

**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST MISSOURI TELEPHONE (COLLECTIVELY “PETITIONERS”), AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners’ Language	Petitioners’ Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator’s Comments
Is resolution of compensation arrangements for traffic occurring prior to the commencement of negotiations properly within the scope of these arbitrations?	1a	5.5	<b>At the same time that the Parties execute this Agreement, they are entering into a confidential agreement to settle all claims related to traffic exchanged between the Parties prior to the effective date of this Agreement. Each Party represents that this settlement agreement completely and finally resolves all such past claims.</b>		None; delete Section 5.5		
If the decision with respect to 1a is in the negative, TTA Section 5.5 should be ordered deleted, and Issues 2, 3, 4, and 5 need not be addressed in this proceeding.	1b	5.5					
If the decision with respect to 1a is in the affirmative, should TTA Section 5.5 be ordered included as	1c	5.5	<b>At the same time that the Parties execute this Agreement, they are entering into a</b>	Yes.	None; delete Section 5.5	No.	

Key: **Bold** represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners

**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN PETITIONERS ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST**  
**MISSOURI TELEPHONE, AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners' Language	Petitioners' Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator's Comments
written?			<b>confidential agreement to settle all claims related to traffic exchanged between the Parties prior to the effective date of this Agreement. Each Party represents that this settlement agreement completely and finally resolves all such past claims.</b>				
What dates should be utilized for computing the interim (negotiation/arbitration period) true-up?	2a	5.5					
What traffic volumes have terminated between the dates determined in 2a?	2b	5.5					
Of the past traffic volumes determined in 2b, what amounts of such traffic are intraMTA?	3a	5.5					

Key: **Bold** represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners

**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN PETITIONERS ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST**  
**MISSOURI TELEPHONE, AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners' Language	Petitioners' Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator's Comments
Of the past traffic volumes determined in 2b, what amounts of such traffic are interMTA?	3b						
Of the interMTA traffic determined in 3b, what proportion of such traffic is terminating interstate traffic?	3c						
Of the interMTA traffic determined in 3b, what proportion of such traffic is terminating intrastate traffic?	3d						
What rate should be applied to the intraMTA traffic volume determined in 3a?	4a						
Taking the volumes of traffic determined in 3a times the rate determined in 4a, the volumes of traffic determined in 3c times the rate	5						

Key: **Bold** represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners

**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN PETITIONERS ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST**  
**MISSOURI TELEPHONE, AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners' Language	Petitioners' Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator's Comments
determined in 4b, the volumes of traffic determined in 3c times the rate determined in 4c, and adding those products together, what is the total compensation owed for true-up period?							
What proportions of T-Mobile traffic terminating to Chariton Valley are interMTA and intraMTA?	6a						
What proportions of T-Mobile traffic terminating to Northeast Rural are interMTA and intraMTA?	6b						
What proportions of T-Mobile Traffic Terminating to Mid-Missouri are interMTA and intraMTA?	6c						

Key: **Bold** represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners

**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN PETITIONERS ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST**  
**MISSOURI TELEPHONE, AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners' Language	Petitioners' Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator's Comments
What intraMTA rate should be adopted for intraMTA T-Mobile traffic terminating to Alma?	7a	Appendix 1	Rates for termination of Local Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate <b>\$0.035 per minute</b>		Rates for termination of <u>interMTA</u> Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate; <u>\$0.004 per minute for end-office switching and \$0.0015 per minute for tandem switching</u>		
What intraMTA rate should be adopted for intraMTA T-Mobile traffic terminating to Chariton Valley?	7b	Appendix 1	Rates for termination of Local Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate <b>\$0.035 per minute</b>		Rates for termination of <u>interMTA</u> Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate; <u>\$0.004 per minute for end-office switching and \$0.0015 per minute for tandem switching</u>		
What intraMTA rate should be adopted for intraMTA T-Mobile traffic terminating to Mid-Missouri?	7c	Appendix 1	Rates for termination of Local Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate <b>\$0.035 per minute</b>		Rates for termination of <u>interMTA</u> Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate; <u>\$0.004 per minute for end-office switching and \$0.0015 per minute for tandem switching</u>		
What intraMTA rate should be adopted for intraMTA T-Mobile traffic terminating to	7d	Appendix 1	Rates for termination of Local Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate		Rates for termination of <u>interMTA</u> Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate;		

Key: **Bold represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.**  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners

**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN PETITIONERS ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST**  
**MISSOURI TELEPHONE, AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners' Language	Petitioners' Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator's Comments
Northeast?			<b>\$0.035 per minute</b>		<u>\$0.004 per minute for end-office switching and \$0.0015 per minute for tandem switching</u>		
The rates determined in 7a, 7b, 7c, and 7d should be ordered inserted in the respective TTA Appendix 1.	7e	Appendix 1	Rates for termination of Local Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate <b>\$0.035 per minute</b>		Rates for termination of <u>interMTA</u> Traffic via an indirect interconnection: Local Termination Rate; <u>\$0.004 per minute for end-office switching and \$0.0015 per minute for tandem switching</u>		
Are Petitioners required to compensate T-Mobile for landline-to-mobile intraMTA calls?	8a					Yes.	
Are the Petitioners required to compensate T-Mobile for call termination of all intraMTA traffic, including traffic they send to a T-Mobile customer with a ported number?	9						
If neither party measures landline-to-	10						

Key: **Bold represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.**  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners

**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN PETITIONERS ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST**  
**MISSOURI TELEPHONE, AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners' Language	Petitioners' Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator's Comments
mobile traffic, should the formula T-Mobile proposes for determining such landline to mobile traffic, which takes the volume of mobile to landline traffic, divides it by 60%, and then multiplies that result by 40%, be used to determine the amount of landline to mobile intraMTA traffic?							
Should traffic studies relating to interMTA/intraMTA factors be based on the location of the cell site/base station at which the call is originated?	11a						
The appropriate language should be ordered with respect to TTA Section 5.2.	11b						
Depending upon the resolution of Issue 8, should the TTAs include an explicit	12a						

Key: **Bold** represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners

**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN PETITIONERS ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST**  
**MISSOURI TELEPHONE, AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners' Language	Petitioners' Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator's Comments
statement that the compensation obligation for intraMTA traffic is reciprocal and symmetrical?							
Depending in part upon the resolution of Issue 1, what dates should be selected as the effective dates for the respective TTAs, and inserted into the first introductory paragraph of the TTAs.	13				January 13,2005		
Do Petitioners have the obligation to provide reciprocal compensation where T-Mobile is indirectly interconnected to their networks?	14						
Do Petitioners have an obligation to compensate T-Mobile for transport costs incurred in terminating land-to-	15						

Key: **Bold** represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners



**DOCKET # IO-2005-0468, Consolidated**  
**MASTER LIST OF ISSUES BETWEEN PETITIONERS ALMA TELEPHONE, CHARITON VALLEY TELEPHONE, MID-MISSOURI TELEPHONE, NORTHEAST**  
**MISSOURI TELEPHONE, AND T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

Issue Statement	Issue No.	Agreement Section(s)	Petitioners' Language	Petitioners' Preliminary Position	T-Mobile Language	T-Mobile Preliminary Position	Arbitrator's Comments
mobile traffic?							
Do the Petitioners have the right to discriminate against T-Mobile by requiring their customers to dial 1+ to reach all T-Mobile customers, including those with telephone numbers in the same locale?	16						

Key: **Bold** represents language proposed by Petitioners and opposed by T-Mobile.  
Underline language represents language proposed by T-Mobile and opposed by Petitioners