

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**OF OREGON**

ARB 526

In the Matter of )  
 )  
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY ) STAFF COMMENTS  
L.P. and QWEST CORPORATION, )  
 )  
Interconnection Agreement Submitted for )  
Commission Approval Pursuant to Section )  
252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. )

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AGREEMENT**

On January 16, 2004, Sprint Communications Company L.P. and Qwest Corporation (Qwest) filed an interconnection agreement with the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Commission). The parties seek approval of this agreement under Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Commission provided notice by posting an electronic copy of the agreement on the World Wide Web, at: <http://www.puc.state.or.us/caragmnt/>. The Commission Staff (Staff) offers these comments.

Under the Act, the Commission must approve or reject an agreement reached through voluntary negotiation within 90 days of filing. The Commission may reject an agreement only if it finds that:

- (1) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or
- (2) the implementation of such agreement or portion thereof is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Staff notes that an interconnection agreement or amendment thereto has no effect or force until approved by a state Commission. *See* 47 U.S.C. Sections 252 (a) and (e). Accordingly, Staff points out that the effective date of this filing will be the date the Commission signs an order approving it, and that any provision stating that the parties' agreement is effective prior to that date is not enforceable.

The parties state the agreement is a Statement of Generally Accepted Terms (SGAT.) The terms and conditions of the agreement may be similar to the SGAT currently

under review; however, at this time there is no approved SGAT on file with the Commission. As such, the agreement should be processed as a negotiated agreement.

Staff recommends approval of the agreement. Staff concludes that the agreement itself does not appear to discriminate against telecommunications carriers who are not parties to the agreement and does not appear to be inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Dated at Salem, Oregon this 3rd day of February, 2004.

---

**Celeste Hari**  
Telecommunications Analyst