

P/B

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Request of CCCMO, Inc.)
doing business as Connect!, for Approval)
of an Interconnection Agreement between) Case No. TO-99-476
CCCMO, Inc., doing business as Connect!,)
and Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.)

NOTICE

On April 20, 1999, CCCMO, Inc., doing business as Connect! (Applicant), filed an application with the Commission seeking approval of an interconnection agreement with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (SWBT) under the provisions of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act). That application did not conform in all respects to the Commission's rules governing applications and the Commission twice, on April 29, 1999, and on June 3, 1999, directed Applicant to supplement or amend its application.

On June 10, 1999, Applicant filed its Supplement to Amended Motion for Approval of Interconnection Agreement. This pleading corrected the deficiencies referred to above. However, this pleading also demonstrated that Applicant is laboring under a misconception which this Notice will seek to address.

Applicant previously, on January 21, 1999, attempted to file an application seeking approval of an interconnection agreement. The tendered pleading was initially accepted and assigned Case No. TO-99-308. However, that application, like the application filed herein on April 20, 1999, was deficient and, on January 28, 1999, the Secretary

of the Commission returned it to Applicant, accompanied by a checklist enumerating its faults. Case No. TO-99-308 was thus removed from the docket and records of the Commission.

Applicant's second application, filed on April 20, 1999, was captioned as an Amended Motion for Approval of Interconnection Agreement and displayed Case No. TO-99-308. However, because that case no longer existed on April 20, 1999, the Secretary of the Commission assigned a new case number—Case No. TO-99-476—to that application and treated it in all respects as an original application. Thus, the status of this matter today, from the point of view of the Commission, is that Applicant on June 10, 1999, finally perfected the application it originally sought to file on April 20, 1999.

Proceedings brought under the Act seeking approval of interconnection agreements are governed by the time limitation at 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(4), that requires a state commission to approve or reject a negotiated agreement within 90 days of submission. Because Applicant did not perfect its application under the Commission's procedural rules until June 10, 1999, the 90-day clock did not start to run until that day. Pursuant to the Act, at 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(3), "nothing in this section shall prohibit a State commission from establishing or enforcing other requirements of State law in its

review of an agreement, including requiring compliance with intrastate telecommunications service quality standards or requirements."

BY THE COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dale Hardy Roberts". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized script.

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 14th day of June, 1999.

Thompson, Deputy Chief Regulatory Law Judge

RECEIVED

JUN 15 1999

COMMISSION COUNSEL
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION