

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 April 17, 2003 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Laura Chappelle, Chairman
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-12927 Ameritech Michigan and Covad Communications Company
Application filed March 5, 2003 for approval of the sixth
amendment to its interconnection agreement (Attachment HFPL
Central Office Testing – Maintenance Only).
- Case No. U-13272 Ameritech Michigan and CenturyTel Solutions, LLC
Application filed March 5, 2003 for approval of the second
amendment to its interconnection agreement (Extends term to
5-26-05, replaces Merger Conditions Appendix and the Merger
Promotion Template, replaces UNE Schedule of Pricing, and
adds UNE Combining Appendix with associated UNE Combo
Schedule of Prices).
- Case No. U-13513 Ameritech Michigan and Sage Telecom, Inc.
Application filed March 19, 2003 for approval of the fifth
amendment to its interconnection agreement (Subscriber Listing
Information Language).

- Case No. U-13722 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and CAT Communications International, Inc. Application filed March 5, 2003 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13724 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Net Express, Inc. d/b/a Advent Telecom. Application filed March 6, 2003 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13726 Ameritech Michigan and Daystar Communications Application filed March 10, 2003 for approval of a resale interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13727 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Metro Teleconnect Companies, Inc. Application filed March 7, 2003 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13728 Ameritech Michigan and EZ Phone, Inc. Application filed March 11, 2003 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement approved on March 21, 2002 in Case No. U-12465 for AT&T Communications of Michigan), including amendments approved on October 3, 2002 but excluding the Mi2A Amendment, although the terms and conditions will continue to apply without reference to the Mi2A Amendment. In addition certain voluntarily negotiated provisions are included in a new Reciprocal Compensation Appendix (Third amendment).
- Case No. U-13732 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and QuantumShift Communications Inc. Application filed March 14, 2003 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to Paragraph 31(a) of the Bell Atlantic/GTE Merger Conditions, released by the FCC on June 16, 2000 in CC Docket No. 98-184, and by letter dated April 17, 2002, the terms of the interconnection agreement between Verizon California, Inc and Sprint Communications Company previously approved by the California Public Utilities Commission on March 29, 2001.)
- Case No. U-13733 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and OnePoint Communications-Illinois LLC Application filed March 14, 2003 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/ Laura Chappelle
Chairman

(S E A L)

/s/ David A. Svanda
Commissioner

/s/ Robert B. Nelson
Commissioner

By its action of April 17, 2003.

/s/ Dorothy Wideman
Its Executive Secretary

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

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of April 17, 2003.

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 April 17, 2003 approving interconnection agreements and amendments, as set forth in the order.”