

ORIGINAL



0000013031

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

30NF

COMMISSIONERS  
MARC SPITZER, CHAIRMAN  
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL  
JEFF HATCH-MILLER  
MIKE GLEASON  
KRISTIN K. MAYES

2004 NOV -5 A 9:06

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL


IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
MCImetro ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES,  
LLC, FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT FOR  
ELIMINATION OF UNE-P AND  
IMPLEMENTATION OF BATCH HOT CUT  
PROCESS AND QPP MASTER SERVICES

Docket No. T-01051B-04-0540  
T-03574A-04-0540

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**

NOV - 5 2004


**STAFF'S NOTICE OF FILING**

DOCKETED BY 

The Arizona Corporation Commission Staff ("Staff") hereby files, as supplemental authority in this case, the attached Orders of the State of South Dakota Public Utilities Commission, Exhibit A and the Public Service Commission of Wyoming, Exhibit B, approving the negotiated Interconnection Agreement between MCImetro and Qwest, and the "Master Service Agreement for the Provision of Qwest Platform Plus" ("QPP"), as an interconnection agreement and rejecting Qwest's Motion to Dismiss.

RESPECTFULLY submitted this 5<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2004

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

By   
Maureen A. Scott  
Attorney, Legal Division  
1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
Telephone (602) 542-6022

1 Original and 13 copies of the foregoing  
2 filed this 5<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2004, with:

3 Docket Control  
4 Arizona Corporation Commission  
5 1200 West Washington  
6 Phoenix, AZ 85007

7 Copy of the foregoing mailed this 4<sup>th</sup>  
8 day of November, 2004, to:

9 Timothy Berg  
10 Theresa Dwyer  
11 Fennemore Craig  
12 3003 N. Central, Suite 2600  
13 Phoenix, AZ 85012


14 Norman G. Curtright  
15 Qwest Corporation  
16 4041 North Central, Suite 1100  
17 Phoenix, AZ 85012

18 Thomas H. Campbell  
19 Michael T. Hallam  
20 Lewis and Roca, LLP  
21 40 North Central Avenue  
22 Phoenix, AZ 85004  
23 Attorneys for MCImetro

24 Thomas F. Dixon  
25 707 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 4200  
26 Denver, CO 80202  
27 Attorneys for MCImetro

28 Joan S. Burke  
29 Osborn Maledon  
30 2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100  
31 Phoenix, AZ 85012-2794

32 Letty Friesen, Esq.  
33 AT&T  
34 1875 Lawrence Street, Suite 1503  
35 Denver, CO 80202-1870

36   
37 \_\_\_\_\_

# EXHIBIT A

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE FILING FOR )  
APPROVAL OF A MASTER SERVICES )  
AGREEMENT BETWEEN QWEST )  
CORPORATION AND MCIMETRO ACCESS )  
TRANSMISSION SERVICES, LLC )

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
TO DISMISS; ORDER  
APPROVING AGREEMENT

TC04-144

On August 2, 2004, the Commission received a filing from MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC (MCI) for approval of an Amendment to an Interconnection Agreement for Elimination of UNE-P and Implementation of Batch Hot Cut Process and Discounts (ICA Amendment) and Qwest Master Services Agreement (MSA) (together, Agreements) between MCI and Qwest Corporation (Qwest).

On August 5, 2004, the Commission electronically transmitted notice of this filing to interested individuals and entities. The notice stated that any person wishing to comment on the parties' request for approval had until August 23, 2004, to do so. On August 17, 2004, the Commission received a Motion to Dismiss Filing for Approval of Negotiated Commercial Agreement from Qwest. On August 23, 2004, the Commission received Comments from AT&T Communications of the Midwest, Inc. (AT&T) and a Response to Qwest Motion to Dismiss from MCI. On October 6, 2004, the Commission received a Supplement to Response to Qwest's Motion to Dismiss from MCI. On October 8, 2004, the Commission received Qwest's Joint Reply to MCI's Response to Qwest Motion to Dismiss and to AT&T's Comments. On October 21, 2004, the Commission received a second Supplement to MCI's Response to Qwest's Motion to Dismiss and Qwest's Reply to MCI's Supplement to Response to Qwest's Motion to Dismiss. On October 25, 2004, the Commission received a third Supplement to MCI's response to Qwest's Motion to Dismiss.

At its duly noticed October 26, 2004, meeting, the Commission considered this matter. Commission Staff recommended denial of Qwest's Motion to Dismiss and approval of the MSA. The Commission unanimously voted to deny the motion to dismiss and to approve the MSA.

The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to SDCL Chapter 49-31 particularly 49-31-81, ARSD 20:10:32:21 through 20:10:32:23 and 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Having considered the filings of record and applicable law, the Commission makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Final Decision and Order:

### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. MCI filed the Agreements with the Commission on August 2, 2004, in accordance with 47 U.S.C. § 252 and ARSD 20:10:32:21 implementing SDCL 49-31-81. On August 17, 2004, Qwest filed a Motion to Dismiss Filing for Approval of Negotiated Commercial Agreement. In its motion, Qwest argues that the MSA is not required to be filed and approved under 47 U.S.C. § 252 and ARSD 20:10:32:21. On October 26, 2004, at its regular meeting, the Commission held a motion hearing on Qwest's Motion to Dismiss and considered MCI's request for approval of the Agreements.
2. On July 26, 2004, Qwest filed the ICA Amendment. On September 22, 2004 in Docket No. TC04-135, the Commission approved the ICA Amendment. Qwest filed the MSA for "informational purposes only." The Commission did not approve the MSA following such filing but rather issued a Request for Comments from interested persons in its Weekly Filings Notice for the period July 22-July 28, 2004.

3. The Commission finds that it can consider the Agreements as filed according to their terms without reference to extrinsic facts and that it can rule on the Motion to Dismiss without an evidentiary hearing.

4. The current standard for determining whether an agreement between carriers is an "interconnection agreement," the filing and approval of which is required by 47 U.S.C. § 252, was laid down by the FCC in *In the Matter of Qwest Communications International Inc. Petition for Declaratory Ruling on the Scope of the Duty to File and Obtain Prior Approval of Negotiated Contractual Arrangements under Section 252(a)(1)*, WC Docket No. 02-89, Memorandum and Order, 17 F.C.C.R. 19337 (Rel. Oct. 4, 2002), ¶ 8:

. . . [W]e find that an agreement that creates an *ongoing* obligation pertaining to resale, number portability, dialing parity, access to rights-of-way, reciprocal compensation, interconnection, unbundled network elements, or collocation is an interconnection agreement that must be filed pursuant to section 252(a)(1). This interpretation, which directly flows from the language of the Act, is consistent with the pro-competitive, deregulatory framework set forth in the Act.

5. As found by the Washington Commission in *In the Matter of MCIMetro Access Transmission Services, LLC and Qwest Corporation for Approval of Negotiated Interconnection Agreement, in its Entirety, Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Order Approving Negotiated Interconnection Agreement in its Entirety, Dockets Nos. UT-960310 and UT-043084 (Oct. 20, 2004) (*Washington Order*), several provisions of the Agreements indicate that they are intended to function as an integrated contractual arrangement. These integrating provisions include, but are not limited to: (i) MSA, Section 23, which provides in pertinent part: ¶

In the event the FCC, a state commission or any other government authority or agency rejects or modifies any material provision in this Agreement, either Party may immediately upon written notice to the other Party terminate this Agreement and any interconnection agreement amendment executed concurrently with this Agreement. (emphasis supplied).

(ii) ICA Amendment, Section 2.2, which provides in pertinent part:

If the QPP MSA is terminated (for reasons other than material breach by MCI) with respect to a particular state, this Amendment shall, by its own terms and notwithstanding any requirement that subsequent modifications or amendments be in writing signed by both Parties, automatically be terminated in the state, and MCI shall be free thereafter to pursue any available means to purchase UNE-P or equivalent services from Qwest.

(iii) ICA Amendment, Section 2.6:

In the event the FCC, a state commission or any other governmental authority or agency rejects or modifies any material provision in this Amendment, either party may immediately upon written notice to the other Party terminate this Amendment and the QPP MSA.

(iv) ICA Amendment, Section 4.1, which provides in pertinent part:

The agreement not to order UNE-P services embodied in this Section shall remain in effect for the Term of this Amendment, and for the avoidance of doubt, shall no longer be binding on MCI or otherwise enforceable in a particular state if the QPP MSA is terminated as to that state (other than for reason of a material breach by MCI).

(v) MSA, Service Exhibit 1- QWEST PLATFORM PLUS™ SERVICE, Section 3.2, which provides *inter alia*:

To the extent that the monthly recurring rate for the loop element in a particular state is modified on or after the Effective Date, the QPP™ port rate for that state in the Rate Sheet will be adjusted (either up or down) so that the total rate applicable to the QPP™ service and loop combination in that state (after giving effect to the QPP™ Port Rate Increases as adjusted for any applicable discount pursuant to Section 3.3 of this Service Exhibit) remains constant.

(vi) MSA, Service Exhibit 1- QWEST PLATFORM PLUS™ SERVICE, Section 3.3, which provides *inter alia*:

Provided that Qwest has implemented the Batch Hot Cut Process in a particular state pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Amendment to MCI's ICAs entered into contemporaneously with this Agreement, the monthly recurring rates for the switch port in the attached Rate Sheets shall increase incrementally by the amount of the applicable QPP™ . . . . .

6. As the Washington Commission found, the Commission finds that the Agreements "reflect integrated pricing in combination of the two agreements, which have to be considered together in order for one to understand the entire agreement between the two parties. This integrated pricing also makes it apparent that the bargain struck by the parties encompasses both the QPP and the . . . ."[ICA Amendment].

7. All of the state Commissions that have considered the ICA Amendment and MSA arrangement within Qwest's territory to date have denied Qwest's motions to dismiss, and Utah and Washington have determined that both the ICA Amendment and MSA are required to be filed pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 and enabling state laws and regulations (the New Mexico Commission deferred decision on the issue of whether filing was required because of a pending consolidated proceeding on the issue to be concluded beyond the 90-day time limit of § 252). See *Washington Order, In the Matter of the Interconnection Agreement Between Qwest Corporation and MCIMetro Access Transmission Services, LLC for Approval of an Amendment for Elimination of UNE-P and Implementation of Batch Hot Cut Process and QPP Master Service Agreement*, Docket No. 04-2245-01, Order Denying Motion to Dismiss (Utah PSC, Sep. 30, 2004); *In the Matter of the Amendment to the Interconnection Agreement Between MCI and Qwest Dated July 16, 2004, and the Master Services Agreement Between MCI and Qwest Dated July 16, 2004*, Case No. 04-00245-UT (N.M. PRC, Oct. 12, 2004). See also, *Sage Telecom, LP v. Public Utility Commission of Texas*, Case No. A-04-CA-364-SS (W.D. Tex., Oct. 7, 2004); *In the Matter of the Request for Commission Approval of an Interconnection Agreement Between SBC Michigan and Sage Telecom, Inc.*, Case No. U-13513 (Mich. PSC, Aug. 3, 2004); *In the Matter, on the Commission's Own Motion, to Require SBC Michigan and Sage Telecom, Inc. to Submit Their Interconnection Agreement for Review and Approval*, Case No. U-14121 (Mich. PSC, April 28, 2004).

8. The Commission accordingly finds that the ICA Amendment and the MSA are sufficiently linked both functionally and legally to be treated as an integrated agreement for purposes of determining whether the MSA is required to be filed and approved pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 and ARSD 20:10:32:21. Since the ICA Amendment is indisputably an interconnection agreement pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 and ARSD 20:10:32:21, the Commission finds that the MSA is also part of an integrated interconnection agreement that is required to be filed and approved.

9. An additional factor militating in favor of finding that the MSA should be required to be filed is the recognized uncertainty involving unbundling requirements and the scope of the filing obligation. The Agreements themselves state as a central assumption of their purpose that "both MCI and Qwest acknowledge certain regulatory uncertainty in light of the DC Circuit Court's decision in *United States Telecom Association v. FCC*, 359 F.3d 554 (March 2, 2004), with respect to the future existence, scope, and nature of Qwest's obligation to provide such UNE-P arrangements under the Communications Act . . . ." The relationship between this uncertainty and the filing obligation under 47 U.S.C. § 252 is brought into sharper focus by the FCC's explicit acknowledgement of the issue recently in *In the Matter of Unbundled Access to Network Elements, Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*, WC Docket No. 04-313, CC Docket No. 01-338, Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 04-179 (Rel. Aug. 20, 2004). The FCC stated in ¶13:

Additionally, we incorporate three petitions regarding incumbent LEC obligations to file commercial agreements, under section 252 of the Act, governing access to network elements for which there is no section 251(c)(3) unbundling obligation. To that end, should we properly treat commercially negotiated agreements for access to network elements that are not required to be unbundled pursuant to section 251(c)(3) under section 252, section 211, or other provisions of law?

Given the consequences that have attended filing omissions in previous cases, the Commission finds that it is prudent to err on the side of requiring filing until more definitive guidance is forthcoming regarding the precise boundaries of the filing requirement. See *In the Matter of Qwest Corporation Apparent Liability for Forfeiture*, File No. EB-03-IH-0263, NAL Acct. No. 200432080022, FRM No. 0001-6056-25, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, FCC 04-57 (Rel. March 12, 2004).

10. The Commission does not reach the issue of whether an agreement dealing with network elements that are not required to be unbundled pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §251(c) is required to be filed pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 252 and ARSD 20:10:32:21 in the absence of material linkage between such agreement and an interconnection agreement dealing with network elements that are required to be unbundled pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §251(c).

11. The Agreements taken as a whole do not discriminate against a telecommunications carrier that is not a party thereto and are consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission concludes that it can consider the Agreements as filed according to their terms without reference to extrinsic facts and that it can rule on the Motion to Dismiss without an evidentiary hearing.

2. The ICA Amendment was previously approved in Docket No. TC04-135.

3. The ICA Amendment and the MSA are sufficiently linked both functionally and legally to be treated as an integrated agreement for purposes of determining whether the MSA is required to be filed and approved pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 and ARSD 20:10:32:21. Since the ICA Amendment is indisputably an interconnection agreement pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 and ARSD 20:10:32:21, the Commission concludes that the MSA is also part of an integrated interconnection agreement that is required to be filed and approved.

4. Qwest's Motion to Dismiss should be denied.

5. The Agreements do not discriminate against a telecommunications carrier that is not a party thereto and are consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

It is therefore

ORDERED, that Qwest's motion to dismiss is denied; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Commission approves the Master Services Agreement between Qwest and MCI dated July 16, 2004.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota, this 29th day of October, 2004.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document has been served today upon all parties of record in this docket, as listed on the docket service list, by facsimile or by first class mail, in properly addressed envelopes, with charges prepaid thereon.

By: Rebecca Kalbo

Date: 10/29/04

(OFFICIAL SEAL)

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

Robert K. Sahr

ROBERT K. SAHR, Chairman

Gary Hanson

GARY HANSON, Commissioner

James A. Burg

JAMES A. BURG, Commissioner

# EXHIBIT B

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WYOMING

IN THE MATTER OF THE CONTRACT )  
FILINGS OF MCIMETRO ACCESS ) DOCKET NO. 70027-TK-04-38  
TRANSMISSION SERVICES, LLC FOR ) DOCKET NO. 70000-TK-04-1020  
APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ITS ) (RECORD NO. 9257)  
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT AND )  
APPROVAL OF THE QWEST MASTER )  
SERVICE AGREEMENT ENTERED INTO )  
WITH QWEST CORPORATION )

### ORDER

(Issued November 1, 2004)

1. This matter is before the Commission upon the contract filings of MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC (MCI) for authority to enter into an Amendment for Elimination of UNE-P and Implementation of Batch Hot Cut Process and Discounts (Amendment) to its Interconnection Agreement and a Qwest Master Service Agreement (MSA), both entered into with Qwest Corporation (Qwest) for the state of Wyoming. These filings were submitted by MCI on August 2, 2004, pursuant to the provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(1) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.

2. The Commission reviewed the Amendment and MSA and issued an Order for Public Notice on August 11, 2004, which provided the public with the opportunity to file statements or other comments, in writing, with the Commission on or before September 13, 2004, regarding the Amendment and/or the MSA.

3. On September 8, 2004, Qwest Corporation filed its Motion to Dismiss Application for Approval of Negotiated Commercial Agreement (Motion to Dismiss) to the extent the MCI filings requested Commission review and approval of the MSA. Qwest Corporation in its Motion to Dismiss alleges, *inter alia*, that the MSA does not create any terms or conditions for services that Qwest is obligated to provide under Sections 251(b) and (c) or Section 252 of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act) and therefore, it is not an interconnection agreement that must be filed pursuant to Section 252(a)(1), nor is it subject to state commission review and approval pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Act. Qwest further argues the MSA does not amend or alter the terms and conditions of existing interconnection agreements between Qwest and MCI. Qwest filed its further Reply to MCImetro's Response to Qwest's Motion to Dismiss on September 28, 2004.

4. On September 13, 2004, AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc. (AT&T) filed its comments and response to MCI's contract filings and Qwest's Motion to Dismiss. AT&T submits that the MSA is an interconnection agreement adopted by negotiation and therefore must be filed with the state commission for

approval pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Act. AT&T further disagrees with Qwest's interpretation of the federal statutes that only agreements adopted under Sections 251(b) and (c) of the Act must be filed for state commission approval. AT&T also states that it takes no position as to whether the Amendment or the MSA meet the standards for approval contained in Section 252(e)(2)(A) of the Act. AT&T filed on October 4, 2004, and October 12, 2004, its Notice of Supplemental Authority and Second Notice of Supplemental Authority, respectively, which were comprised of the September 30, 2004, Order Denying Motion to Dismiss issued by the Public Service Commission of Utah and the *Sage Telecom, L.P. v. Public Utility Commission of Texas*, decision of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas, Austin Division, in Case No. A-04-CA-364-SS.

5. MCI filed on September 20, 2004, its Response to Qwest's Motion to Dismiss, arguing, *inter alia*, that the MSA is a voluntarily negotiated interconnection agreement which must be filed for State commission review and approval pursuant to Section 252(a)(1) and Section 252(e)(1) and (3) of the Act. MCI supports the denial of Qwest's Motion to Dismiss.

6. Qwest, MCI and AT&T presented oral argument at the Commission's open meeting of October 20, 2004 to supplement and support their respective pleadings. The Commission set the matter for public deliberations to be held on October 27, 2004.

7. The Commission conducted public deliberations, with regard to this matter, on October 27, 2004. During these deliberations, the Commission denied Qwest's Motion to Dismiss and determined that the MSA was a negotiated interconnection agreement subject to this Commission's review and approval pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Act. By separate order, the Commission will detail its findings and conclusions resulting in the denial of Qwest's Motion to Dismiss.

8. No statements or comments were filed with the Commission that alleged that either the Amendment or the MSA were discriminatory in nature or were not in the public interest.

9. Pursuant to the provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A)(i) and (ii), the Commission may reject a negotiated agreement, or any part of such agreement, if it finds (a) that the agreement, or any portion of it, discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement, or (b) that the implementation of such an agreement, or portion of the agreement, is not consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

10. The Commission reviewed the contract filings at its scheduled open meeting of October 27, 2004, and found and concluded that the above referenced Amendment and MSA generally comport with the standards set forth in 47 USC § 252(e)(2)(A)(i) and (ii) as they are nondiscriminatory and promote competition in Wyoming, consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. The contract filings of MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC for authority to enter into an Amendment for Elimination of UNE-P and Implementation of Batch Hot Cut Process and Discounts (Amendment) to its Interconnection Agreement with Qwest Corporation and the Qwest Master Service Agreement (MSA) entered into with Qwest Corporation, are hereby approved.


2. This Order is effective immediately.

MADE and ENTERED at Cheyenne, Wyoming this 1<sup>st</sup> day of November 2004.


PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WYOMING




ROB HURLESS, Chairman



STEVE FURTNEY, Deputy Chair



KATHLEEN A. LEWIS, Commissioner



ATTEST:



DAVID J. LUCERO, Assistant Secretary