



## Guide to Telecom Rules

### CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS

#### TITLE 47 – Telecommunications

#### PART 51 –Interconnection

##### **How to use this document**

The NECA Guide to Telecom Rules is a companion document for use in conjunction with the Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. The GTR augments the e-CFR by providing:

##### **Summaries of significant actions**

This section includes all orders that changed this part. The initial date in each summary refers to the date the FCC released an order; effective dates are at the end of each summary. This section may also include relevant court orders and other significant decisions that may affect this part without changing any specific rules.

##### **Chronologies**

Each section title is accompanied by a chronology listing orders that changed the section. All dates refer to *release dates* of Orders that changed the rule. Clicking on any date sends you to the corresponding significant action summary where you will find effective dates, as well as links to the order for further details. (Some early orders are not available electronically and will not have a link.)

##### **Text of pending rules**

Rules that have been adopted by the FCC but are not yet effective because they are awaiting Federal Register publication or Office of Management and Budget approval, are indicated in the Chronologies section. Click on **(pending text)** to go to the text of the pending rules.

##### **Additional information**

This PDF format is fully searchable and printable. Refer to [Adobe Acrobat®](#) for instructions on how to use.

##### **About the e-CFR**

The e-CFR is a regularly updated, unofficial editorial compilation of CFR material and Federal Register amendments produced by the National Archives and Records Administration's Office of the Federal Register and the Government Printing Office. FCC rules are located in [Title 47](#) of the CFR.

*This document was prepared by NECA, a third party, to complement the Federal Communications Commission's Part 51 Rules. It is believed to be complete and current, but is not intended to supersede 47 C.F.R. Part 51. NECA makes no claim to original U.S. Government works. The copyright notice is limited to the arrangement, compilation, notes and references in this otherwise public domain material.*

## Significant Actions Affecting 47 C.F.R. Part 51

08/08/96 The Commission adopted new Part 51 implementing interconnection requirements set out in Sections 251 and 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Established national rules specifically interpreting, inter alia, section 251(a), (b)(1), (b)(4), (b)(5), (c)(1), (c)(2), (c)(3), (c)(4), and (c)(6). The Commission: concluded the term “interconnection” only refers to the physical linking of two networks for the mutual exchange of traffic; defined a minimum of six “technically feasible” points at which ILECs must provide interconnection; and identified a minimum set of network elements that ILECs must provide on an unbundled basis to requesting telecommunications carriers. The rules require ILECs to provide any technically feasible method of interconnection or access requested by a telecommunications carrier, including physical collocation, virtual collocation, and interconnection at meet points. The Commission established a limited set of rules interpreting a “rural telephone company” exemption from requirements of interconnection under certain circumstances. It also adopted a minimum set of rules regarding notice of standards and procedures that FCC will use if it has to assume responsibilities of a state commission under section 252 of the 1996 Act. Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98; Interconnection between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers, CC Docket No. 95-185; [First Report and Order](#), 11 FCC Rcd 15499 (1996) Effective 9/30/96.

08/08/96 The Commission amended §§ 51.5, 51.305(g) and 51.307(e); and added §§ 51.205, 51.207, 51.209, 51.211, 51.213, 51.215, 51.217, 51.325, 51.327, 51.329, 51.331, 51.333, and 51.335. The new rules addressed ILEC obligations to provide their competitors with dialing parity and nondiscriminatory access to certain services and functionalities, including telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance and directory listings. Furthermore, the new rules required ILECs to make network information disclosures. Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98; Interconnection between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers, CC Docket No. 95-185; Area Code Relief Plan for Dallas and Houston, Ordered by the Public Utility Commission of Texas, NSD File No. 96-8; Administration of the North American Numbering Plan, CC Docket No. 92-237; Proposed 708 Relief Plan and 630 Numbering Plan Area Code by Ameritech-Illinois, IAS File No. 94-102, [Second Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order](#), 11 FCC Rcd 19392 (1996). §§ 51.5, 51.205, 51.207, 51.209, and 51.211 (in part) are effective 10/7/96. §§ 51.211 (in part), 51.213, 51.217, 51.305(g), 51.307(e), 51.325, 51.327, 51.329, 51.331, 51.333, and 51.335 are effective 11/15/96.

09/27/96 The Commission established a flat-rated default proxy range (of \$1.10 to \$2.00) for the non-traffic sensitive costs of basic residential and business line ports associated with the unbundled local switching element, and clarified that the requesting carrier is effectively precluded from using unbundled switching to substitute for switched access services where the loop is used to provide both exchange access to the requesting carrier and local service by the ILEC. Revises §§ 51.513(c)(2) and 51.707(b)(2) to correct typographical errors. Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, Interconnection Between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers, CC Docket No. 95-185, [Order on Reconsideration](#), 4 FCC Rcd 13042 (1996). Effective 10/08/96.

07/18/97 The U.S. Court of Appeals, 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit, vacated the Commission’s pricing rules in §§ 51.501 – 51.515 (except 51.515(b)), 51.601 – 51.611, 51.701 – 51.717, 51.809, 51.405, 51.303, and 51.315(b) – (f). Additionally, the Court struck down §§ 51.305(a)(4) and 51.311(c) on grounds that these rules did not reflect the plain meaning of the 1996 Act. However, the Court upheld the Commission’s remaining unbundling rules after concluding that they did not subvert the goals of the 1996 Act. [Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC](#), 120 F. 3d 753 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir.1997) *amended on rehearing*.

08/18/97 The Commission revised §§ 51.319 and 51.515, and required ILECs to provide competing carriers with access to unbundled transport facilities on a shared basis between an ILEC’s switches. The Order also made several clarifications such as: ILECs are required to provide requesting carriers with access to shared transport for all transmission facilities connecting ILECs’ switches; ILECs are not required to provide shared transport between their switches or their serving wire centers and requesting carriers’ switches; a competing carrier that takes shared or dedicated transport as an

unbundled network element may use such transport to provide interstate exchange access services to customers to whom it provides local exchange service; when a requesting carrier provides interstate exchange access services to customers to whom it also provides local exchange service, the requesting carrier is entitled to assess originating and terminating access charges to interexchange carriers, and it is not obligated to pay access charges to the ILEC. The Commission also concluded that ILECs must permit requesting carriers that purchase unbundled shared transport and unbundled switching to use the same routing table and transport links that the incumbent LEC uses to route and carry its own traffic. Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, Interconnection Between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers, CC Docket No. 95-185, [Third Order on Reconsideration and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#), 12 FCC Rcd 12460 (1997). Effective 09/29/97.

01/25/99 On review of [8<sup>th</sup> Circuit Iowa Utilities](#), the U.S. Supreme Court upheld all but one of the Commission's local competition rules. However, the Court vacated § 51.319, concerning specific unbundling requirements, on grounds that the Commission failed to interpret the statutory terms in a reasonable fashion. The Court held that the Commission had rulemaking authority to carry out provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, which included local competition provisions added by the *1996 Act*, and that the Commission's "pick and choose" rule was reasonable. The Court directed the Commission to give substance to the "necessary" and "impair" standards under the unbundling obligations of section 251(d)(2) of the *1996 Act*, and to develop a limiting standard that is rationally related to the goals of the *1996 Act*. Additionally, the Court required the Commission to consider the availability of alternative network elements outside the incumbent's network. See [AT&T Corp., et. al. v. Iowa Utilities Board, et. al.](#), 525 U.S. 366 (1999).

02/26/99 The Commission issued a declaratory ruling recognizing that ISP-bound traffic is jurisdictionally mixed with the majority being interstate in nature. The Commission stated that the requirement to pay reciprocal compensation was governed, in the absence of a federal rule regarding compensation between carriers, by existing interconnection agreements, subject to interpretations by state commissions. Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98; Inter-Carrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Traffic, CC Docket No. 99-68, [Declaratory Ruling in CC Docket No. 96-98 and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 99-68](#), 14 FCC Rcd 3689 (1999). Effective 02/26/99. (*ISP-Bound Traffic Declaratory Ruling*).

03/10/99 In Title for Part 64, Subpart G and in § 64.702 (b) and § 64.702 (c), the Commission removed words "Communications Common Carrier" and added in their place "Bell Operating Company" and revised last sentence of § 64.702 (d). The Commission concluded that although BOCs must continue to comply with CEI obligations, BOCs should no longer be required to file or obtain pre-approval of CEI plans or plan amendments before initiating or altering an intraLATA information service. Instead, the Commission required BOCs to post their CEI plans and plan amendments on publicly accessible Internet sites and to notify CCB of the posting. The Commission concluded that network information disclosure rules in Computer II and Computer III proceedings were successfully superseded by disclosure rules that the Commission adopted pursuant to the 1996 Act and these rules should be eliminated. The Commission also amended § 51.325. Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services, CC Docket No. 95-20, and 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review of Computer III and ONA Safeguards and Requirements, CC Docket No. 98-10, [Report and Order](#), 14 FCC Rcd 4289 (1999).

03/31/99 The Commission amended §§ 51.5, 51.321, and 51.323 to strengthen the collocation rules. The Commission instituted spectrum compatibility and management rules to allow competitive providers to deploy innovative advanced services technology in a timely manner. Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket No. 98-147, [First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#), 14 FCC Rcd 4761 (1999). Effective 05/13/99, changed to 06/01/99 by 64 Fed. Reg. 23229 (1999).

09/09/99 The Commission revised § 51.217(c)(3) to affirm the requirement that ILECs offer competitors access to telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance, and directory listings that is equal to the access that the ILEC provides itself. The Commission required each ILEC to provide access to adjunct features related to providing operator services and directory assistance

services. Additionally, the Commission precluded ILECs from negotiating exclusive contracts with third party vendors of such adjunct features that would prevent competing providers from negotiating licensing agreements with the vendors for access to their services. Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary Network Information and Other Customer Information, CC Docket No. 96-115, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, Provision of Directory Listing Information Under the Telecommunications Act of 1934, CC Docket No. 99-273, [Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-115, Second Report and Order on Reconsideration of the Second Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 99-273](#), 14 FCC Rcd 15550 (1999). Effective 12/14/99.

11/05/99 The Commission amended §§ 51.5, 51.317, and 51.319, and addressed the “necessary” and “impair” standard in response to the [Supreme Court Iowa Utilities](#). The Commission specified the portions of the nation’s local telephone networks that ILECs must make available to competitors seeking to provide competitive local telephone service. The Commission adopted a standard for determining whether incumbents must unbundle a network element. Applying this standard, the Commission reaffirmed that ILECs must provide unbundled access to six of the original seven network elements that it required to be unbundled in the original 1996 order: 1) loops, including loops used to provide high-capacity and advanced telecommunications services; 2) network interface; 3) local circuit switching (except for larger customers in major urban markets); 4) dedicated and shared transport; 5) signaling and call-related databases; and 6) operations support systems. The Commission determined that it was no longer necessary for ILECs to provide competitive carriers with the seventh element of the original list — access to operator and directory assistance services. The Commission also concluded that, due to competitive deployment of switches in major urban areas, subject to certain conditions, ILECs need not provide access to unbundled local circuit switching for business customers with four or more lines that were located in the densest parts of the top 50 MSAs. Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, [Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#), 15 FCC Rcd 3696 (2000). **Errata**, FCC 99-238, (rel. Dec. 3, 1999), **Errata** (rel. Jan. 14, 2000). Effective 02/17/00.

11/09/99 The Commission amended §§ 51.605 and 51.607, and clarified that digital subscriber line services (xDSL) used to provide high-speed Internet service are not subject to the discounted resale obligations of the 1996 Telecommunications Act when sold in bulk to Internet Service Providers (ISPs), and further clarified that advanced telecommunications services sold directly to residential and business end-users are not exempt from the resale obligations of the Act. Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket No. 98-147, [Second Report and Order](#), 65 Fed. Reg. 6912 (1999). Effective 03/13/00.

12/09/99 The Commission added the definition of “Binder or binder group” to § 51.5, and adopted § 51.319(h) (High Frequency Portion of the Loop), 51.230, 51.231, 51.232 and 51.233. The Commission amended the unbundling rules to require ILECs to provide unbundled access to the high frequency portion of the local loop. Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket Nos. 98-147 and 96-98, [Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 98-147, Fourth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98](#), 14 FCC Rcd 20912 (1999). **Errata** (rel. Dec. 22, 1999). Effective 02/09/00.

03/17/00 The U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, vacated and remanded certain provisions of the Commission’s 03/31/99 Collocation Order. The Court affirmed the rules that required ILECs to expand their collocation offerings to include cageless and adjacent collocation. The Court also affirmed rules that precluded ILECs from imposing unreasonable minimum space requirements on collocators, and the requirement that ILECs allocate the costs of preparing premises for collocation among potential collocators, rather than making the first collocator in a premises responsible for all site preparation charges. However, the Court vacated and remanded for further consideration rules that an ILEC permit the physical collocation of equipment that provides functionalities in addition to interconnection and access to UNEs. In addition, the Court vacated rules that allowed the requesting carrier to select its physical collocation space and precluded the ILEC from requiring collocators to use separate or isolated rooms or floors, and rules that required ILECs to permit collocating carriers to interconnect

their equipment with other collocating carriers through cross connections. [GTE v. FCC](#), 205 F.3d 416 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

03/24/00 The U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, vacated and remanded certain provisions of the Commission's 02/26/99 *ISP Bound Traffic Declaratory Ruling*. The Court ruled that the Commission had not adequately justified the application of its jurisdictional analysis in determining whether a call to an ISP was subject to the reciprocal compensation requirement of section 252(b)(5) of the Telecommunications Act. The Court noted that the Commission failed to apply its definition of "termination" to its analysis, and the cases upon which the Commission relied in its end-to-end analysis could be distinguished on the theory that they involved continuous communication switched by IXCs, as opposed to ISPs, which were not telecommunications providers. Additionally, the Court held that the Commission had not adequately justified the application of its jurisdictional analysis in determining whether a call to an ISP was subject to the reciprocal compensation requirement of section 251(b)(5) of the Telecommunications Act. [Bell Atlantic Telephone v. FCC](#), 206 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

07/18/00 In response to [Supreme Court Iowa Utilities](#), the U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit, reconsidered the substantive merits of the Commission's pricing rules as well as other matters. The 8th Circuit overturned the Commission's TELRIC price rules for interconnection and UNEs. Additionally, the Court upheld its previous decision to vacate the Commission's requirement that ILEC's recombine UNEs for competitors in any technically feasible combination, the standards for reviewing an ILEC's request for a rural exemption from certain interconnection requirements, and the requirement that preexisting interconnection agreements be submitted to the states for review. The Court vacated §§ 51.505(b)(1), 51.609, 51.513, 51.611, 51.707, 51.317, 51.405(a), (c), and (d), 51.303, 51.305(a)(4), 51.311(c), and 51.315(c)-(f). [Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC](#), 219 F.3d 744 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000).

08/10/00 The Commission amended §§ 51.5, 51.321, and 51.323, adopting time frames for the implementation of collocation provisioning. The new rules require ILECs to provide physical collocation no later than 90 calendar days after receiving a collocation request. Additionally, the rules require ILECs to allow competitors to construct adjacent structures on land owned or controlled by the ILEC due to a lack of space in the ILEC structure. Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability and Implementation of the Local Competition provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket Nos. 98-147 and 96-98, [Order on Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 98-147 and Fifth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 96-98](#), 15 FCC Rcd 17806 (2000). Effective 10/10/00.

04/27/01 In response to the Court's 03/24/00 remand in [Bell Atlantic Telephone](#), the Commission reaffirmed its previous conclusion that traffic delivered to an ISP was not subject to the reciprocal compensation obligations of section 251 (b)(5). Determining that intercarrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic was within its jurisdiction, the Commission adopted a thirty-six month transition towards a complete bill and keep recovery mechanism. The Commission amended § 51.701. Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Intercarrier Compensation of ISP-Bound Traffic, CC Docket Nos. 96-98 and 99-68, [Order on Remand and Report and Order](#), 16 FCC Rcd 9151 (2001). Effective 06/14/01.

08/08/01 In response to the D.C. Circuit's 03/17/00 remand in [GTE v. FCC](#), the Commission amended §§ 51.5, 51.321 and 51.323 of the collocation rules. The Commission concluded that equipment was necessary for interconnection or access to UNEs and may be collocated if, absent deployment of the equipment, the requesting carrier would be precluded from obtaining equal in quality interconnection or nondiscriminatory access to UNEs from the ILEC. The Commission also limited which multi-functional equipment a requesting carrier may collocate. The Commission further concluded that while an ILEC need not allow collocators to install and maintain cross-connects between different carrier's collocated equipment, an ILEC itself must provide those cross-connects upon reasonable request. In addition, the Commission concluded that an ILEC may decide where collocated equipment would be placed within its premises as long as the ILEC acted reasonably and nondiscriminatorily, and the Commission specified minimum standards defining reasonable and nondiscriminatory behavior in this context. The Commission also determined that an ILEC may separate the space physical collocators

occupy and the entrances to that space from other space and entrances within its premises, except in certain limited circumstances. Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket No. 98-147, [Fourth Report and Order](#), 16 FCC Rcd 15435 (2001). Effective 09/19/01.

11/05/01 The Commission released its second biennial review of the accounting rules and the (ARMIS) reporting requirements that apply to ILECs. The review resulted in major accounting and reporting reforms including: consolidation and streamlining of Class A accounting requirements, the relaxation of certain aspects of the affiliate transaction rules, simplified cost allocation rules for major carriers and a reduction of the ARMIS reporting requirements for both large and mid-sized ILECs. The FCC amended numerous sections in Parts 32, 51, 54, 64, 65 and 69. 2000 Biennial Regulatory Review – Comprehensive Review of the Accounting Requirements and ARMIS Reporting Requirements for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers: Phase 2, Amendments to the Uniform System of Accounts for Interconnection, Jurisdictional Separations Reform and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board, Local Competition and Broadband Reporting, CC Docket Nos. 00-199, 97-212, 80-286, 99-301, [Report and Order in CC Docket Nos. 00-199, 97-212 and 80-286, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket Nos. 00-199, 99-301 and 80-286](#), 16 FCC Rcd 19911(2001). Erratum, 17 FCC Rcd 768 (2002). Effective 08/06/02. [Order on Reconsideration](#) (17 FCC Rcd 4766 (2002)) reinstated Account 3400 (§ 32.3400) and deferred the effective date of all other rule changes adopted in the 11/05/01 Report and Order until 01/01/03. The Commission subsequently suspended the effective date for rule changes consolidating § 32.5230 into § 32.5200, §§ 32.6621-6623 into § 32.6620, and §§ 32.6561-6565 into § 32.6560 pending further review by the Joint Conference (67 Fed. Reg. 77432 (2002); 68 Fed. Reg. 38641 (2003); 68 Fed. Reg. 75455 (2003); 69 Fed. Reg. 53645 (2004)). The Commission also made a correction to reinstate suspended rules that had been removed from 47 CFR Part 32 (69 Fed. Reg. 44607 (2004)).

03/14/02 The Commission created a Media Bureau, Wireline Competition Bureau and Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, by reorganizing the International Bureau and by further consolidating enforcement and consumer information functions. The Common Carrier Bureau was renamed the Wireline Competition Bureau and continued to be responsible for the policy programs of communications common carriers and ancillary operations (other than wireless telecommunications services). The Commission amended various sections of Parts 32, 51, 52, 54, 61, 64 and 65 of its rules to reflect the new structure. Establishment of the Media Bureau, the Wireline Competition Bureau and the Consumer Governmental Affairs Bureau, Reorganization of the International Bureau and Other Organizational Changes, [Order](#), 17 FCC Rcd 4672 (2002). Effective 03/25/02.

05/03/02 The U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, remanded the Commission's 04/27/01 *ISP Bound Traffic Declaratory Ruling*, finding that the Commission could not use Section 251(g) of the *1996 Act* as a basis for its actions, since there were no pre-existing obligations regarding ISP-bound traffic. [WorldCom, Inc. v. FCC, et al.](#), 288 F.3d 429 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

05/13/02 The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed in part, reversed in part and remanded [Iowa Utilities Remand](#). The Court upheld the Commission's TELRIC methodology, finding that ILECs failed to prove that TELRIC produced unreasonable results or that the *1996 Act* required the calculation of forward-looking rates to be based on historical investment. In addition, the Court upheld Commission authority to require ILECs to combine UNEs upon request, finding that the *1996 Act's* language left open who should do the work of combination. The Court further found that it was a "stretch" to read into language of the *1996 Act* a statutory right on the part of the ILECs to refuse to combine UNEs for requesting carriers and maintained that requiring ILECs to combine elements was a reasonable way to achieve the *1996 Act's* goals of competition and nondiscrimination. [Verizon Communications, Inc., et al. v. FCC, et al.](#), 122 S. Ct. 1646 (2002).

05/21/02 The U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, upheld the Commission's directive (16 FCC Rcd 2834 (2001)) to classify ISP costs as intrastate for separations purposes. The Court concluded that the Commission's intrastate classification of costs was consistent with the Commission's temporary exemption of enhanced service providers from interstate access charges and would be temporary, and allowable, as well. Additionally, the Court vacated the Commission's order requiring ACS Anchorage, Inc. to pay damages for rate-of-return violations. The Court found that the Part 61 streamlined tariff provisions, under which a tariff is deemed lawful and immune to refund liability if not subject to

suspension or investigation within a prescribed time frame after filing, also barred refunds for rate-of-return violations. [ACS Anchorage, Inc. v. FCC, et al.](#), 290 F. 3d 403.

05/24/02 The U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, remanded the Commission's 11/05/99 *Third Report and Order* and 12/09/99 *Fourth Report and Order*. The Court criticized the Commission's failure to consider market-specific variations in its decision to make its unbundling requirements applicable uniformly, with minor exceptions, to all elements in every geographic or customer market. The Court found that the Commission used additional selection criteria, with the stated intent to promote the pro-competitive goals of the *1996 Act*, to implement a belief that "more unbundling is better." However, the Court explained that, in keeping with Congressional intent, "impairment" should remain the touchstone and that the Commission needed something "a bit more concrete than its belief in the beneficence of the widest unbundling possible" to justify its ubiquitous UNE rules. The Court criticized the Commission's cost impairment analysis as being overly broad to the point where any cost disparity was reason enough to order unbundling. In addition, the Court vacated and remanded the line sharing requirement for failure to adequately consider intermodal competition. The Court opined that in ordering the unbundling of the high frequency portion of the loop the Commission, "failed to consider the relevance of competition in broadband services coming from cable (and to a lesser extent satellite)." [U.S. Telecom Ass'n v. FCC](#), 290 F.3d 415 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

06/14/02 The U.S. Court of Appeals, D. C. Circuit, determined that the Commission could not require IXCs to purchase interstate switched access services from CLECs, even when the end user customer has requested long distance service from the IXC through the CLECs. The Court found that the Commission failed to follow the section 201(a) procedures, which provide that the Commission may order a carrier to establish physical connection with another carrier only after opportunity for a hearing. [AT&T Corp. v. FCC et al.](#), 292 F.3d 808 (2002) (D.C. Cir. 2002).

08/21/02 On remand from [Supreme Court Iowa Utilities Remand](#), the U.S. Court of Appeals, 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit, vacated those portions of its [Iowa Utilities](#) decision, which invalidated § 51.505(b)(1) (TELRIC) and § 51.315 (c)-(f) (additional combination rules). [Iowa Utilities Brd., et al. v. FCC](#), 301 F.3d 957 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002).

09/04/02 The Commission determined that ILECs must include cross-connect offerings in federal tariffs, and concluded that in certain circumstances ILECs may rely on individual case basis pricing when establishing rates for cross-connects. Also, the Commission found that federally mandated limits on the time period for which ILECs and CLECs may reserve potential collocation space for future use were not warranted. In addition, the Commission concluded that disputes regarding conversion of virtual collocation arrangements to physical collocation arrangements should be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Lastly, the Commission determined that ILECs may not compel collocators to interconnect through point-of-termination bays. Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket 98-147, [Order on Reconsideration of Fourth Report and Order, and Fifth Report and Order](#), 17 FCC Rcd 16960 (2002). Effective 10/30/02 except that the Commission's actions regarding federal tariffing of the cross-connect requirement and pricing of cross-connects in paragraph 3 of this document are not effective until approved by OMB.

10/25/02 The U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit Court, denied Competitive Telecommunications Association's (CompTel) Petition for Review of the Commission's *Third Report and Order* and *Fourth Report and Order*, both addressing the CLECs' access to a combination of UNEs known as enhanced extended link (EEL). The Court found that the Commission had the authority to make service-by-service distinctions based on regional differences or on customer markets, and was entitled to reconsider orders that rested on faulty readings of a statute. The Court also upheld the Commission's justification of use restrictions as a temporary measure to preserve the status quo pending completion of access and universal service reform. Finally, the Court rejected CompTel's claims that the "safe harbor" and commingling restrictions were arbitrary and capricious, finding instead that the use restrictions were administratively feasible and that the Commission had reasonable concerns about gaming to justify the commingling restriction. [Competitive Telecom Ass'n v. FCC, et al.](#), 309 F.3d 8 (D.C. Cir. 2002). ([Competitive Telecom](#)).

08/21/03 Considering the history and meaning of the *1996 Act*, as well as the [Iowa Utilities](#), [U.S.T.A.](#), and [Competitive Telecom](#) court cases, the Commission amended §§ 51.5, 51.301, 51.305, 51.309,

51.311, 51.315, 51.316, 51.317, 51.318, 51.319, 51.320, 51.325, 51.331, 51.333 and 51.509 establishing a new standard for determining the existence of impairment under section 251 of the 1996 Act, setting forth a new list of UNEs, and creating a specifically defined role for the states in the unbundling inquiry. The Commission modified the ILEC UNE obligations and delegated responsibility to state commissions to conduct “more granular” route-specific and market-specific impairment analysis to determine the ongoing need for certain elements (e.g., mass market switching, high capacity loops, and high capacity dedicated transport) but retained uniform nationwide unbundling obligations for copper loops used to provide “mass market” narrowband services. The Commission established new conditions for requesting carriers to obtain access to high-capacity EEL on an unbundled basis, superseding “safe harbor” restrictions. The Commission also modified the line sharing requirement to allow existing customers to retain their existing rates and new customers to be added during the first year of the transition period at rates that increased over the course of the transition period until the rate for stand-alone copper loop was reached. At the end of the three-year transition period, new customers must be served via a line splitting arrangement, stand-alone copper loop, or through other arrangements negotiated with the ILEC to replace line sharing. Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, 98-147, [Report and Order and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#), 18 FCC Rcd 16978 (2003). Effective 10/02/03. **Errata**, 18 FCC Rcd 19020 (2003). (*Triennial Review Order*). On March 2, 2004 Federal Appeals Court ruled that portions of the Commission’s Triennial Review Order covering UNE-P rules were invalid. **U.S. Telecom Ass’n v. FCC, et al.**, 2004 WL 374262 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

03/02/04 The United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated portions of the Commission’s 08/21/03 *Triennial Review Order* (18 FCC Rcd 16978 (2003)) on unbundling requirements. The court vacated the Commission’s subdelegation of authority to state commissions to determine the availability of mass market switching (a component of the UNE-P combination) and certain dedicated transport unbundled network elements (UNEs). The court vacated and remanded Commission decision to allow wireless carriers access to dedicated transport. The court vacated the Commission’s distinction between qualifying and non-qualifying services for purposes of restricting competing carrier use of UNEs. The court remanded (but did not vacate) Commission decisions disallowing use of unbundled high capacity loop/transport combinations (EELs) for provision of long distance service and removing entrance facilities from the list of required transport elements. This decision became effective on June 16, 2004. **United States Telecom Association v. Federal Communications Commission**, 359 F.3d 554 (D.C. Cir., 2004), cert. denied, 125 S. Ct. 313 (2004), 125 S. Ct. 316 (2004), and 125 S. Ct. 345 (2004).

06/24/04 The Commission amended §§ 32.11, 32.27, 32.1280, 32.2000, 32.2005, 32.2682, 32.2690, 32.3000, 32.3100, 32.3200, 32.3400, 32.3410, 32.4999, 32.5001, 32.5200, 32.5230, 32.5999, 32.6560, 32.6561, 32.6562, 32.6563, 32.6564, 32.6565, 32.6620, 32.6621, 32.6622, 32.6623, 51.609, 65.450, including the reinstatement of Accounts 5230, 6621, 6622, 6623, and 6561-6565, after considering industry comments on recommendations made by the Federal-State Joint Conference on Accounting Issues (Joint Conference) on October 9, 2003. Federal State Joint Conference on Accounting Issues, 2000 Biennial Regulatory Review - Comprehensive Review of the Accounting Requirements and ARMIS Reporting Requirements for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers: Phase II, Judicial Separations Reform and Referral to the Federal State Joint Board, Local Competition and Broadband Reporting, WC Docket Nos. 00-199, 02-269, 80-286, 99-301, [Report and Order](#), 19 FCC Rcd 11732 (2004). Effective 03/02/05. However, carriers were permitted to implement Part 32 accounting changes on January 1, 2005, including modifications to §§ 32.5200, 32.6562 and 32.6620, and §§ 32.5230, 32.6561, 32.6563, 32.6564, 32.6565, 32.6621, 32.6622 and 32.6623 originally adopted in the 11/05/01 ARMIS Order, but suspended pending further review by the Joint Conference on Accounting Issues.

07/13/04 The Commission amended § 51.809, which implements the Section 252(i) requirement of the Act to allow third parties to opt into the terms and conditions of negotiated interconnection agreements. The Commission eliminated carriers’ option to “pick and choose” among provisions of state-approved interconnection agreements, replacing it instead with a requirement that requesting carriers adopt an agreement in its entirety (“all-or-nothing”). The Commission believes the “all-or-nothing” rule will speed the emergence of robust competition while providing adequate protection



against potential discrimination. Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, CC Docket No. 01-338, [Second Report and Order](#), 19 FCC Rcd 13494 (2004). Effective 08/23/04. **Erratum** released 07/20/04. Effective 08/23/04.

08/09/04 The Commission amended § 51.319 to clarify that the fiber-to-the-home (FTTH) rules adopted in the Triennial Review Order (August 2003) apply to multi-dwelling units (MDUs) that are predominantly residential. The FTTH rules relieve incumbent LECs from certain unbundling obligations for fiber loops deployed in new build, or “greenfield,” situations. Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Deployment of Wireline Service Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, 98-147, [Order on Reconsideration](#), 19 FCC Rcd 15856 (2004). Effective 10/12/04.

08/20/04 The Commission adopted a twelve-month stabilization plan in response to the 03/02/04 decision vacating portion of 08/21/03 *Triennial Review Order*, to avoid disruption in the telecommunications industry while new unbundling rules are being written. The plan generally calls for incumbent LECs to continue providing unbundled access to switching, enterprise market loops, and dedicated transport for six months from the effective date of the interim order, under the same rates, terms and conditions that applied under interconnection agreements as of June 15, 2004. Following the six month freeze, if the Commission has yet to adopt final unbundled rules, these elements will continue to be available for an additional six month transition period, but at a higher rate (*i.e.*, the June 15 rate plus one dollar for the UNE platform, or 115% of the June rate for enterprise loops and/or dedicated transport). At the end of the transition period, incumbent LECs may cease to offer elements no longer subject to the Commission’s unbundling regime. The Commission’s interim rules may be superseded by voluntary agreement, Commission orders affecting unbundling obligations, or state public utility orders raising the rates for elements. Unbundled Access to Network Elements, Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, WC Docket Nos. 01-338, 04-313, [Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#), 19 FCC Rcd 16783 (2004). Effective 09/13/04.

10/18/04 The Commission amended §§ 51.319, 51.325, 51.331, 51.333 in response to several petitions for reconsideration of the 2003 Triennial Review Order. The Commission extended unbundling relief to fiber-to-the-curb (FTTC) loops, defined as fiber transmission facilities connected to copper distribution plant that is not more than 500 feet from the customer’s premises. The Commission also clarified that its network modification rules do not require incumbent LECs to build time division multiplexing (TDM) capabilities packet-based. Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, 98-147, [Order on Reconsideration](#), 19 FCC Rcd 20293 (2004). [Errata](#) (rel. 10/29/04). Effective 01/28/05.

10/18/04 The Commission granted partial forbearance from application of the 04/27/01 *ISP Remand Order*, including relief from provisions that established “growth caps” to limit the annual amount of ISP-bound minutes eligible for reciprocal compensation and that prescribed bill-and-keep for carriers entering new markets. Petition of Core Communications, Inc. for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) from Application of the ISP Remand Order, WC Docket No. 03-171, [Order](#), 19 FCC Rcd 20179 (2004). Effective 10/18/04.

02/04/05 The Commission amended §§ 51.5, 51.309, 51.317, 51.319, in response to a 2004 D.C. Circuit remand of the *2003 Triennial Review Order*. The Commission eliminated unbundled access to mass market circuit switching, and UNE platform (UNE-P), and adopted a 12-month plan for competing carriers to transition away from use of unbundled switching. During this transition period, competitive carriers will retain access to UNE-P at a rate equal to the higher of (1) the rate at which the requesting carrier leased that combination of elements on June 15, 2004, plus one dollar, or (2) the rate the state PUC established, if any, between June 16, 2004 and the effective date of this Order (March 11, 2005), for a combination of elements, plus one dollar. Also, the Commission retained unbundled access to high-capacity loops and dedicated interoffice transport in most wire centers with limited exclusions based on line size and number of fiber-based collocators; adopted a 12-month plan for competing carriers to transition away from the use of high-capacity loops and dedicated transport

where they are not impaired; and an 18-month plan to govern transitions away from dark fiber loops and transport. These transitions apply only to the embedded customer base and do not permit CLECs to add new high-capacity loop and dedicated transport UNEs in the absence of impairment. During this transition, competitive carriers will retain access to unbundled facilities at a rate equal to the higher of (1) 115% of the rate the requesting carrier paid for the unbundled loops or transport element on June 15, 2004, or (2) 115% of the rate the state PUC has established, if any, between June 16, 2004 and the effective date of this Order (March 11, 2005). Unbundled Access to Network Elements, Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, WC Docket Nos. 04-313, 01-338, [Order on Remand](#), 20 FCC Rcd 2533 (2005). Effective 03/11/05.

02/24/05 The Commission issued a declaratory ruling to the effect that its prior rules did not prohibit ILECs from filing state wireless termination tariffs. However, going forward (April 29, 2005), the Commission prohibited all LECs from attempting to impose via tariff compensation obligations for non-access CMRS traffic. In addition, the Commission amended § 20.11 so as to allow ILECs to request interconnection from CMRS carriers, and invoke the negotiation and arbitration procedures set forth in section 252 of the Act. Developing a Unified Inter-carrier Compensation Regime, CC Docket No. 01-92, T-Mobile et al Petition for Declaratory Ruling Regarding Incumbent LEC Wireless Termination Tariffs, [Declaratory Ruling and Report and Order](#), 20 FCC Rcd 4855 (2005), *petitions for reconsideration and review pending*. Effective 04/29/05.

08/21/06 The Commission as part of its 2004 biennial regulatory review, and pursuant to Section 11 of the Communications Act, amended, modified and deleted various rules administered by the Wireline Competition Bureau. Section 11 requires the Commission to review biennially its regulations that apply to the operations and activities of any provider of telecommunications service, determine whether these regulations are no longer necessary in the public interest as the result of meaningful economic competition between providers, and if necessary, repeal or modify such regulations. The Commission amended or revised the following rules: §§ 36.2, 36.125, 36.126, 36.142, 36.152, 36.154, 36.156, 36.212, 36.214, 36.375, 36.377, 36.631, 51.213, 51.329, 51.515, 52.5, 52.11, 52.13, 52.15, 52.31, 54.201, 54.313, 54.507, 54.604, 54.623, 64.1330, and 64.1903. The Commission deleted: § 36.641, and certain terms and their definition in Part 36 Glossary, and §§ 51.211, 52.27, 52.29, 69.116, 69.117, 69.126, 69.127, and 69.612. Biennial Regulatory Review of Regulations Administered by the Wireline Competition Bureau, WC Docket No. 02-313, [Report and Order](#), 21 FCC Rcd 9937 (2006). **Erratum** (rel. 09/19/06). Effective 12/11/06.

03/01/07 The Commission granted Time Warner Cable's petition for declaratory ruling, declaring that wholesale telecommunications carriers are entitled to interconnect and exchange traffic with incumbent local exchange carriers (LECs) when providing services to other service providers, including voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service providers. The Commission reaffirmed that wholesale providers of telecommunications services are telecommunications carriers for the purposes of sections 251(a) and (b) of the Act, and are entitled to the rights of telecommunications carriers under that provision. The Commission concluded that state commission decisions denying wholesale telecommunications service providers the right to interconnect with incumbent LECs pursuant to sections 251(a) and (b) of the Act are inconsistent with the Act and Commission precedent and would frustrate the development of competition and broadband deployment. Time Warner Cable Request for Declaratory Ruling that Competitive Local Exchange Carriers May Obtain Interconnection under Section 251 of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended, to Provide Wholesale Telecommunications Services to VoIP Providers, WC Docket No. 06-55, [Memorandum Opinion and Order](#), 22 FCC Rcd 3513 (2007). Effective 03/01/07.

06/11/07 Eight Circuit decided the Missouri PSC was correct in ruling that rural local exchange carriers (RLECs) were required to pay reciprocal compensation to wireless providers for calls from a local landline phone to a mobile phone, even if the calls are routed through a long-distance carrier. [Alma Communications, et al. v. Missouri PSC](#), 490 F.3d 619 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007).

07/26/07 The Commission denied Core Communications' petition requesting that the Commission forbear from the rate regulation preserved by section 251(g) of the Communications Act, the rate averaging and rate integration required by section 254(g) of the Act, and all related implementing rules with respect to all telecommunications carriers. The Commission determined Core's request failed to meet the statutory forbearance criteria. Specifically, forbearance from 251(g) rate regulation

for access charges would not ensure that “charges and practices are just and reasonable” because the 251(b)(5) reciprocal compensation rules would not automatically, by default, govern such traffic. The Commission also denied Core’s application for review of the Bureau Extension Order which granted the Commission an additional 90 days for review of Core’s petition. Petition of Core Communications, Inc. for Forbearance from Section 251(g) and 254(g) of the Communications Act and Implementing Rules, WC Docket No. 06-100, [Memorandum Opinion and Order](#), 22 FCC Rcd 14118 (2007). Effective 07/26/07.

07/27/07 Tenth Circuit Court affirmed a lower court’s decision granting summary judgment to Qwest in a dispute with Union Telephone over terminating access charge payments. Union alleged that Qwest did not properly compensate it for toll traffic, despite alleged applicability of Union’s tariffs. The Tenth Circuit pointed out that FCC rules forbid Union from applying tariff-based access charges to intraMTA wireless traffic. Also, because Union did not file separate tariffs for wireless traffic, the court said it lacks the appropriate tariff for terminating wireless tariff under state law. [Union Telephone v. Qwest](#), 495 F. 3d 1187 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007).

10/16/07 First Circuit upheld a Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy decision that found the Commission’s 1999 Internet Traffic Order (followed by the ISP Remand Order) ended Verizon’s obligation to pay reciprocal compensation to Global NAPS for ISP-bound calls. The Court held that the 1999 Order concluded that ISP calls were not local calls triggering reciprocal compensation. [Global NAPS v. Verizon New England et al.](#), 505 F. 3d 43 (1st. Cir. 2007).

10/31/08 The D.C. Circuit Court dismissed Core Communications’ petition for review of the Commission’s July 2007 decision denying Core’s petition for forbearance from access charge and rate integration regulations based on Core’s failure to demonstrate it has standing on the issues. The court noted Core failed to explain how it was being injured by the application of §§ 251(g) and 254(g). [Core v. Federal Communications Commission](#), 545 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2008).

11/05/08 The Commission responded to the D.C. Circuit’s ISP-bound traffic writ of mandamus order in *Core Communications*, and remand order in *Worldcom v. FCC*. The Commission reaffirmed its prior finding that ISP-bound traffic is interstate, interexchange traffic, but concurred with the court that this traffic is covered by section 251(b)(5). The Commission concluded, however, it has authority under Section 201 to establish pricing rules for this traffic, and maintained the \$0.0007 rate cap and the mirroring rule for ISP-bound traffic. The Commission found that section 251(b)(5) is not limited to local traffic, and that the traffic it elected to bring within this framework fits squarely within the meaning of “telecommunications.” The Commission observed that had Congress intended to preclude the Commission from bringing certain types of telecommunications traffic within the section 251(b)(5) framework, it could have easily done so by incorporating restrictive terms in section 251(b)(5). High-Cost Universal Service Support, WC Docket No. 05-337, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45, Lifeline and Link Up, WC Docket No. 03-109, Universal Service Contribution Methodology, WC Docket No. 06-122, Numbering Resource Optimization, CC Docket No. 99-200, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime, CC Docket No. 01-92, Intercarrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Traffic, CC Docket No. 99-68, IP-Enabled Services, WC Docket No. 04-36, [Order on Remand, Report and Order](#), 73 Fed. Reg. 66821 (2008). Effective 11/05/08.

11/18/11 The Commission revised its rules to reform universal service and intercarrier compensation. The FCC created a new Connect America Fund with an annual budget of no more than \$4.5 billion, made mobile broadband an independent universal service objective for the first time in history, and dedicated support through a new separate Mobility Fund for wireless carriers. Revises §§ 51.701, 51.703, 51.705, 51.709, 51.711, 51.713, and 51.715. Removes §§ 51.707 and 51.717. Adds §§ 51.700 and Subpart J – Transitional Access Service Pricing. Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future, WC Docket No. 10–90 et al., [Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#), 26 FCC Rcd 17663 (2011). [Erratum](#) (rel. 02/06/12). Effective 12/29/11, except for § 51.919 which requires Office of Management and Budget approval. Effective date will be published in the Federal Register after OMB approval. Sections 51.907(b)(1), (c)(1), and (d) through (h); 51.909(b)(1), and (c) through (k); 51.911(b) and (c); 51.915(e)(5) and (f)(6); and 51.917(e)(6) and (f)(3) are effective 06/14/12, following FR publication of OMB approval.

02/03/12 The Commission clarified certain rules in the USF/ICC Transformation Order which reforms universal service and intercarrier compensation. The order also modifies certain initial filing deadlines required to comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act requirements. Revises § 51.917(d)(1)(i) – (iii). Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future, WC Docket No. 10–90 et al., [Order](#), 27 FCC Rcd 605 (2012). Effective 04/09/12.

04/25/12 The Commission addressed several issues raised in petitions for reconsideration of certain aspects of the USF/ICC Transformation Order. It granted in part a request to reconsider the VoIP intercarrier compensation rules adopted in the USF/ICC Transformation Order. Specifically, it modified rules to permit LECs, prospectively, to tariff a transitional default rate equal to their intrastate originating access rates when they originate intrastate toll VoIP traffic until June 30, 2014. Revises § 51.913(a). Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future, WC Docket No. 10–90 et al., [Second Order on Reconsideration](#), 27 FCC Rcd 4648 (2012). Effective 07/13/12.

06/05/12 The Commission revised and clarified certain provisions of its rules relating to the transition of intrastate switched access rates and the operation of the transitional recovery mechanism that were adopted in the USF/ICC Transformation Order. Revises §§ 51.907(b)(2)(v) and (vi); 51.907(c)(1); 51.909(a)(3); 51.909(b)(2)(v); 51.909(b)(3); 51.909(c); 51.911(b), (b)(3), (6); and 51.915 (d)(1)(i)(C)(2)(i), (d)(1)(ii)(C)(2)(i), (d)(1)(iii)(3)(E)(2)(i), (d)(1)(iv)(E)(2)(i), (d)(1)(v)(E)(2)(i), (d)(1)(vi)(F)(2)(i) and (d)(1)(vii)(G)(2)(i). Adds §§ 51.907(b)(3), 51.907(c)(4), 51.909(b)(4) and 51.911(b)(7). Removes § 51.907(c)(3). Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future, WC Docket No. 10–90 et al., [Order](#), 27 FCC Rcd 5986 (2012). [Erratum](#) (rel. 06/12/12). Effective 09/13/12.

10/10/12 The FCC made a number of nonsubstantive, editorial or conforming revisions to its rules to delete certain rule provisions that are without current legal effect or are otherwise obsolete. These nonsubstantive revisions are part of the FCC's ongoing examination and improvement of FCC processes and procedures. The revisions clarify, simplify, and harmonize rules, making them more readily accessible to the public and avoiding potential confusion for interested parties and Commission staff alike. Revises § 51.319(a), deletes § 51.319(d), redesignates § 51.319(e)-(g) as (d)-(f), and revises newly redesignated (d). Nonsubstantive, Editorial or Conforming Amendments of the Commission's Rules, [Order](#), 27 FCC Rcd 11965 (2012). Effective 01/28/13.

03/27/13 The FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau clarified and corrected certain CAF ICC rules. The Order harmonized inconsistent CAF ICC support eligibility certification and reporting filing deadlines so they coincide with the annual interstate access tariff filing dates. The Order also: corrected the rules governing the transition of rate-of-return carriers' intrastate switched access rates; clarified access charge rules on the treatment of LSS in the calculation of the line-side port costs shift to the Common Line category and the allocation of Transport Interconnection Charge costs among the various access charge expense categories; clarified the operation of the corporate operations expense limit and monthly \$250 per-line cap on universal service support; and corrected errors implementing the Eligible Recovery true-up adjustment mechanism. Revises §§ 51.909, 51.915, 54.917, 54.304, 54.901, 69.306 and 69.415. Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future, WC Docket No. 10–90 et al., [Order](#), 28 FCC Rcd 3319 (2013). Effective 06/05/13.

03/31/14 The FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau corrected certain intercarrier compensation rules adopted in the USF/ICC Transformation Order. The Bureau clarified: language to reflect ongoing rate parity in the transition process for price cap and rate-of-return local exchange carriers, consistent with the intent of the USF/ICC Transformation Order; certain aspects of the FCC's rules relating to the transition of terminating end office access rates and the calculation of Eligible Recovery for price cap and rate-of-return carriers beginning in 2014; and issues related to duplicative recovery and the true-up of regulatory fees and revenue calculations. Revises §§ 51.907, 51.909, 51.915 and 51.917. Connect America Fund, Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime; WC Docket No. 10-90 and CC Docket No. 01-92; [Order](#), 29 FCC Rcd 3245 (2014). Effective 06/19/14.

11/26/14 The Commission amended its procedural rules to require electronic filing for three common types of wireline proceedings: applications for authorization of domestic transfers of control under section 214(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act); applications for authorization to discontinue, reduce, or impair a service under section 214(a) of the Act; and notices of network

changes under section 251(c)(5) of the Act. Revises § 51.329. Amendment of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure; Electronic Filing of Domestic Section 214 Applications and Notices of Network Changes; GC Docket No. 10-44; [Order](#), 29 FCC Rcd 14955 (2014). Effective 02/12/15.

02/25/15 The FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau clarified certain rules relating to implementation of the ICC transition for rate-of-return local exchange carriers adopted in the *USF/ICC Transformation Order*. Specifically, the Bureau clarified rules governing eligible recovery calculations under section 51.917(d) to address a limited number of unanticipated results associated with application of the true-up process. Adds §§ 51.917(d)(1)(viii)(A) and (B). Connect America Fund, Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime; WC Docket No. 10-90 and CC Docket No. 01-92; [Order](#), 30 FCC Rcd 1887 (2015). Effective 04/27/15.

08/07/15 The Commission adopted rules requiring providers to notify retail customers and interconnecting carriers of plans to retire copper networks. It also clarified that a carrier must obtain FCC approval before discontinuing, reducing or impairing a service used as a wholesale input when such actions affect service to end users. As an interim measure until final rules are adopted, to receive such authority an ILEC must commit to providing competitive carriers wholesale access at rates, terms and conditions that are reasonably comparable to those of the legacy services. Revises §§ 51.325(a)(4) and 51.333(b)-(c); adds 51.325(e) and 51.332; deletes 51.331(c) and 51.333(f). Technology Transitions, Policies and Rules Governing Retirement Of Copper Loops by Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Special Access for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers, AT&T Corporation Petition for Rulemaking to Reform Regulation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Rates for Interstate Special Access Services; GN Docket No. 13-5, RM-11358, WC Docket No. 05-25, RM-10593; [Report and Order](#), [Order on Reconsideration and FNPRM](#), 30 FCC Rcd 9372 (2015). [Erratum](#), released 09.25.15, corrects 51.332(b)(3). Sections 51.325(a)(4) and (e), 51.332, and 51.333(b)-(c) are effective 03/24/16, following Federal Register publication of OMB approval. Sections 51.331(c) and 51.333(f) are deleted, effective 03/30/16.

03/30/16 The FCC adopted rules reforming universal service support for rate-of-return carriers. The Order creates two paths for RoR carrier USF support: a model-based option and a Broadband Loop Support mechanism that will provide support for standalone broadband and replace ICLS. Neither type of support will be provided in census blocks where an unsubsidized competitor offers qualifying service. The Order contains broadband deployment milestones, service performance requirements, OpEx and CapEx limitations, as well as budget controls to maintain the \$2 billion per year budget. The Order also reduces the allowable rate of return from the current 11.25 percent to 9.75 percent, with a phased transition. Revises § 51.917. Connect America Fund, ETC Annual Reports and Certifications, Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime; WC Docket Nos. 10-90 and 14-58, CC Docket No. 01-92; [Report and Order](#), [Order](#), [Order on Reconsideration](#), and [FNPRM](#); [Erratum](#), 05/04/16; [Second Erratum](#), 06/07/16. 31 FCC Rcd 3087 (2016). An [Order](#) released on 06/15/16 (DA 16-661) addresses several matters arising from implementation of the original order (no rule changes). The 03/30/16 Order is effective 05/25/16. Section 51.917(f)(4) is effective 12/04/17.

07/15/16 The Commission has acted to advance the ongoing transition from networks based on time-division multiplexed circuit-switched voice services running on copper loops to all-internet protocol multi-media networks using copper, co-axial cable, wireless, and/or fiber as physical infrastructure. Revises § 51.329. Technology Transitions, USTelecom Petition for Declaratory Ruling That Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers Are Non-Dominant in the Provision of Switched Access Services, Policies and Rules Governing Retirement of Copper Loops by Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers; GN Docket No. 13-5, WC Docket No. 13-3, RM-11358. [Declaratory Ruling](#), [Second Report and Order](#), and [Order on Reconsideration](#). 31 FCC Rcd 8283 (2016). Effective 10/11/17.

11/29/17 The FCC revised certain rules on further changes to the pole attachment rules, network change disclosure processes, and section 214(a) discontinuance processes. Revises §§ 51.325, 51.329 and 51.333; deletes § 51.332. Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment, WC Docket 17-84, [Report and Order](#), [Declaratory Ruling and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#), 32 FCC Rcd 11128 (2017). Effective 05/14/18.

12/18/17 – The FCC [amended](#) rules in parts 0, 1, 51 and 61, to reflect the closure of the post office box used for manual filings with WCB. The Bureau now will require the use of an electronic payment

system and, wherever possible, electronic filing. Amendment of Parts 0, 1, 51, and 61 of the Commission's Rules, MD Docket No. 17-357, Order. Effective 30 days after publication in the Federal Register.

02/16/18 - The FCC reconsidered rules adopted in the March 2016 Rate-of-Return Reform [Order](#) relating to RoR LECs provision of consumer broadband-only loops. The FCC revised its rules to replace the surrogate cost method for determining the cost of CBOLs with rules employing existing separations and cost allocation procedures. The FCC also revised the rule requiring RoR carriers to impute on CBOLs an amount equal to the Access Recovery Charge that could have been assessed on a voice or voice/broadband line to better implement its intent to maintain the balance between end user charges and universal service adopted in the USF/ICC Transformation Order. The FCC also clarified issues relating to reductions in CAF Broadband Loop Support due to competitive overlap. Revised §§ 51.917, 54.319, 69.311 and 69.416. Connect America Fund, WC Docket No. 10-90, ETC Annual Reports and Certifications, WC Docket No. 14-58 and Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime, CC Docket No. 01-92, [Second Order on Reconsideration and Clarification](#), 33 FCC Rcd 2399 (2018). Effective 30 days after publication in the Federal Register.

06/08/18 – The FCC revised section 214(a) service discontinuance, network change disclosure, and the Part 68 customer notification processes. Amended §§ 51.325 and 51.333. Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment, WC Docket No. 17-84, [Second Report and Order](#), 33 FCC Rcd 5660 (2018). Effective upon OMB approval.

10/24/18 - The Commission allowed certain RLECs that receive fixed high-cost support the opportunity to transition from rate-of-return regulation to incentive regulation for their business data services. For carriers that opt in, the order: provides an opportunity to move their legacy BDS to incentive regulation similar to the price cap regulation adopted in 2017; relieves their lower speed TDM-based end user channel terminations services of ex ante pricing regulation in areas deemed competitive by a competitive market test; eliminates ex ante pricing regulation for their higher speed TDM-based BDS (above DS3) and their packet-based BDS; and forbears from requiring electing carriers to comply with cost support, cost assignment and jurisdictional separations requirements. The Commission amended §§ 32.1, 32.11, 51.903, 61.41, 61.50, 61.55 and 69.114. Regulation of Business Data Services for Rate-of-Return Local Exchange Carriers, WC Docket 17-144, Business Data Services in an Internet Protocol Environment, WC Docket No. 16-143, and Special Access for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers, WC Docket No. 05-25, [Report and Order, Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#), 33 FCC Rcd 10403 (2016). Effective: 02/26/19

09/27/19 – The FCC adopted reforms to eliminate access arbitrage schemes, including rules making access-stimulating LECs—rather than IXCs—financially responsible for the tandem switching and transport service access charges associated with the delivery of traffic from an IXC to the access-stimulating LEC end office or its functional equivalent. The FCC amended §§ 51.903, 51.917, 61.3, 61.26, 61.39, 69.3, 69.4 and 69.5 and added § 51.914. Updating the Intercarrier Compensation Regime to Eliminate Access Arbitrage, [Report and Order and Modification of Section 214 Authorization](#), WC Docket No. 18-155, FCC 19-4. Effective: 30 days after publication in the Federal Register except for §§ 51.914(b) and 51.914(e) which are subject to OMB approval.

## Chronologies

<b>Subpart A – General Information</b>		
<b>§ 51.1</b>	Basis and purpose	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.3</b>	Applicability to negotiated agreements	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.5</b>	Terms and definitions	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>08/08/96</u> , <u>03/31/99</u> , <u>11/05/99</u> , <u>12/09/99</u> , <u>08/10/00</u> , <u>08/08/01</u> , <u>08/21/03</u> , <u>02/04/05</u>
<b>Subpart B – Telecommunications Carriers</b>		
<b>§ 51.100</b>	General duty	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>Subpart C – Obligations of All Local Exchange Carriers</b>		
<b>§ 51.201</b>	Resale	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.203</b>	Number portability	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.205</b>	Dialing parity: General	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.207</b>	Local dialing parity	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.209</b>	Toll dialing parity	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.213</b>	Toll dialing parity implementation plans	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>08/21/06</u>
<b>§ 51.215</b>	Dialing parity: Cost recovery	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.217</b>	Nondiscriminatory access: Telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance services, and directory listings	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>09/09/99</u>
<b>§ 51.219</b>	Access to rights of way	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.221</b>	Reciprocal compensation	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.223</b>	Application of additional requirements	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.230</b>	Presumption of acceptability for deployment of an advanced services loop technology	Adopted: <u>12/09/99</u>
<b>§ 51.231</b>	Provision of information on advanced services deployment	Adopted: <u>12/09/99</u>
<b>§ 51.232</b>	Binder group management	Adopted: <u>12/09/99</u>
<b>§ 51.233</b>	Significant degradation of services caused by deployment of advanced services	Adopted: <u>12/09/99</u>
<b>Subpart D – Additional Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers</b>		
<b>§ 51.301</b>	Duty to negotiate	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>08/21/03</u>
<b>§ 51.303</b>	Preexisting agreements	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>07/18/00</u>
<b>§ 51.305</b>	Interconnection	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>08/08/96</u> , <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>07/18/00</u> , <u>08/21/03</u>
<b>§ 51.307</b>	Duty to provide access on an unbundled basis to network elements	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>§ 51.309</b>	Use of unbundled network elements	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>08/21/03</u> , <u>02/04/05</u>
<b>§ 51.311</b>	Nondiscriminatory access to unbundled network elements	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>07/18/00</u> , <u>08/21/03</u>

§ 51.313	Just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions for the provision of unbundled network elements	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">09/27/96</a>
§ 51.315	Combination of unbundled network elements	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">07/18/97</a> , <a href="#">01/25/99</a> , <a href="#">07/18/00</a> , <a href="#">05/13/02</a> , <a href="#">08/21/02</a> , <a href="#">08/21/03</a>
§ 51.316	Conversion of unbundled network elements and services	Adopted: <a href="#">08/21/03</a>
§ 51.317	Standards for requiring the unbundling of network elements	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">07/18/97</a> , <a href="#">11/05/99</a> , <a href="#">07/18/00</a> , <a href="#">08/21/03</a> , <a href="#">02/04/05</a>
§ 51.318	Eligibility criteria for access to certain unbundled network elements	Adopted: <a href="#">08/21/03</a>
§ 51.319	Specific unbundling requirements	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">08/18/97</a> , <a href="#">01/25/99</a> , <a href="#">11/05/99</a> , <a href="#">12/09/99</a> , <a href="#">08/21/03</a> , <a href="#">03/02/04</a> , <a href="#">08/09/04</a> , <a href="#">08/20/04</a> , <a href="#">10/18/04</a> , <a href="#">02/04/05</a> , <a href="#">10/10/12</a>
§ 51.320	Assumption of responsibility by the Commission	Adopted: <a href="#">08/21/03</a>
§ 51.321	Methods of obtaining interconnection and access to unbundled elements under section 251 of the Act	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">03/31/99</a> , <a href="#">08/10/00</a> , <a href="#">08/08/01</a>
§ 51.323	Standards for physical collocation and virtual collocation	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">03/31/99</a> , <a href="#">08/10/00</a> , <a href="#">08/08/01</a>
§ 51.325	Notice of network changes: Public notice requirement ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )*	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">03/10/99</a> , <a href="#">08/21/03</a> , <a href="#">10/18/04</a> , <a href="#">08/07/15</a> , <a href="#">11/29/17</a> , <a href="#">06/08/18</a> *
§ 51.327	Notice of network changes: Content of notice	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a>
§ 51.329	Notice of network changes: Methods for providing notice ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )*	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">03/14/02</a> , <a href="#">08/21/06</a> , <a href="#">11/26/14</a> , <a href="#">07/15/16</a> , <a href="#">11/19/17</a> , <a href="#">12/18/17</a> *
§ 51.331	Notice of network changes: Timing of notice	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">08/21/03</a> , <a href="#">10/18/04</a> , <a href="#">08/07/15</a>
§ 51.332	[Repealed]	Adopted: <a href="#">08/07/15</a> , amended: <a href="#">11/29/17</a>
§ 51.333	Notice of Network Changes: Short term notice, objections thereto and objections to retirement of copper loops and copper subloops ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )*	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">03/14/02</a> , <a href="#">08/21/03</a> , <a href="#">10/18/04</a> , <a href="#">08/07/15</a> , <a href="#">11/19/17</a> , <a href="#">06/08/18</a> *
§ 51.335	Notice of network changes: Confidential or proprietary information	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a>
<b>Subpart E – Exemptions, Suspensions, and Modifications of Requirements of Section 251 of the Act</b>		
§ 51.401	State authority	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a>
§ 51.403	Carriers eligible for suspension or modification under section 251(f)(2) of the Act	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a>
§ 51.405	Burden of proof	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">07/18/97</a> , <a href="#">07/18/00</a> , <a href="#">05/13/02</a>
<b>Subpart F – Pricing of Elements</b>		
§ 51.501	Scope	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">07/18/97</a>
§ 51.503	General pricing standard	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">07/18/97</a>
§ 51.505	Forward-looking economic cost	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">07/18/97</a> , <a href="#">07/18/00</a> , <a href="#">05/13/02</a> , <a href="#">08/21/02</a>
§ 51.507	General rate structure standard	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> , amended: <a href="#">07/18/97</a>



§ 51.509	Rate structure standards for specific elements	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>08/21/03</u>
§ 51.511	Forward-looking economic cost per unit	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u>
§ 51.513	Proxies for forward-looking economic cost	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>09/27/96</u> , <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>07/18/00</u>
§ 51.515	Application of access charges	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>08/18/97</u> , <u>08/21/06</u>
<b>Subpart G – Resale</b>		
§ 51.601	Scope of resale rules	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u>
§ 51.603	Resale obligation of all local exchange carriers	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u>
§ 51.605	Additional obligations of incumbent local exchange carriers	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>11/09/99</u>
§ 51.607	Wholesale pricing standard	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u> , <u>11/09/99</u>
§ 51.609	Determination of avoided retail costs	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u> , <u>07/18/00</u> , <u>11/05/01</u> , <u>06/24/04</u>
§ 51.611	Interim wholesale rates	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>07/18/00</u>
§ 51.613	Restrictions on resale	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
§ 51.615	Withdrawal of services	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
§ 51.617	Assessment of end user common line charge on resellers	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u>
<b>Subpart H – Reciprocal Compensation for Transport and Termination of Telecommunications Traffic</b>		
§ 51.700	Purpose of this subpart See FCC 11-161, page 9 (chart identifying steps in transition)	Adopted: <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.701	Scope of transport and termination pricing rules	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> , amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>10/18/04</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.703	Non-Access reciprocal compensation obligation of LECs	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> ; amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.705	LECs' rates for transport and termination	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> ; amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.707	[Reserved]	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> ; amended: <u>09/27/96</u> , <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>07/18/00</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.709	Rate structure for transport and termination	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> ; amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.711	Symmetrical non-access reciprocal compensation	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> ; amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.713	Bill-and-keep arrangements	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> ; amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>01/25/99</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.715	Interim transport and termination pricing	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> ; amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
§ 51.717	[Reserved]	Adopted: <u>08/08/96</u> ; amended: <u>07/18/97</u> , <u>04/27/01</u> , <u>11/18/11</u>
<b>Subpart I – Procedures for Implementation of Section 252 of the Act</b>		

§ 51.801	Commission action upon a state commission's failure to act to carry out its responsibility under section 252 of the Act.	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a>
§ 51.803	Procedures for Commission notification of a state commission's failure to act	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a>
§ 51.805	The Commission's authority over proceedings and matters	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a>
§ 51.807	Arbitration and mediation of agreements by the Commission pursuant to section 252(e)(5) of the Act	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a>
§ 51.809	Availability of agreements to other telecommunications carriers under section 252(i) of the Act	Adopted: <a href="#">08/08/96</a> ; amended: <a href="#">07/18/97</a> , <a href="#">01/25/99</a> , <a href="#">07/13/04</a>
<b>Subpart J – Transitional Access Service Pricing</b>		
§ 51.901	Purpose and scope of transitional access service pricing rules	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a>
§ 51.903	Definitions ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )*, ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )**	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a> ; amended <a href="#">10/24/18</a> *, <a href="#">09/27/19</a> **
§ 51.905	Implementation	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a>
§ 51.907	Transition of price cap carrier access charges	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a> ; amended: <a href="#">06/05/12</a> , <a href="#">03/31/14</a>
§ 51.909	Transition of rate-of-return carrier access charges	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a> ; amended: <a href="#">06/05/12</a> , <a href="#">03/27/13</a> , <a href="#">03/31/14</a>
§ 51.911	Access reciprocal compensation rates for competitive LECs	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a> ; amended: <a href="#">06/05/12</a>
§ 51.913	Transition for VoIP-PSTN traffic	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a> ; amended: <a href="#">04/25/12</a>
§ 51.914	Additional provisions applicable to access stimulation traffic ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )*	Adopted: <a href="#">09/27/19</a> *
§ 51.915	Recovery mechanism for price cap carriers	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a> , amended: <a href="#">06/05/12</a> , <a href="#">03/27/13</a> , <a href="#">03/31/14</a>
§ 51.917	Revenue recovery for Rate-of-Return Carriers ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )* ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )**	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a> , amended: <a href="#">02/03/12</a> , <a href="#">03/27/13</a> , <a href="#">03/31/14</a> , <a href="#">02/25/15</a> , <a href="#">03/30/16</a> , <a href="#">02/16/18</a> *, <a href="#">09/27/19</a> **
§ 51.919	Reporting and monitoring ( <a href="#">pending text</a> )*	Adopted: <a href="#">11/18/11</a> *