

**STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
JEFFERSON CITY
December 1, 1999**

CASE NO: TO-2000-261

Office of the Public Counsel
P.O. Box 7800
Jefferson City, MO 65102

General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102


**Paul G. Lane/Leo J. Bub/ Katherine C. Swaller/
Anthony K. Conroy**
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company
One Bell Center, Room 3536
St. Louis, MO 63101

James M. Fischer
101 West McCarty Street, Suite 215
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Joe Cosgrove
SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc.
1010 N. St. Mary's, Room 1407
San Antonio, TX 78215

Enclosed find certified copy of an ORDER in the above-numbered case(s).

Sincerely,



Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of SBC)
Advanced Solutions, Inc. for Approval of an)
Interconnection Agreement with Southwestern) Case No. TO-2000-261
Bell Telephone Company)

ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT

Procedural History

On September 30, 1999, SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc. (Applicant) filed with the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission) an Interconnection Agreement (Agreement) and Application for Approval of Interconnection Agreement (Application) under the provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act). The Commission issued its Order Directing Notice and Making Southwestern Bell Telephone Company a Party on October 7, 1999, directing any party wishing to request a hearing or participate without intervention to do so no later than October 27, 1999, and also making Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (SWBT) a party. No applications to participate or requests for hearing were filed. 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.

On November 9, 1999, MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC, Brooks Fiber Communications of Missouri, Inc., and MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. filed an application for participation without intervention, which was denied on November 30, 1999.

Applicant was granted a certificate of service authority to provide interexchange and nonswitched local exchange telecommunication services in the order issued in the matter of the Application of SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc. for a Certificate of Service Authority to Provide (Advanced Services Telecommunications) within the State of Missouri on November 8, 1999, in Case No. TA-2000-260.

Discussion

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e) of the Act, has the authority to approve an interconnection agreement negotiated between an incumbent local exchange company 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 November 24, 1999, the Staff of the Commission (Staff) filed a Memorandum that recommended that Applicant and SWBT be granted approval of the resale and facilities-based interconnection agreement (i.e., the Agreement). Staff stated that the Agreement meets the limited requirements of the Act. Specifically, Staff stated that the Agreement

does not appear to discriminate against telecommunications carriers not party to the Agreement, and the Agreement does not appear to be against the public interest, convenience or necessity. Staff further recommended that the Commission direct SWBT and Applicant to submit any modifications or amendments to the Agreement 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 finds that the Agreement meets the requirements of the Act in that it does not unduly discriminate against a nonparty carrier and also finds that 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 pursuant to Commission Rule 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.

SWBT and Applicant have already provided the Staff with a copy of the resale or interconnection agreement with all pages, including the appendices, numbered seriatim 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 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 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 Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc., filed on September 30, 1999, is approved.

2. That any changes or modifications to the Interconnection Agreement between Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc., filed on September 30, 1999, shall be filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure outlined in this order.

3. That this order shall become effective on December 13, 1999.

4. That this case may be closed on December 14, 1999.

BY THE COMMISSION



Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Bill Hopkins, Senior 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 1st day of December, 1999.

FYI: To Be Issued By Delegation

ALJ/Sec'y:

Hopkins/Boyce

11-30
Date Circulated

12-3
Return by 3 p.m.
10 a.m.

TO 2000-261
CASE NO.

[Signature]
Lumpe, Chair

[Signature]
Crumpton, Commissioner

[Signature]
Murray, Commissioner

[Signature]
Schemenauer, Commissioner

[Signature]
Drainer, Vice-Chair

**STATE OF MISSOURI
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

I have compared the preceding copy with the original on file in this office and

I do hereby certify the same to be a true copy therefrom and the whole thereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal of the Public Service Commission, at Jefferson
City, Missouri, this 1st day of December 1999.

Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

