BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Application of ExOp of Missouri, d/b/a Unite,)	
for Approval of a Traffic Termination)	Case No. TO-2006-0177
Agreement under the Telecommunications)	Case No. 10-2000-01//
Act of 1996	ì	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

COMES NOW the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) and for its recommendation respectfully states:

- 1. In the attached Memorandum, labeled Appendix A, the Staff recommends that the Missouri Public Service Commission grant approval of the Agreement characterized as a "Traffic Termination Agreement" between ExOp of Missouri, Inc. and United States Cellular Corporation (the "Agreement"), filed by ExOp of Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Unite under the provisions of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.
- 2. The terms of the Agreement do not discriminate against telecommunications carriers not a party to the Agreement and are not against the public interest, convenience or necessity. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §252(e), the Commission is to approve a negotiated interconnection agreement unless the terms of the agreement discriminate against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement, or implementation of the agreement or any portion thereof is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, or necessity.
- 3. Staff further states that ExOp of Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Unite submitted this negotiated Agreement pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and characterized the Agreement as a "Traffic Termination Agreement." Staff can find no reference in Section 252 to "Traffic Termination Agreement." Consequently, Staff recommends the Commission issue an

Order approving a wireless "interconnection agreement" and not an Order approving "Traffic Termination Agreement." The Commission has addressed this topic in a series of proceedings, consolidated for argument with the lead case of *Application of Kingdom Telephone Company for Approval of a Traffic Termination Agreement under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Case No. IO-2003-0201, and found the classification of "traffic termination agreement" to be nonexistent. *See, e.g.*, Order Denying Motion for Correction, *In the Matter of the Application of Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative for Approval of a Traffic Termination Agreement Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Case No. IK-2003-0245 (Sept. 25, 2003).

WHEREFORE, because the terms of the Agreement satisfy the standard set forth in 47 U.S.C. §252(e), Staff recommends the Commission approve the Agreement as a Wireless Interconnection Agreement and direct the parties to submit any future modifications or amendments to the Agreement to the Commission for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

DANA K. JOYCE General Counsel

/s/ David A. Meyer

David A. Meyer Senior Counsel Missouri Bar No. 46620

Attorney for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission P. O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-8706 (Telephone)
(573) 751-9285 (Fax)
david.meyer@psc.mo.gov

Certificate of Service

I hereby	certify	that copie	s of the	foregoing	have b	een ma	iled, h	and-delivered,	transmitted 1	bу
facsimile	or elect	tronically	mailed to	all couns	el of rec	cord this	s 16 th d	lay of Novembe	er 2005.	

/s/	David	A.	Meyer	
	_ 00 1 - 00			

MEMORANDUM

To: Missouri Public Service Commission Official Case File Case No. TO-2006-0177							
	Party: ExOp of Missouri d/b/a Unit	te					
	Type of Certification:	.•					
	None						
	Basic Local						
	Local (restricted to private line)						
	Local (no restrictions)						
	Interexchange						
	Party: US Cellular						
	None						
	Basic Local						
	Local (restricted to private li	ine)					
	Local (no restrictions) Interexchange						
	interexchange						
From:	Lisa Mahaney, Telecommunications Department						
	William Voight 11/16/05	/s/ David A. Meyer	. 11/16/05				
	Utility Operations Division/Date						
	Carrier Carrie						
Subject:	Staff Recommendation for Approva	al of Interconnection A	Agreement				
Date:	November 21, 2005						
Date Filed:	10/19/05	Staff Deadline:	11/21/05				
	munications Department Staff (Staff es submitted (may check more than or		Parties be granted				
	Resale Agreement						
	Facilities-based Interconnection Agreement						
	_						
	Wireless Interconnection Agreement						

The parties submitted the proposed Agreement to the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission) pursuant to the terms of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act). Staff has reviewed the proposed Agreement and believes it meets the limited requirements of the Act. Specifically, the Agreement: 1) does not discriminate against telecommunications carriers not party to the Agreement and 2) is not against the public interest, convenience or necessity. Staff recommends the Commission direct the Parties to submit any modifications or amendments to the Commission for approval.

		Staff does not have a serially numbered copy of the Agreement and recommends the Commission direct the Parties to submit a serially numbered copy of the Agreement. Staff has a serially numbered copy of the Agreement.					
		Interconnection Agreement Review Items					
\boxtimes	No ap	plications to intervene filed.					
\boxtimes	Agreement signed by both Parties.						
assess Th relief/a should delinq	ment. e Compaction of the instruction.	any is not delinquent in filing an annual report and paying the PSC rany is delinquent. Staff recommends the Commission grant the requested in the condition the applicant corrects the delinquency. The applicant ructed to make the appropriate filing in this case after it has corrected the l report \times Unpaid PSC assessment. Amount owed:)					
		achment to this recommendation indicating any recommendations or special s: X yes No					

Attachment to Case No. TO-2006-0177

The Parties have submitted this negotiated Agreement pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and characterized the Agreement as a "Traffic Termination Agreement." Staff can find no reference in Section 252 to "Traffic Termination Agreement." Consequently, Staff recommends the Commission issue an Order approving a wireless "interconnection agreement" and not an Order approving "Traffic Termination agreement."