

Will

1

(

(

(

The Commission Staff (Staff) filed a Memorandum on October 15, 1999, recommending that the Agreement be approved. 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 asked permission
to participate or requested a hearing in this case, the Commission may
grant the relief requested based on the verified application.

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 interconnec-
tion agreement only if the agreement is discriminatory or is inconsistent
with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

Staff stated in its recommendation that the terms of this
Agreement are substantially similar to the interconnection agreement
between Buy-Tel Communications and SWBT, approved in Case No. TO-99-3.
Staff stated in its memorandum 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. This condition has been applied in prior cases
where the Commission has approved similar agreements. Staff also
recommends, and the Commission agrees, that any modifications to this
agreement that may arise from modifications to the interconnection

agreement between Applicant and SWBT should be submitted according to the modification procedure discussed herein.

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 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:

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. Section 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. Section 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. Section 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 resale Agreement between SWBT and Applicant 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 Camarato Distributing, Inc., and Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, filed on September 10, 1999, is approved.

2. That Camarato Distributing, Inc., shall file an executed copy of this agreement with the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, with the pages numbered seriatim in the lower right-hand corner, on or before December 16, 1999. Camarato Distributing, Inc., 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 November 26, 1999.

BY THE COMMISSION

Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Kevin A. Thompson, Deputy Chief
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 16th day of November, 1999.

RECEIVED

NOV 16 1999

COMMISSION COUNSEL
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION