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In response to the requirement set forth in the Commission's August 21, 2000 Procedural Order in the above-captioned proceeding, Z-Tel Communications, Inc. ("Z-Tel") hereby sets forth its proposed issues for Phase III of the proceeding. Z-Tel submits that the following issues are encompassed by the scope of Phase II, but were not addressed by Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") in its direct testimony in Phase II. Accordingly, it is appropriate to include these issues in Phase III.

Z-Tel Issue 1: What rate should be used for the unbundled local switching ("ULS") network element?

Rationale in Brief: The rate for the ULS network element is critical to competitive to providers, especially those such as Z-Tel, which utilize the unbundled network element platform ("UNE-P") to compete with incumbent carriers. The Commission should examine the level of the ULS network element rate in this proceeding, and determine whether it is consistent with TELRIC principles.

...
Z-Tel Issue 2: Should the rate for the unbundled local switching ("ULS") network element be derived from a legacy cost model including usage-sensitive components, or should it be a flat-rated charge based on the forward-looking cost per port of utilizing all functionalities of the local switch?

Rationale in Brief: Legacy cost models for deriving the cost of local switching cannot properly be utilized to generate costs for the ULS network element for two principal reasons: (i) they were designed for an entirely different purpose, viz., to allocate costs of individual features of a local switch among users of less than all features; and (ii) they place undue emphasis on usage-sensitive components to model the cost. These flaws result in the inflation of the cost of the ULS network element. The cost of the ULS network element should be modeled on an entirely different basis, since it assumes use by the purchaser of all switch features. In addition, the usage-sensitive components of the ULS network element cost, if any, are minimal and should not be overemphasized. The correct model would derive costs based on the forward-looking cost of the switch, the port capacity that particular switch supports, and the portion of that capacity leased by a given purchaser of the ULS network element.

Z-Tel Issue 3: Should the purchase of the ULS network element include access to all existing line class codes ("LCCs") that define basic and customized calling scopes that reside in a local switch?

Rationale in Brief: The LCCs resident in the incumbent’s switch define basic and customized calling scopes (such as extended area service or “EAS”) for the subscriber to a given line. As part of the ordering and purchase of the ULS network element, competitive carriers should be allowed to choose between the available pool of LCCs. Access to resident LCCs is necessary to enable competitive carriers to use combinations of UNEs or UNE-P to originate and deliver the full range of call types within a LATA.

...
Z-Tel Issue 4: What non-recurring rate, if any, should be charged to a competitive carrier for access to LCCs upon ordering of the ULS network element?

Rationale in Brief: To the extent that the Commission considers that an additional charge is necessary for competitive access to LCCs resident in the incumbent's switch, the Commission should set a permanent, non-recurring rate for such access. Z-Tel submits that it is in any event inappropriate to charge a recurring rate, since it is a one-time transaction. In addition, the transaction is simply sharing existing information in the possession of the incumbent, and requires at most only a minimal effort. Accordingly, any non-recurring fee should be very small. Moreover, Z-Tel submits that any such non-recurring fee should only be applicable in cases in which a competitive carrier requests continuation of a customized LCC or the addition of a new, customized LCC to the ULS network element for a new unbundled loop.

Z-Tel Issue 5: Should competitive carriers be enabled to originate and deliver all types of calls, including local, EAS and intraLATA toll calls, within a LATA employing UNE combinations or UNE-P without delivering the calls to an interexchange carrier ("IXC")?

Rationale in Brief: The Commission should clarify that competitive carriers can utilize UNE combinations and UNE-P to originate and deliver any type of call within a LATA, including intraLATA toll calls, in the same fashion as the incumbent carrier, viz., by routing such calls utilizing the incumbent’s interoffice network. If competitive carriers are forced to deliver UNE-P generated intraLATA toll traffic to an IXC (causing the IXC to incur intrastate terminating access charges), this artificially inflates the cost of handling this type of traffic for competitive carriers, and yields a significant, and undue, competitive advantage to the incumbent local carrier. Z-Tel notes that Qwest originates and delivers intraLATA toll calls in Arizona using its interoffice network, and does not hand off those calls to an IXC.
Z-Tel Issue 6: What rates should be used for signaling and call-related database items, including Advanced Intelligent Network ("AIN") items?

Rationale in Brief: The Commission should establish permanent, cost-based rates associated with SS7 queries and responses, AIN service management system ("SMS") access and AIN Toolkit services (including required access to central office switch triggers). Allowing competitors such as Z-Tel to access AIN components and call-related databases promotes innovation and allows competitors to utilize all of the features and functions of the central office switch in conjunction with call-related databases, as required by the Telecommunications Act of 1996.
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