

FCC 271 Checklist Item 4 Line sharing Quotes

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FCC DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>FCC PROCEEDING</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	
ME	CC Docket No. 02-61	FCC 02-187	31	44	Our conclusion is based on our review of Verizon's performance for all loop types, which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, xDSL-capable loops, digital loops, and high capacity loops, and our review of Verizon's processes for hot cuts, line sharing and line splitting.
ME	CC Docket No. 02-61	FCC 02-187	36	51	Based on the evidence in the record, we find, as did the Maine Commission, that Verizon demonstrates that it provides nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop. Through March 2002, Verizon had provisioned 800 line sharing orders in Maine for unaffiliated competitive LECs. Verizon's performance data for lineshared DSL loops demonstrates that it is in compliance with the parity and benchmark measures established in Maine.
ME	CC Docket No. 02-61	FCC 02-187	D-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
ME	CC Docket No. 02-61	FCC 02-187	D-27	51	To determine whether a BOC makes Line Sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the Bell Atlantic New York and SWBT Texas orders.
PA	CC Docket No. 01-138	FCC 01-269	40	76	Our conclusion is based on our review of Verizon's performance for all loop types, which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, hot cuts, xDSL-capable loops, digital loops, and high capacity loops, and our review of Verizon's processes for line sharing and line splitting.
PA	CC Docket No. 01-138	FCC 01-269	40	77	Finally, we note that commenters have not raised any significant issues with voice grade loops, which comprise the overwhelming majority of loops ordered by competitive LECs. ²⁷²
PA	CC Docket No. 01-138	FCC 01-269	40	272 (footnote)	²⁷² The record reflects that in Pennsylvania, Verizon has provisioned approximately...1000 line sharing arrangements to competitive LECs as of June 21, 2001.
PA	CC Docket No. 01-138	FCC 01-269	46	88	<i>Line Sharing</i> . We find that Verizon demonstrates that it provides nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop, pursuant to its interconnection agreements and in accordance with our rules. Although ordering volumes have been low, Pennsylvania performance data demonstrate that Verizon's performance for provisioning and maintaining line-shared DSL loops to competitors is generally in parity.
PA	CC Docket No. 01-138	FCC 01-269	C-23	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FCC DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>FCC PROCEEDING</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	
PA	CC Docket No. 01-138	FCC 01-269	C-24	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the Bell Atlantic New York and SWBT Texas orders.
MD DC WV	WC Docket No. 02-384	FCC 03-57	71	119	Our conclusion is based on our review of Verizon's performance for all loop types, which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, hot cut provisioning, x-DSL capable loops, digital loops, high capacity loops, as well as our review of Verizon's processes for line sharing and line splitting.
MD DC WV	WC Docket No. 02-384	FCC 03-57	F-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
MD DC WV	WC Docket No. 02-384	FCC 03-57	F-28	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York</i> and <i>SWBT Texas Orders</i> .
VA	WC Docket No. 02-214	FCC 02-297	80	138	Our conclusion is based on our review of Verizon's performance for all loop types, which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, hot cut provisioning, x-DSL capable loops, digital loops, high capacity loops, as well as our review of Verizon's processes for line sharing and line splitting.
VA	WC Docket No. 02-214	FCC 02-297	87	151	<p>Line Sharing and Line Splitting. Covad argues that Verizon discriminates against competitors by refusing to provision UNE shared loops for customers served by resale voice providers. Covad complains that when it submits orders for UNE line shared loops for customers served by resellers of Verizon's voice service, Verizon refuses to provision the line sharing UNE, returning a rejection notice indicating "third party voice." We disagree with Covad that Verizon is obligated to provide access to the high frequency portion of the loop when the customer's voice service is being provided by a reseller, and not by Verizon.</p> <p>Our rules do not require incumbent LECs to provide access to the high frequency portion of the loop when the incumbent LEC is not providing voice service over that loop. We disagree with Covad that Verizon is still considered the voice provider when a reseller is providing resold voice service to an end user customer. We agree, therefore, with Verizon that it is not required to provide access to the high frequency portion of the loop under these circumstances. We note that Verizon does permit the resale of its DSL service over resold voice lines so that customers purchasing resold voice are able to obtain DSL services from a provider other than Verizon.</p>
VA	WC Docket No. 02-214	FCC 02-297	C-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FCC DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>FCC PROCEEDING</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	
VA	WC Docket No. 02-214	FCC 02-297	C-27	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York</i> and <i>SWBT Texas Orders</i> .
NH and DE	WC Docket No. 02-157	FCC 02-262	62	105	Our conclusion that Verizon complies with checklist item 4 is based on our review of Verizon's performance for all loop types, which include, as in past 271 orders, voice grade loops, x-DSL capable loops, digital loops, and high capacity loops, as well as our review of Verizon's processes for hot cuts, line sharing, and line splitting.
NH and DE	WC Docket No. 02-157	FCC 02-262	F-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
NH and DE	WC Docket No. 02-157	FCC 02-262	F-27	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York</i> and <i>SWBT Texas orders</i> .
NJ	WC Docket No. 02-67	FCC 02-189	68	136	Our conclusion is based on our review of Verizon's performance for all loop types, which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, xDSL-capable loops, digital loops, and high capacity loops, and our review of Verizon's processes for hot cuts, line sharing and line splitting.
NJ	WC Docket No. 02-67	FCC 02-189	76-77	152	<i>Line Sharing and Line Splitting.</i> We find that Verizon demonstrates that it provides nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop, and access to network elements necessary for competing carriers to provide line splitting. Verizon provides line sharing pursuant to its interconnection agreements and in accordance with our rules. Verizon states that it provides line sharing to competitive LECS using substantially the same methods and procedures as in the other states where the Commission has found Verizon to be checklist compliant. According to Verizon, it had in service approximately 1,800 line sharing arrangements in New Jersey as of February 2002. We note that Verizon generally has met the relevant performance standards for provisioning, maintaining and repairing line-shared loops for competitors in New Jersey. We also note that the commenters in this proceeding do not criticize Verizon's performance with regard to the provisioning, maintenance and repair of line shared loops.
NJ	WC Docket No. 02-67	FCC 02-189	C-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
NJ	WC Docket No. 02-67	FCC 02-189	C-27	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York</i> and <i>SWBT Texas Orders</i> .

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FCC DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>FCC PROCEEDING</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	
FL and TN	WC Docket No. 02-307	FCC 02-331	68	132	As in past Section 271 orders, our conclusion is based on a review of BellSouth's performance for all loop types, including voice grade loops, x-DSL capable loops, high capacity loops, and digital loops, as well as our review of BellSouth's hot cut, line-sharing and line splitting processes.
FL and TN	WC Docket No. 02-307	FCC 02-331	77-78	144	<i>Line Sharing.</i> We find, as did the state commissions, that Bellsouth offers nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop in Florida and Tennessee. Bellsouth has provisioned 2,850 line sharing arrangements in Florida and 931 linesharing arrangements in Tennessee, as of July 2002. We recognize that Bellsouth's performance in Florida and Tennessee, with respect to one installation timeliness measure...was out of parity for several months. We note, however, that the data under another installation timeliness metric-percent missed installation appointments-shows that Bellsouth generally provisioned line shared loops in timely fashion during the relevant period. Accordingly, we find that Bellsouth's provisioning of line-shared loops satisfies checklist item 4. Should Bellsouth's performance in this area deteriorate, we will pursue appropriate enforcement action.
FL and TN	WC Docket No. 02-307	FCC 02-331	D-30	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
FL and TN	WC Docket No. 02-307	FCC 02-331	D-30	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York</i> and <i>SWBT Texas Orders</i> .
AL, KY, MS, NC and SC	WC Docket No. 02-150	FCC 02-260	130	232	As in past Section 271 orders, our conclusion is based on a review of BellSouth's performance for all loop types, including voice grade loops, x-DSL capable loops, high capacity loops and digital loops, as well as our review of BellSouth's hot cut, line-sharing and line splitting processes.
AL, KY, MS, NC and SC	WC Docket No. 02-150	FCC 02-260	143	248	<i>Line Sharing.</i> We find, as did the state commissions, that Bellsouth offers nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop in each applicable state. We note that competitive LECs in Mississippi and South Carolina have not yet ordered any line-sharing arrangements from Bellsouth. Because order volumes for line-shared loops are low in each of the states, we look to Bellsouth's line-sharing performance in Georgia to inform our analysis. We further note that no party has alleged that Bellsouth's line-sharing offerings in Mississippi and South Carolina fail to provide nondiscriminatory access to high frequency portion of the loop.

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FCC DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>FCC PROCEEDING</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	
AL, KY, MS, NC and SC	WC Docket No. 02-150	FCC 02-260	143-144	249	Because BellSouth's performance data show that it installs line-sharing arrangements in accordance with the standards approved by the state commissions, we reject Covad's reliance on BellSouth's alleged failure to provision line-sharing arrangements within the time frame specified in its interconnection agreement with Covad. Given that BellSouth's line-sharing provisioning intervals for its retail customers and competitive LECs are comparable, and recognizing BellSouth's timeliness performance during the relevant period in Georgia, we find that BellSouth's installation performance does not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance.
AL, KY, MS, NC and SC	WC Docket No. 02-150	FCC 02-260	144	250	We also reject Covad's claim that BellSouth's line-sharing provisioning and maintenance and repair performance precludes a grant of long distance authority. Although BellSouth's performance with regard to certain measures-customer trouble reports within 30 days of installation and repeat trouble reports within 30 days of maintenance or repair-is out of parity in certain months, we find these disparities in reported performance do not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance.
AL, KY, MS, NC and SC	WC Docket No. 02-150	FCC 02-260	145	250	BellSouth generally performed at or above parity with regard to line-sharing maintenance, as measured by its trouble report rate for line-sharing arrangements, during the relevant period. In these circumstances, we conclude that BellSouth's customer trouble report and repeat trouble report rates for line sharing do not support a finding of checklist noncompliance.
AL, KY, MS, NC and SC	WC Docket No. 02-150	FCC 02-260	H-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
AL, KY, MS, NC and SC	WC Docket No. 02-150	FCC 02-260	H-27	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York</i> and <i>SWBT Texas Orders</i> .
MI	WC Docket No. 03-138	FCC 03-228	73	127	Our conclusion is based on our review of Michigan Bell's performance for all loop types, which include voice grade loops, xDSL-capable loops, digital loops, high capacity loops, as well as our review of Michigan Bell's processes for hot cut provisioning, and line sharing and line splitting.
MI	WC Docket No. 03-138	FCC 03-228	78	133	<i>Line Sharing and Line Splitting</i> . Based on the evidence in the record, we find, as did the Michigan Commission, that Michigan Bell provides nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop (line sharing.) Michigan Bell had approximately 73,000 high frequency portion of the loop (HFPL) UNEs in service as of the end of 2002. Michigan Bell's performance data for the line shared loops demonstrate that it is generally in compliance with the parity and benchmark measures established in Michigan.
MI	WC Docket No. 03-138	FCC 03-228	81	140	...the Michigan Commission required Michigan Bell to establish procedures for migrations from line sharing to line splitting, line sharing to UNE-P, and UNE-P to line splitting.

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FCC DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>FCC PROCEEDING</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	
NV	WC Docket No. 03-10	FCC 03-80	33	65	<i>Line Sharing and Line Splitting.</i> Based on the evidence in the record, we find, as did the Nevada Commission, that Nevada Bell demonstrates that it provides nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop. Given the low number of orders in Nevada...we examine Pacific Bell's performance in California. To the extent that there were discrepancies in Pacific Bell's California performance, with regard to line sharing and line splitting trouble reports after provisioning, such discrepancies in Pacific Bell's California performance with regard to line sharing and line splitting trouble reports after provisioning, such discrepancies do not appear to be competitively significant. Moreover, as discussed in the high-capacity loop section above, Pacific Bell's new line testing procedures have lowered the percentage of trouble reports.
NV	WC Docket No. 03-10	FCC 03-80	D-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
NV	WC Docket No. 03-10	FCC 03-80	D-27	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the Bell Atlantic New York and SWBT Texas Orders.
CA	WC Docket No. 02-306	FCC 02-330	71	123	Our conclusion is based on our review of Pacific Bell's performance for all loop types, which include voice-grade loops, x-DSL-capable loops, digital loops high-capacity loops, as well as our review of Pacific Bell's processes for hot cut provisioning, and line sharing and line splitting.
CA	WC Docket No. 02-306	FCC 02-330	76	132	<i>Line Sharing and Line Splitting.</i> Based on the evidence in the record, we find, as did the California Commission, that Pacific Bell provides non discriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop. For the relevant five-month period, Pacific Bell provisioned over 16,000 line sharing orders in California for unaffiliated competitive LECs. Pacific Bell's performance data for line-shared loops demonstrates that it is generally in compliance with the parity and benchmark measures established in California.
CA	WC Docket No. 02-306	FCC 02-330	C-30	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
CA	WC Docket No. 02-306	FCC 02-330	C-30	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York</i> and <i>SWBT Texas Orders</i> .
CO, ID, IA, MT, NB, ND, UT, WA, and WY	WC Docket No. 02-314	FCC 02-332	182	335	Our conclusion is based on our review of Qwest's performance for all loop types-which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, xDSL capable loops and high capacity loops-as well as hot cut provisioning and our review of Qwest's processes for line sharing and line splitting.

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FCC DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>FCC PROCEEDING</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	
CO, ID, IA, MT, NB, ND, UT, WA, and WY	WC Docket No. 02-314	FCC 02-332	189	342	<i>Line Sharing and Line Splitting.</i> We find that Qwest demonstrates that it provides nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop, and access to network elements necessary for competing carriers to provide line splitting. Qwest provides line sharing pursuant to its SGAT and state-approved interconnection agreements. According to Qwest, as of September 30, 2002, it had in service approximately 5,885 unbundled shared loops in Colorado, 4 unbundled shared loops in Idaho, 312 unbundled shared loops in Iowa, 309 unbundled shared loops in Montana, 126 unbundled shared loops in Nebraska, no unbundled shared loops in North Dakota, 1,858 unbundled shared loops in Utah, 5,850 unbundled shared loops in Washington, and 95 unbundled shared loops in Wyoming.
CO, ID, IA, MT, NB, ND, UT, WA, and WY	WC Docket No. 02-314	FCC 02-332	189	343	Both Covad and Touch America argue that Qwest's performance under measures of maintenance and repair timeliness reveals multiple disparities. We recognize that Qwest's performance with regard to line sharing maintenance and repair measure-the All Troubles Cleared Within 24 Hours metric-is out of parity for some months in Colorado, Utah, and Washington, but we do not find that these disparities warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance given the relatively low volumes observed during these months and the difficulties associated with drawing strong conclusions based on low volumes of data.
CO, ID, IA, MT, NB, ND, UT, WA, and WY	WC Docket No. 02-314	FCC 02-332	190	344	We note that Qwest's performance with regard to two other line-sharing maintenance and repair measures-the All Troubles Cleared Within 48 Hours and the Mean Time to Restore metrics-is also out of parity for some recent months in Colorado, Utah and Washington. First, the All Troubles Cleared Within 48 Hours metric shows that Qwest missed the parity standard for two of the relevant months in Colorado, Utah and Washington. Next, Qwest's performance for the Mean Time to Restore metric indicates that Qwest missed parity for dispatch orders for two of the relevant months in Colorado and Utah, and for three of the relevant months in Washington.
CO, ID, IA, MT, NB, ND, UT, WA, and WY	WC Docket No. 02-314	FCC 02-332	192	347	Covad also argues that maintenance and repair performance for line shared loops would improve if Qwest provided competitive LECs with the same "router test" for end-to-end data continuity that Qwest provides for its own customers as part of the provisioning process. Specifically, Covad states that many of the line shared loop orders for which it receives a service order completion notice suffer from missing or incomplete cross-connects in the central office that would be detected by the use of the router test, and could be corrected prior to delivery of the line shared loop.
CO, ID, IA, MT, NB, ND, UT, WA, and WY	WC Docket No. 02-314	FCC 02-332	193	347	As noted above, we find that Qwest's overall performance with respect to maintenance and repair of the line shared loops is nondiscriminatory.
CO, ID, IA, MT, NB, ND, UT, WA, and WY	WC Docket No. 02-314	FCC 02-332	K-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FCC DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>FCC PROCEEDING</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	
CO, ID, IA, MT, NB, ND, UT, WA, and WY	WC Docket No. 02-314	FCC 02-332	K-27	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York and SWBT Texas Orders</i> .
NM, OR, and SD	WC Docket No. 03-11	FCC 03-81	53	93	Our conclusion is based on our review of Qwest's performance for all loop types-which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, xDSL capable loops and high capacity loops-as well as hot cut provisioning and our review of Qwest's processes for line sharing and line splitting.
NM, OR, and SD	WC Docket No. 03-11	FCC 03-81	F-27	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
NM, OR, and SD	WC Docket No. 03-11	FCC 03-81	F-28	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York and SWBT Texas Orders</i> .
MN	WC Docket No. 03-90	FCC 03-142	29	53	Our conclusion is based on our review of Qwest's performance for all loop types-which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, xDSL capable loops and high capacity loops-as well as hot cut provisioning and our review of Qwest's processes for line sharing and line splitting.
MN	WC Docket No. 03-90	FCC 03-142	C-26	50	On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL.)
MN	WC Docket No. 03-90	FCC 03-142	C-27	51	To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the <i>Line Sharing Order</i> , the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the <i>Bell Atlantic New York and SWBT Texas Orders</i> .

