		<b></b>			
	•	*Adn	inistrative Rules S	Stamp	
	MATT BLUNT		, RECEN	9 90 va 900. 	
	Secretary of State Administrative Rules Division	)P	NOV 3 0	2004	
	RULE TRANSMITTAL		SECRETARY C Administrativ	OF SVATE V <b>e Ru</b> lei	S
A.	A "SEPARATE" rule transmittal sheet MUST be us Rule Number 4 CSR 240-29.100	ed for EA	CH individual rule	emaking.	·
Δ.	Diskette File Name Proposed Rule 29.100	· · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	Name of person to call with questions about this rul	e:			
	Content Keith Krueger	Phone	573-751-4140	FAX	573-751-9285
	Data entry Lesli Belt	Phone	573-751-7499	FAX	Same as above
	Email address <u>keith.krueger@psc.mo.gov</u>				
		uilding, 20	0 Madison St., 8th 1		
	Statutory Authority 386.040 386.250	١	Current RSMo	o date	2000 2003
	Date filed with the Joint Committee on Administrat	ive Rules	 Exempt p	er Section	ns 536.024 and
	536.037, RSMo 2000, and Executive Order No. 97-97 (Ju	une 27, 199			
B.	Cover letter       Image: A fidavit       Ima	Authority Public cos Private cos	-	rule	if any
C.	RULEMAKING ACTION TO BE TAKEN Emergency rulemaking, (check one) rule MUST include effective date	amend	ment 🗌 rescissio	on 🗌 te	rmination
	<ul> <li>Proposed Rulemaking (check one) rule</li> <li>Order of Rulemaking (check one) rule</li> <li>MUST complete page 2 of this transmittal</li> <li>Withdrawal (check one) rule</li> <li>Rule action notice</li> <li>In addition</li> <li>Rule under consideration</li> </ul>	amend amend ent re	ment Tescissi	_	termination
D.	SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate any sp identify material to be incorporated by reference, or	pecial inst forms inc	ructions (e.g., pub luded herein).	lication	date preference,
			JCAR Stamp	·	

NOTE: ALL changes MUST be specified here in order for those chan in the *Missouri Register* and the *Code of State Regulations*.

Add additional sheet(s), if more space is needed.



Commissioners

STEVE GAW Chair

CONNIE MURRAY ROBERT M. CLAYTON III JEFF DAVIS LINWARD "LIN" APPLING POST OFFICE BOX 360 JEFFERSON CITY MISSOURI 65102 573-751-3234 573-751-1847 (Fax Number) http://www.psc.mo.gov

Missouri Public Service Commission

November 30, 2004

ROBERT J. QUINN, JR. Executive Director

WESS A. HENDERSON Director, Utility Operations

ROBERT SCHALLENBERG Director, Utility Services

DALE HARDY ROBERTS Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

> DANA K. JOYCE General Counsel

Mr. Matt Blunt Secretary of State Administrative Rules Division 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Blunt,

### RE: 4 CSR 240-29.100 Objections to Payment Invoices

### **CERTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RULE**

I hereby certify that the attached is an accurate and complete copy of the proposed rule lawfully submitted by the Missouri Public Service Commission for filing on this 30th day of November 2004.

The Missouri Public Service Commission has determined and hereby certifies that this proposed rule will not have an economic impact on small businesses. The Missouri Public Service Commission also certifies that it has conducted an analysis of whether or not there has been a taking of real property pursuant to section 536.017 RSMo 2000 and that this proposed rule does not constitute a taking of real property under relevant state and federal law.

Statutory Authority: Sections 386.040 and 386.250.

Page 2 of 2 November 30, 2004

If there are any questions, please contact:

Keith Krueger, Deputy General Counsel P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102 (573) 751-4140, FAX (573) 751-9285 <u>keith.krueger@psc.mo.gov</u>

BY THE COMMUN

Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

# Title 4—DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT Division 240—Public Service Commission Chapter 29 – Enhanced Record Exchange Rules

#### **PROPOSED RULE**

#### 4 CSR 240-29.100 Objections to Payment Invoices

PURPOSE: The purpose of this rule is to establish a procedure for objecting to payment of invoices received for terminating LEC-to-LEC network telecommunications traffic.

(1) Objections to invoices received for terminating LEC-to-LEC traffic shall be made in writing or e-mail to the terminating carrier. Questions pertaining to such invoices may be submitted by telephone.

(2) All objections under this rule shall be promptly investigated by the terminating carrier responsible for sending payment invoices. The results of all such investigations shall be reported back to the objecting party in writing or by e-mail no later than thirty (30) days after receipt of the objection. A written or e-mail correspondence showing a summary or results of all such investigations must be provided by the terminating company to the manager of telecommunications, Missouri Public Service Commission.

(3) In the event any terminating local exchange carrier in any billing period or periods receives billing records for compensable traffic that are less than the total terminating compensable traffic received and recorded by the terminating local exchange carrier for that period or periods ("unidentified traffic"), the terminating local exchange carrier may render a written or e-mail objection to the receipt of the unidentified traffic to the terminating tandem carrier across whose facilities the terminating local exchange carrier believes such unidentified traffic was transited. Such objection need not be in the form of an invoice. Within twenty (20) days after receipt of such objection, the terminating tandem carrier shall in turn notify all carriers it believes may have placed or transited the unidentified traffic on the LEC-to-LEC network. Objections and notifications informing carriers of unidentified terminating traffic shall be promptly investigated by all carriers that receive them. The objecting carrier, tandem carriers, and originating carriers shall work cooperatively and in good faith and shall provide complete and accurate billing records to the objecting terminating local exchange carrier. The terminating local exchange carrier shall make available the ANI and such other information relating to such unidentified traffic as is in its possession. All carriers shall make full disclosure of their positions, and evidence in support thereof, to all other carriers participating in the investigation, and to the manager of telecommunications, Missouri Public Service Commission, and shall make duplicates of such evidence and information available to all participants. Within sixty (60) days after the objection is made, the results of such investigation shall be reported back to all carriers concerned, and written or e-mail correspondence showing a summary of results of the investigations shall be provided by all involved carriers to the manager of telecommunications, Missouri Public Service Commission. In the event the carriers cannot agree on a common report, each carrier may submit its own report.

(4) In the event any objection to invoice, or any objection to the receipt of unidentified traffic, remains unresolved or uncompensated for more than thirty (30) days following provision of investigation reports to the manager of telecommunications, Missouri Public Service Commission, the carrier rendering the invoice, or the carrier objecting to the receipt of unidentified traffic, may initiate the following intercarrier compensation complaint process applicable to traffic placed on the LEC-to-LEC network:

(A) After having complied with (3) and (4) above, the objecting carrier may file a formal complaint in accordance with 4 CSR 240-2.070. Said complaint may name as respondents any or all carriers participating in the investigation process, and any carriers notified of the investigation process but not participating in it. Tandem carriers named as parties in such complaint shall have thirty (30) days from being served to identify and name as additional parties respondent any other carriers that may have originated or transited such unidentified traffic. Such carriers shall be served with the complaint and pleading naming them as additional parties in the same manner as is described in 4 CSR 240-2.070 (7), and shall answer within thirty (30) days of the date of notice as provided therein.

(B) Within thirty (30) days after all answers are filed, or within thirty (30) days of the last date for timely answer, the commission will set the matter for evidentiary hearing without the need for prefiled testimony.

(C) Within twenty (20) days after the conclusion of said hearing the regulatory law judge assigned shall file a recommended decision to the commission, and serve copies thereof on each party. Said recommended decision shall address and resolve objections to invoices, and shall address and resolve objections to the receipt of unidentified traffic, and may find originating carriers or originating tandem carriers liable to the terminating LEC for unidentified traffic.

(D) Each party shall have twenty (20) days from the filing of the recommended decision in which to file a response to the recommended decision. In the event no party responds, the recommended decision shall be the decision of the commission. In the event any party does respond, the commission shall thereafter consider the recommended decision and the responses thereto, and enter its decision within thirty (30) days of the filing of responses to the recommended decision.

AUTHORITY: sections 386.040 and 386.250, RSMo 2000. Original rule filed November 30, 2004.

PUBLIC COST: This proposed rule will not cost state agencies or political subdivisions more than five hundred dollars (\$500) in the aggregate.

PRIVATE COST: This proposed rule will not cost private entities more than five hundred dollars (\$500) in the aggregate.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND NOTICE TO SUBMIT COMMENTS: Anyone may file a statement in support of or in opposition to this proposed rule with the Missouri Public Service Commission, Dale Hardy Roberts, Secretary of the Commission, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102. To be considered, comments must be received at the commission's offices on or before February 2, 2005, and should include a reference to commission Case No. TX-2003-0301.

If comments are submitted via a paper filing, an original and eight (8) copies of the comments are required. Comments may also be submitted via a filing using the commission's electronic filing and information system at <u>http://www.psc.state.mo.us/efis.asp</u>. A public hearing regarding this proposed rule is scheduled for February 9, 2005, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 310 of the Governor Office Building, 200 Madison Street, Jefferson City, Missouri. Interested persons may appear at this hearing to submit additional comments and/or testimony in support of or in opposition to this proposed rule, and may be asked to respond to commission questions. Any persons with special needs as addressed by the Americans with Disabilities Act should contact the Missouri Public Service Commission at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing at one (1) of the following numbers: Consumer Services Hotline 1-800-392-4211 or TDD Hotline 1-800-829-7541.

- Sec. 1.

### AFFIDAVIT

### STATE OF MISSOURI

)
}

)

### COUNTY OF COLE

I, Anne Walker, Deputy Director of the Department of Economic Development, first being duly sworn on my oath state that it is my opinion that the cost of the **Proposed Rule** 4 CSR 240-29.100, **Objections to Payment Invoices** is less than five hundred dollars in the aggregate to this agency, any other agency of state government or any political subdivision thereof.

alher

Anne Walker Deputy Director Department of Economic Development

Sı	ıbscrib	ed and sworn to	befor	e m	e this	<u>)</u> day o	of Nover	mber	<b></b> , 20	04.
Ι	am	commissioned	as	а	notary	public	within	the	County	of
	<u>ole</u>	······,	State	of	Missouri	, and	my comr	nission	expires	on
1	lique	+ 12, 2005	3		. <u> </u>					

NOTARY PUBLIC



# FISCAL NOTE PRIVATE ENTITY COST

# I. RULE NUMBER

Title:Missouri Department of Economic DevelopmentDivision:Missouri Public Service CommissionChapter:Filing and Reporting RequirementsType of Rulemaking:Proposed Rule MakingRule Number and Name:4 CSR 240-29.100 Objections to Payment Invoices.

# II. SUMMARY OF FISCAL IMPACT

Estimate of the number of entities by class which would likely be affected by the adoption of the proposed rule:	Classification* by types of the business entities which would likely be affected:	Estimate in the aggregate as to the cost of compliance with the rule by the affected entities:
4	Class A Local Telephone Companies	\$0
0	Class B Local Telephone Companies	\$0
0	Class C Local Telephone Companies	\$0
	Class Interexchange Companies	\$0
	All entities	\$0

\* Class A Telephone Companies are incumbent local telephone companies with more than \$100,000,000 annual revenues system wide; Class B Telephone Companies are incumbent local telephone companies with \$100,000,000 annual revenues or less system wide; Class C Local Telephone Companies are all other companies certificated to provide basic local exchange telecommunications services, Class Interexchange Companies are long distance providers.

#### **III. WORKSHEET**

1. The Staff does not project a cost impact on any telephone company. This rule defines "unidentified traffic" as compensable traffic delivered to terminating LECs for which no billing record was created. The rule specifically outlines an *informal* dispute resolution process in which the parties attempt to resolve differences without creating a docketed case. For the first time, such informal dispute resolution actively encourages involvement of the Staff of the PSC. The rule does not permit terminating LECs to simply add up total minutes of use and claim they are being denied payment; rather, the rule requires terminating LECs to engage in fact finding to demonstrate receipt of unidentified traffic prior to filling a formal complaint. For example, the rule requires terminating LECs to present call detail information (such as the caller's telephone number) to transiting carriers before terminating LECs file a complaint case for unidentified traffic. In the Staff's view, by encouraging informal dispute resolution, and by encouraging certain fact finding prior to litigation, the expedited dispute resolution process should result in less, not more, litigation.

### IV. ASSUMPTIONS

1. SBC claims the expedited dispute resolution process set forth in sections (3) and (4) of this rule is likely to lead to continued litigation. SBC estimates an impact of \$50,000 per related case per year.

2. Sprint claims the proposed rule will generate nine contested cases to resolve instances of unidentified traffic sent to terminating LECs by Sprint. Sprint points to live direct testimony with a discovery process, and estimates these procedural and litigation activities to cost \$225,000.

,



### Matt Blunt Secretary of State

## Administrative Rules Division Rulemaking Transmittal Receipt

Rule ID: 2112 Date Printed: 11/30/2004 Rule Number: 4 CSR 240-29.100 Rulemaking Type: Proposed Rule Date Submitted to Administrative Rules Division: 11/30/2004 Date Submitted to Joint Committee on Administrative Rules:

Content: Keith Krueger RuleDataEntry: Lesli Belt	Phone: 751-4140 Phone: 751-7499	Email: keith.krueger@psc.mo.gov Email: keith.krueger@psc.mo.gov	Fax: Fax:
n a na ann an an an ann an ann an ann an a		ที่สารสีวิที่แข้งสารสารที่สารสารที่สารสารสารสารสารสารสารสารแกลสายแกกสายแกลสายและสายและสายสารสารสารสารสารสารสาร	
cluded with Rulemaking:			
cluded with Rulemaking: Cover Letter		11/30/2004	
Ū		11/30/2004 11/30/2004	

