Docket No. 11900-U

In Re: Investigation of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Provision of Unbundled Network Elements for the xDSL Service Providers

ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

On February 15, 2000, Rhythms Links Inc. filed a Petition to Initiate Docket to Investigate BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Provision of Unbundled Network Elements ("Petition"). The Petition requested that the Commission initiate a generic proceeding to consider BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s ("BellSouth") provision of unbundled network elements ("UNEs") to CLECs that provide DSL services and other advanced services. On March 21, 2000, the Commission issued a Procedural and Scheduling Order, initiating this docket to consider BellSouth's provision of unbundled network elements ("UNEs") to CLECs that provide DSL services and other advanced services.

I. JURISDICTION AND PROCEEDINGS

Under the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Federal Act), state Commissions are authorized to set rates and pricing policies for interconnection and access to unbundled elements. In addition to its jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Sections 251 and 252 of the Federal Act, the Commission also has general authority and jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceeding, conferred upon the Commission by Georgia's Telecommunications and Competition Development Act of 1995 (Georgia Act), O.C.G.A. §§46-5-160 *et seq.*, and generally O.C.G.A. §§ 46-1-1 *et seq.,* 46-2-20, 46-2-21, and 46-2-23.

Hearings took place before the Commission on January 29 through February 1, 2001. On March 1, 2001, BellSouth, the Data Coalition, AT&T Communications of the Southern States ("AT&T"), WorldCom, Inc., and Sprint Communications Company, L.P. ("Sprint") filed briefs with the Commission. On March 27, 2001, BellSouth filed with the Commission a Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement") with Rhythms Links, Inc., Covad Communications Company, BlueStar Networks, Inc., and BroadSlate Networks of Georgia, Inc. (Attachment 1).

The Commission has before it the testimony, evidence, arguments of counsel and all appropriate matters of record enabling it to reach its decision.

II. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Issue 1 xDSL Loops

(a) Do any xDSL loops need to be designed?

The Commission approves the resolution contained in the Settlement Agreement.

(b) What are the appropriate recurring and nonrecurring charges for the nondesigned xDSL loops to be offered by BellSouth?

The Commission approves the resolution contained in the Settlement Agreement.

(c) What are the appropriate recurring and nonrecurring charges for the xDSL loops currently offered by BellSouth (ADSL, HDSL, UCL short and long)?

In the Second Procedural and Scheduling Order, the Commission ordered BellSouth to file with its cost studies all comprehensive work papers and documents that disclose and explain the basis for all BellSouth's study assumptions, inputs, and underlying analysis. On November 13, 2000, BellSouth filed cost studies supporting its proposed nonrecurring rates for the ADSL, HDSL, UCL-short, and UCL-long rates in this docket. BellSouth offered testimony supporting these cost studies.

BellSouth and the CLECs differed over whether BellSouth's proposed rates reflected costs based on efficient task times for a forward-looking network. The FCC has interpreted the Federal Act's mandate for just and reasonable rates for network elements based on the cost of providing the network element to require forward-looking costs assuming "the most efficient network architecture, sizing technology, and operating decisions that are operationally feasible and currently available to the industry." First Report and Order, *In re: Implementation of Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, 11 FCC Rcd 15499, ¶ 620 (Aug. 8, 1996), *vacated in part, Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, 120 F.3d 753 (8th Cir. 1997), *rev'd in part, aff'd in part MCI Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 119 S. Ct. 721 (1999) ("First Report and Order").

BellSouth argued that its cost studies reflected the recurring and nonrecurring costs it expects to incur in providing unbundled network elements ("UNEs") on a going-forward basis in Georgia. (BellSouth Brief, p. 8). BellSouth stated that it developed these rates using (1) the BellSouth TELRIC calculator, (2) the BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, (3) the Loop Model, and (4) the Shared and Common Cost Model. *Id.* BellSouth contends that the since no other party to the proceeding submitted any cost study of its own, that the Commission must use BellSouth's cost studies to establish rates in this proceeding. *Id.*

The Data Coalition did not agree that BellSouth's studies complied with TELRIC. The Data Coalition stated that BellSouth's nonrecurring cost studies "were not based on work flow, task times or probability factors considering a forward-looking network design." (Data Coalition Brief, p. 20). In support of this criticism, the Data Coalition pointed out that BellSouth's proposed rates were as much as ten to eleven times higher than the rates approved in Texas and California. *Id.* at p. 21. Further, the Data Coalition argued that BellSouth's witness did not have the adequate experience provisioning xDSL loops to support the task times underlying BellSouth's cost studies. The Data Coalition argued that BellSouth's cost studies reflect "greatly inflated" times for multiple aspects of xDSL loop provisioning. *Id.* at p. 22.

The Commission does not agree that it is bound to adopt BellSouth's cost studies because other parties did not file cost studies. The Commission may evaluate the critiques of BellSouth's cost studies advanced by other parties.

Recurring Rates

In this docket, BellSouth proposed that the Commission reconfirm the recurring rates established in Docket No. 7061-U for the ADSL and HDSL loops. For the UCL-short and UCL-long loops, BellSouth proposed recurring rates using the same methodology adopted by this Commission in Docket No. 7061-U. Several CLECs agreed to accept these recurring rates as part of a settlement of a number of issues in the docket. The Commission finds that the following rates are just, reasonable and fall within the range that a reasonable application of TELRIC would produce. The permanent recurring rates are as follows:

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3
2-wire ADSL Compatible Loop	$ 11.23	$ 12.97	$ 20.62
2-wire HDSL Compatible Loop	$7.88	$9.09	$14.46
4-wire HDSL Compatible Loop	$10.39	$12.00	$19.07
2-wire UCL-Long	$35.56	$41.07	$65.28
2-wire UCL-Short	$12.02	$13.88	$22.07

Nonrecurring Rates

After considering the testimony and arguments presented on these issues, the Commission agrees with the Data Coalition that BellSouth's proposed rates should be modified significantly. The evidence in the record is insufficient to support BellSouth's proposed nonrecurring rates for the ADSL, HDSL, UCL-short and UCL-long loops. The Commission hereby orders BellSouth to perform a time and motion study for the tasks included in the nonrecurring charges for the HDSL, UCL-short and UCL-long and file them with the Commission when the Commission schedules its next generic pricing docket. The rates approved by the Commission are just, reasonable and fall within the range that a reasonable application of TELRIC would produce. Table 1 reflects the nonrecurring charges proposed by BellSouth, and Table 2 shows the nonrecurring charges that the Commission approves in this matter.

Table 1

BellSouth Proposed Nonrecurring Charges

	Connect	Additive	Disconnect	Total
ADSL w/LMU	$ 268.96	$ 12.91	$ 115.19	$ 397.06
ADSL w/o LMU	$ 190.26	$ 12.91	$ 97.18	$ 300.35
HDSL w/LMU	$ 286.08	$ 12.91	$ 115.19	$ 414.18
HDSL wo/LMU	$ 207.38	$ 12.91	$ 97.18	$ 317.47
UCL-Short w/LMU	$ 267.12	$ 12.91	$ 115.19	$ 395.22
UCL-Short wo/LMU	$ 188.42	$ 12.91	$ 97.18	$ 298.51
UCL-Long w/LMU	$ 267.12		$ 115.19	$ 382.31
UCL-Long wo/LMU	$ 188.42		$ 97.18	$ 285.60

Table 2

	Connect	Additive	Disconnect•	Total
ADSL w/LMU	$44.69 first $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34
ADSL w/o LMU	$44.69 first $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34
HDSL w/LMU	$44.69 first $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34
HDSL wo/LMU	$44.69 fist $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34
UCL-Short w/LMU	$44.69 first $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34
UCL-Short wo/LMU	$44.69 first $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34
UCL-Long w/LMU	$44.69 first $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34
UCL-Long wo/LMU	$44.69 first $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34

- Pursuant to Docket 7061-U, Disconnect charges will apply at the time of disconnection by the CLEC.

(d) What are the appropriate provisioning intervals for xDSL loops?

The Commission approves the resolution of this issue contained in the Settlement Agreement.

ISSUE 2 <u>Two-wire universal digital channel loops</u>

(a) What are the appropriate recurring and nonrecurring charges for the two-wire universal digital channel (also know as the IDSL-capable loop) ("UDC/IDSL") loop?

<u>Recurring Rates</u>

Several of the parties and BellSouth agreed that the recurring rate for the UDC/IDSL should be equal to the recurring rate for the ISDN unbundled loop established by the Georgia Commission in Docket No. 7061-U. These rates are interim and subject to true-up once the Commission establishes a new recurring rate for the ISDN unbundled loop in the generic cost docket that will be held later this year. Consistent with the Commission order in Docket No. 7061-U, these rates are reasonable and fall within the range that a reasonable application of TELRIC would achieve. These rates are as follows:

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3
Universal Digital Channel/IDSL-Compatible Loop	$ 21.89	$ 25.27	$ 40.17

<u>Nonrecurring Rates</u>

The evidence in the record is insufficient to support BellSouth's proposed nonrecurring rates for the UDC/IDSL-compatible loop. The Commission finds that BellSouth's workflows, task times and probability factors need to be reviewed in greater detail to ensure that they reflect a forward looking network design. The Commission hereby orders BellSouth to perform a time and motion study for the tasks included in the nonrecurring charges for the UDC/IDSL and file them when the Commission schedules its next generic pricing docket. The Commission finds that promotion of competition requires immediate resolution of pricing issues for CLECs providing xDSL service in Georgia. As a result, the Commission establishes the following nonrecurring rates as interim rates. After 18 months has passed the Commission will revisit these rates in an upcoming cost docket. The Commission finds that these interim rates are reasonable and fall within the range that a reasonable application of TELRIC principles would achieve.

Loop	Installations	Additive	Disconnect•	Total
UDC/IDSL	$44.69 first $31.55 add.	$ 0	$25.65 first $7.06 add.	$70.34

• Pursuant to Docket No. 7061-U, Disconnect charges will apply at the time of disconnection by the CLEC.

Issue 3 Digital Loop Carriers

(a) Should the Commission require BellSouth to provide CLECs with access to DSL capable loops that traverse fiber-fed digital loop carrier ("DLC") systems?

(b) Should the Commission require BellSouth to provide CLECs with the opportunity to specify the line cards which would be placed in the DLC systems for the individual loops ordered by the CLECs?

(c) If the Commission determines that BellSouth must provide CLECs with access to DSL capable loops that traverse fiber-fed digital loop carrier ("DLC") systems, should the Commission establish a future docket to set rates, terms and conditions for this functionality?

The Commission approves the resolution of this issue contained in the Settlement Agreement.

Issue 4 Loop Deconditioning

(a) Is it appropriate to impose an additional or separate charge for loop conditioning?

(b) If a charge for loop conditioning is imposed, should it be included in loop charges or should loop deconditioning be charged as a separate network element (referred to as "Unbundled Loop Modification")?

(c) If the cost of loop deconditioning should be included in loop charges, what impact, if any, would this decision have on the appropriate recurring and nonrecurring loop charges?

(d) If the cost of loop deconditioning should be charged as a separate network element, what is the appropriate charge?

Loop Deconditioning is the process of removing from loops load coils, excessive bridged tap, DAMLs and other interferors that may impede xDSL service or other advanced services. With respect to costs ILECs impose on CLECs for line conditioning, the FCC defered to state commissions to ensure that ILECs comply with the FCC's pricing rules for nonrecurring costs. *In the Matter of Implementation of Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* CC Docket No. 96-98, Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,(November 5, 1999) ¶ 194 ("UNE Remand Order"). BellSouth proposed three nonrecurring rates for loop conditioning: (1) ULM Load Coil/Equipment Removal-Short; (2) ULM Load Coil/Equipment Removal – Long; and (3) ULM – Bridged Tap Removal. (BellSouth Post-Hearing Brief, p. 29). In addition, BellSouth proposed a ULM- Additive rate to recover part of the cost of removing load coils on copper loops of less than 18,000 feet. *Id.* at 30. While not disputing that "a forward-looking network being designed today would not include load coils," BellSouth maintains that it still incurs costs related to the removal of these elements, and that it is entitled to recover these costs. *Id*.

The Data Coalition argues that a forward looking network would not include load coils and excessive bridged tap, and therefore, the forward looking cost of removing such impediments is zero. (Tr. 921). They cite several other state commissions that have reached the conclusion that the forward-looking cost of deconditioning is zero.[1] (Data Coalition Post-Hearing Brief, p. 46). Likewise, they indicate that outside plant engineering guidelines in place for over twenty years preclude placing or maintaining the network with these impediments on loops shorter than 18,000 feet. (Tr. pp. 916-918). The Data Coalition notes that BellSouth does not impose a nonrecurring charge on its retail ISDN or T-1 customers that require deconditioned loops, and thus, no charge should be imposed on CLECs seeking the same deconditioned loops. (Tr. p. 922). Finally, if a deconditioning charge is imposed, the Data Coalition argues that it should be based on conditioning 50 loops at a time with reasonable task times, supplied by their expert witness. (Tr. 1070-1080).

BellSouth's workflows, task times and probability factors need to be reviewed in greater detail to ensure that they reflect a forward looking network design. The Commission finds that BellSouth shall perform a time and motion study for the tasks included in the NRCs and file them with the Commission when the Commission schedules its next generic pricing docket. In order to promote competition, the Commission approves an interim rate of $0.00. After 18 months, this interim rate will be replaced by a permanent rate set in the upcoming generic cost docket. The Commission finds that this interim rate is reasonable and complies with TELRIC principles.

Issue 5 Line Sharing

Line sharing enables CLECs to use the high frequency portion of an existing voice grade loop for xDSL services. Thus, a single voice grade loop carries both voice and data signals without interfering with each other. This feature benefits consumers because it allows xDSL services to be provisioned in a short period of time and at lower overall costs. For competitors, line sharing provides an opportunity to compete directly with BellSouth's largest xDSL offering, which utilizes a customer's existing voice loop for ADSL service. This docket afforded the Commission an opportunity to establish rates, terms and conditions governing this important UNE.

(a) What is the method by which CLECs should be provided access for testing purposes in line sharing arrangements?

The parties do not dispute that CLECs need test access for line sharing. The issue is where the CLECs should be allowed to test. BellSouth's position is that the testing should take

---

[1] *Consolidated Petitions of New England Telephone and Telegraph, et al., DPU/DTE* 96-73/73, Phase 4-L (October 14, 1999); Public Utility Commission of Texas, *Arbitration Award*, Dockets Nos. 20226 and 20272, November 30, 1999; Utah Public Service Commission Phase III Part C Report and Order in Docket No. 94-999-01, issued June 2, 1999.

place with bantam test jacks, while CLECs have requested testing access at the main distribution frame ("MDF"). BellSouth opposes the CLECs' request because it argues that testing at the MDF would adversely impact voice service. In addition, BellSouth argues that bantam test jacks allow CLECs to test the loop from the splitter to the Network Interface Device ("NID"). (BellSouth Post-Hearing Brief, p. 35).

The Commission agrees that allowing CLECs to conduct tests directly on the MDF could adversely impact voice service. CLECs may conduct tests through the bantam jack or any other mutually agreed upon place. BellSouth should cooperate with CLECs to ensure that CLECs have access to the loop facility for testing, maintenance and repair activities.

(b) What splitter ownership options should BellSouth be required to offer?

The Commission approves the resolution of this issue contained in the Settlement Agreement.

(c) Where should the splitter be located in line sharing arrangements?

The Data Coalition sponsored testimony that stated CLECs had consistently urged BellSouth to mount the splitter on the MDF. (Joint Rebuttal Testimony of Robert Williams, Michael Zulevic, Joe Riolo, Lans Chase, p. 3). The Data Coalition argued that placement of the splitter on the MDF decreased the length of the line shared loop, enabling CLECs to serve more customers at a greater distance from the central office. (Tr. pp. 1202-1205). WorldCom argued that the MDF is the most efficient placement of the splitter for line sharing. (WorldCom Post-Hearing Brief, p. 10). In support of this position, WorldCom reasoned that this placement "reduces excess cabling, which minimizes the potential for service quality degradation." *Id.* While AT&T did not address this issue specifically in brief, it did state that it generally supported the positions taken by the Data Coalition. (AT&T Post-Hearing Brief, p. 1).

BellSouth countered that placing a splitter on the MDF would lead to frame space exhaustion and pose a greater risk for service interruption, than did placing the splitter in the common area collocation space or in a relay rack in the BellSouth line-up near the MDF. (Tr. 305-306). BellSouth argued that it must maintain flexibility in splitter placement to accommodate the diversity in its central office space.

The Commission finds that the splitter should be placed on relay racks, rather than on the MDF itself. Nonetheless, this placement should not increase the cost of cabling or other activities related to the installation of a splitter.

(d) Should CLECs be able to obtain Splitter Capacity on a Port-by-Port basis?

The Commission approves the resolution of this issue contained in the Settlement Agreement.

(e) How should BellSouth provide access to Line Sharing over fiber-fed loops?

The Commission approves the resolution of this issue contained in the Settlement Agreement.

(f) What are the appropriate recurring and nonrecurring charges for line-sharing?

In its *Advanced Services Order*, the FCC identified five types of direct costs ILECs potentially incur in providing access to line sharing: (1) loops; (2) OSS; (3) cross connects; (4) splitters; and (5) line conditioning. ¶ 136. BellSouth asserts that its proposed rates for line sharing comply with the FCC's requirements. In support of this contention, BellSouth states that its cost studies do not include any costs associated with the local loop, that the parties have reached a settlement on an interim OSS rate, and that its cost studies include the physical components involved in line sharing. (BellSouth Post-Hearing Brief, p. 43).

The Data Coalition, however, contends that BellSouth's proposed recurring and nonrecurring charges for splitters are unreasonable. The Data Coalition argues that BellSouth's cost study includes numerous unexplained costs, and has not employed an efficient methodology to provide line sharing. (Data Coalition Post-Hearing Brief, p. 61).

The evidence in the record is insufficient to support BellSouth's proposed nonrecurring rates and recurring rates for line sharing. The Commission finds that BellSouth's workflows, task times and probability factors need to be reviewed in greater detail to ensure that they reflect a forward looking network design. The Commission hereby orders BellSouth to perform a time and motion study for the tasks included in the nonrecurring and recurring charges for line sharing (including splitter placements and related costs which BellSouth proposes to recover on a recurring basis) and file them when the Commission schedules its next generic pricing docket. The Commission finds that promotion of competition requires immediate resolution of pricing issue for CLECs providing xDSL service in Georgia. As a result, the Commission adopts the Data Coalition proposed nonrecurring and recurring rates for line sharing as interim rates until permanent rates are set in the upcoming cost docket. The Commission finds that these interim rates are reasonable and comply with TELRIC principles.

(g) What are the appropriate intervals for provisioning splitters and collocation augments for line sharing?

The Commission approves the resolution of this issue contained in the Settlement Agreement.

(h) What are the appropriate intervals for provisioning a line shared loop?

The Commission approves the resolution of this issue contained in the Settlement Agreement.

Issue 6 Remote Terminal collocation

(a) What are the appropriate terms and conditions for Remote Terminal Collocation?

(b) What are the appropriate recurring and nonrecurring charges for remote terminal collocation?

The Commission approves the resolution of these issues contained in the Settlement Agreement.

Issue 7 Operations Support Systems

(a) What pre-ordering and ordering functionalities must BellSouth make available to CLECs to support CLECs' ordering of xDSL loops for line sharing, line splitting and standalone xDSL, in what form must BellSouth make such functionalities available, and by when must BellSouth make such functionalities available?

(b) Should BellSouth be required to make available to CLECs an integrated pre-ordering and ordering electronic interface OSS, and if so by what date?

The Commission approves the resolution of these issues contained in the Settlement Agreement.

(c) What are the appropriate OSS charges, if any?

The Data Coalition argues that charges for mechanized loop makeup should be set at zero. However, it urges the Commission to modify BellSouth's proposed charges should the Commission allow BellSouth to impose manual loop makeup charges on CLECs. The Data Coalition again argues that BellSouth's proposed charges are inflated. In this instance, the Data Coalition states that BellSouth's assumptions for the percentage of the loops for which a makeup is requested will not be found in LFACS is greater than admitted in the testimony of BellSouth's own witness. (Data Coalition Post-Hearing Brief, p.84). In addition, the Data Coalition states that the evidence demonstrates that it is not a major imposition to locate information that cannot be found in BellSouth's LFACS database. *Id.*

The Commission finds it appropriate to assess OSS charges on a recurring basis. This enables CLECs to be charged for access to OSS at the volumes that they are using OSS and a reasonable recurring rate. After reviewing the evidence in this case, the Commission finds the following OSS charges comply with TELRIC principles and shall be the permanent OSS rates.

Recurring	
Mechanized Loop Qualification	
OSS Per first 1,000 MLQs	$100
OSS Next 1000 MLQs	$50

SI with LMU w/o Facility Reservation Number	$35
SI with LMU w Facility Reservation Number	$45

Issue 8 What are the appropriate terms and conditions for line splitting?

The Settlement Agreement included a proposed resolution for this issue. The Commission adopts a modified version of this resolution. The Settlement Agreement sets forth a number of circumstances in which BellSouth will continue to own the splitter in a line splitting situation. These situations include:

> when a line sharing arrangement is in place such that a customer receives voice service from BellSouth and xDSL service from a DLEC, and the DLEC leases a BellSouth owned splitter, if the customer switches voice service from BellSouth to another CLEC, the DLEC may continue to lease the BellSouth owned-splitter to provide xDSL service and the CLEC may lease the unbundled network elements necessary to provide voice service.

(Settlement Agreement, p. 7).

The Commission finds that in addition to the above circumstances, it is appropriate for BellSouth to continue to own the splitter when the DLEC wants to serve a new customer with voice and xDSL service.

The Settlement Agreement states that "the applicable recurring charges to be paid by the CLEC for this line splitting arrangement will be the recurring rates for the loop and port established by the Georgia Commission in Docket 10692-U and the two cross connects established by the Commission in Docket 7061-U." (Settlement Agreement, p. 7). The applicable recurring charges to be paid by the CLEC for this linesplitting arrangement will be the recurring rates for the loop and port established by the Georgia Commission in Docket No. 10692-U and the two cross connects established by the Commission in Docket No. 7061-U. For nonrecurring charges to be paid by the CLEC for line splitting, the Settlement Agreement proposes to apply the rate for the loop-port combination (switch as is) established by the Commission in Docket No. 10692-U. *Id.* The Commission finds that the application of this rate is reasonable.

The Commission hereby orders BellSouth to file an OSS implementation schedule for line splitting within two months after issuance of this Order. The implementation of the OSS shall be within six (6) months after the issuance of this order. This is intended to address the unique situation presented with line splitting and shall in no way be construed as precedent setting. It remains the Commission's position that OSS related matters are most appropriately handled through the Change Control Process.

III. INTERIM RATES

Unless specifically noted above, the interim rates set forth in this Order are not subject to true-up. These interim rates are effective as of the date of this Order and shall remain in effect for a period of 18 months from the date of this Order, at which time they will be replaced with permanent rates established in the upcoming generic UNE pricing docket.

IV. TIME AND MOTION STUDIES

BellSouth shall file the required time and motion 90 (ninety) days after this Order. When these studies are filed, BellSouth shall include a narrative description of the scope of the time and motion studies, the sampling methodology used, a description of all assumptions made and all work papers for Staff review.

V. ORDERING PARAGRAPHS

This Commission finds and concludes the rates, terms and conditions set forth above are reasonable and appropriate and should be adopted pursuant to Georgia's Telecommunications and Competition Development Act of 1995 and Sections 251 and 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

WHEREFORE IT IS ORDERED, that all findings, conclusions, statements, and directives made by the Commission and contained in the foregoing sections of this Order are hereby adopted as findings of fact, conclusions of law, statements of regulatory policy, and orders of this Commission.

ORDERED FURTHER, the rates, terms and conditions set forth in the body of this Order are adopted and BellSouth shall submit such compliance filings as are necessary to reflect and implement the standards and mechanism established by this Order.

ORDERED FURTHER, that a motion for reconsideration, rehearing, or oral argument or any other motion shall not stay the effective date of this Order, unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

ORDERED FURTHER, that jurisdiction over these matters is expressly retained for the purpose of entering such further Order or Orders as this Commission may deem just and proper.

The above by action of this Commission in Administrative Session on the 3rd day of April, 2001.

____________________________	____________________________
Reece McAlister Executive Secretary	Lauren McDonald, Jr. Chairman
Date: ______________________	Date: ______________________