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§ 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 by information on the speed and 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]

§ 51.231 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 power at which the signal will be transmitted.

[65 FR 1345, Jan. 10, 2000]
§ 51.301 Duty to negotiate.

(a) An incumbent LEC shall negotiate in good faith the terms and conditions of agreements to fulfill the duties established by sections 251 (b) and (c) of the Act.

(b) A requesting telecommunications carrier shall negotiate in good faith the terms and conditions of agreements described in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) If proven to the Commission, an appropriate state commission, or a court of competent jurisdiction, the following actions or practices, among others, violate the duty to negotiate in good faith:

(1) Demanding that another party sign a nondisclosure agreement that precludes such party from providing information requested by the Commission, or a state commission, or in support of a request for arbitration under section 252(b)(2)(B) of the Act;

(2) Demanding that a requesting telecommunications carrier attest that an agreement complies with all provisions of the Act, federal regulations, or state law;

(3) Refusing to include in an arbitrated or negotiated agreement a provision that permits the agreement to be amended in the future to take into account changes in Commission or state rules;

(4) Conditioning negotiation on a requesting telecommunications carrier first obtaining state certifications;

(5) Intentionally misleading or coercing another party into reaching an agreement that it would not otherwise have made;

(6) Intentionally obstructing or delaying negotiations or resolutions of disputes;

(7) Refusing throughout the negotiation process to designate a representative with authority to make binding representations, if such refusal significantly delays resolution of issues; and

(8) Refusing to provide information necessary to reach agreement. Such refusal includes, but is not limited to:

(i) Refusal by an incumbent LEC to furnish information about its network that a requesting telecommunications carrier reasonably requires to identify the network elements that it needs in order to serve a particular customer; and

(ii) Refusal by an incumbent LEC to furnish cost data that would be relevant to setting rates if the parties were in arbitration.

[65 FR 1346, Jan. 10, 2000]

Subpart D—Additional Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers

§ 51.303 Preexisting agreements.

(a) All interconnection agreements between an incumbent LEC and a telecommunications carrier reasonably requires to identify the network elements that it needs in order to serve a particular customer; and

(b) Interconnection agreements negotiated before February 8, 1996, between Class A carriers, as defined by §32.11(a)(1) of this chapter, shall be filed by the parties with the appropriate state commission no later than June 30, 1997, or such earlier date as the state commission may require.

(c) If a state commission approves a preexisting agreement, it shall be made available to other parties in accordance with section 252(i) of the Act and §51.809 of this part. A state commission may reject a preexisting agreement on the grounds that it is inconsistent with