



Public Service Commission
CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

RECEIVED - PSC
JUL 24 AM 10:38
COMMISSION CLERK

DATE: JULY 24, 2003

TO: DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF THE COMMISSION CLERK & ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (BAYÓ)

FROM: OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL (TEITZMAN) *AK* *MC*
DIVISION OF COMPETITIVE MARKETS & ENFORCEMENT (BARRETT) *MCB* *MB*

RE: DOCKET NO. 010795-TP - PETITION BY SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP FOR ARBITRATION WITH VERIZON FLORIDA INC. PURSUANT TO SECTION 251/252 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

AGENDA: 08/05/03 - REGULAR AGENDA - POST HEARING DECISION - PARTICIPATION IS LIMITED TO COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: NONE

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\GCL\WP\010795.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

On June 1, 2001, Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership (Sprint) filed a Petition for Arbitration pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act), seeking arbitration of certain unresolved terms and conditions of a proposed renewal of its interconnection agreement with Verizon Florida, Inc. f/k/a GTE Florida, Incorporated (Verizon). Verizon filed a response and the matter was set for hearing.

In Sprint's petition, 15 issues were enumerated for arbitration. Prior to the administrative hearing, the parties resolved or agreed to stipulate a number of those issues. The administrative hearing was held on January 17, 2002. On January 7, 2003, Order No. PSC-03-0048-FOF-TP, Final Order on Arbitration, was issued.

DOCUMENT # 48818-DATE
06648 JUL 24 8
PSC-COMMISSION CLERK

DOCKET NO. 010795-TP
DATE: July 24, 2003

On February 5, 2003, Sprint and Verizon filed a Joint Motion for Extension of Time to file an interconnection agreement. On February 12, 2003, Order No. PSC-03-0212-PCO-TP was issued granting this Motion.

On February 12, 2003, Sprint and Verizon filed a Second Joint Motion for Extension of Time, which was granted by Order No. PSC-03-0229-PCO-TP, issued February 18, 2003.

On February 28, 2003, Verizon filed a Motion for Approval of Interconnection, Resale, Unbundling and Collocation Agreement with Sprint, though the attached agreement was unsigned. (Verizon Motion)

On February 28, 2003 Sprint filed a Motion to Resolve Disputed Language. This pleading also contained an unsigned agreement. While Verizon and Sprint agreed on most of the language to be included in their agreement, they continued to disagree on how certain arbitration rulings should be memorialized in their contract. Specifically, Verizon and Sprint did not agree on language to define "Local Traffic," multi-jurisdictional trunks, and Sprint VAD/00- traffic. Verizon and Sprint also did not agree on language reflecting the current state of the Commission's UNE pricing for Verizon.

On March 7, 2003 Verizon filed its Opposition to Sprint's Motion to Resolve Disputed Language. On March 10, 2003 Sprint filed its Opposition to Verizon's Motion for approval of interconnection agreement. By Order No. PSC-03-0637-FOF-TP, issued May 27, 2003, the Commission specified which language, where the parties were in disagreement, should be included in the final interconnection agreement.

DOCKET NO. 010795-TP

DATE: July 24, 2003

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should the Commission approve the arbitrated Interconnection Agreement between Verizon and Sprint in Docket No. 010795-TP?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. The Commission should approve the arbitrated Interconnection Agreement between Verizon and Sprint in Docket No. 010795-TP. (BARRETT)

STAFF ANALYSIS: On June 26, 2003, Verizon filed its final executed Interconnection Agreement with Sprint pursuant to Order Nos. PSC-03-0048-FOF-TP and PSC-03-0637-FOF-TP. Staff has reviewed the agreement and has determined that it complies with the Commission's decisions in the above referenced orders, as well as the Act. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission approve the arbitrated Interconnection Agreement between Verizon and Sprint in Docket No. 010795-TP, filed June 26, 2003.

ISSUE 2: Should this docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. If the Commission approves staff's recommendation in Issue 1, no further action will be required in this docket. Therefore, this docket may be closed. (TEITZMAN)

STAFF ANALYSIS: If the Commission approves staff's recommendation in Issue 1, no further action will be required in this docket. Therefore, this docket may be closed.