

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
Capital Circle Office Center • 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 2, 1997

TO: DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (BARONE)  
DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS (GREER)

RE: DOCKET NO. 961150-TP - PETITION BY SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS  
COMPANY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP D/B/A SPRINT FOR ARBITRATION  
WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. CONCERNING  
INTERCONNECTION RATES, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS, PURSUANT TO  
THE FEDERAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

AGENDA: APRIL 14, 1997 - REGULAR AGENDA - POST HEARING DECISION  
PARTICIPATION IS LIMITED TO COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: I:\PSC\LEG\WP\961150-2.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

Part II of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act) provides for the development of competitive markets in the telecommunications industry. Section 251 of the Act addresses interconnection with the incumbent local exchange carrier and Section 252 sets forth the procedures for negotiation, arbitration, and approval of agreements.

Section 252(b) addresses agreements arrived at through compulsory arbitration. Specifically, Section 252(b)(1) states:

(1) Arbitration. - During the period from the 135th to 160th day (inclusive) after the date on which an incumbent local exchange carrier receives a request for negotiation under this section, the carrier or any other party to the negotiation may petition a State commission to arbitrate any open issues.

Section 252(b)(4)(C) states that the State commission shall resolve each issue set forth in the petition and response, if any, by imposing the appropriate conditions as required. This section requires this Commission to conclude the resolution of any

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03385 APR-26

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

DOCKET NO. 961150-TP  
DATE: APRIL 2, 1997

unresolved issues not later than 9 months after the date on which the local exchange carrier received the request under this section.

On April 15, 1996, Sprint Communications Company, L.P. (Sprint), formally requested negotiations with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth), under Section 251 of the Act. On September 20, 1996, Sprint filed a Petition for Arbitration under the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

On August 8, 1996, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) released its First Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98 (Order). The Order established the FCC's rules and requirements for interconnection, unbundling and resale based on its interpretation of the 1996 Act. The Commission appealed certain portions of the FCC's rules and Order, and requested a stay pending that appeal. On October 15, 1996, the Eight Circuit Court of Appeals granted a stay of those portions of the FCC's rules and Order implementing Section 252(i) and the pricing provisions of the Act.

By the date of the hearing, December 3, 1996, Sprint and BellSouth had reached agreement resolving most of the issues in Sprint's arbitration petition. Accordingly, the Commission's determinations were limited to those issues the parties were unable to resolve. The Commission voted on those issues at its January 7, 1997, Agenda Conference. The Commission's decisions were memorialized in Order No. PSC-97-0122-FOF-TP, issued on February 3, 1997. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth) filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the Order. On February 25, 1997, Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership d/b/a Sprint (Sprint) filed its response to the Motion.

#### STANDARD OF REVIEW

The purpose of a Motion for Reconsideration is to bring to the attention of the Commission some point which it overlooked or failed to consider when it rendered its Order in the First instance. It is not intended to be used to re-argue the whole case merely because the losing party disagrees with the order. Diamond Cab Co. v. King, 146 So.2d 889, 891 (Fla. 1962); Pingree v. Quaintance, 394 So.2d 161 (Fla. 1st DCA 1981).

DOCKET NO. 961150-TP  
DATE: APRIL 2, 1997

### DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

**ISSUE 1:** Should the Commission grant BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-97-0122-FOF-TP?

**RECOMMENDATION:** No. The Commission should not grant BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-97-0122-FOF-TP.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:** On February 18, 1997, BellSouth filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-97-0122-FOF-TP. Sprint filed its response to the Motion on February 25, 1997.

In Order No. PSC-97-0122-FOF-TP, the Commission held that BellSouth should provide Sprint access to customer service records under a blanket letter of authorization. The Commission approved a blanket letter, over prior written authorization from each customer, for BellSouth to allow access to customer service records. The Commission also required BellSouth to develop a real-time operational interface to deliver customer service records to alternative local exchange companies.

In its Motion for Reconsideration, BellSouth requests that the Commission reconsider its decision regarding the issue of access to customer records. As a general premise, BellSouth states that the Commission must reconsider its decision because it "overlooked or failed to consider evidence affecting the outcome of this proceeding or misapplied the law as it pertains to this case."

Specifically, BellSouth requests reconsideration of the Commission's decision to require that BellSouth provide direct, on-line access to the full customer records for preordering purposes before protections against "roaming" are implemented. BellSouth believes that this type of unrestricted access for Sprint jeopardizes the privacy of customers' data. BellSouth argues that this blanket letter of authorization policy for local service will result in slamming problems similar to or worse than those currently facing the interexchange carrier industry. Alternatively, if a blanket letter of authorization is permitted, BellSouth requests that the Commission implement rules governing slamming and unauthorized records access.

Sprint, however, argues that BellSouth's Motion fails to meet the required legal threshold to warrant the Commission's reconsideration of its decision. Sprint believes BellSouth is attempting to reargue an issue and raise new points that it failed to bring out in the hearing on this matter. Sprint contends that BellSouth has provided no legal ground for reconsideration, such as

DOCKET NO. 961150-TP  
DATE: APRIL 2, 1997

disregard for competent evidence or inadequate or unsubstantiated findings.

Sprint also argues that BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration presents no factual basis to warrant reconsideration. Sprint believes that the issue BellSouth presents in its motion was fully discussed and considered by the Commission. Further, Sprint contends that BellSouth, through its witness Calhoun and other representations in this proceeding, has either affirmatively taken or silently acquiesced in a position counter to the one taken in its Motion with regards to a blanket letter of authorization. Sprint claims that BellSouth never questioned the propriety of a blanket letter of authorization prior to the Commission's decision. Sprint also states that a blanket letter of authorization is not prohibited by either federal or state law.

Staff believes BellSouth has failed to meet the standard for reconsideration. The Commission considered at length customer service records at pages 6 - 10 of its Order. With respect to privacy concerns raised by BellSouth, the Commission stated:

Upon review, we find that Section 222 of the Act and Section 364.24(2), Florida Statutes, protect customer proprietary network information. In particular, Section 222(b) imposes on all carriers the obligation to use customer account information responsibly; that is, only for provisioning telecommunications services from which the CPNI is derived. Thus, we believe that the ILECs need not be the sole guardians of the customer's privacy. The ALECs have that duty as well. In addition, Section 222(d)(1) provides for access to CPNI for purposes of initiating telecommunication services without mention of customer approval. Accordingly, we find that the blanket letter of authorization satisfies this section. Order at p. 10.

In addition, the Commission stated:

We recognize BellSouth's concern that providing direct, on-line access to its customer service records allows Sprint or any other ALEC free access to all BellSouth customer records. We do not believe, however, that on-line access should be denied to Sprint

DOCKET NO. 961150-TP  
DATE: APRIL 2, 1997

because BellSouth cannot at this time technically devise a way to provide CSR data without also giving access to all other customer records in its data base. We do not believe the alternatives that BellSouth has proposed provide for a level playing field in this competitive market. In order to compete effectively, new entrants must have immediate access to customer information. If BellSouth wants to prevent disclosure of all customer information it should continue to work toward devising a method to prevent access to all customer information.

Staff also notes that BellSouth's argument that the blanket letter of authorization policy will result in slamming problems is being raised for the first time on reconsideration. Moreover, staff reviewed the transcript and found that there were no facts in the record upon which the Commission could determine whether or not slamming would be a problem. Therefore, BellSouth's argument does not raise a point of fact which the Commission failed to consider in rendering its Order in the first instance. Also, staff believes BellSouth's request to implement rules governing slamming and unauthorized records access does not support a Motion for Reconsideration. Based on the foregoing, staff recommends that the Commission deny BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration.

DOCKET NO. 961150-TP  
DATE: APRIL 2, 1997

**ISSUE 2:** Should this docket be closed?

**RECOMMENDATION:** No. This docket should remain open until the parties have filed their signed arbitration agreement.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:** No. This docket should remain open until the parties have filed their signed arbitration agreement.