

Federal Communications Commission

§ 51.217

LATA boundaries. When a single LATA covers more than one state, the LEC shall use the implementation procedures that each state has approved for the LEC within that state's borders.

(b) A LEC shall implement toll dialing parity through a presubscription process that permits a customer to select a carrier to which all designated calls on a customer's line will be routed automatically. LECs shall allow a customer to presubscribe, at a minimum, to one telecommunications carrier for all interLATA toll calls and to presubscribe to the same or to another telecommunications carrier for all intraLATA toll calls.

(c) A LEC may not assign automatically a customer's intraLATA toll traffic to itself, to its subsidiaries or affiliates, to the customer's presubscribed interLATA or interstate toll carrier, or to any other carrier, except when, in a state that already has implemented intrastate, intraLATA toll dialing parity, the subscriber has selected the same presubscribed carrier for both intraLATA and interLATA toll calls.

(d) Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, states may require that toll dialing parity be based on state boundaries if it deems that the provision of intrastate and interstate toll dialing parity is procompetitive and otherwise in the public interest.

[61 FR 47349, Sept. 6, 1996]

§ 51.213 Toll dialing parity implementation plans.

(a) A LEC must file a plan for providing intraLATA toll dialing parity throughout each state in which it offers telephone exchange service. A LEC cannot offer intraLATA toll dialing parity within a state until the implementation plan has been approved by the appropriate state commission or the Commission.

(b) A LEC's implementation plan must include:

(1) A proposal that explains how the LEC will offer intraLATA toll dialing parity for each exchange that the LEC operates in the state, in accordance with the provisions of this section, and a proposed time schedule for implementation; and

(2) A proposal for timely notification of its subscribers and the methods it proposes to use to enable subscribers to affirmatively select an intraLATA toll service provider.

(3) A LEC that is not a BOC also shall identify the LATA with which it will associate for the purposes of providing intraLATA and interLATA toll dialing parity under this subpart.

[61 FR 47349, Sept. 6, 1996, as amended at 71 FR 65750, Nov. 9, 2006]

§ 51.215 Dialing parity: Cost recovery.

(a) A LEC may recover the incremental costs necessary for the implementation of toll dialing parity. The LEC must recover such costs from all providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service in the area served by the LEC, including that LEC. The LEC shall use a cost recovery mechanism established by the state.

(b) Any cost recovery mechanism for the provision of toll dialing parity pursuant to this section that a state adopts must not:

(1) Give one service provider an appreciable cost advantage over another service provider, when competing for a specific subscriber (*i.e.*, the recovery mechanism may not have a disparate effect on the incremental costs of competing service providers seeking to serve the same customer); or

(2) Have a disparate effect on the ability of competing service providers to earn a normal return on their investment.

[61 FR 47350, Sept. 6, 1996]

§ 51.217 Nondiscriminatory access: Telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance services, and directory listings.

(a) *Definitions.* As used in this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) *Competing provider.* A "competing provider" is a provider of telephone exchange or telephone toll services that seeks nondiscriminatory access from a local exchange carrier (LEC) in that LEC's service area.

(2) *Nondiscriminatory access.* "Nondiscriminatory access" refers to access to telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance and directory listings that is at least equal to the access that the providing local exchange

carrier (LEC) itself receives. Nondiscriminatory access includes, but is not limited to:

(i) Nondiscrimination between and among carriers in the rates, terms, and conditions of the access provided; and

(ii) The ability of the competing provider to obtain access that is at least equal in quality to that of the providing LEC.

(3) *Providing local exchange carrier (LEC).* A “providing local exchange carrier” is a local exchange carrier (LEC) that is required to permit nondiscriminatory access to a competing provider.

(b) *General rule.* A local exchange carrier (LEC) that provides operator services, directory assistance services or directory listings to its customers, or provides telephone numbers, shall permit competing providers of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service to have nondiscriminatory access to that service or feature, with no unreasonable dialing delays.

(c) *Specific requirements.* A LEC subject to paragraph (b) of this section must also comply with the following requirements:

(1) *Telephone numbers.* A LEC shall permit competing providers to have access to telephone numbers that is identical to the access that the LEC provides to itself.

(2) *Operator services.* A LEC must permit telephone service customers to connect to the operator services offered by that customer’s chosen local service provider by dialing “0,” or “0” plus the desired telephone number, regardless of the identity of the customer’s local telephone service provider.

(3) *Directory assistance services and directory listings*—(i) *Access to directory assistance.* A LEC shall permit competing providers to have access to its directory assistance services, including directory assistance databases, so that any customer of a competing provider can obtain directory listings, except as provided in paragraph (c)(3)(iv) of this section, on a nondiscriminatory basis, notwithstanding the identity of the customer’s local service provider, or the identity of the provider for the customer whose listing is requested. A LEC must supply access to directory

assistance in the manner specified by the competing provider, including transfer of the LECs’ directory assistance databases in readily accessible magnetic tape, electronic or other convenient format, as provided in paragraph (c)(3)(iii) of this section. Updates to the directory assistance database shall be made in the same format as the initial transfer (unless the requesting LEC requests otherwise), and shall be performed in a timely manner, taking no longer than those made to the providing LEC’s own database. A LEC shall accept the listings of those customers served by competing providers for inclusion in its directory assistance/operator services databases.

(ii) *Access to directory listings.* A LEC that compiles directory listings shall share directory listings with competing providers in the manner specified by the competing provider, including readily accessible tape or electronic formats, as provided in paragraph (c)(3)(iii) of this section. Such data shall be provided in a timely fashion.

(iii) *Format.* A LEC shall provide access to its directory assistance services, including directory assistance databases, and to its directory listings in any format the competing provider specifies, if the LEC’s internal systems can accommodate that format.

(A) If a LEC’s internal systems do not permit it provide directory assistance or directory listings in the format the specified by the competing provider, the LEC shall:

(1) Within thirty days of receiving the request, inform the competing provider that the requested format cannot be accommodated and tell the requesting provider which formats can be accommodated; and

(2) Provide the requested directory assistance or directory listings in the format the competing provider chooses from among the available formats.

(B) [Reserved]

(iv) *Unlisted numbers.* A LEC shall not provide access to unlisted telephone numbers, or other information that its customer has asked the LEC not to make available, with the exception of customer name and address. The LEC shall ensure that access is permitted to the same directory information, including customer name and address,

Federal Communications Commission

§ 51.230

that is available to its own directory assistance customers.

(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