

retail comparison standards for this checklist item. Verizon also demonstrates that it offers interconnection in Maryland, Washington, DC, and West Virginia to other telecommunications carriers at just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory rates, in compliance with checklist item 1.

#### Other Items in Dispute

12. *Checklist Item 4—Unbundled Local Loops.* Verizon demonstrates that it provides unbundled local loops in accordance with the requirements of section 271 and our rules, in that it provides “local loop transmission from the central office to the customer’s premises, unbundled from local switching or other services.” The Commission’s conclusions are based on Verizon’s performance for all loop types, which include, as in past section 271 orders, voice grade loops, hot cut provisioning, xDSL-capable loops, digital loops, high capacity loops, as well as our review of Verizon’s processes for line sharing and line splitting.

13. *Checklist Item 7—911–E911 Access & Directory Assistance/Operator Services.* Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(I), (II), and (III) require a BOC to provide nondiscriminatory access to “911 and E911 services,” “directory assistance services to allow the other carrier’s customers to obtain telephone numbers” and “operator call completion services,” respectively. Additionally, section 251(b)(3) of the 1996 Act imposes on each LEC “the duty to permit all [competing providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service] to have nondiscriminatory access to “\* \* \* operator services, directory assistance, and directory listing with no unreasonable dialing delays.” Based on the evidence in the record, the Commission concludes that Verizon offers nondiscriminatory access to its 911–E911 databases, operator services (OS), and directory assistance (DA).

14. *Checklist Item 8—White Pages.* Section 271(c)(2)(B)(viii) of the Act requires a BOC to provide “[w]hite page directory listings for customers of the other carrier’s telephone exchange service.” The Commission has previously found that a BOC satisfies the requirements of checklist item 8 by demonstrating that it: (1) Provides nondiscriminatory appearance and integration of white page directory listings to competitive LECs’ customers; and (2) provides white page listings for competitors’ customers with the same accuracy and reliability that it provides its own customers. Based on the

evidence in the record, the Commission concludes that Verizon satisfies checklist item 8.

15. *Checklist Item 10—Databases and Associated Signaling.* Section 271(c)(2)(B)(x) of the Act requires a BOC to provide “nondiscriminatory access to databases and associated signaling necessary for call routing and completion.” Based on the evidence in the record, the Commission finds that Verizon provides nondiscriminatory access to databases and signaling networks in the application states.

16. *Checklist Item 11—Local Number Portability.* Section 251(b)(2) requires all LECs “to provide, to the extent technically feasible, number portability in accordance with requirements prescribed by the Commission.” Based on the evidence in the record, the Commission finds that Verizon complies with the requirements of checklist item 11.

17. *Checklist Item 13—Reciprocal Compensation.* Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii) of the Act requires BOCs to enter into “[r]eciprocal compensation arrangements in accordance with the requirements of section 252(d)(2).” In turn, section 252(d)(2)(A) specifies the conditions necessary for a state commission to find that the terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation are just and reasonable. The Commission concludes that Verizon provides reciprocal compensation as required by checklist item 13.

18. *Checklist Item 14—Resale.* Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv) of the Act requires that a BOC make “telecommunications services \* \* \* available for resale in accordance with the requirements of section 251(c)(4) and section 252(d)(3).” Based on the record in this proceeding, the Commission concludes as that Verizon satisfies the requirements of this checklist item. Verizon has demonstrated that it has satisfied its legal obligation to make retail telecommunications services available for resale to competitive LECs at wholesale rates.

19. *Remaining Checklist items (3, 5, 6 and 9).* In addition to showing that it is in compliance with the requirements discussed above, an applicant under section 271 must demonstrate that it complies with checklist item 3 (access to poles, ducts, and conduits), item 5 (unbundled transport), item 6 (local switching unbundled from transport), and item 9 (numbering administration). Based on the evidence in the record, the Commission concludes that Verizon demonstrates that it is in compliance with the requirements of these checklist items. It notes that no party objects to Verizon’s compliance with these

checklist items (other than checklist item 5, which is addressed as part of checklist item 4).

20. *Section 272 Compliance.* Based on the record, Verizon provides evidence that it maintains the same structural separation and nondiscrimination safeguards in the application states as it does in Virginia, New Jersey, Connecticut, Maine, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts—where Verizon has already received section 271 authority. Based on the record before us, we conclude that Verizon has demonstrated that it will comply with the requirements of section 272.

21. *Public Interest Analysis.* The Commission concludes that approval of this application is consistent with the public interest. From its extensive review of the competitive checklist, which embodies the critical elements of market entry under the Act, we find that barriers to competitive entry in the local exchange markets have been removed and the local exchange markets in Maryland, Washington, DC and West Virginia are open to competition. The Commission further finds that, as noted in prior section 271 orders, BOC entry into the long distance market will benefit consumers and competition if the relevant local exchange market is open to competition consistent with the competitive checklist. Verizon demonstrates that there is significant local competition in Maryland, Washington, DC and West Virginia and that Verizon’s local market will remain open to competition, and that section 271 approval would enhance local and long distance competition in Maryland, Washington, DC and West Virginia.

22. *Section 271(d)(6) Enforcement Authority.* Working with each of the state commissions, the Commission intends to closely monitor Verizon’s post-approval compliance to ensure that Verizon continues to meet the conditions required for section 271 approval. It stands ready to exercise its various statutory enforcement powers quickly and decisively in appropriate circumstances to ensure that the local market remains open in each of the states.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–7332 Filed 3–26–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P