BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of a Master Interconnection, Collocation And Resale Agreement by and between Embarq Missouri, Inc., d/b/a CenturyLink and New Edge Network, Inc., d/b/a New Edge Networks pursuant to Sections 251 And 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)))))	**File No. TK-2012-0014**

ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION, COLLOCATION AND RESALE AGREEMENT

Issue Date: August 23, 2011 Effective Date: September 2, 2011

This order approves the Interconnection, Collocation and Resale Agreement executed by the parties and filed by Embarq Missouri, Inc., d/b/a CenturyLink (CenturyLink).

On July 15, 2011, CenturyLink filed an application with the Commission for approval of an Interconnection, Collocation and Resale Agreement with New Edge Network, Inc., d/b/a New Edge Networks (New Edge Networks). The Agreement was filed pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.[1] Both CenturyLink and New Edge Networks hold certificates of service authority to provide basic local exchange telecommunications services in Missouri.

Although New Edge Networks is a party to the Agreement, it did not join in the application. On July 22, 2011, the Commission issued an order making New Edge Networks a party in this case and directing any party wishing to request a hearing to do so no later than August 11, 2011. No requests for hearing were filed.

---

[1] *See* 47 U.S.C. § 251, *et seq*.

The Staff of the Commission filed a memorandum and recommendation on August 22, 2011, recommending that the Agreement be approved.

Discussion

Under Section 252(e) of the Act, any interconnection agreement adopted by negotiation must be submitted to the Commission for approval. The Commission may reject an agreement if it finds that the agreement is discriminatory or that it is not consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

The Staff memorandum recommends that the Agreement be approved and notes that the Agreement meets the limited requirements of the Act in that it is not discriminatory toward nonparties and is not against the public interest. Staff recommends that the Commission direct the parties to submit any amendments to the Commission for approval.

Findings of Fact

The Commission has considered the application, the supporting documentation, and Staff's verified recommendation. Based upon that review, the Commission finds that the Agreement meets the requirements of the Act in that it does not 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 shall be conditioned upon the parties submitting any amendments to the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure set out below.

Amendment Procedure

The Commission has a duty to review all interconnection agreements, whether arrived at through negotiation or arbitration, as mandated by the Act.[2] In order for the Commission's role of review and approval to be effective, the Commission must also review

and approve or recognize amendments to these agreements. The Commission has a further duty to make a copy of every interconnection agreement available for public inspection.[3] 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]

The parties to each interconnection agreement must maintain a complete and current copy of the agreement, together with all amendments, in the Commission's offices. Any proposed amendment must be submitted pursuant to Commission rule 4 CSR 240-3.513(6).

Conclusions of Law

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e)(1) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996,[5] is required to review negotiated interconnection 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.[6] Based upon its review of the Agreement between CenturyLink and New Edge Networks and its findings of fact, the Commission concludes that the Agreement is neither discriminatory nor inconsistent with the public interest and shall be approved.

The Commission notes that prior to providing telecommunications services in Missouri, a party shall possess the following: (1) an interconnection agreement approved by the Commission; (2) except for wireless providers, a certificate of service authority from

---

[2] 47 U.S.C. § 252.

[3] 47 U.S.C. § 252(h).

[4] 4 CSR 240-3.545.

[5] 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(1).

the Commission to provide interexchange or basic local telecommunications services; and (3) except for wireless providers, a tariff approved by the Commission.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

1. The Interconnection, Collocation and Resale Agreement between Embarq Missouri, Inc., d/b/a CenturyLink and New Edge Network, Inc., d/b/a New Edge Networks, filed on July 15, 2011, is approved.

2. Any changes or amendments to this Agreement shall be submitted in compliance with 4 CSR 240-3.513(6).

3. This order shall become effective on September 2, 2011.

4. This file may be closed on September 3, 2011.

BY THE COMMISSION

Steven C. Reed
Secretary

(S E A L)

Morris L. Woodruff, Chief Regulatory Law Judge, by delegation of authority pursuant to Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 23rd day of August, 2011.

[6] 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A).