

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter of the joint requests for Commission)
approval of interconnection agreements and)
amendments.)
_____)

At the December 6, 2002 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. David A. Svanda, Commissioner
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner

OPINION AND ORDER

The following parties have filed joint applications for approval of interconnection
agreements and amendments:

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Case No. U-12627 | Ameritech Michigan and New Edge Network, Inc.
Application filed November 18, 2002 for approval of the fourth
amendment (revised pricing schedule). |
| Case No. U-12758 | Ameritech Michigan and VoiceStream Wireless Corporation
Application filed September 30, 2002 for approval of the first
amendment (911 wireless emergency number service access
appendix). |
| Case No. U-12758 | Ameritech Michigan and VoiceStream Wireless Corporation
Application filed November 7, 2002 for approval of the second
amendment (change notice information amendment). |
| Case No. U-12886 | Ameritech Michigan and 1-800-Reconex, Inc.
Application filed November 7, 2002 for approval of the third
amendment (extends the term one year and changes other general
terms and conditions). |

- Case No. U-12927 Ameritech Michigan and Covad Communications Corporation
Application filed October 31, 2002 for approval of the fifth amendment (state-specific performance measures).
- Case No. U-13211 Ameritech Michigan and Ameritech Advanced Data Services of Michigan, Inc.
Application filed October 31, 2002 for approval of the sixth amendment (bridged tap removal).
- Case No. U-13211 Ameritech Michigan and Ameritech Advanced Data Services of Michigan, Inc.
Application filed November 4, 2002 for approval of the seventh amendment (HFPL central office sync testing maintenance).
- Case No. U-13254 Ameritech Michigan and VarTec Telecom, Inc.
Application filed November 7, 2002 for approval of the second amendment (rates for OS and DA branding).
- Case No. U-13614 Ameritech Michigan and ACN Communication Services, Inc.
Application filed October 31, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 525(i), of an agreement approved on March 21, 2002 in Case No. U-12465 for AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc.) and the first amendment (negotiated reciprocal compensation).
- Case No. U-13615 Talk Unlimited Now, Inc., and Ameritech Michigan
Application filed on November 4, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13629 CenturyTel of Michigan, Inc., and RACC Enterprises, LLC
Application filed November 13, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.

Section 252 of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 252, requires that any interconnection agreement that is adopted by negotiation be submitted to the Commission for approval. 47 USC 252(e) provides in part:

- (2) The State commission may only reject
 - (A) an agreement (or any portion thereof) adopted by negotiation under subsection (a) of this section if it finds that--
 - (i) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or

- (ii) the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity;
- (3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), but subject to section 253 of this title, nothing in this section shall prohibit a State commission from establishing or enforcing other requirements of State law in its review of an agreement, including requiring compliance with intrastate telecommunications service quality standards or requirements.

47 USC 252(e)(2) and (3).

The Commission concludes, after reviewing the applications, agreements, and amendments, that it should approve the applications. The Commission finds that the agreements and amendments are consistent with federal and state law and are in the public interest. Under 47 USC 252(i) and MCL 484.2359(2), the services provided under the agreements, as amended, must be made available to other telecommunications carriers upon the same terms and conditions.

The Commission FINDS that:

- a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 151 et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1992 AACS, R 460.17101 et seq.
- b. The interconnection agreements and amendments listed above should be approved.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

- A. The interconnection agreements and amendments listed above are approved.
- B. Approval of the interconnection agreements and amendments does not alter the duty of the parties to comply with relevant federal and state law and past and future Commission orders and rules.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

(S E A L)

/s/ David A. Svanda
Commissioner

/s/ Robert B. Nelson
Commissioner

By its action of December 6, 2002.

/s/ Dorothy Wideman
Its Executive Secretary

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of December 6, 2002.

Its Executive Secretary

In the matter of the joint requests for Commission)
approval of interconnection agreements and)
amendments.)
_____)

Suggested Minute:

“Adopt and issue order dated December 6, 2002 approving interconnection agreements and amendments, as set forth in the order.”