qwest notes 11 that EUDIT and UDIT are available in all technically feasible bandwidths where 12 facilities exist, to include all OCN level services existing in the Qwest network at 13 the time of the CLEC's request for UDIT or EUDIT. In response to a request 14 from AT&T, Qwest has agreed to add prices for bandwidths through OC-48. 15 Higher bandwidths will be handled on an ICB basis. 16 To meet concerns raised in the Colorado workshop, Qwest has added the 17 following language to Section 9.6.1.1: 18 Qwest shall allow CLEC to access UDIT that is a part of a meet point 19 arrangement between Qwest and another local exchange carrier if CLEC 20 has an interconnection agreement containing access to UDIT with the 21 connecting local exchange carrier at the determined meet point. Qwest 22 rates, terms and conditions shall apply to the percentage of the route 23 owned by Qwest. 24 Qwest also agreed to update Technical Publication 77389, which is referenced in 25 Section 9.6.1.1. Once that publication is updated, this issue should be resolved. 26 27

AT&T pages 25 and 26.

1 Q. TR-2. AT&T AND WCOM ARE CONCERNED THE SGAT CREATES A
2 DISTINCTION BETWEEN DEDICATED TRANSPORT PROVIDED BETWEEN
3 TWO QWEST WIRE CENTERS (UDIT) AND DEDICATED TRANSPORT
4 PROVIDED BETWEEN A QWEST WIRE CENTER AND A CLEC WIRE
5 CENTER OR IXC POP, I.E. EXTENDED UNBUNDLED DEDICATED
6 INTEROFFICE TRANSPORT ("EUDIT").<sup>2</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.

Qwest provides existing unbundled dedicated transport between all locations identified in the FCC rules and related orders. By delineating the unbundled dedicated transport between the Qwest serving wire center and the CLEC central office as "EUDIT", Qwest's intent was to clearly identify that this specific segment of dedicated transport has historically been recovered in cost models and resultant rate schedules as a non-distance sensitive rate element. All other "interoffice" transport has typically been "cost modeled" and rated on a fixed and per mile basis.

For example, other transport services have this segment of "transport" as a nondistance sensitive rate component, e.g., in Switched Access Services it is an "entrance facility" and in retail private line tariffs it is typically called a "channel termination".

AT&T correctly identifies (using a private line analogy) if transport was required from the CLEC central office and through the Qwest serving wire center to a distant Qwest central office, the CLEC would have an EUDIT (i.e. a channel termination) into the serving wire center, and then UDIT (i.e., the fixed and per mile) element between the serving wire center and the distant central office.

In response to a request in the workshops, Qwest has agreed to develop a process for a CLEC to order UDIT and EUDIT on one ASR. Now that Qwest has made this concession, the only issue regarding UDIT and EUDIT is one of price.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Α.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> AT&T at page 27 and WCom at page 8.

This is a standard industry practice on how to rate dedicated transport and is not an inappropriate rate structure as implied by AT&T. The FCC suggested use of existing rates for interstate dedicated switched transport as a default proxy for unbundled dedicated transport.<sup>3</sup> The FCC actually gave an example of the price structure difference between the equivalent of UDIT and EUDIT:

Interstate access rates for dedicated transport vary by region, type of circuit, mileage, and other factors. For example, BellSouth's entrance facility charge, for transport from an IXC's point of presence to a BellSouth serving wire center, is \$134 monthly per DS1 circuit (\$5.58 per derived voice grade circuit) and \$2,100 monthly per DS3 circuit (\$3.13 per derived voice grade circuit). Dedicated transport for 10 miles of interoffice transmission between a serving wire center and an end office is \$325 monthly per DS1 circuit (\$13.54 per derived voice grade circuit) and \$2,950 monthly per DS3 circuit (\$4.39 per derived voice grade circuit). Installation, multiplexing and other transport-related charges may also apply.<sup>4</sup>

SBC's Texas 271 Agreement provides for a price structure similar to Qwest's distinction between UDIT and EUDIT:

The price for dedicated transport is found in Appendix Pricing – UNE Schedule of Prices labeled "Interoffice Transport." Entrance facility rates are found in Appendix Pricing – UNE Schedule of Prices, labeled as "Dedicated Transport, Entrance Facilities." (T2A, Attachment UNE-TX, Section 8.2.1).

In reality, this "concern" among the parties is really a cost model and rate issue. Therefore, Qwest recommends that the cost and rate structure issues associated with the EUDIT portion of unbundled transport be deferred to the cost docket.

# Q. TR-3. WCOM ASKS IF REQUESTS FOR COMBINATIONS OF EUDITS AND UDIT CAN BE ORDER ON A SINGLE ORDER?<sup>5</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.

In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, First Report and Order, FCC-96-325 (Local Competition First Report and Order), para. 821.

Local Competition First Report and Order, fn. 1948.

WCom at page10.

1 A. In the Colorado workshops, Qwest has committed to develop a process for CLECs to order UDIT and EUDIT on a single ASR.

Q. TR-4. AT&T STATES THAT QWEST'S SGAT IS UNCLEAR WHETHER A MULTIPLEXER IS REQUIRED AS A PART OF A CLEC'S ACCESS TO DEDICATED TRANSPORT AS A UNE. AT&T BELIEVES MULTIPLEXING IN THIS CONTEXT SHOULD BE OFFERED AS AN OPTION AVAILABLE TO CLECS. AT&T RECOMMENDS THAT QWEST CLARIFY WHETHER IT IS BEING OFFERED AS A UNE UNDER THE SGAT, OR, IF IT IS NOT BEING OFFERED AS A UNE, EXPLAIN WHY IT IS NOT A UNE. AT&T REQUESTS QWEST ADD SONET ADD/DROP MULTIPLEXING TO SECTION 9.6.1.2.6 ELI CLAIMS QWEST OFFERS MUXING AS A UNE.7 ELI REQUEST THAT MUXING BE MORE GENERALLY AVAILABLE, NOT JUST WITH TRANSPORT, SUCH AS WITH UNBUNDLED LOOPS.8 PLEASE RESPOND.

Multiplexing is an option in the SGAT available to the CLEC. Multiplexing is not a UNE, because it is not identified in the FCC unbundling rules as a separate stand-alone UNE. Multiplexing is a feature; functionality of transport that Qwest is offering as part of the UDIT UNE. Use of a multiplexer is an option available to the CLEC on an as-needed basis. In response to the AT&T request that Qwest should add SONET add/drop multiplexing to Section 9.6.1.2, Qwest has added the following language to Section 9.6.1.2:

SONET add/drop multiplexing is available on an ICB basis where facilities are available and capacity exists.

In response to the concerns of ELI wanting to add an individual DS1 loop to a multiplexer, that is contemplated with the multiplexed EEL. Any other concerns that ELI may have regarding the use of multiplexers and unbundled loops would be addressed in the unbundled loop workshop. However, to install the

Α.

ELI at page 14.

<sup>6</sup> AT&T page 28.

ELI at page 3.

- multiplexer, first the high side of the multiplexer needs to be tied down to some type of DS3 facility. Typically, this would be a DS3 transport facility.
- Q. TR-5. AT&T QUESTIONS IF A CROSS CONNECTION IS REQUIRED

  BETWEEN AN EUDIT AND A UDIT, OR THAT IF A CLEC CAN BE REQUIRED

  TO MAKE THE NECESSARY CROSS CONNECTIONS.9 PLEASE RESPOND.
- A. Qwest does, upon request of the CLEC, make any necessary cross connections between unbundled network elements. Specifically, Qwest will make requested combinations including EUDIT and UDIT. I would note that EUDIT and UDIT are not separate network elements. They are two rate components for the single network element of dedicated transport. To clarify this point, the parties in Colorado agreed to the following language:
  - 9.6.2.1 To the extent that CLEC is ordering access to a UNE Combination, and cross-connections are necessary to combine UNEs, Qwest will perform requested and necessary cross-connections between UNEs in the same manner that it would perform such cross-connections for its end user customers or for itself. If not ordered as a combination, CLEC is responsible for performing cross connections at its Collocation or other mutually determined demarcation point between UNEs and ancillary or finished services, and for transmission design work including regeneration requirements for such connections. Such cross-connections will not be required of CLEC when CLEC orders a continuous dedicated transport element from one point to another.
  - AT&T's suggests that it is should not be required to pay for a cross connection between the UDIT and EUDIT. This is a pricing issue, and should be considered in with other cost and pricing issues.
- Q. TR-6. AT&T STATES QWEST MUST AMEND THE UDIT AND EUDIT
  SECTIONS TO ELIMINATE THE REQUIREMENT THAT A CLEC ORDER OR
  PROVIDE REGENERATION. 10 PLEASE RESPOND.

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

AT&T at pages 28 and 29.

AT&T at page 28.

- A. Qwest does not accept the AT&T recommendation that Qwest must provide
  regeneration at no additional charge. The current cost studies for UDIT do not
  include regeneration. Qwest agrees that it will provision the appropriate template
  signal, whether it is DS0, DS1, DS3 or OCN level UDIT. Should the CLECs
  accept Qwest's offer of connecting via EICTs, Qwest would modify the technical
  publications to move the "design to" point to the demarcation point.
- 7 Q. TR-7. WCOM QUESTIONS THE NEED FOR COLLOCATION AT BOTH 8 ENDS OF A UDIT. PLEASE RESPOND.
- 9 A. To clarify this language in Colorado, the parties agreed to the following language:
- 10 9.6.2.3.1 With the exception of combinations provided through the UNE Combinations Section, Section 9.23, CLEC may utilize 11 any form of collocation at both ends of the UDIT. Collocation 12 is required at the Qwest Central Office end of EUDIT. When 13 14 UDIT and EUDIT are ordered together, at the same bandwidth, to form a single transmission path, collocation is 15 required only when one end of the unbundled transport 16 terminates in a Qwest Central Office. 17
  - This agreement should close this issue.
- 19 Q. TR-8. AT&T STATES THAT QWEST DOES NOT OFFER HERE, NOR IN THE
  20 INTERCONNECTION SECTION, TO COMPENSATE THE CLEC FOR
  21 COLLOCATION OF QWEST'S EQUIPMENT. 11 PLEASE RESPOND.
- 22 A. In Colorado, AT&T conceded this issue, and this issue should be closed.
- Q. TR-9. WCOM REQUESTS CLARIFICATION ON WHY 9.6.3.9, AND THREE
  ADDITIONAL PARAGRAPHS IN SECTION 9.6.6 REARRANGEMENT
  PROVISIONS, ARE IN THE ARIZONA SGAT, BUT NOT IN THE
  WASHINGTON SGAT. PLEASE RESPOND.
- 27 A. Those sections have been included in the SGAT.

AT&T at page 29.

1	Q.	TR-10. AT&T RECOMMENDS THIS SECTION BE REVISED TO MORE
2		CLOSELY TRACK THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE FCC AS IDENTIFIED IN
3		THE TEXAS 271 ORDER. SPECIFICALLY, SECTION 9.8 SHOULD INCLUDE
4		AN AFFIRMATION OF THE REQUIREMENT THAT CLEC TRAFFIC SHALL
5		USE THE SAME ROUTING TABLE RESIDENT IN QWEST'S SWITCH AND
6		THAT THIS ELEMENT MAY CARRY ORIGINATING AND TERMINATING
7		ACCESS TRAFFIC FROM, AND TO CUSTOMERS TO WHOM THE
		REQUESTING CARRIER IS ALSO PROVIDING LOCAL EXCHANGE
8		
9		SERVICE. <sup>12</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
10	A.	Qwest has included the following language in a new section 9.8.2.3.
11 12		9.8.2.3 Qwest has the following obligations with respect to shared transport:
13 14 15		<ul> <li>a) Provide shared transport in a way that enables the traffic of CLEC to be carried on the same transport facilities that Qwest uses for its own traffic;</li> </ul>
16 17 18		<li>b) Provide shared transport transmission facilities between end office switches, between end office and tandem switches, and between tandem switches in its network;</li>
19 20 21		<ul> <li>c) Permit CLEC that purchases unbundled shared transport and unbundled switching to use the same routing table that is resident in Quests switch;</li> </ul>
22 23 24		d) Permit CLEC to use shared (or dedicated) transport as an unbundled element to carry originating access traffic from, and terminating to, customers to whom the CLEC provide local exchange service.
25		In Colorado, the parties agreed that this issue is closed.

1	

#### IV. GENERAL CHECKLIST ITEM 2 ISSUES

- Q. CL2-1. AT&T'S WITNESS MR. HYDOCK SUGGESTED CONCERN WITH
   QWEST'S TESTING ENVIRONMENT FOR ITS EDI INTERFACE.<sup>13</sup> PLEASE
   RESPOND.
- A. This is an OSS issue, which is being addressed in the ROC test. The test vendor has issued an observation report regarding this issue, and Qwest has responded.

  The adequacy of Qwest's testing environment will be addressed in the context of that test observation.
  - To clarify, Qwest engages in extensive testing with CLECs during EDI development. Qwest first engages in connectivity training, which verifies that Qwest's interface works with the CLEC's interface. Next, Qwest and the CLEC participate in interoperability testing, during which Qwest and the CLEC verify that the CLEC can issue LSR's that can be processed by Qwest. Finally, Qwest and the CLEC participate in a managed introduction process during which the CLEC submits orders, and Qwest and the CLEC verify that Qwest can receive and provision CLEC's orders.
  - The issue that has arisen during OSS testing is the size and extent of the test bed that Qwest provides to CLECs. This issue is also a subject of Qwest's change management process ("CICMP"). Eschelon brought this issue to the CICMP forum (see CR #4868276, Exhibit KAS-2), and Qwest issued a proposal to develop an additional test bed for CLECs to use. Qwest's proposal included an expanded test bed and gave CLECs the choice of making interoperability testing optional or mandatory. On February 23, the CLECs voted to accept Option B, which made interoperability testing optional.

- Qwest's CICMP response will be reviewed during the ROC OSS test, and there 1 is no reason to further discuss this issue in the workshop. 2
- MR. HOLDRIDGE OF YIPES REQUESTS THAT QWEST ALLOW Q. 3 CLECS TO DIRECTLY SPLICE INTO QWEST UNBUNDLED DARK FIBER. 14 4 PLEASE RESPOND. 5
- A. As identified by Mr. Holdridge, checklist item 2 is access to all UNEs, which does 6 include access to unbundled dark fiber. However, Qwest believes this is a 7 specific issue directly related to unbundled dark fiber, and recommends that this 8 issue be deferred to Workshop 4 that will address Emerging Services. Qwest will 9 respond to this issue in its emerging services reply testimony, without further 10 filing required of Yipes. 11

CL2-3. AT&T REQUESTS THAT QWEST PROVIDE A DETAILED Q. 13 INVENTORY OF ITS PRESENT CHALLENGES TO "EXISTING RULES" AND 14 RECOMMENDS THAT SECTION 9.1.1 BE DELETED BECAUSE IT IS 15 REDUNDANT.<sup>15</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.

> Section 9.1 and 9.23 of the SGAT originally contained language regarding how to incorporate changes in law, including additions or deletions from the FCC list of UNEs. AT&T objected to the provision on the grounds that it is redundant in light of the change of law section of the SGAT, Section 2.2. Qwest concurred that Section 2.2 is adequate and has deleted the change of law provisions from Section 9, and replaced them with the following:

> > Changes in law, regulations or other "Existing Rules" relating to unbundled network elements ("UNEs"), including additions and deletions of elements Qwest is required to unbundle and/or provide in a UNE Combination, shall be incorporated into this Agreement by amendment pursuant to Section 2.2.

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

A.

<sup>13</sup> Hydock at page 4.

<sup>14</sup> Holdridge at page 3.

<sup>15</sup> AT&T at page 16.

1		Qwest made this change so that challenges of all parties to existing rules	
2		will be treated in the same way. Thus, there is no need to list all of	
3		challenges to existing rules that have been made by CLECs and Qwest.	
4		This change of law provision is consistent with FCC requirements:	
5 6 7 8		In addition, we find that it is a <i>per se</i> failure to negotiate in good faith for a party to refuse to include in an agreement a provision that permits the agreement to be amended in the future to take into account changes in Commission or state rules. <sup>16</sup>	
9		The parties in Colorado agreed that this issue is closed.	
10 11 12 13	Q.	CL2-4. AT&T ASSERTS THAT THE DEFINITIONS SHOULD BE REWRITTEN TO ELIMINATE ANY AMBIGUITY THAT UNE-P AND UNE-COMBINATIONS ARE NOT LIMITED TO PRE-EXISTING OR COMBINED UNES OR ANY SPECIFIC TYPES OF COMBINATIONS. <sup>17</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.	
14 15	A.	To address AT&T's concerns, Qwest has revised Sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. The parties in Colorado agreed that this issue is closed.	
16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	CL2-5. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THE SGAT MIRROR THE FCC STANDARDS FOR ACCESS TO UNES. AT&T STATES THAT SECTION 9.1.2 IMPERFECTLY CAPTURES THE APPROPRIATE FCC STANDARDS TO BE FOLLOWED IN PROVIDING ACCESS TO UNES. AT&T RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING SGAT LANGUAGE:	
22 23 24 25 26 27 28		9.1.2 Qwest shall provide non-discriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point on rates, terms and conditions that are just, reasonably and nondiscriminatory. Qwest shall provide the same quality of UNEs and access to UNEs as it provides all requesting carriers, itself, its end users, its affiliates and any other third person, and, where technically feasible, the access and	

<sup>16</sup> FCC First Competition Report and Order, para. 152. AT&T at pages 46 and 47. AT&T at pages 19 and 20.

<sup>17</sup> 

<sup>18</sup> 

unbundled network element provided by Qwest must be provided in substantially the same time and manner to that which the incumbent provides itself, its end users, its affiliates and any other third person. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Qwest shall provide access and UNEs at the service performance levels set forth in Section 20. Notwithstanding specific language in other sections of this SGAT, all provisions of this SGAT regarding unbundled network elements are subject to this requirement. In addition, U S WEST shall comply with all state wholesale and retail service quality requirements.

9.1.2.1 In the event Qwest fails to meet the requirements of Section 9.1.2, Qwest shall release, indemnify, defend and hold harmless CLEC and each of its officers, directors, employees and agents (each an "Indemnitee) from and against and in respect of any loss, debt, liability, damage, obligation, claim, demand, judgment or settlement of any nature or kind, known or unknown, liquidated or unliquidated including, but no limited to, costs and attorneys' fees.

Qwest shall indemnify and hold harmless Indemnities from and against any and all claims, losses, damages or other liability that arises from Qwest's failure to comply with state retail or wholesale service quality standards in the provision of unbundled network elements.<sup>19</sup>

- A. Qwest has agreed to more closely quote the FCC standards noted by AT&T in paragraphs 490-491 of the UNE Remand Order. However, the actual SGAT language proposed by AT&T also "imperfectly captures" the FCC language. The actual FCC language states:
  - 490. We reaffirm the conclusion the Commission adopted in the *Local Competition First Report and Order* that national rules defining "nondiscriminatory access" to unbundled network elements will reduce the costs of entry and speed the development of competition in local telecommunications markets.986 We find that the phrase "nondiscriminatory access" in section 251(c)(3) means at least two things: first, the quality of an unbundled network element that an incumbent LEC provides, as well as the access provided to that element, must be equal between all carriers

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> AT&T at pages 19 and 20.

requesting access to that element; second, where technically feasible, the access and unbundled network element provided by an incumbent LEC must be provided in "substantially the same time and manner" to that which the incumbent provides to itself.

491. In those situations where an incumbent LEC does not provide access to network elements to itself, we reaffirm our requirement that incumbent LECs must provide access in a manner that provides a requesting carrier with a meaningful opportunity to compete.988 Because we believe that the technical infeasibility problem will arise rarely, we expect incumbent LECs to fulfill the non-discrimination requirement in nearly all instances where they provision unbundled network elements. In the rare instances where technical feasibility issues arise, incumbent LECs must prove to a state commission that it is technically infeasible to provide access to unbundled elements at the same level of quality that the incumbent LEC provides to itself.<sup>20</sup>

Qwest has included the following revised SGAT language, which mirrors the FCC access to UNE requirements:

9. 1.2 Qwest shall provide non-discriminatory access to unbundled network elements on rates, terms and conditions that are non-discriminatory, just and reasonable. The quality of an unbundled network element Qwest provides, as well as the access provided to that element, will be equal between all CLECs requesting access to that element; second, where technically feasible, the access and unbundled network element provided by Qwest will be provided in "substantially the same time and manner" to that which Qwest provides to itself. In those situations where Qwest does not provide access to network elements to itself, Qwest will provide access in a manner that provides CLEC with a meaningful opportunity to compete.

Qwest objects to AT&T's language in Section 9.1.2 regarding state wholesale and retail service quality standards. Clearly, retail service quality standards are clearly beyond the scope of this workshop. Qwest has every intention of following state wholesale and retail service quality standards. However, the

1 2

UNE Remand order at paragraph 490 and 491 (footnote omitted).

- issue of the applicability of such standards, and especially the retail standards, is generally considered in the actual state service quality proceeding.
- Qwest also objects to AT&T's proposed indemnity language in Section 9.1.2.1.

  Indemnity issues are covered in Sections 5.8 and 5.9 of the SGAT, and these
  general SGAT provisions will be reviewed in the SGAT docket and not in this
  workshop. Additionally, the development of a performance assurance plan will
  impact the appropriateness of these types of indemnity clauses.
- Q. CL2-6. AT&T RECOMMENDS THAT 9.1.3 BE REVISED TO CONFIRM IT

  ALLOWS ALL PERMITTED USE OF UNES UNDER FCC RULES. AT&T

  BELIEVES THE REFERENCE TO "ANCILLARY SERVICES," IS UNCLEAR,

  HOWEVER, HAS NO SUGGESTIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS.<sup>21</sup> ELI STATES

  THE COMMISSION SHOULD REJECT THE LOCAL SERVICES

  CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR ALL BUT EEL CONVERSIONS.<sup>22</sup>

  PLEASE RESPOND.
- Α. Qwest will allow all permitted uses of UNEs under current FCC rules. The 15 "ancillary services" identified in Section 9.1.3 generally refers to the list of 16 ancillary services contained in Appendix A of the SGAT. Qwest does not agree 17 with ELI that the significant amount of local service requirements is limited only to 18 the conversion of special access circuits to EELs. The FCC's order is not so 19 limited. In its Supplemental Order Clarification, the FCC referred to the fact that 20 it had limited the use of shared transport to CLECs providing local service to a 21 customer, and the FCC referred several times to the fact that its order precluded 22 CLECs from using combinations of network elements for switched access, unless 23 the CLEC met the significant amount of local traffic standard.<sup>23</sup> 24

AT&T at page 20.

ELI at page 14.

In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Supplemental Order Clarification, FCC 00-183, paras. 3, 7, 15 (June 2, 2000) (Supplemental Order Clarification).

- Q. CL2-7. AT&T STATES QWEST SHOULD NOT CHARGE CLECS ANY KIND
  OF RECURRING CHARGE FOR THE ITP. IN ADDITION, AT&T
  RECOMMENDS QWEST ADD AN ADDITIONAL KIND OF DEMARCATION
  POINT AS SUBSECTION 9.1.4(D).<sup>24</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
- A. Qwest does not agree to AT&T's recommendation that the recurring charges for ITPs be eliminated. The issue of appropriate ITP cost recovery, and its resulting impact on recurring and non-recurring rates for ITPs, should be reviewed with other cost issues, and is beyond the scope of this workshop.
- Qwest has agreed to add the additional kind of demarcation point identified by AT&T. Qwest has added the following language as section (d) and re-labeled the existing section (d) as (e):
- 12 (d) if CLEC elects to use a direct connection from their collocation space to the distribution frame serving a particular element.<sup>25</sup>
- Q. CL2-8. AT&T BELIEVES QWEST SHOULD INSERT IN SECTION 9.1.6.1 A
  REPRESENTATION THAT A CLEC'S ACCESS WILL PERMIT ALL
  REQUIRED TESTING FOR DETERMINING END-TO-END TRANSMISSION
  AND CIRCUIT FUNCTIONALITY.<sup>26</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
- Α. Qwest agrees that CLECs will have access to UNEs at the collocation-18 19 established network demarcation point to perform all technically feasible testing to determine end-to-end transmission and circuit functionality. Upon a 20 21 reasonable request by the CLEC, Qwest will confirm functionality or other operating parameters of the UNE consistent with the rates and charges for such 22 23 testing as identified in Exhibit A SGAT under 9.20 Miscellaneous Elements. Further, Qwest agrees to modify this provision to make clear that Qwest will test 24 individual elements at the reasonable request of the CLEC when Qwest's 25

AT&T at page 21.

AT&T at page 21.

AT&T at page 21.

- maintenance and repair activities require it. Such testing will be consistent with
- testing appropriate to the individual UNE being tested and subject to 12.3.4
- 3 Trouble Isolation section of the SGAT.
  - Qwest has proposed the following SGAT language:
  - 9.1.6.1.1 Except as set forth in the UNE Combinations Section, Qwest provides UNEs on an individual element basis. circumstances. CLEC is responsible for the end-to-end transmission and circuit functionality. CLEC is responsible to test end-to-end on unbundled loops, ancillary and finished services combinations. CLEC will have access to UNEs at the collocation-established network demarcation point to perform all technically feasible testing to determine end-toend transmission and circuit functionality. Upon a reasonable request by CLEC, Qwest will confirm functionality or other operating parameters testing of the UNE consistent with the rates and charges for such testing as identified in Exhibit A under 9.20 Miscellaneous Elements. Qwest will test individual elements at the reasonable request of the CLEC when Qwest's maintenance and repair activities require it. Such testing will be consistent with testing appropriate to the individual UNE being tested and subject to 12.3.4 Trouble Isolation.
  - Q. CL2-9. AT&T STATES THAT EXHIBIT C TO THE SGAT SHOULD CONTAIN INTERVALS FOR ALL UNES AND BE CONSISTENT WITH FCC REQUIREMENTS AND STATE PERFORMANCE PLANS. ELI RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION ESTABLISH THROUGH RULES AND/OR SGAT INSTALLATION INTERVALS FOR UNBUNDLED TRANSPORT.<sup>27</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
- 29 A. Qwest has amended Exhibit C of the SGAT to include the installation intervals for each UNE included in this workshop. These intervals are reasonable and compare favorably with intervals for comparable retail services.

32

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Q. CL2-10. AT&T ASSERTS THAT QWEST SHOULD PROVIDE IN SECTION
  9.1.9 EXAMPLES OF THE KINDS OF MODIFICATIONS THAT WOULD
  AFFECT "NETWORK INTEROPERABILITY" THAT WOULD REQUIRE
  ADVANCE NOTICE PURSUANT TO FCC RULES.<sup>28</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
  - A. Minor changes to transmission parameters of UNEs will present themselves in activities associated with changes to the UNE transmission medium or software. These changes will not, however, alter the technical parameters (i.e., interface requirements) tied to individual services provisioned over the UNE. An example of minor maintenance activities which might result in minor changes to transmission parameters is migration of a copper pair from one cable to another. In this scenario, an irreparable copper pair, or cable, in one cable may be moved to another copper cable that serves the same customer. This movement may result in minor changes to the loop length, copper gauge, or bridge tap, for instance. In any case, the transmission parameters of the new copper cable will be within established limits for individual services provisioned over that cable.

Minor network modernization activities may include migration of copper feeder pairs to a digital loop carrier system, migration of T1 facilities from a D4 carrier bank to a DACS, migration of T1 AMI circuits to HDSL, or replacement of TR-057 ISDN digital loop carrier line cards with TR-393 line cards. While transmission parameters may change in these scenarios, the services provisioned to the CLEC by the affected UNEs will be delivered within transmission parameters appropriate to that service.

Qwest proposes the following SGAT language to address the concerns of AT&T:

9.1.6.2 In order to maintain and modernize the network properly, Qwest may make necessary modifications and changes to the UNEs in its network on an as needed basis. Such changes may result in minor changes to transmission parameters. Network maintenance and modernization activities will result in UNE

transmission parameters that are within transmission limits of the 1 2 UNE ordered by CLEC. Qwest shall provide advance notice of changes that affect network interoperability pursuant to 3 4 applicable FCC rules. Changes that affect interoperability include changes to local dialing from 7 to 10 digit, 5 area code splits, new area code implementation. FCC rules are 6 contained in CFR Part 51 and 52. Qwest provides such 7 disclosures on an internet web site. 8

- 9 Q. CL2-11. AT&T ASSERTS THAT QWEST SHOULD SUPPLY, FREE OF
  10 CHARGE, REGENERATION FOR UNES TO CLEC'S POINT OF ACCESS AND
  11 RECOMMENDS THAT SECTION 9.1.10 BE DELETED.<sup>29</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
- A. Qwest does not agree to this recommendation. When Qwest (U S WEST) first developed its Expanded Interconnection Channel Terminations (EICT) functionally to provide a CLEC access to a UNE in its collocation space, it included the "jumper" functionality and regeneration as required. During arbitration proceedings Qwest was required to remove the charges for regeneration, and to charge regeneration only when required and as requested by the CLEC.
- Q. CL2-12. AT&T STATES THE SGAT SHOULD SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFY THE
  CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH "MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES" WILL
  APPLY AND THAT ANY RATES BE JUST AND REASONABLE. PLEASE
  RESPOND.
- 23 A. Qwest agrees to define and identify when "Miscellaneous Charges" will apply at 24 the point in time the other general sections of the SGAT are reviewed.
- Q. CL2-13. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S PROPOSAL THAT THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH BE ADDED TO THE SGAT AS A NEW SECTION 9.23.1.3:

AT&T at page 23.

AT&T at pages 24 and 25.

- 9.23.1.3 CLEC and Qwest agree that the network elements identified in 1 Section 9 are not exclusive and that pursuant to changes in 2 FCC rules, State laws, or the Bona Fide Request process. 3 CLEC may identify and request that Qwest furnish additional 4 or revised network elements to the extent required under 5 Section 251(c)(3) of the Act and other applicable laws. 6 Additionally, if Qwest provides any Network Element or 7 Combination or interconnection arrangement that is not 8 identified in this Agreement to requesting 9 а Telecommunications Carrier including a Qwest affiliate, to its 10 own subscribers or to any other entity, Qwest will make 11 available the same Network Element, UNE Combination or 12 interconnection arrangement to CLEC without CLEC being 13 required to use the Bona Fide Request process. Failure to list 14 a Network Element herein shall not constitute a waiver by 15 CLEC to obtain a Network Element subsequently defined by 16 the FCC or by the state commission. All network elements and 17 **UNE Combinations provided pursuant to this Agreement shall** 18 be provided by Qwest for the Term of this Agreement 19 independent of any state or Federal action eliminating a 20 regulatory obligation to provide a Network Element or UNE 21 22 Combination.
- A. In Colorado, the parties agreed that this issue was closed when Qwest agreed to replace Section 9.23.1.2 with the following:

25

26

27

28

29

30 31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

- 9.23.1.2 Qwest will offer to CLEC UNE Combinations on rates, terms and conditions that are just, reasonable and non-discriminatory in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement and the requirements of Section 251 and Section 252 of the Act, the applicable FCC rules, and other applicable laws. The methods of access to UNE Combinations described in this section are not exclusive. Qwest will make available any other form of access requested by CLEC that is consistent with the Act and the regulations thereunder. CLEC shall be entitled to access to all combinations' functionality as provided in FCC rules and other applicable laws. Qwest shall not require CLEC to access any UNE combinations in conjunction with any other service or element unless specified in this Agreement or as required for technical feasibility reasons. Qwest shall not place any use restrictions or other limiting conditions on UNE combinations(s) accessed by CLEC except as specified in this Agreement or required by Existing Rules.
- 9.23.1.2.1 Changes in law, regulations or other "Existing Rules" relating to UNEs and UNE Combinations, including additions and deletions of elements Qwest is required to unbundled and/or provide in a UNE Combination, shall be

incorporated into this Agreement pursuant to Section 2.2. CLEC and Qwest agree that the UNEs identified in Section 9 are not exclusive and that pursuant to changes in Existing Rules or the Bona Fide Request process, CLEC may identify and request that Qwest furnish additional or revised UNEs to the extent required under Section 251(c)(3) of the Act and other applicable laws. Failure to list a UNE herein shall not constitute a waiver by CLEC to obtain a UNE subsequently defined by the FCC or the state commission.

- 9.23.1.2.2 In addition to the UNE combinations provided by Qwest to CLEC hereunder, Qwest shall permit CLEC to combine any UNE provided by Qwest with another UNE provided by Qwest or with compatible network components provided by CLEC or provided by third parties to CLEC in order to provide telecommunications service. UNE Combinations will not be directly connected to a Qwest finished service, whether found in a tariff or otherwise, without going through a Collocation, unless otherwise agreed to by the parties. Notwithstanding the foregoing, CLEC can connect its UNE Combination to Qwest's Directory Assistance and Operator Services platforms.
- 17 Q. CL2-14. WCOM RECOMMENDS THAT SPECIFIC PROVISIONS BE ADDED
  18 TO ALLOW THE CLEC TO CHALLENGE QWEST IF THE DECISION IS MADE
  19 NOT TO CONSTRUCT, ALONG WITH APPROPRIATE DISPUTE
  20 RESOLUTIONS PROCEDURES.<sup>31</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
- 21 A. WCom's recommendation is not appropriate. Any disputes under the SGAT can 22 be resolved through the dispute resolution clause of the SGAT.
- Q. CL2-15. WCOM DOES NOT BELIEVE THAT CONSTRUCTION SHOULD BE
  LIMITED TO UNBUNDLED LOOPS.<sup>32</sup> ELI RECOMMENDS THAT SECTION
  9.19 BE AMENDED TO REFLECT QWEST WILL CONSTRUCT LOOPS
  UNDER THE SAME TERMS AND CONDITIONS IT CONSTRUCTS LOOPS
  FOR END USERS OR OTHER WHOLESALE CUSTOMERS. PLEASE
  RESPOND.
- 29 A. Qwest does not agree with WCom's suggestion to expand the construction 30 requirements beyond unbundled loops or with ELI's suggestion. Qwest's 31 obligations to build UNEs for CLECs should be limited to situations where Qwest

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

WCom at page 14.

WCom at page 14.

would be legally bound to build for retail end users customers, which is limited only to certain unbundled loops. The FCC has clearly stated that Qwest has no obligation to build other UNEs such as UDIT:

In this section, for example, we expressly limit the provision of unbundled interoffice facilities to *existing* incumbent LEC facilities.<sup>33</sup>

- Q. CL2-16. WCOM QUESTIONS WHY SECTION 9.19 REFERENCES TERMS
   FOR CONSTRUCTION FOR ANCILLARY AND FINISHED SERVICES, WHEN
   THIS SECTION DEALS WITH ACCESS TO UNE'S.<sup>34</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
- 9 A. Qwest will remove from this section any references to ancillary and finished services.
- 11 Q. CL2-17. AT&T REQUESTS THAT QWEST DESCRIBE WHAT UNBUNDLED
  12 CUSTOMER CONTROLLED REARRANGEMENT ELEMENT (UCCRE), AND
  13 TO CLARIFY ITS REASON FOR PLACING UCCRE IN THE SGAT. 35 PLEASE
  14 RESPOND.
- A. UCCRE is the wholesale version of "Command-a-Link". Command-a-Link, like 15 UCCRE, allows the IXC to configure elements through the manipulation of ports 16 on the Digital Cross-Connect System (DCS). The First Report and Order 17 required ILECs to provide digital cross connect capabilities to CLECs in the same 18 manner an ILEC offers it to Interexchange carriers. Qwest offers the CLEC 19 UCCRE to provide the same Command-a-Link functionality to CLECs. Qwest 20 has not received any orders for UCCRE. Qwest does not require CLECs to 21 utilize UCCRE to access features, functions or to combine UNEs. The parties in 22 23 Colorado agreed that this issue is closed.

24

4

FCC First Competition Report and Order, para. 451.

WCom at page 15.

AT&T at page 46.

#### VIII. UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS COMBINATIONS (UNE C) -- GENERAL

Q. UNEC-1. WCOM ASSERTS THAT QWEST'S PRODUCT QUESTIONNAIRE
 FOR UNE-COMBINATIONS IS TOO LONG.<sup>36</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.

A. While the product/amendment questionnaire is 27 pages long, for UNE-P there is only about three to four pages of total information required. Additionally, the questionnaire is not limited to the collection of information provided by the CLEC. Several pages of the questionnaire include information about reports that are available to the CLEC and instructions for completing the questionnaire. The questionnaire is also loaded on the web. I have attached the questionnaire as Exhibit KAS-3 and highlighted in blue the areas required for UNE-P.

The CLEC Questionnaire is a tool used by Qwest to obtain information that is critical to establishing the business relationship between Qwest and the CLEC. Some sections of the questionnaire are required to enable Qwest to establish the CLEC in internal and external systems, e.g., billing accounts, contact information, etc. In addition, the CLEC Questionnaire was designed to allow CLECs to specify their requirements for billing and contact information based on product or based on the CLEC's requirement for multiple contacts and contact locations. Since not all CLECs have the same requirements, the questionnaire was designed to allow for these differences.

Qwest has elected to obtain as much information as possible about the CLEC's requirements on a single document. The other BOCs require much of the same information but often require the CLEC to prepare separate documents or forms to obtain the information Qwest requests on a single questionnaire.

The entire questionnaire as contained in KAS-26 does not have to be completed to enable the CLEC to begin doing business with Qwest. Qwest recognizes that not all the information requested on the questionnaire is available at the start of the business negotiations with Qwest. Therefore, Qwest only requires information that is needed to establish the CLEC as a certified local service provider and for billing of products/services provided to the CLEC by Qwest. The required entries would include information from the following sections of the questionnaire:

- General Information
- Billing & Collections Section 1
- Qwest Output Section 2 (Minimum information required is Contact Name & Telephone Number if no other information available)
- Input to Qwest Section 3
- Contact List Section 4

If the CLEC is not prepared to provide some information when initially submitting the questionnaire, a designation of "to be determined" may be entered in some fields and the information can be provided at a later time. In addition, while some sections of the questionnaire contain several sub-sections by product or functionality, the use of "same as above" can be used in subsequent sections of the questionnaire if some or all of the information is the same. If the CLEC is not planning to order certain products, those product specific sections may be left blank or designated as "not applicable" or "n/a.

To begin ordering new products, e.g., combinations of UNEs such as EEL, the CLEC will need to provide Qwest with a Questionnaire Amendment, (see Exhibit KAS-27) containing the information for the new product/service requested.

Qwest uses the information provided by the CLEC to establish billing accounts in the billing systems, load the CLECs contact information in internal systems to enable the referral of the CLEC's customers, as well as providing contact information to the Qwest wholesale centers responsible for processing CLEC requests. Also, Qwest uses some of the information to establish the method and system requirements for exchange of call usage data and begins the process of establishing the CLEC's requirements for either an EDI or GUI link to Qwest's IMA system. All of the information provided by the CLECs is required to enable Qwest to establish the necessary interfaces, whether business or systems, between the CLEC and Qwest. This information is not shared with any department within Qwest without a need to know and none of this information is used for marketing purposes.

- Q. UNEC-2. WCOM IS CONCERNED THAT AFTER OBTAINING NEW BAN NUMBERS THAT IT TAKES 3 TO 4 WEEKS TO LOAD THE APPROPRIATE RATES INTO THE PROVISIONING AND BILLING SYSTEMS.<sup>37</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
- A. The appropriate rates must be loaded individually for each CLEC, since every

  CLEC can have its own specific rates. The CLEC must complete the

  questionnaire (some of the data on that—such as ACNA & OCN--is pertinent to

  the loading process). The USOCs and rates need to be sent to be loaded into

  several systems (CRIS, IABS & CPPD). Qwest is working to improve its

  processes and reduce the time required to load rates.

Q. UNEC-3. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THE CURRENT LANGUAGE BE DELETED IN SECTION 9.23.1.2.1, AND BE REPLACED WITH:<sup>38</sup>

9.23.1.2.1 In no event shall Qwest require CLEC to purchase any UNE Combinations in conjunction with any other service or

WCom at page 5.

AT&T at pages 48 and 49.

element. Qwest shall place no use restrictions or other limiting conditions on UNE Combinations purchased by CLEC under the terms of this Agreement.

A. In Colorado, the parties agreed that this issue was closed when Qwest agreed to add the following language to Section 9.23.1.2:

Qwest shall not require CLEC to access any UNE combinations in conjunction with any other service or element unless specified in this Agreement or as required for technical feasibility reasons. Qwest shall not place any use restrictions or other limiting conditions on UNE combinations(s) accessed by CLEC except as specified in this Agreement or required by Existing Rules.

# Q. UNEC-4. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S RECOMMENDATION THAT SECTION 9.23.1.2.2 BE MODIFIED AS FOLLOWS:<sup>39</sup>

9.23.1.2.2 At such time that CLEC provides Qwest with an order for particular UNE Combination, CLEC, at its option, may designate any technically feasible network interface, including without limitation, DS0, DS1, DS3, STS1, and OCn (where n equals 1 to 192) interfaces, and any other interface described in the applicable Telecordia standard and any other industry standard technical references. Any such requested network interface shall be provided by Qwest, unless Qwest provides CLEC, within five (5) days, with a written notice that it believes such a request is technically infeasible, including a detailed statement supporting such claim. Any such denial shall be resolved in accordance with the Dispute resolution process set forth in Section 5.18 of this Agreement. Unless otherwise specified, any references to DS1 in this Section 9.23 shall mean, at CLEC's option, either DS1 AMI or xDSL facility.

29 A. Qwest does not agree to add the proposed SGAT language identified above.
30 Qwest's technical publications include the network interfaces available for
31 products. AT&T has several options available to it to expand those interfaces.
32 First, the CLEC can use the Special Request Process (detailed later in this
33 testimony) if the "combination" using the requested interface already exist in the
34 Qwest network. Second, the CLEC can use the CICMP change control and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> AT&T at page 50.

forum process to add new interfaces to technical publications. Third, for new interfaces not in the Qwest network, the CLEC can use the BFR process. The BFR process allows Qwest to determine if the requested interface (or in reality the requested UNE) is a UNE (i.e. meets the necessary and impair standards), can it be implemented within the existing Qwest network, and in what time frames and at what rate.

Moreover, Qwest's existing network is unbundled for CLECs. Qwest still retains the ability to manage and control its network. Qwest is not required to build a new network for CLECs, as the language above appears to contemplate.

In addition, it appears that AT&T is requesting the ability to direct what under lying transmission technology is utilized to provide CLEC requested UNEs. Unless, other wise indicated by NCI codes (such as providing a loop over unloaded copper pairs) Qwest does not agree to allow CLECs to dictate what transmission facilities will be used to provide UNEs.

- Q. UNEC-5. WCOM EXPRESSED CONCERNS ABOUT THE REQUIREMENT TO HAVE AN ADDENDUM TO THEIR INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT TO ORDER UNE-P SERVICE.<sup>40</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.
- In the Emerging Services workshop, Qwest confirmed its policy of requiring Α. 18 specific interconnection agreement language to cover all services, rates and 19 charges that would apply to CLEC. It is not realistic (nor practical) that complex 20 21 services and legal obligations would not be a in a written form between the parties. This issue was identified in the Emerging Services workshop. The issue 22 of requiring an interconnection agreement addendum is not product or checklist 23 item specific, but is applicable to all sections of the SGAT. Therefore, any 24 additional discussion that WCom believes is necessary should be raised in that 25 workshop so that the record for this issue is within a single workshop record. I 26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

<sup>0</sup> 

would note that the WCom interconnection agreement did not contain all the terms, conditions and rates necessary for UNE-P, to include shared transport.

In addition, the FCC has held that issues like this are not appropriate for resolution in the Section 271 process:

Finally, MFNS's alleged difficulties negotiating collocation arrangement with SWBT are best resolved through the section 252 negotiation and arbitration process or through the section 208 complaint process. As we have found in past section 271 proceedings, the section 271 process simply could not function if we were required to resolve every interpretive dispute about the precise content of an incumbent LEC's obligations to its competitors, including fact-intensive interpretive disputes.<sup>41</sup>

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

## Q. UNEC-6. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S RECOMMENDATION THAT A NEW PARAGRAPH 9.23.1.2.3 BE ADDED AS FOLLOWS:<sup>42</sup>

In addition to the UNE Combinations provided by Qwest 9.23.1.2.3 to CLEC hereunder, Qwest shall permit CLEC to combine any Network Element or network elements provided by Qwest with another Network Element, other network elements or other services (including Access Services) obtained from Qwest or with compatible network components provided by CLEC or provided third parties to CLEC to provide by Telecommunications Services to CLEC, its affiliates and to CLEC end users.

A. Qwest does not agree to add this language. Qwest believes that this language is unnecessary in light of the changes it has made to Section 9. Qwest can agree to allow CLECs to combine UNEs with other UNEs, but it cannot agree to language that is overly broad regarding allowing any UNE to be connected to "other services." For example, the FCC order limiting EELs to a substantial amount of local service provides that CLECs may not connect the EEL to other ILEC services.<sup>43</sup> In addition, Qwest is unclear of the meaning of "to combine

FCC Kansas/Oklahoma Section 271 Order, para. 230.

AT&T at pages 50 and 51.

FCC Supplemental Order Clarification, para. 22.

network elements made available by Qwest with other contiguous Qwest network elements or Qwest Access Services."

The language proposed by AT&T is generally the same as the language already contained in Section 9.1.5 of the SGAT. Nevertheless, Qwest will agree to add the following to Section 9.23.1.2.2:

In addition to the UNE combinations provided by Qwest to CLEC hereunder, Qwest shall permit CLEC to combine any UNE provided by Qwest with another UNE provided by Qwest or with compatible network components provided by CLEC or provided by third parties to CLEC in order to provide telecommunications service.

# Q. UNEC-7. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S RECOMMENDATION THAT SECTION 9.23.1.3 BE MODIFIED AS FOLLOWS:44

When ordered in combination, network elements that are currently connected and ordered together will not be physically disconnected or separated in any fashion except if it is technically infeasible not to provision the combination without physically disconnecting or separating the combination or if requested by the CLEC. Network elements to be provisioned together shall be identified and ordered by the CLEC as such. Network elements ordered as a UNE Combination shall be provisioned in combination unless the CLEC specifies that the network elements ordered in combination be provisioned separately. When existing service(s), including but not limited to Access Services, employed by the CLEC are replaced with a combination(s) of network elements of equivalent functionality, Qwest will not physically disconnect or separate in any other fashion equipment and facilities employed to provide the service(s) except for technical reasons or if requested by the CLEC. Charges for such transitioning of an existing service(s) to a combination of network elements are priced at total element long-run incremental cost as set forth in this Agreement.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 31

- A. Qwest has included the following language in the SGAT that assures CLECs that
  Qwest will not disconnect UNEs that are currently combined, unless the CLEC
  specifically requests that they be separated:
  - 9.23.1.3 When ordered in combination, UNEs that are currently combined and ordered together will not be physically disconnected or separated in any fashion except for technical reasons or if requested by the CLEC. Network elements to be provisioned together shall be identified and ordered by CLEC as such.
- AT&T's language regarding non-recurring charges in redundant of Section 9.23.4 and is not appropriate in Section 9.23.1.
  - Q. UNEC-8. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH BE ADDED TO THE SGAT AS A NEW SECTION 9.23.1.4:45
    - 9.23.1.4 CLEC and Qwest agree that the network elements identified in Section 9 are not exclusive and that pursuant to changes in FCC rules, State laws, or the Bona Fide Request process, CLEC may identify and request that the Qwest furnish additional or revised network elements to the extent required under Section 251(c)(3) of the Act and other applicable laws. Additionally, if Qwest provides any Network Element or Combination or interconnection arrangement that not identified in this Agreement to a requesting Telecommunications Carrier including a Qwest affiliate, to its own subscribers or to any other entity, Qwest will make available the same Network Element, UNE Combination or interconnection arrangement to CLEC without CLEC being required to use the Bona Fide Request process. Failure to list a Network Element herein shall not constitute a waiver by CLEC to obtain a Network Element subsequently defined by the FCC or by the state commission. All network elements and **UNE Combinations provided pursuant to this Agreement shall** be provided by Qwest for the Term of this Agreement independent of any state or Federal action eliminating a regulatory obligation to provide a Network Element or UNE Combination.

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> AT&T at pages 52 and 53.

- 1 A. These issues have been addressed in Section 9.1.1 and the revised 2 Section 9.23.1.2.
- Q. UNEC-9. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S PROPOSAL THAT THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE BE INCLUDED AS SECTION 9.23.1.5:46
  - 9.23.1.5 Notwithstanding the foregoing, without additional components furnished by the CLEC to itself or through third parties, the CLEC shall be permitted to combine network elements made available by Qwest with other contiguous Qwest network elements or Qwest Access Services provided however, that to the extent that the CLEC requests that Qwest either combine contiguous network elements or combine noncontiguous unbundled network elements in a manner different than that contemplated in Table 1 of this Section 9.23, or in accordance with efficient engineering principles, or in any previous Bona Fide Request from CLEC or any other Telecommunications Carrier, such request shall be handled through the Bona Fide Request process.

19 A. This language is redundant of Section 9.23.1.2.2, and is not as clear as that section.

Q. UNEC-10. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S PROPOSAL THAT THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH BE ADDED AS SECTION 9.23.1.6:47

9.23.1.6 For each Network Element ordered individually, Qwest shall provide a demarcation point (e.g., an interconnection point at a Digital Signal Cross Connect or Light Guide Cross Connect panels or a Main or Intermediate Distribution Frame) when requested by the CLEC and, if necessary, access to such demarcation point, which CLEC agrees is suitable. However, where Qwest provides a UNE Combination of contiguous Qwest network elements or a continuous combination of Access Services and network elements to CLEC, Qwest will provide the existing interconnections and no demarcation shall exist between such contiguous Qwest network elements.

AT&T at page 53.

AT&T at page 53.

Qwest does not believe the proposed language is necessary since the issue of demarcation points have already been addressed in the SGAT. In general, Qwest agrees that there is a network demarcation point established for each UNE as identified in section 9 of the SGAT. Moreover, as identified in SGAT section 9.1.4, there is the option of a unique demarcation point "e) at another demarcation point mutually-agreed to by the parties" already contemplated. Qwest also agrees that there may be combinations where the CLEC does not have a network demarcation point within the Qwest network, such as UNE-P, were the CLEC demarcation point is in reality at the customer premises. In these cases, without a network demarcation point, the CLEC would not have access to the UNE combination in the Qwest central office for testing and/or monitoring.

A.

In addition, Qwest is unclear of AT&T's intent with the following statement: "However, where Qwest provides a UNE Combination of contiguous Qwest network elements or a continuous combination of Access Services and network elements to CLEC, Qwest will provide the existing interconnections and no demarcation shall exist between such contiguous Qwest network elements."

# Q. UNEC-11. ELI REQUESTED THAT IN SECTIONS 9.23.1.4-6 "PROVIDED THAT FACILITIES ARE AVAILABLE" BE DELETED.

19 A. Qwest does not agree with ELI's suggestion to remove this language. Qwest's
20 obligations to build UNEs (and therefore UNE combinations) for CLECs should
21 be limited to situations where Qwest would be legally bound to build for retail end

users customers, which is limited only to certain unbundled loops. The FCC has 1 clearly stated that Qwest has no obligation to build other UNEs such as UDIT: 2 In this section, for example, we expressly limit the provision of unbundled 3 interoffice facilities to existing incumbent LEC facilities. 48 4 5 **UNEC-12.** PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S PROPOSAL THAT THE Q. 6 FOLLOWING LANGUAGE TO BE ADDED AS A NEW SECTION 9.23.1.7:49 7 9.23.1.7.1. Qwest shall not charge CLEC an interconnection fee 8 demand other consideration for 9 interconnecting any Network Element or UNE 10 Combination to any other Network Element or UNE 11 Combination provided by Qwest to CLEC if Qwest 12 directly interconnects the same network elements 13 or UNE Combinations in providing any service to its 14 own end users or a Qwest affiliate, including the use 15 of intermediate devices, such as a digital signal 16 perform cross connect panel. to such 17 interconnection. 18 19 Α. Qwest has agreed to charge cost-based nonrecurring charges to recover its 20 costs in combining elements. In Arizona, Qwest proposed that it add language to 21 the SGAT indicating that the nonrecurring charges would be cost-based. 22 However, the CLECs participating in the Workshops suggested that the language 23 be changed to indicate that nonrecurring charges would be compliant with 24 Existing Rules. Qwest has made the suggested change to Section 9.23.4.1.2. 25 Although Qwest does not impose a glue charge to combine elements (it has 26 proposed a cost-based non-recurring charge), Qwest notes that the FCC has 27

held that an ILEC is not precluded from charging a glue charge in situations

where it is combining elements on behalf of CLECs:

AT&T at page 54.

.

FCC First Competition Report and Order, para. 451.

This Commission found in the SWBT Texas Order that, because the Supreme Court's determination in *AT&T v. lowa Utilits. Bd.* did not specifically find that incumbent LECs must combine separate UNEs, SWBT is not required to provide new UNE combinations and may therefore set market based rates for such a service . . . Since then, the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit specifically reiterated its conclusion that incumbent LECs are not required to make new UNE combinations . . . We note that SWBT's interconnection agreements include a method, other than the COAC, of combining elements that are not previously combined in SWBT's network . . . Because of the court's determination, and because competitive LECs have a method of avoiding the COAC, we did not examine whether SWBT's COAC charges in Texas were cost-based, and we decline to do so here for similar reasons.<sup>50</sup>

## Q. UNEC-13. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH BE ADDED TO THE SGAT:<sup>51</sup>

9.23.1.8 Orders for UNE Combinations may also specify ancillary equipment (e.g., multiplexers, bridges, etc.) which, although integral to the functionality of the Network Element, may need to be specified for purposes of unbundled pricing and/or engineering of the UNE Combination. Specification of such information is not an acknowledgment on the part of the CLEC that the items specified represent separate network elements nor is it a waiver of the CLEC's right to request and have the equipment provided in the future for the then existing UNE Combination.

27 A. 28

Qwest is not clear what ancillary equipment exists, other than multiplexing, which is the example given by AT&T. Qwest already allows access to multiplexing. In addition, Qwest believes that "engineering" requirements of UNEs are generally specified by the use of NC-NCI codes.

AT&T at page 54.

FCC Kansas/Oklahoma Section 271 Order, para. 157.

1	Q.	UNEC-14. PLEASE RESPOND TO AT&T'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THE	
2		SGAT BE REWRITTEN TO ELIMINATE ANY AMBIGUITY THAT UNE-P AND	
3		UNE-COMBINATIONS ARE LIMITED TO PRE-EXISTING OR COMBINED	
4		UNES OR ANY TYPES OF COMBINATIONS. 52	
5	A.	The SGAT is clear. Qwest has agreed to combine unbundled network elements	
6		on behalf of CLECs throughout its region, despite the fact that the Eighth Circuit	
7		has vacated all sections of Rule 315 that required ILECs to combine UNEs.	
8		Qwest has agreed to provide access to UNEs that it has combined on behalf of	
9		the CLEC, whether they be UNEs Qwest ordinarily combines, UNEs Qwest does	
10		not ordinarily combine (to the extent technically feasible), or combinations of	
11		Qwest UNEs with CLEC UNEs. During the Workshop, CLECs requested that	
12		Qwest spell out these changes in the SGAT. To reflect these changes, Qwest	
13		has added the following sections to the SGAT:	
14		9.23.1.4 When ordered in combination, Qwest will combine for CLEC	
15		UNEs that are ordinarily combined in Qwest's network provided that	
16		facilities are available.	
17		9.23.1.5 When ordered in combination, Qwest will combine for CLEC	
18		UNEs that are not ordinarily combined in Qwest's network, provided	
19		that facilities are available and such combination:	
20		9.23.1.5.1 Is technically feasible;	
21		9.23.1.5.2 Would not impair the ability of other carriers to obtain	
22		access to UNEs or to interconnect with Qwest's network;	
23		and 0.23.1.5.2 Would not impoir Owent's use of its	
24 25		9.23.1.5.3 Would not impair Qwest's use of its network.	
25 26		Hetwork.	
27		9.23.1.6 When ordered in combination, Qwest will combine CLEC	
28		UNEs with Qwest UNEs, provided that facilities are available and	
29		such combination:	
30		9.23.1.6.1.1.1 Is technically feasible;	
31		9.23.1.6.1.1.1.2 Shall be performed in a manner that provides	
32		Qwest access to necessary facilities;	

1	9.23.1.6.2	Would not impair the ability of other carriers to	
2	obtain access to UNEs or to interconnect with Qwest's network;		
3	and		
4	9.23.1.6.3	Would not impair Qwest's use of its network.	

5

# Q. UNEC-15. ELI REQUEST THAT A STANDARD COMBINATION OF UNBUNDLED LOOPS AND MULTIPLEXING BE ESTABLISHED AS PART OF 9.23.2.53

9 A. In response to the concerns of ELI wanting to add an individual DS1 loop to a
10 multiplexer, that is contemplated with the multiplexed EEL. Any other concerns
11 that ELI may have regarding the use of multiplexers and unbundled loops would
12 be addressed in the unbundled loop workshop. However, to install the
13 multiplexer, first the high side of the multiplexer needs to be tied down to some
14 type of DS3 facility. Typically, this would be a DS3 transport facility.

- 15 Q. UNEC-16. PLEASE RESPOND TO WCOM'S RECOMMENDATION THAT
  16 SECTION 9.23.3.13 BE MODIFIED WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE CLEC
  17 AGREES TO ACCEPT JUST THOSE ELEMENTS THAT COULD BE
  18 PROVISIONED AT THAT TIME. 54
- 19 A. Qwest thinks that this language is clear. It states "and CLEC elects to have Qwest provision the other elements before all elements are available."

21

Q. UNEC-17. WCOM EXPRESSES CONCERN THAT IT WILL BE REQUIRED TO
ASK FOR AN AMENDMENT OF ITS CONTRACT TO ORDER

ELI at page 16.

WCom at pages 19.and 20.

## COMBINATIONS DIFFERENT THAN THE SGAT IDENTIFIED STANDARD PRODUCTS.<sup>55</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.

Qwest has clarified Section 9.23.5.1.1. WCom will not be required to amend its contract to order additional UNE combinations, assuming that the interconnection agreement already contains all the individual UNE rates. Qwest has developed a streamlined and standardized process for CLECs to request access to additional combinations in the Qwest network as a combination of UNEs. The process begins by the CLEC filling out a brief Special Request Applications Form. Exhibit KAS-28 contains a copy of the Special Request Applications Form and a process flow. The form identifies the specific time frames Qwest will use in responding to the CLEC's request. A basic underlining principle of this request process is that the CLEC and Qwest have reason to believe that the combination or features requested is technically feasible and only contains FCC identified UNEs. For those UNEs that Qwest does not ordinarily combine in its network, the CLEC must use the BFR process, to allow Qwest to determine if the requested combination is technical feasible. In addition, as demand materializes, Qwest will continue to expand its list of standard UNE combinations. The SGAT states:

CLEC may request access to and, where appropriate, development of, additional UNE Combinations. For UNEs that Qwest currently combines in its network, CLEC can use the Special Request Process (SRP) set forth in Exhibit F. For UNEs that Qwest does not currently combine, CLEC must use the Bona Fide Request Process. In its BFR or SRP request, CLEC must identify the specific combination of UNEs, identifying each individual UNE by name as described in this Agreement. <sup>56</sup>

Α.

sGAT at 9.23.3.10.

WCom at pages 15.and 16.

Q. UNE-C-18. AT&T INSISTS THAT QWEST DEVELOP A PRODUCT CALLED 1 CLEC LOOP TERMINATION, WHICH IS THE COMBINATION OF SWITCH 2 PORT AND SHARED TRANSPORT. PLEASE RESPOND. 3

4

18

- By its very definition, shared transport is ordered with unbundled switching. Α. 5 Therefore, this product already exists.<sup>57</sup> In the Colorado workshop, the parties 6 7 agreed that this issue was closed.
- Q. UNE-C-19. AT&T SUGGESTS THAT QWEST DEVELOP UNSPECIFIED 8 PRODUCTS INVOLVING UNE COMBINATIONS WITH TRANSPORT AND 9 DARK FIBER.<sup>58</sup> PLEASE RESPOND. 10
- As I have already stated, CLECs can order additional combinations existing in Α. 11 the Qwest network using the Special Request Process. If there is significant 12 13 demand, Qwest will develop a standard product. To the extent that the CLEC requests combinations not in the Qwest network, the CLEC can use the BFR 14 process. Qwest does not agree to "light" dark fiber with electronics, so Qwest is 15 uncertain what type of combination Qwest can be required to make with transport 16 and dark fiber. 17

#### IX. **ENHANCED EXTENDED LOOPS (EELS)**

- EEL-1. ELI STATES 9.23.3.7.1 SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO APPLY ONLY TO Q. 19 CONVERSIONS OF TARIFF SPECIAL ACCESS CIRCUITS TO EELS.59 20 PLEASE RESPOND. 21
- Α. Qwest is not sure what distention ELI is trying to draw between "tariffed" and 22 presumably "non-tariffed" special access conversions. Qwest does not agree to 23 the change proposed by ELI. The SGAT language is consistent with the FCC 24 June 2, 2000 Supplemental Order Clarification on limiting the use of 25

<sup>57</sup> AT&T at page 63.

<sup>58</sup> AT&T at page 64.

<sup>59</sup> ELI at pages 16-17.

- loop/transport combinations to situations where the CLEC certifies a significant amount of local service.
- Q. EEL-2. WCOM STATES 9.23.3.7.2.7 SHOULD BE DELETED FROM THE
  SGAT BECAUSE THE FCC DID NOT LIMIT THE CONNECTION OF A
  QUALIFYING EEL WITH ANY TARIFFED SERVICE.<sup>60</sup> ELI HAS SIMILAR
  CONCERNS WITH THIS SECTION AND SECTIONS 9.23.3.7.2.10 AND 13,
  AND BELIEVES THESE SECTIONS SHOULD BE REJECTED.<sup>61</sup> PLEASE
  RESPOND.
- 9 A. The FCC did limit the connection of a qualifying EEL with any tariffed service in its June 2, 2000 Supplemental Order Clarification, FCC 00-183, paragraph 28:

We further reject the suggestion that we eliminate the prohibition on "comingling" (i.e. combining loops or loop-transport combinations with tariffed special access services) in the local usage options discussed above. See MCI WorldCom Apr. 4, 2000 Letter at 6-8; February 28, 2000 Joint Letter at 2. We are not persuaded on this record that removing this prohibition would not lead to the use of unbundled network elements by IXCs solely or primarily to bypass special access services. We emphasize that the comingling determinations that we make in this order do not prejudge any final resolution on whether unbundled network elements may be combined with tariffed services. We will seek further information on this issue in the Public Notice that we will issue in early 2001.

In addition, the FCC included the following language in each of the three options for establishing a significant amount of local exchange service:

This option does not allow loop-transport combinations to be connected to the incumbent LEC's tariffed services.<sup>62</sup>

In response to ELI's additional concerns about ratcheting, co-mingling and

232425

26

27

28

29

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

WCom at pages 16.and 17.

ELI at pages 17 and 18.

Supplemental Order Clarification, para. 22.

grooming charges, Qwest's position is fully supported by the Supplemental Order Clarification:

We further reject the suggestion that we eliminate the prohibition on "comingling. . ."

The "grooming charges" referred to by ELI are simply charges that apply if ELI chooses to reconfigure its special access trunks. In addition, these issues are already before the FCC. Qwest believes the FCC is in the best position to rule on the merits of these requests. To the extent that this interpretative issue has not yet been resolved, the FCC has indicated that it will not deny a 271 application based upon such a dispute:

[D]espite the comprehensiveness of our local competition rules, there will inevitably be, in any Section 271 proceeding, new and unresolved interpretive disputes about the precise content of an incumbent LEC's obligations to its competitors that our rules have not yet addressed and that do not involve *per se* violations of self-executing requirements of the act. The Section 271 process simply could not function as Congress intended if we were generally required to resolve all such disputes as a precondition to granting a Section 271 application.<sup>63</sup>

We observed in the SWBT Texas Order that carriers should expect to be affected by future resolutions of disputed issues, and that such concern is insufficient to warrant denial of a Section 271 application.<sup>64</sup>

Q. EEL-3. ELI RECOMMENDS THAT 9.23.3.7.2.6 BE DELETED. ELI BELIEVES
THE SGAT ALREADY CONTAINS A GENERAL AUDIT PROVISION THAT
SHOULD BE ADEQUATE TO ENABLE QWEST TO AUDIT THE CLEC'S

FCC Kansas/Oklahoma Section 271 Order, para. 19.

FCC Kansas/Oklahoma Section 271 Order, para. 222.

1 2		PERFORMANCE UNDER THE SGAT, INCLUDING ANY LEGITIMATE LOCAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.65
3	A.	Qwest does not agree to delete the audit provisions in the EEL section of the
4		SGAT. Qwest believes its SGAT language, as modified at CLEC request during
5		the Arizona workshop, is very consistent with the FCC Supplemental Order
6		Clarification, FCC 00-183.66 Given the very specific nature of the FCC significant
7		amount of local service requirements, Qwest does not believe that general
8		provisions covering CLEC compliance with the SGAT would be sufficiently clear
9		for all parties.
10	Q.	EEL-4. ELI BELIEVES SECTION 9.23.3.7.2.12.2 UNLAWFULLY AND
11		UNREASONABLY EXTENDS THE FCC'S LOCAL CERTIFICATION
12		REQUIREMENTS TO NEW INSTALLATION OF UNES COMBINED INTO AN
13		EEL AND SHOULD BE DELETED. <sup>67</sup>
14	A.	Qwest does not agree to delete this section. Clearly, the FCC meant
15		conversions or new combinations. In their June 2, 2000 Supplemental Order
16		Clarification, FCC 00-183, paragraph 21, the FCC stated:
17		
18 19 20		To reduce uncertainty for incumbent LECs and requesting carriers and to maintain the status quo while we review the issues contained in the <i>Fourth FNPRM</i> , we now define more precisely the "significant amount of least explanate apprior" that a requesting carrier must provide in order to
21		local exchange service" that a requesting carrier must provide in order to

obtain unbundled loop-transport combinations. . .

ELI at page 17.

ELI at pages 17-18.

23

ELI was a participant in the Arizona workshop on Checklist item 2.

- Q. EEL-5. ELI BELIEVES SECTION 9.23.3.7.2.12.8 UNLAWFULLY LIMITS
  QWEST'S OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE EELS TO WHEN EXISTING
  FACILITIES ARE AVAILABLE AND SHOULD BE DELETED.
- A. Qwest does not agree with ELI's suggestion to remove this language. The FCC has clearly stated that Qwest has no obligation to build UDIT, which is a necessary element of EELs:

In this section, for example, we expressly limit the provision of unbundled interoffice facilities to *existing* incumbent LEC facilities.<sup>68</sup>

- 10 Q. EEL-6. ELI STATES TO THE EXTENT SUBSECTION 9.23.3.12 REQUIRES
  11 PAYMENT OF TERMINATION LIABILITY FOR TARIFF SERVICES THE CLEC
  12 OBTAINED AND SEEKS TO CONVERT TO A UNE COMBINATION, SHOULD
  13 BE MODIFIED TO MAKE ANY TERMINATION LIABILITY INAPPLICABLE
  14 UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES.
- 15 A. Qwest disagrees and does not agree to modify this section. Typically, when a
  16 termination liability exists it is due to a term and/or volume discount previously
  17 applied to the full rate for the service. Qwest applies the discount in return for a
  18 period of time commitment at that rate by the CLEC. To the extent a CLEC is
  19 now attempting to "disconnect" this rate, then clearly termination liabilities should
  20 and do apply.
- Q. EEL-7. ELI STATES SECTION 9.23.3.14 SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO
  REMOVE FORECASTS AS A CONDITION OF QWEST'S OBLIGATION TO
  ACCEPT ORDERS FOR AND PROVISION UNE COMBINATIONS.

FCC First Competition Report and Order, para. 451.

A. Qwest has agreed in Colorado to review its complete requirements for UNE and
UNE combination forecasts on March 19, 2001, and where possible to have
consistency across SGAT offerings. Qwest would recommend deferring forecast
requirements till after this workshop has been concluded. Qwest agrees to
amend the relevant SGAT sections in all states to be consistent with the forecast
agreements developed in that workshop.

- Q. EEL-8. REGARDING SECTION 9.23.4.1.2, ELI EXPRESSED CONCERNS ON NONRECURRING CHARGES BEING "BASED UPON THE EXISTING RULES" FOR UNE COMBINATIONS.
- A. Qwest's intent with this section was to state that its rates for UNE combination conversions would be cost based. However, in other states, CLECs were concerned that cost rules may be changing, and requested a more general reference to existing rules, including a particular Commission's pricing and costing rules.
- 15 Q. EEL-9. ELI BELIEVES THERE SHOULD NOT BE A DELAY TO LOAD THE
  16 APPROPRIATE RATES INTO THE PROVISIONING AND BILLING SYSTEMS
  17 PRIOR TO A CLEC ORDERING UNE COMBINATIONS. 69 PLEASE
  18 RESPOND.
- 19 A. The appropriate rates for a CLEC's requested combinations must be loaded 20 individually for each CLEC, since every CLEC can have its own specific rates. 21 The USOCs and rates need to be sent to be loaded into several systems (CRIS,

WCom at page 5.

IABS & CPPD). Qwest is working to improve its processes and reduce the time required to load rates.

A.

### Q. EEL-10. WCOM RECOMMENDS THAT QWEST ADOPT A SINGLE PROCESS FOR THE ORDERING OF EEL COMBINATIONS.<sup>70</sup> PLEASE RESPOND.

Qwest initially developed two EEL products, one to handle conversion of combinations of loop and dedicated transport to EEL (then called UNE-C-PL) and one to handle Qwest's obligation to combine loop and dedicated transport in Zone 1 of the top 50 MSAs (then called EEL). In Arizona, CLECs suggested that the products be combined. Prior to the Workshop, Qwest submitted language combining the products into one EEL product. This change made sense in light of Qwest's agreement to combine loop and dedicated transport in its entire 14-state region, and not just within Zone 1 of the top 50 MSAs. However, because Qwest had implemented two different processes to provision the two products, the SGAT defined two EEL options, EEL Provisioning (EEL-P) and EEL Conversion (EEL-C).

Qwest had developed two provisioning processes, to maximize the efficiency of providing each product. EEL-C used an LSR process and could be ordered on a single LSR. EEL-P was a new combination of loop and transport. It used an ASR process. EEL-P without multiplexing and could be ordered on a single ASR, while EEL-P with multiplexing required two ASRs. A change or augment to an EEL-C or an EEL-P was be ordered using the same process the CLEC used when first ordering the EEL.

Per CLEC request, Qwest is developing an ordering process were new and existing conversions of EELs can occur using LSR forms. The new LSR process will be in place within the next several months. Qwest will rewrite all internal and

CLEC methods and procedures, modify the IRRG and assure training is complete before converting to the one LSR process for all EELs. We expect that work to be complete and the conversion to occur in early April time frame. Under the new process, EELs without multiplexing can be ordered on a single LSR, while EELs with multiplexing require two LSRs.

This process is more efficient than the process that the FCC approved in its Kansas/Oklahoma Section 271 Order. The FCC's order states:

E.spire argues that SWBT's two-step process for converting access circuits to UNE pricing, which requires a requesting carrier to complete both an ASR and LSR, violates the rules set forth in the Supplemental Order Clarification governing EEL provisioning. We disagree. In our Supplemental Order Clarification, we established a general rule to govern the EEL provisioning process in recognition that incumbent LECs may adopt different procedures to ensure that access circuits are converted to unbundled loop transport combinations simply and without delay. We find that our rules do not expressly prohibit the two-step process performed by SWBT.<sup>71</sup>

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

### WCOM STATES QWEST WILL NOT PROVISION ANY EELS.72 Q. PLEASE RESPOND.

Qwest is not aware of any EEL orders that have not been provisioned. Α. 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

With regard to its negotiations, WCom tells only part of the story. In order for a CLEC to begin ordering EEL service, it must first have a contract which contains the required rate elements, i.e. Unbundled Loop, UDIT, Multiplexing etc. If the contract does not contain these rate elements, then a determination will need to be made by Product Management if an Amendment to the CLEC's existing contract is required. The existing WCom contract does not contain the required

WCom at page 6.

<sup>71</sup> FCC Kansas/Oklahoma Section 271 Order, para. 176.

rate elements necessary to implement EEL. Qwest is presently working with WCom on the development of a new Amendment to include EEL.

- Q. EEL-12. PARTIES ASK FOR CLARIFICATION THAT EEL IS AVAILABLE
   THROUGH OC-192. PLEASE RESPOND.
- A. Qwest had at first limited EELs to specified bandwidths, and the CLECs objected to the limitation. The SGAT has been revised to indicate that any existing bandwidths are available, including bandwidths DS0 through OC-192. DSO, DS1 And DS3 bandwidths are standard products. Other bandwidths can be ordered through the special request process explained in Exhibit F of the SGAT.
- 11 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 12 A. Yes, this concludes my testimony.