

108

(

(

## (

(

services in the order approving stipulation and agreement issued on January 12, 1999, in case number TA-99-48.

### **Discussion**

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

On February 4, 1999, the Staff of the Public Service Commission (Staff) filed a Memorandum that recommends that the Commission approve the submitted interconnection agreement. Staff stated in its recommendation 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. Staff recommended approval of the Agreement provided that all modifications to the Agreement are submitted to the Commission for approval. This condition has 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 and the supporting documentation, including Staff's recommendation. Based upon that review, the Commission has reached the conclusion that the interconnection 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**

The 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 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 telecommunications 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.

The parties shall provide 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 official record of the original agreement and all the modifications made will be maintained by the Telecommunications Staff 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 interconnection agreement between SWBT and Nextlink 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 Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and Nextlink Missouri, Inc. filed on December 11, 1998 is approved.

2. That Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and Nextlink Missouri, Inc. shall file a copy of the agreement with the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, with the pages numbered seriatim in the lower right-hand corner no later than February 20, 1999. The parties shall file on the same date a notice in the official case file advising

the Commission that the agreement has been submitted to Staff as required.

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 February 23, 1999.

5. That this case may be closed on February 24, 1999.

BY THE COMMISSION



Dale Hardy Roberts  
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

( S E A L )

Lumpe, Ch., Crumpton, Murray,  
Schemenauer, and Drainer, CC., concur

Hopkins, Senior Regulatory Law Judge

RECEIVED  
FEB 10 1999  
COMMISSION COUNSEL  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION