

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.

MICHAEL K. KELLOGG
PETER W. HUBER
MARK C. HANSEN
K. CHRIS TODD
MARK L. EVANS
STEVEN F. BENZ
NEIL M. GORSUCH
GEOFFREY M. KLINEBERG
REID M. FIGEL

SUMNER SQUARE
1615 M STREET, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-3209
(202) 326-7900
FACSIMILE:
(202) 326-7999

HENK BRANDS
SEAN A. LEV
EVAN T. LEO
ANTONIA M. APPS
MICHAEL J. GUZMAN
AARON M. PANNER
DAVID E. ROSS
SILVIJA A. STRIKIS
RICHARD H. STERN, OF COUNSEL

April 24, 2001

RECEIVED

Ex Parte Presentation

APR 24 2001

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY


Re: *Application by Southwestern Bell for Provision of In-Region,
InterLATA Services in Missouri, CC Docket No. 01-88*

Dear Ms. Salas:

On behalf of SBC Communications Inc., I am attaching a copy of an order of the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Missouri PSC"), dated April 20, 2001, approving the interconnection agreement between SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc. ("ASI") and Logix Communications Corporation ("Logix"). In his affidavit submitted with this Application, Lincoln E. Brown discussed the fact that ASI and Logix had entered into an interconnection agreement (App. G, Tab 114) and had submitted it to the Missouri PSC for approval on March 9, 2001. See Brown Aff. ¶ 36 (App. A, Tab 8). The Missouri PSC has now approved this interconnection agreement under section 252.

Pursuant to the Commission's rules governing ex parte communications, I am enclosing two copies of this letter and attached order. Please file stamp and return the additional copy. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,


Geoffrey M. Klineberg

Attachment

Number of Copies rec'd 012
BY CODE

Magalie Roman Salas
April 24, 2001
Page 2

Ex Parte Presentation

cc: Tom Navin
Gary Remondino
Layla Seirafi
Dan Joyce
ITS

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of)
SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc. for)
Approval of its Interconnection)
Agreement with Logix Communications)
Corporation under 47 U.S.C. § 252.)

Case No. TO-2001-481

ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT

On March 9, 2001, SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc. (SBC-ASI) filed an application with the Commission for approval of a resale and facilities-based interconnection agreement (Agreement) with Logix Communications Corporation (Logix). The Agreement was filed pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act).¹ The Agreement would permit SBC-ASI to resell local telecommunications services.

SBC-ASI was granted a certificate of service authority to provide interexchange and local exchange telecommunications services in Case No. TA-2000-2260 on November 8, 1999.

Although Logix is a party to the Agreement, it did not join in the application. On March 20, 2001, the Commission issued an order making Logix a party and directing any party wishing to request a hearing to do so no later than April 9, 2001. No 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

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 251, et seq.

opportunity to present evidence.² Since no one has requested a hearing, the Commission may grant the relief requested based on the application.

The Staff of the Commission filed a memorandum and recommendation on April 17, 2001, recommending that the Agreement be approved.

Discussion

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e) of the Act, has authority to approve an interconnection or resale agreement negotiated between an incumbent local exchange company and a new provider of basic local exchange service. Staff noted that SBC-ASI is a successor or assign of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and is, therefore, an incumbent local exchange carrier as defined at 47 U.S.C. Section 251(h)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act. Staff stated that SBC-ASI has the duty to offer its services for resale under Section 252(c)(4) of the Act. The Commission may reject an interconnection or resale agreement only if the agreement is discriminatory or is inconsistent with the public interest.

The Staff memorandum recommends that the Agreement be approved, and notes 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 recommends that the Commission direct the parties to submit any further modifications or amendments to the Commission for approval. Staff stated that it has a sequentially-numbered copy of the Agreement.

² State ex rel. Rex Deffenderfer Enterprises, Inc. v. Public Service Commission, 776 S.W.2d 494, 496 (Mo. App. 1989).

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 concludes that the 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

The Commission has a duty to review all resale and interconnection agreements, whether arrived at through negotiation or arbitration, as mandated by the Act.³ In order for the Commission's role of review and approval to be effective, the Commission must also review and approve or recognize modifications to these agreements. The Commission has a further duty to make a copy of every resale and interconnection agreement available for public inspection.⁴ 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.⁵

³ 47 U.S.C. § 252.

⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 252(h).

⁵ 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 or recognition, whether the modification arises through negotiation, arbitration, or by means of alternative dispute resolution procedures.

Modifications to an agreement must be submitted to the Staff for review. When approved or recognized, 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 Commission will take notice of the modification once Staff has verified that the provision is an approved provision and prepared a recommendation. 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 1996,⁶ 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 Agreement between SBC-ASI and Logix 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 SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc. and Logix Communications Corporation, filed on March 9, 2001, is approved.
2. That any changes or modifications to this Agreement shall be filed with the Commission pursuant to the procedure outlined in this order.
3. That this order shall become effective on April 30, 2001.

⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(1)

4. That this case may be closed on May 1, 2001.

BY THE COMMISSION



Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Shelly A. Register, Regulatory Law
Judge, by delegation of authority
pursuant to Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 20th day of April, 2001.