

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Review of the Section 251 Unbundling)	
Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange)	CC Docket No. 01-338
Carriers)	
)	
Implementation of the Local Competition)	CC Docket No. 96-98
Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of)	
1996)	
)	
Deployment of Wireline Services Offering)	CC Docket No. 98-147
Advanced Telecommunications Capability)	

ORDER

Adopted: October 28, 2003

Released: October 28, 2003

By the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau

1. In a Public Notice released October 9, 2003, the Commission published a list of parties that had filed petitions for reconsideration and clarification of the Commission's Triennial Review Order¹ released August 21, 2003.² In the Public Notice, the Commission noted that oppositions to those petitions must be filed within 15 days of public notice of the petitions in the Federal Register.³ Based upon publication of notice in the Federal Register, parties are required to file oppositions to the petitions by November 6, 2003.⁴ Replies to the oppositions must be filed by November 17, 2003 – within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

¹ *Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (CC Docket No. 01-338), Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (CC Docket No. 96-98), and Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability (CC Docket No. 98-147), Report and Order and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 03-36 at paras. 713, 720-29 (rel. Aug. 21, 2003) (Triennial Review Order).*

² Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98 and 98-147, Public Notice, Report No. 2635 (rel. Oct. 9, 2003).

³ *Id.*

⁴ 68 FR 60391 (Oct. 22, 2003).

2. On October 22, 2003, the Association of Local Telecommunications Services (“ALTS”) filed a motion to extend the dates for filing comments and reply comments.⁵ In its motion, ALTS claims that the extension of time it requested is essential to allow parties the opportunity to consider and evaluate the multiple petitions for reconsideration.⁶ Specifically, ALTS says the issues raised by the BellSouth Petition for Reconsideration require more time for the parties to develop “a thorough record, backed by detailed studies evaluating the consequences of further deregulation.”⁷

3. It is the policy of the Commission that extensions of time are not routinely granted.⁸ In this instance, the Bureau finds that ALTS has not shown good cause for an extension of the deadline for filing comments in this proceeding. As BellSouth noted in its opposition to the ALTS motion,⁹ the issues contained in the petitions are related to issues that the Commission has been considering for more than a year. Thus, ALTS is already familiar with the issues here and maintaining the existing pleading cycle should not place any unreasonable burdens on ALTS.

4. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i) and 4(j), of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i) and 154(j), and sections 0.91 and 0.291 of the Commission’s rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, the ALTS motion for extension of the comment period regarding petitions for reconsideration IS DENIED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

William F. Maher, Jr.
Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau

⁵ Motion for Extension of Comment Period Regarding Petitions for Reconsideration, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98 and 98-147 (filed Oct. 22, 2003). MCI supports the ALTS’s request for an extension of time. Letter from Kimberly A. Scardino, Director, Federal Advocacy, MCI, to William F. Maher, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98 and 98-147 (filed Oct. 27, 2003).

⁶ *Id.* at 1.

⁷ *Id.* at 2.

⁸ 47 C.F.R. § 1.46(a).

⁹ BellSouth Opposition to Motion for Extension of Time, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98 and 98-147 (filed Oct. 24, 2003).