

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Spectra Communications Group, LLC,)	
d/b/a CenturyTel,)	
)	
Complainant,)	Case No. IC-2008-0127
)	
vs.)	
)	
Socket Telecom, LLC,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

SOCKET TELECOM'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND COUNTERCLAIM

COMES NOW Socket Telecom, LLC pursuant to 4 CSR 240-2.070 and 47 USC 252 and for its Answer to the Complaint and its Counterclaim in this matter states to the Commission:

Answer

1. Socket admits the averments of paragraph 1 of the Complaint.
2. Socket admits the averments of paragraph 2 of the Complaint.
3. Socket admits the averments of paragraph 3 of the Complaint.
4. Socket lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the averments of paragraph 4 of the Complaint and, therefore, denies those averments.
5. Socket admits the averments of paragraph 5 of the Complaint.
6. Socket admits the averments of paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
7. Socket admits the averments of paragraph 7 of the Complaint.
8. Socket admits the averments of paragraph 8 of the Complaint.
9. Socket admits that Spectra makes the request as described in paragraph 9 of the Complaint, and Socket admits that Spectra has accurately set forth the definitions of "Local

Traffic”, “Section 251(b)(5) Traffic”, and “ISP Traffic” from the parties’ Interconnection Agreement. Socket denies that the agreement provides for the mutual exchange of such traffic at no charge for transport and termination under Section 251(b)(5) of the Act, states that Spectra is not entitled to the relief it seeks by its request, and denies any remaining averments of paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

10. Socket admits that the parties’ Interconnection Agreement provides that they will interconnect their respective networks for the mutual exchange of “Local Interconnection Traffic” as defined in the agreement, including “Local Traffic” as defined in the agreement. Socket admits that “Local Traffic” includes “Section 251(b)(5) Traffic” and local “ISP Traffic” as defined in the agreement. Socket denies the remaining averments of paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

11. Socket admits that on or about September 19, 2007, it began submitting invoices to Spectra including charges for reciprocal compensation for termination of Spectra-originated Local Traffic as defined in the parties’ Interconnection Agreement. Socket admits that to date Spectra has not invoiced Socket for reciprocal compensation under the parties’ Interconnection Agreement. Socket denies the remaining averments of paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

12. Socket admits that all of the traffic billed under its reciprocal compensation invoices issued to Spectra pursuant to the parties’ Interconnection Agreement constitutes “Local Traffic” as defined in the agreement and that such traffic includes local “ISP Traffic” as defined in the agreement. Socket denies that it has billed Spectra reciprocal compensation for any “VNXX Traffic” as defined in the agreement and denies the remaining averments of paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. Socket admits that the parties have unsuccessfully engaged in dispute resolution pursuant to the provisions of the Interconnection Agreement regarding the matters described in the Complaint and this Answer and Counterclaim, and that Socket continues to assert it is entitled to reciprocal compensation in accordance with the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement including payment from Spectra of the currently-disputed invoices. Socket admits that the parties have agreed that: (i) that the issues related to this dispute are substantially identical to those at issue between CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC and Socket in Case No. IC-2008-0068, which was filed on September 5, 2007 (the "companion case"); (ii) each party's position in this dispute is the same as in the companion case; and (iii) the outcome of any dispute resolution negotiations specific to this dispute would be the same as that which preceded the filing of the companion case.

14. Socket admits that Spectra seeks a determination and order from the Commission as described in paragraph 14 of the Complaint, that there is a real, substantial, and presently-existing controversy between the parties regarding the application of reciprocal compensation to Local Traffic exchanged by the parties pursuant to their Interconnection Agreement, that both parties have pecuniary interests at stake, that Socket continues to assert it is entitled to payment of reciprocal compensation for termination of Local Traffic originated by Spectra, and that this controversy is ripe for adjudication. Socket denies that Spectra is entitled to any relief and denies the remaining averments of paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

15. Socket admits that Spectra specifically seeks a determination and order as described in paragraph 15 of the Complaint, denies that Spectra is entitled to any relief, and denies the remaining averments of paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Socket moves the Commission to dismiss Spectra's Complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and to grant such other and further relief to Socket as the Commission deems meet and proper in the premises.

Counterclaim

1. Socket Telecom, LLC ("Socket") is a Missouri limited liability company, with its principal place of business located at 2703 Clark Avenue, Columbia, Missouri 65202. Socket is a certificated competitive local exchange carrier in Missouri that provides service in various parts of Missouri, including in CenturyTel's service territory.

2. Spectra is a Delaware limited liability corporation that is duly authorized to do business in Missouri. Spectra's principal place of business in Missouri is 1151 CenturyTel Drive, Wentzville, Missouri 63885. Spectra is a "telecommunications company" and a "public utility" as those terms are defined in § 386.020 R.S.Mo., and, thus, is subject to the jurisdiction, supervision and control of this Commission.

3. All inquiries, correspondence, communications, pleadings, notices, orders and decisions relating to this matter should be directed to:

Carl J. Lumley, #32869
Leland B. Curtis, #20550
Curtis, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe, PC
130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
Telephone: (314) 725-8788
Facsimile: (314) 725-8789
Email: clumley@lawfirmemail.com
lcurtis@lawfirmemail.com

4. Spectra and Socket are parties to an interconnection agreement which was arbitrated before the Commission pursuant to § 252(b)(1) of the Act and the Commission's rules

in Case No. TO-2006-0299 (hereinafter "Interconnection Agreement" or "Agreement"). After the above-referenced arbitration, the Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement on October 3, 2006, which order became effective on October 13, 2006.

5. The Commission has jurisdiction over this controversy pursuant to its grant of authority under § 252(e)(1) of the Act to approve negotiated or arbitrated interconnection agreements. This grant of authority to the Commission necessarily includes the power to interpret and enforce approved interconnection agreements. *See Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. v. Connect Communications Corp.*, 225 F.3d 942, 946-47 (8th Cir. 2000). The Commission also has jurisdiction over this controversy pursuant to 4 C.S.R. 240-2.070(3) (governing formal complaints complaining that a party has violated a Commission order or decision).

6. The Commission is the proper forum for this controversy pursuant to Article III, Section 18.3 of the parties' Interconnection Agreement.

7. Pursuant to Article III, Section 18 of the Agreement, the parties have engaged in dispute resolution negotiations regarding the subject matter of this complaint. Accordingly, Socket has directly contacted Spectra on the subject matter about which this complaint is being made consistent with 4 CSR 240-2.070(5)(E). The parties, however, were unable to resolve this dispute within the time required by the Agreement for such negotiations.

8. The Interconnection Agreement provides that the parties will pay each other reciprocal compensation for the mutual exchange of "Local Traffic" as that term is defined by the agreement.¹ Such "Local Traffic" includes local "ISP Traffic" as defined by the agreement.²

¹ Under the agreement, "Local Traffic includes all Section 251(b)(5) Traffic that is originated by Socket's end users and terminated by Spectra's end users (or vice versa) that: (i) originates and terminates to such end-users in the same Spectra exchange area; or (ii) originates and terminates to such end-users within different exchange areas that share a common local calling area, as defined in Spectra's tariff. *e.g.*, Extended Area Service (EAS), mandatory and optional Metropolitan Calling Area, or other like types of expanded local calling scopes." Agreement, Article III, Sec. 1.78. With respect to "Section 251(b)(5) Traffic," the Agreement at issue provide that "calls originated by Socket's end users and terminated to Spectra's end users (or vice versa) will be classified as 'Section 251(b)(5)

However, the agreement expressly provides that "VNXX Traffic" as defined in the agreement³ shall be exchanged on a "bill and keep" basis.⁴

9. Specifically, the Interconnection Agreement provides:

- (a) MCA Traffic will be exchanged on a bill-and-keep basis consistent with prior Commission decisions (Article V, Sec. 9.2, 9.2.1, 9.2.2);
- (b) VNXX Traffic will be exchanged on a bill-and-keep basis (Article V, Sec. 9.2.3);
- (c) Other Local Traffic shall be subject to the termination rates set forth in Article VII.A⁵ (Article V, Section 9.7, 9.7.1, 9.7.2);
- (d) Other traffic may not be aggregated with bill-and-keep traffic (Article V, Sec. 9.8).
- (e) On request parties will supply Percentage Local Usage for amount of Local Interconnection Traffic minutes to be billed, but if adequate message recording technology is available then the terminating party may use such information to determine Local Interconnection Traffic usage compensation to be paid. (Article III, Sec. 10.2).
- (f) Annual audits can be conducted regarding billing for Local Traffic. (Article III, sec. 10.4).

Copies of the foregoing provision of the Interconnection Agreement are attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

Traffic' under this Agreement if the call: (i) originates and terminates to such end-users in the same Spectra exchange area; or (ii) originates and terminates to such end-users within different exchange areas that share a common local calling area, as defined in Spectra's tariff, *e.g.*, Extended Area Service (EAS), mandatory and optional Metropolitan Calling Area, or other like types of expanded local calling scopes." Agreement, Article III, Sec. 1.108.

² The Agreement defines "ISP Traffic" as "traffic to and from an ISP." Agreement, Article III, Sec. 1.57 (included in definition of "Internet Service Provider").

³ The Agreement defines Virtual NXX Traffic (VNXX Traffic) as follows - "As used in this Agreement, Virtual NXX Traffic or VNXX Traffic is defined as calls in which a Party's customer is assigned a telephone number with an NXX Code (as set forth in the LERG) assigned to a Rate Center that is different from the Rate Center associated with the customer's actual physical premises location." (Agreement, Article II, Sec. 1.131).

⁴ The Agreement defines "Bill-and-Keep Agreement" as "a compensation arrangement whereby the Parties do not render bills to each other or charge each other for the switching, transport, and termination of traffic as specified in this Agreement." (Agreement, Article II, Sec. 1.12). See also Agreement, Article V, Sec. 9.4.2: "Bill-and-Keep" refers to an arrangement in which neither of two interconnection Parties charges the other for terminating traffic that originates on the other Party's network."

⁵ Applicable Local Switching rate is \$0.0033912 per minute.

10. Consistent with the provisions of the parties' Interconnection Agreement which authorize charges for reciprocal compensation for the exchange of Local Traffic, on or about September 19, 2007, Socket began regularly and periodically submitting invoices to Spectra including charges for reciprocal compensation for its termination of Spectra-originated Local Traffic. Socket billed Spectra for terminating Local Traffic in exchanges where Spectra required Socket to provision loop facilities as a condition of porting the customer's phone number, thus making the traffic Local Traffic rather than VNXX traffic.

11. All of the traffic billed under Socket's invoices constitutes "Local Traffic" as defined in the parties' Interconnection Agreement that is subject to reciprocal compensation charges for termination by Socket.

12. Pursuant to 4 CSR 240-2.070(3) and the Commission's authority to interpret and enforce interconnection agreements, Socket seeks a determination and order from this Commission interpreting and enforcing the Interconnection Agreement and the parties' rights and liabilities there under pertaining to intercarrier compensation for Local Traffic. There exists a real, substantial, and presently-existing controversy between Socket and Spectra as to whether their Interconnection Agreement applies charges for reciprocal compensation to the Local Traffic they exchange. Socket has a legally protectable, pecuniary interest at stake, insofar as it is owed sums for reciprocal compensation as required by the Agreement, and Socket continues to assert entitlement to additional sums for reciprocal compensation. This controversy is ripe for adjudication.

13. Specifically, Socket seeks a determination and order that the Interconnection Agreement at issues applies reciprocal compensation charges to the parties' exchange of Local Traffic (including Section 251(b)(5) Traffic and local ISP Traffic), and that Socket is entitled to

receive reciprocal compensation payments from Spectra for terminating Local Traffic, Section 251(b)(6) Traffic and local ISP Traffic originated by Spectra's customers.

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing, Socket respectfully requests that the Commission:

(a) issue an Order determining that the parties' Interconnection Agreement applies reciprocal compensation charges to the parties' exchange of Local Traffic (including Section 251(b)(5) Traffic and local ISP Traffic);

(b) promptly set a pre-hearing conference for the purpose of establishing a procedural schedule in this case; and

(c) grant such other and further relief to which Socket is justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

CURTIS, HEINZ,
GARRETT & O'KEEFE, P.C.

/s/ Carl J. Lumley

Carl J. Lumley, #32869
Leland B. Curtis, #20550
130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200
Clayton, Missouri 63105
(314) 725-8788
(314) 725-8789 (FAX)
clumley@lawfirmemail.com
lcurtis@lawfirmemail.com

Attorneys for Socket Telecom, LLC

Certificate of Service

A true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon the parties identified on the attached service list on this 5th day of November, 2007, by email and/or by placing same in the U.S. Mail, postage paid.

/s/ Carl J. Lumley

General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
gencounsel@psc.mo.gov

Lewis Mills
Office of Public Counsel
P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
opcservice@ded.mo.gov

William Haas
Missouri Public Service Commission
200 Madison Street, Suite 800
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
William.Haas@psc.mo.gov

Larry Dority
Fischer & Dority
101 Madison, Suite 400
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
lwdority@sprintmail.com

Gavin E. Hill
Hughes & Luce, LLP
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
gavin.hill@hughesluce.com