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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.


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 §§ 51.319 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

07/18/97 The U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th 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 (8th 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 8th 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).


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).


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 adjacent features related to providing operator services and directory assistance

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.


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 colocation. 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 ILECs’ 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 (8th Cir. 2000).

08/10/00 The Commission amended §§ 51.5, 51.321, and 51.323, adopting time frames for the implementation of collocation provision. 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 17806 (2000). 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
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, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in
(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
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.

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.,

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
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, 8th 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 (8th 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,
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
Effective 10/02/03.

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

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, 32.3205, 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


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.


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 Intercarrier 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 (8th 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 (10th 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

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, 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; 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.


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
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 05/03/18.

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: 08/08/18; sections 51.333(g)(1)(i), (g)(1)(iii), and (g)(2) and effective 12/26/18.

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, 34 FCC Rcd 9035 (2019). Effective: 11/27/19. Compliance with requirements in §§ 51.914(b) and 51.914(e) is required as of June 9, 2020.
# Chronologies

## Subpart A – General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.1</td>
<td>Basis and purpose</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.3</td>
<td>Applicability to negotiated agreements</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.5</td>
<td>Terms and definitions</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 03/31/99, 11/05/99, 12/09/99, 08/10/00, 08/08/01, 08/21/03, 02/04/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Subpart B – Telecommunications Carriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.100</td>
<td>General duty</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Subpart C – Obligations of All Local Exchange Carriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.201</td>
<td>Resale</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.203</td>
<td>Number portability</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.205</td>
<td>Dialing parity: General</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.207</td>
<td>Local dialing parity</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.209</td>
<td>Toll dialing parity</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.213</td>
<td>Toll dialing parity implementation plans</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 08/21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.215</td>
<td>Dialing parity: Cost recovery</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.217</td>
<td>Nondiscriminatory access: Telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance services, and directory listings</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 09/09/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.219</td>
<td>Access to rights of way</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.221</td>
<td>Reciprocal compensation</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.223</td>
<td>Application of additional requirements</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.230</td>
<td>Presumption of acceptability for deployment of an advanced services loop technology</td>
<td>12/09/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.231</td>
<td>Provision of information on advanced services deployment</td>
<td>12/09/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.232</td>
<td>Binder group management</td>
<td>12/09/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.233</td>
<td>Significant degradation of services caused by deployment of advanced services</td>
<td>12/09/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Subpart D – Additional Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.301</td>
<td>Duty to negotiate</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 08/21/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.303</td>
<td>Preexisting agreements</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 07/18/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.305</td>
<td>Interconnection</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 08/08/96, 07/18/97, 07/18/00, 08/21/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.307</td>
<td>Duty to provide access on an unbundled basis to network elements</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.309</td>
<td>Use of unbundled network elements</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 08/21/03, 02/04/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.311</td>
<td>Nondiscriminatory access to unbundled network elements</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 07/18/00, 08/21/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Adopted/Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.313</td>
<td>Just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions for the provision of unbundled network elements</td>
<td>08/08/96, amended: 09/27/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.315</td>
<td>Combination of unbundled network elements</td>
<td>08/08/96, 01/25/99, 07/18/00, 05/13/02, 08/21/02, 07/18/97, 08/21/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.316</td>
<td>Conversion of unbundled network elements and services</td>
<td>08/21/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.317</td>
<td>Standards for requiring the unbundling of network elements</td>
<td>08/08/96, 11/05/99, 07/18/00, 08/21/03, 07/18/97, 02/04/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.318</td>
<td>Eligibility criteria for access to certain unbundled network elements</td>
<td>08/21/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.319</td>
<td>Specific unbundling requirements</td>
<td>08/08/96, 01/25/99, 11/05/99, 12/09/99, 08/21/03, 08/09/04, 08/20/04, 07/18/97, 02/04/05, 10/18/04, 10/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.320</td>
<td>Assumption of responsibility by the Commission</td>
<td>08/21/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.321</td>
<td>Methods of obtaining interconnection and access to unbundled elements under section 251 of the Act</td>
<td>08/08/96, 08/10/00, 08/08/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.323</td>
<td>Standards for physical collocation and virtual collocation</td>
<td>08/08/96, 03/31/99, 08/08/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.325</td>
<td>Notice of network changes: Public notice requirement</td>
<td>08/08/96, 08/21/03, 08/07/15, 11/29/17, 06/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.327</td>
<td>Notice of network changes: Content of notice</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.329</td>
<td>Notice of network changes: Methods for providing notice</td>
<td>08/08/96, 03/14/02, 08/21/06, 11/26/14, 07/15/16, 11/19/17, 12/18/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.331</td>
<td>Notice of network changes: Timing of notice</td>
<td>08/08/96, 08/21/03, 08/07/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.332</td>
<td>[Repealed]</td>
<td>08/07/15, amended: 11/29/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.333</td>
<td>Notice of Network Changes: Short term notice, objections thereto and objections to retirement of copper loops and copper subloops</td>
<td>08/08/96, 03/14/02, 08/21/03, 08/07/15, 11/19/17, 06/08/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 51.335</td>
<td>Notice of network changes: Confidential or proprietary information</td>
<td>08/08/96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subpart E – Exemptions, Suspensions, and Modifications of Requirements of Section 251 of the Act**

| § 51.401 | State authority                                                             | 08/08/96                                  |
| § 51.403 | Carriers eligible for suspension or modification under section 251(f)(2) of the Act | 08/08/96                                  |
| § 51.405 | Burden of proof                                                             | 08/08/96, 07/18/00, 05/13/02             |

**Subpart F – Pricing of Elements**

| § 51.501 | Scope                                                                      | 08/08/96, 07/18/97                         |
| § 51.503 | General pricing standard                                                   | 08/08/96, 07/18/97                         |
| § 51.505 | Forward-looking economic cost                                             | 08/08/96, 07/18/00, 05/13/02, 08/21/02, 07/18/97 |
| § 51.507 | General rate structure standard                                            | 08/08/96, 07/18/97                         |
### Part 51 – Interconnection

#### § 51.509
Rate structure standards for specific elements
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 08/21/03

#### § 51.511
Forward-looking economic cost per unit
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97

#### § 51.513
Proxies for forward-looking economic cost
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 07/18/00

#### § 51.515
Application of access charges
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 08/18/97, 08/21/06

### Subpart G – Resale

#### § 51.601
Scope of resale rules
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 01/25/99

#### § 51.603
Resale obligation of all local exchange carriers
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 04/27/01, 11/18/11

#### § 51.605
Additional obligations of incumbent local exchange carriers
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 01/25/99, 11/18/11

#### § 51.607
Wholesale pricing standard

#### § 51.609
Determination of avoided retail costs
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 01/25/99, 07/18/00, 11/05/01, 06/24/04

#### § 51.611
Interim wholesale rates
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97

#### § 51.613
Restrictions on resale
Adopted: 08/08/96

#### § 51.615
Withdrawal of services
Adopted: 08/08/96

#### § 51.617
Assessment of end user common line charge on resellers
Adopted: 08/08/96

### Subpart H – Reciprocal Compensation for Transport and Termination of Telecommunications Traffic

#### § 51.700
Purpose of this subpart See FCC 11-161, page 9 (chart identifying steps in transition)
Adopted: 11/18/11

#### § 51.701
Scope of transport and termination pricing rules
Adopted: 08/08/96, amended: 07/18/97, 04/27/01, 07/18/00, 11/18/11

#### § 51.703
Non-Access reciprocal compensation obligation of LECs
Adopted: 08/08/96; amended: 07/18/97, 04/27/01, 11/18/11

#### § 51.705
LECs' rates for transport and termination
Adopted: 08/08/96; amended: 07/18/97, 04/27/01, 11/18/11

#### § 51.707
[Reserved]
Adopted: 08/08/96; amended: 09/27/96, 07/18/97, 01/25/99, 04/27/01, 07/18/00, 11/18/11

#### § 51.709
Rate structure for transport and termination
Adopted: 08/08/96; amended: 07/18/97, 01/25/99, 04/27/01, 11/18/11

#### § 51.711
Symmetrical non-access reciprocal compensation
Adopted: 08/08/96; amended: 07/18/97, 01/25/99, 04/27/01, 11/18/11

#### § 51.713
Bill-and-keep arrangements
Adopted: 08/08/96; amended: 07/18/97, 01/25/99, 04/27/01, 11/18/11

#### § 51.715
Interim transport and termination pricing
Adopted: 08/08/96; amended: 07/18/97, 04/27/01, 11/18/11

#### § 51.717
[Reserved]
Adopted: 08/08/96; amended: 07/18/97, 04/27/01, 11/18/11

### Subpart I – Procedures for Implementation of Section 252 of the Act
### § 51.801
Commission action upon a state commission's failure to act to carry out its responsibility under section 252 of the Act.  
**Adopted:** 08/08/96

### § 51.803
Procedures for Commission notification of a state commission's failure to act  
**Adopted:** 08/08/96

### § 51.805
The Commission's authority over proceedings and matters  
**Adopted:** 08/08/96

### § 51.807
Arbitration and mediation of agreements by the Commission pursuant to section 252(e)(5) of the Act  
**Adopted:** 08/08/96

### § 51.809
Availability of agreements to other telecommunications carriers under section 252(i) of the Act  
**Adopted:** 08/08/96; amended: 07/18/97, 01/25/99, 07/13/04

### Subpart J – Transitional Access Service Pricing

#### § 51.901
Purpose and scope of transitional access service pricing rules  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11

#### § 51.903
Definitions *(pending text)*  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11; amended 10/24/18*, 09/27/19

#### § 51.905
Implementation  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11

#### § 51.907
Transition of price cap carrier access charges  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11; amended: 06/05/12, 03/31/14

#### § 51.909
Transition of rate-of-return carrier access charges  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11; amended: 06/05/12, 03/27/13, 03/31/14

#### § 51.911
Access reciprocal compensation rates for competitive LECs  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11; amended: 06/05/12

#### § 51.913
Transition for VoIP-PSTN traffic  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11; amended: 04/25/12

#### § 51.914
Additional provisions applicable to access stimulation traffic  
**Adopted:** 09/27/19

#### § 51.915
Recovery mechanism for price cap carriers  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11, amended: 06/05/12, 03/27/13, 03/31/14

#### § 51.917
Revenue recovery for Rate-of-Return Carriers  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11, amended: 02/03/12, 03/27/13, 03/31/14, 02/25/15, 03/30/16, 02/16/18, 09/27/19

#### § 51.919
Reporting and monitoring *(pending text)*  
**Adopted:** 11/18/11