

## Federal Communications Commission

## § 51.230

(v) *Adjuncts to services.* Operator services and directory assistance services must be made available to competing providers in their entirety, including access to any adjunct features (e.g., rating tables or customer information databases) necessary to allow competing providers full use of these services.

(d) *Branding of operator services and directory assistance services.* The refusal of a providing local exchange carrier (LEC) to comply with the reasonable request of a competing provider that the providing LEC rebrand its operator services and directory assistance, or remove its brand from such services, creates a presumption that the providing LEC is unlawfully restricting access to its operator services and directory assistance. The providing LEC can rebut this presumption by demonstrating that it lacks the capability to comply with the competing provider's request.

(e) *Disputes—(1) Disputes involving nondiscriminatory access.* In disputes involving nondiscriminatory access to operator services, directory assistance services, or directory listings, a providing LEC shall bear the burden of demonstrating with specificity:

(i) That it is permitting nondiscriminatory access, and

(ii) That any disparity in access is not caused by factors within its control. "Factors within its control" include, but are not limited to, physical facilities, staffing, the ordering of supplies or equipment, and maintenance.

(2) *Disputes involving unreasonable dialing delay.* In disputes between providing local exchange carriers (LECs) and competing providers involving unreasonable dialing delay in the provision of access to operator services and directory assistance, the burden of proof is on the providing LEC to demonstrate with specificity that it is processing the calls of the competing provider's customers on terms equal to that of similar calls from the providing LEC's own customers.

[61 FR 47350, Sept. 6, 1996, as amended at 64 FR 51911, Sept. 27, 1999]

EFFECTIVE DATE NOTE: At 64 FR 51911, Sept. 27, 1999, § 51.217 was amended by revising paragraph (c)(3). This paragraph contains information collection and recordkeeping requirements and will not become effective

until approval has been given by the Office of Management and Budget.

### § 51.219 Access to rights of way.

The rules governing access to rights of way are set forth in part 1, subpart J of this chapter.

### § 51.221 Reciprocal compensation.

The rules governing reciprocal compensation are set forth in subpart H of this part.

### § 51.223 Application of additional requirements.

(a) A state may not impose the obligations set forth in section 251(c) of the Act on a LEC that is not classified as an incumbent LEC as defined in section 251(h)(1) of the Act, unless the Commission issues an order declaring that such LECs or classes or categories of LECs should be treated as incumbent LECs.

(b) A state commission, or any other interested party, may request that the Commission issue an order declaring that a particular LEC be treated as an incumbent LEC, or that a class or category of LECs be treated as incumbent LECs, pursuant to section 251(h)(2) of the Act.

### § 51.230 Presumption of acceptability for deployment of an advanced services loop technology.

(a) An advanced services loop technology is presumed acceptable for deployment under any one of the following circumstances, where the technology:

(1) Complies with existing industry standards; or

(2) Is approved by an industry standards body, the Commission, or any state commission; or

(3) Has been successfully deployed by any carrier without significantly degrading the performance of other services.

(b) An incumbent LEC may not deny a carrier's request to deploy a technology that is presumed acceptable for deployment unless the incumbent LEC demonstrates to the relevant state commission that deployment of the particular technology will significantly degrade the performance of other advanced services or traditional voiceband services.

## § 51.231

(c) Where a carrier seeks to establish that deployment of a technology falls within the presumption of acceptability under paragraph (a)(3) of this section, the burden is on the requesting carrier to demonstrate to the state commission that its proposed deployment meets the threshold for a presumption of acceptability and will not, in fact, significantly degrade the performance of other advanced services or traditional voice band services. Upon a successful demonstration by the requesting carrier before a particular state commission, the deployed technology shall be presumed acceptable for deployment in other areas.

[65 FR 1345, Jan. 10, 2000]

### § 51.231 Provision of information on advanced services deployment.

(a) An incumbent LEC must provide to requesting carriers that seek access to a loop or high frequency portion of the loop to provide advanced services:

(1) Uses in determining which services can be deployed; and information with respect to the spectrum management procedures and policies that the incumbent LEC.

(2) Information with respect to the rejection of the requesting carrier's provision of advanced services, together with the specific reason for the rejection; and

(3) Information with respect to the number of loops using advanced services technology within the binder and type of technology deployed on those loops.

(b) A requesting carrier that seeks access to a loop or a high frequency portion of a loop to provide advanced services must provide to the incumbent LEC information on the type of technology that the requesting carrier seeks to deploy.

(1) Where the requesting carrier asserts that the technology it seeks to deploy fits within a generic power spectral density (PSD) mask, it also must provide Spectrum Class information for the technology.

(2) Where a requesting carrier relies on a calculation-based approach to support deployment of a particular technology, it must provide the incumbent LEC with information on the speed and

## 47 CFR Ch. I (10–1–08 Edition)

power at which the signal will be transmitted.

(c) The requesting carrier also must provide the information required under paragraph (b) of this section when notifying the incumbent LEC of any proposed change in advanced services technology that the carrier uses on the loop.

[65 FR 1345, Jan. 10, 2000]

### § 51.232 Binder group management.

(a) With the exception of loops on which a known disturber is deployed, the incumbent LEC shall be prohibited from designating, segregating or reserving particular loops or binder groups for use solely by any particular advanced services loop technology.

(b) Any party seeking designation of a technology as a known disturber should file a petition for declaratory ruling with the Commission seeking such designation, pursuant to § 1.2 of this chapter.

[65 FR 1346, Jan. 10, 2000]

### § 51.233 Significant degradation of services caused by deployment of advanced services.

(a) Where a carrier claims that a deployed advanced service is significantly degrading the performance of other advanced services or traditional voiceband services, that carrier must notify the deploying carrier and allow the deploying carrier a reasonable opportunity to correct the problem. Where the carrier whose services are being degraded does not know the precise cause of the degradation, it must notify each carrier that may have caused or contributed to the degradation.

(b) Where the degradation asserted under paragraph (a) of this section remains unresolved by the deploying carrier(s) after a reasonable opportunity to correct the problem, the carrier whose services are being degraded must establish before the relevant state commission that a particular technology deployment is causing the significant degradation.

(c) Any claims of network harm presented to the deploying carrier(s) or, if subsequently necessary, the relevant state commission, must be supported