

JW

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of       )  
AccuTel of Texas, Inc. for Approval       )  
of a Resale Agreement under the       )  
Telecommunications Act of 1996       )  
Case No. TO-2000-577

### ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT

On March 17, 2000, AccuTel of Texas, Inc. (AccuTel) filed a petition with the Commission requesting approval of its resale agreement (the Agreement) with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (SWBT) under the provisions of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act). Although SWBT is a party to the Agreement, it did not join in the application. On March 24, 2000, the Commission issued an order making SWBT a party in this case and directing any party wishing to request a hearing or to participate without intervention to do so no later than April 13, 2000. No applications to participate or requests for hearing were filed.

The requirement for a hearing is met when the opportunity for hearing has been provided and no proper party has requested the opportunity to present evidence. State ex rel. Rex Deffenderfer Enterprises, Inc. v. Public Service Commission, 776 S.W.2d 494, 496 (Mo. App. 1989). Since no one has requested permission to participate or requested a hearing, the Commission may grant the relief requested based on the application.

The Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) was directed to file a memorandum advising its position regarding this agreement by May 30, 2000. On April 21, 2000, Staff filed its recommendation that the Agreement be approved.

### Discussion

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e) of the Act, has authority to approve an interconnection or resale agreement negotiated between an incumbent local exchange company (LEC) and a new provider of basic local exchange service. The Commission may reject an interconnection or resale agreement only if the agreement is discriminatory or is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

The application stated that the Agreement was negotiated and entered into by SWBT and AccuTel pursuant to Section 252(A)(1) of the federal Telecommunications Act. Further, the applicant stated that the Agreement was executed by AccuTel on November 9, 1999, and by SWBT on November 16, 1999, and that there are no outstanding issues between SWBT and AccuTel that need assistance of mediation or arbitration.

Staff stated in its recommendation that the terms and rates of this Agreement are similar to those contained and approved in other interconnection agreements, with a specific reference to Case No. TO-2000-451, the interconnection agreement between SWBT and Comm South Companies, Inc. Staff also stated that the Agreement meets the limited requirements of the Act in that it does not appear to be discriminatory toward nonparties, and does not appear to be against the public interest, convenience or necessity. Staff recommended

approval of the Agreement provided that all modifications to the Agreement be submitted to the Commission for approval. These conditions have been applied in prior cases where the Commission has approved similar agreements.

### **Findings of Fact**

The Missouri Public Service Commission, having considered all of the competent and substantial evidence upon the whole record, makes the following findings of fact.

The Commission has considered the application, the supporting documentation, and Staff's recommendation. Based upon that review, the Commission has reached the conclusion that the Agreement meets the requirements of the Act in that it does not unduly discriminate against a nonparty carrier, and implementation of the Agreement is not inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity. The Commission finds that approval of the Agreement should be conditioned upon the parties submitting any modifications or amendments to the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure set out below.

### **Modification Procedure**

This Commission has a duty to review all resale and interconnection agreements, whether arrived at through negotiation or arbitration, as mandated by the Act. 47 U.S.C. § 252. In order for the Commission's role of review and approval to be effective, the Commission must also review and approve modifications to these agreements. The Commission has a further duty to make a copy of every resale and interconnection agreement available for public inspection.

47 U.S.C. § 252(h). This duty is in keeping with the Commission's practice under its own rules of requiring telecommunication companies to keep their rate schedules on file with the Commission. 4 CSR 240-30.010.

The parties to each resale or interconnection agreement must maintain a complete and current copy of the agreement, together with all modifications, in the Commission's offices. Any proposed modification must be submitted for Commission approval, whether the modification arises through negotiation, arbitration, or by means of alternative dispute resolution procedures.

AccuTel has provided the Telecommunications Staff with a copy of the resale or interconnection agreement with the pages numbered consecutively in the lower right-hand corner. Modifications to an agreement must be submitted to the Staff for review. When approved the modified pages will be substituted in the Agreement, which should contain the number of the page being replaced in the lower right-hand corner. Staff will date-stamp the pages when they are inserted into the Agreement. The Telecommunications Staff will maintain the official record of the original agreement and all the modifications made in the Commission's tariff room.

The Commission does not intend to conduct a full proceeding each time the parties agree to a modification. Where a proposed modification is identical to a provision that has been approved by the Commission in another agreement, the modification will be approved once Staff has verified that the provision is an approved provision, and prepared a recommendation advising approval. Where a proposed

modification is not contained in another approved agreement, Staff will review the modification and its effects and prepare a recommendation advising the Commission whether the modification should be approved. The Commission may approve the modification based on the Staff recommendation. If the Commission chooses not to approve the modification, the Commission will establish a case, give notice to interested parties and permit responses. The Commission may conduct a hearing if it is deemed necessary.

### Conclusions of Law

The Missouri Public Service Commission has arrived at the following conclusions of law.

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e)(1) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. 252(e)(1), is required to review negotiated resale agreements. It may only reject a negotiated agreement upon a finding that its implementation would be discriminatory to a nonparty or inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity under Section 252(e)(2)(A). Based upon its review of the Agreement between AccuTel and SWBT, and its findings of fact, the Commission concludes that the Agreement is neither discriminatory nor inconsistent with the public interest and should be approved.

### **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

1. That the interconnection agreement between AccuTel of Texas, Inc. and Southwestern Bell Telephone Company filed on March 17, 2000 is approved.


2. That a copy of the interconnection agreement with the pages numbered seriatim in the lower right-hand corner shall be filed in the tariff room.

3. That any changes or modifications to this Agreement shall be filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure outlined in this order.

4. That this order shall become effective on May 9, 2000.

5. That this case may be closed after May 10, 2000.

BY THE COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Dale Hardy Roberts". The signature is written in a cursive style with a vertical line to the left of the name.

Dale Hardy Roberts  
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Shelly A. Register, Regulatory Law  
Judge, by delegation of authority  
pursuant to 4 CSR 240-2.120(1),  
(November 30, 1995) and Section 386.240,  
RSMo 1994.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,  
on this 27th day of April, 2000.