

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 October 3, 2002 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-12465 | Ameritech Michigan and AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc.
Application filed August 19, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (rates and charges for certain network interconnection services) and the second amendment (CNAM). |
| Case No. U-12465 | Ameritech Michigan and TCG Detroit
Application filed August 19, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (rates and charges for certain network interconnection services) and the second amendment (CNAM). |
| Case No. U-12709 | Ameritech Michigan and Michigan's Utility & Company Payment Systems
Application filed September 6, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (rates, prices, and charges approved by the Commission in Case No. U-11831) and the second amendment (extending the term; replacing the mutual compensation, confidentiality, and intervening law sections; replacing the reciprocal compensation appendix). |

- Case No. U-12954 Ameritech Michigan and Buckeye TeleSystem, Inc.
Application filed September 3, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (rates and charges approved by the Commission in Cases Nos. U-11831 and U-12696).
- Case No. U-12988 Ameritech Michigan and ACD Telecom Inc.
Application filed August 27, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (rates and charges approved by the Commission in Cases Nos. U-11831 and U-12696) and the second amendment (Appendix Performance Measurements).
- Case No. U-13032 Ameritech Michigan and B & S Telecom, Inc.
Application filed September 9, 2002 for approval of the third amendment (Appendix Directory Assistance and Appendix Operator Services and associated pricing schedules).
- Case No. U-13507 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems and Excel Telecommunications, Inc.
Application filed August 9, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13509 Ameritech Michigan and CAT Communications International, Inc.
Application filed August 15, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13513 Ameritech Michigan and Sage Telecom, Inc.
Application filed August 20, 2002 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, Inc., including the Mi2A amendment) and the first amendment (reciprocal compensation).
- Case No. U-13521 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems and Talk Unlimited Now, Inc.
Application filed August 27, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13530 Ameritech Michigan and Budget Phone, Inc.
Application filed September 9, 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 AACCS, 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 October 3, 2002.

/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 October 3, 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 October 3, 2002 approving interconnection agreements and amendments, as set forth in the order.”