Verizon-MA'S RESPONSES TO COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY INTERVENORS REGARDING VERIZON-MA'S REVISED LICENSE AGREEMENTS

CLEC	COMMENT submitted by intervenor	Verizon-MA's response
NECTA, Pg. 9	Verizon-MA has lacked real efforts to update its terms, conditions and procedures for pole attachment access to accord with legal requirements.	 Verizon-MA made significant changes in its current license agreements that were included in the draft agreements that were provided to the Department and other parties in December, 1999. Verizon-MA subsequently revised the draft agreements in BA-MA's responses to Information Requests DTE-ATT-4-18 and DTE-ATT-4-19. Verizon-MA 's agreement complies with the Act and the FCC's requirements.
NECTA, Pg. 24	Verizon-MA continues to insist upon subordinating third- party attachment rights to other parties' rights. It insists that cable remain a "licensee," which by law means a pre- emptible user without property rights of permanency.	As noted in Verizon-MA's response to Information Request DTE-NECTA 4-5(b), the rights and responsibilities of the parties are delineated by the terms of the agreement, and the licensee designation is neither pejorative nor inaccurate characterization. Furthermore, see the Department order in D.T.E. 96-98-A and definition of licensee in 220 CMR 45.02
NECTA, Pg. 23	Verizon-MA insists that cable and CLEC "tag" their lines to permit ease of identification, but it will not tag its own lines.	See Verizon-MA 's response to Information Request DTE-NECTA-4-7(f).
NECTA Pg. 23	Verizon-MA insists on reserving capacity on its poles for far longer than a third-party applicant is afforded to attach to space it has applied for. Likewise, Verizon-MA insists on reserving the capacity on anchors.	See Verizon-MA's Supplemental Filing, pg. 43
AT&T, Pg. 52	Verizon-MA's proposed agreement does not meet non-discriminatory standards of the Act. AT&T suggests using its proposed modifications submitted in Jan. 2000.	Verizon-MA disagrees with AT&T's view. Verizon-MA's agreement meets the requirements of the Act.
AT&T, Pg. 53	AT&T objects that Verizon-MA's proposed license be entirely revocable because it provides CLECs with no assurance that they can rely on the license. <i>See</i> , p. 5 of redlined contract.	See Verizon-MA's response to Information Request DTE-NECTA-4-5(c).
AT&T, Pg. 53	Verizon-MA seeks to limit its obligations to provide access if such access would interfere with Verizon-MA's "service requirements." <i>See</i> , p. 6 of redlined contract.	Verizon-MA modified Section 2.6 of the agreements to include the term "existing" in reference to Verizon-MA's service requirements.
AT&T, Pg. 53	Verizon-MA seeks the right to terminate without notice its license in certain situations, rather than a specific notice period to enable CLECs to find alternatives.	This section relates to conduit where it has been licensed, but not occupied in 90 days. Verizon-MA is willing to change wording to allow 30 days notice before termination if a licensed conduit system is not occupied within 90 days.
AT&T,	Verizon-MA has not proposed the inclusion of an	See Section 5.4 of conduit occupancy agreement and 5.3 of

This sheet includes comments submitted by NECTA, AT&T and RCN regarding the revised license agreements for pole attachments and conduit occupancy, and Verizon-MA's responses.

Verizon-MA'S RESPONSES TO COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY INTERVENORS REGARDING VERIZON-MA'S REVISED LICENSE AGREEMENTS

REGARDING VERIZON-WAS REVISED LICENSE AGREEMENTS				
Pg. 53	affirmative obligation on its part to provide additional space if space is insufficient for a CLEC's needs or, alternatively,	pole attachment agreement. This language complies with the FCC requirements. (Checklist Affidavit ¶ 147). In addition,		
	to provide certain other options. AT&T seeks explicit	Procedure 9 incorporated as part of the conduit occupancy		
	treatment of this issue. See, p. 11 of the redlined contract	agreement provides 3 options that include Verizon-MA		
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	seeking alternative paths. (See Verizon-MA's Supplemental		
		Filing, page 43).		
AT&T,	Verizon-MA treats applicants for access to its facilities as	As noted in Verizon-MA's response to Information Request		
Pg. 54	second-class users whose licenses can be easily revoked and	DTE-NECTA 4-5(b), the rights and responsibilities of the		
	does not recognize that CLECs should have the same right of	parties are delineated by the terms of the agreement, and the		
	access and right of occupancy that it recognizes for itself.	licensee designation is neither pejorative nor inaccurate		
		characterization.		
AT&T,	Verizon-MA requires all make-ready work to be performed	See Checklist Reply Affidavit ¶ 156, Supplemental Checklist		
Pg. 53	by itself, at rates and charges over which it has sole control.	Affidavit and Supplemental Filing, pg. 44.		
	AT&T proposes that it be permitted to perform the make			
	ready work if it can do it more cheaply than Verizon-MA.			
AT&T,	AT&T proposes changes to the process for applying for,	Verizon-MA's requirement that a Licensee make a pre-		
Pg. 53	conducting, and paying for records searches, manhole	payment before work is done is a reasonable commercial		
	surveys and make ready. See, e.g., p. 13 of the redlined	practice. This requirement avoids potential disputes by		
	contract.	ensuring the existence of an unambiguous indication that a		
		Licensee has ordered the work to be done. In addition, it		
		reduces the cost of make-ready work by eliminating the		
		carrying charges reflecting the revenue lag associated with		
		subsequent payments.		
AT&T,	Verizon-MA's proposed master license agreement fails to	Verizon-MA has a separate Right of Way agreement		
Pg. 54	include explicitly rights of way to and within buildings and	previously provided in this docket (Harrington Affidavit,		
	building complexes. See, p. 17 of redlined contract.	Attachment 1C). Further, the Department has established		
		rules regarding ROWs in its Order in D.T.E. 98-36-A.		
AT&T,	Verizon-MA refuses to be held responsible for damage it	See Verizon-MA's response to Information Request DTE-		
Pg. 54	may cause to AT&T facilities. See, p. 24 of redlined	NECTA-4-5(c).		
	contract.			
AT&T,	Verizon-MA requires a party using its poles, ducts, conduit	Verizon-MA's requirements are fully consistent with the		
Pg. 54	and rights of way to bear all expenses associated with	FCC. See ¶ 1216 of the FCC's Local Competition Order.		
	rearranging facilities to accommodate the party or to	Also see Checklist Affidavit, ¶ 159.		
	accommodate Verizon-MA's own needs but provides the			
	party with no credit if Verizon-MA realizes additional			
	revenue from the additional space that results from the			
	rearrangement.			

This sheet includes comments submitted by NECTA, AT&T and RCN regarding the revised license agreements for pole attachments and conduit occupancy, and Verizon-MA's responses.

Verizon-MA'S RESPONSES TO COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY INTERVENORS REGARDING VERIZON-MA'S REVISED LICENSE AGREEMENTS

	ALL GITTED IN (G. VENTEN OF VINE VINE VINE VINE VINE VINE VINE VINE			
AT&T,	Verizon-MA grants itself broad preferences in emergency	See Verizon-MA's response to Information Request DTE-4-		
Pg. 54	conditions, and allows Verizon-MA to displace or rearrange	5(g). As noted, Verizon-MA modified the agreement to state		
	a CLEC's facilities to accommodate its own while CLECs	that "all parties will work cooperatively in the case of an		
	are granted no reciprocal rights in emergency situations	emergency to restore service to their respective customers".		
AT&T, Pg. 54	Verizon-MA has not remedied any of the defects that AT&T has identified in the proposed master license agreement.	Verizon-MA's revised license agreement complies with the Communications Act of 1996. Furthermore, Verizon-MA has reviewed comments submitted by CLECs, and has		
		modified certain portions of the agreement. <i>See</i> Verizon-MA's responses to Information Requests DTE-ATT-4-18 and DTE-ATT-4-19.		
AT&T,	Verizon-MA continues to insist upon one-sided indemnities	See Verizon-MA's response to Information Request DTE-		
Pg. 54	in its draft pole and conduit agreements which insure	NECTA-4-5(c).		
	protection of its plant and rights against damage, but which leave the licensees' facilities largely unprotected.			
RCN,	Verizon-MA reserves to itself rights superior to those of the	See Verizon-MA's response to Information Request DTE-		
Pg. 11	attacher to a degree not necessitated by the circumstances, including indemnification obligations.	NECTA-4-5(c).		