

RECEIVED

SEP 5 1989

COMMISSION COUNSEL
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a session of the Public Service Commission held at its office in Jefferson City on the 5th day of September, 1989.

In the matter of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's application for classification of its nonbasic services.

Case No. TO-89-56

ORDER

On July 26, 1989, MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI) filed a motion requesting the Commission determine whether the appropriate classification of services approved by the Commission in Cases No. TR-89-256 and TR-89-257 (Micro-link I, Selective Call Forwarding and Call Control Options) will be addressed in this case. The Commission approved Microlink I and Call Control as transitionally competitive services on July 19, 1989. On August 2, 1989, Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (SWB) filed a response in which it indicated it had no objection to the Commission considering the proper classification of these services in this case.

Since the motion and response filed above, SWB has filed a pleading withdrawing its prefiled testimony in this matter and amending its request for classification of services. SWB now is requesting only that Speed Calling and Billing and Collection services be classified as transitionally competitive. SWB states it is withdrawing its prefiled testimony because of the length of time until the classification issues will be addressed under the new procedural schedule adopted by the Commission on July 14, 1989. SWB states it is amending its request for classification to streamline the proceedings and because of its concerns that the Commission's decision concerning the costing and pricing of services may be "so onerous as to render effective and vigorous participation by Southwestern Bell in the marketplace impossible."

SWB is entitled to withdraw its testimony and amend its requests for classification as it determines will meet its best interest. The Commission, though, is perplexed at SWB's reluctance now to proceed with the classification of its services since it concurred in the procedural schedule adopted by the Commission, even though the Commission proposed a much shorter schedule. If SWB's reduction of the number of services to be classified will streamline these proceedings, the Commission appreciates SWB's actions. Any indication, though, that the two-year procedural schedule cannot be met seems very pessimistic. Now that the primary focus of this case is on the costing and pricing issues, the procedural schedule should not need further modification.


The Commission has determined, further, that since SWB has withdrawn the request for classification for all but two services, there will be no added burden to the record to review whether Call Control Options, Selective Call Forwarding and Microlink I are properly classified as transitionally competitive. These services shall be addressed in this case.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED: 1. That classification of Call Control Options, Selective Call Forwarding and Microlink I will be considered in this case.

ORDERED: 2. That this order shall become effective on the date hereof.

BY THE COMMISSION


Harvey G. Hubbs
Secretary

(S E A L)

Mueller, Fischer and Rauch, CC.,
Concur.
Steinmeier, Chm., Absent.