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DECISION AND ORDER

I.

By a petition filed on October 7, 2002, VERIZON HAWAII INC. (Verizon Hawaii) requests that the commission approve Amendment No. 2 to the negotiated interconnection agreement between Cellco Partnership, dba Verizon Wireless and VERIZON HAWAII INC. (Amendment No. 2). Amendment No. 2 was filed pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act) and Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) § 6-80-54.

1We note that Verizon Hawaii had filed Amendment No. 1 to the interconnection agreement between itself and Verizon Wireless on August 14, 2002, for commission review and approval, which became a matter of Docket No. 02-0213. By letter dated and filed on November 7, 2002, Verizon Hawaii withdrew its approval request. By Order No. 19778, filed on November 18, 2002, the commission approved Verizon Hawaii’s withdrawal and closed Docket No. 02-0213.

2The Act amended Title 47 of the United States Code (U.S.C.). Section references in this decision and order are, thus, to those in 47 U.S.C., as amended by the Act.
Copies of Verizon Hawaii’s petition were served on the Division of Consumer Advocacy of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs (Consumer Advocate). Through a statement of position filed on November 22, 2002, the Consumer Advocate informed the commission that it does not object to the approval of Verizon Hawaii’s petition.

The commission is required to approve or reject a negotiated interconnection agreement within 90 days after an agreement is submitted for our review (90-day review period). The 90-day review period ends on January 5, 2003. The commission notes that no persons moved to intervene or participate in this docket.

II.
A.

Verizon Hawaii is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Hawaii (State), and is engaged in the provision of varied telecommunications services to its customers and the general public within its chartered territory in the State. Verizon Hawaii is an incumbent local exchange carrier, as contemplated by § 252 of the Act.

Verizon Wireless began as a joint venture between Bell Atlantic Corporation (Bell Atlantic) and Vodafone Airtouch, P.L.C. By Decision and Order No. 17819, filed on July 7, 2000, in Docket No. 00-0190, the commission granted Verizon Wireless a

\[37 \text{U.S.C. } \$ \text{252(e)(4)} \text{ and HAR } \$6-80-54(c).\]
certificate of registration to operate as commercial mobile radio service provider in the State. In that decision and order, the commission also approved the transfer of assets necessary to provide wireless services in Hawaii from GTE Wireless Incorporated (GTE Wireless) to Verizon Wireless.

B.

Amendment No. 2 alters the original interconnection agreement between GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company Incorporated, now known as Verizon Hawaii, and GTE Wireless of the Pacific Incorporated (GTE Pacific). GTE Pacific was a subsidiary of GTE Wireless. The commission approved the original interconnection agreement by Decision and Order No. 15715, filed on July 11, 1997, in Docket No. 97-0195.

The terms and conditions of Amendment No. 2 appear to have been arrived at through voluntary negotiations between the parties, as contemplated by 47 U.S.C. § 252(a). Amendment No. 2 establishes new reciprocal compensation rates for local traffic transport and termination and sets forth other conditions and definitions for service.

III.

In our review of Amendment No. 2, we are governed by 47 U.S.C. § 252 (e) and HAR § 6-80-54. These sections provide that we may reject a negotiated agreement only if:

\[\text{Decision and Order No. 17819 at 2.}\]
(1) The agreement, or any portion of the agreement, discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or

(2) The implementation of the agreement, or any portion of the agreement, is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Our review indicates that Amendment No. 2, filed on October 7, 2002, does not discriminate against other telecommunications carriers and that the implementation of the amendment is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. The Consumer Advocate appears to agree with our assessment of Amendment No. 2.

IV.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS:

1. Amendment No. 2 to the interconnection agreement between Verizon Wireless and Verizon Hawaii, filed on October 7, 2002, is approved.

2. This docket is closed.
DONE at Honolulu, Hawaii this 23rd day of December, 2002.
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