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DECISION AND ORDER

I. Application

VERIZON HAWAII INC. ("Verizon") requests commission approval of Amendment No. 1 ("Amendment") to the interconnection agreement dated June 25, 2003 ("Interconnection Agreement"), between Verizon and MCI Metro Access Transmission Services LLC ("MCI") (together with Verizon, "Parties"). Verizon submitted its request for approval to the commission on January 23, 2004, and included a copy of the Amendment as part of its request. The Amendment was filed pursuant to section 252(e) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("Act") and Hawaii Administrative Rules ("HAR") § 6-80-54.

Copies of Verizon's petition were served upon the DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS, DIVISION OF CONSUMER

1The 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.
ADVOCACY ("Consumer Advocate"). By a statement of position ("SOP") filed on April 13, 2004, the Consumer Advocate informed the commission that it does not object to the commission's approval of the Amendment.

Level(3) Communications, LLC, ("Level(3)") submitted comments on the instant matter, which were filed with the commission on February 12, 2004 ("Comments"). MCI filed reply comments on March 16, 2004. Level(3) is not a participant or a party to this proceeding, and as such, the commission will not consider its Comments.

II.

Background

Verizon is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Hawaii (State), and engaged in the provision of varied telecommunications services within its certificated territory in the State. Verizon is an "incumbent local exchange carrier" as the term is defined in 47 U.S.C. § 252.

The commission approved the Interconnection Agreement between the Parties by Decision and Order No. 20585, filed on October 22, 2003, in Docket No. 03-0199. The Amendment amends all interconnection agreements between MCI and all Verizon incumbent local exchange carriers. The Amendment resolves

Level(3) neither filed a motion to participate, pursuant to Hawaii Administrative Rules ("HAR") § 6-61-56, nor a motion to intervene, pursuant to HAR § 6-61-55. Level(3)'s Comments were unsolicited and without the permission of the commission.
"outstanding disputes pertaining to intercarrier compensation and
. . . establish[es] uniform terms governing intercarrier
compensation arrangements for certain traffic exchanged between
the Parties".3 The Amendment is effective from December 1, 2003,
to June 13, 2006.4 The terms and conditions of the Amendment
were negotiated and arrived at voluntarily by the Parties,5 as

III.

Consumer Advocate

The Consumer Advocate states that the rates, terms and
conditions of the Amendment do not appear to discriminate against
a telecommunications carrier not a party to the Interconnection
Agreement.6 In addition, granting MCI the opportunity to provide
telephone services pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth
in the Amendment is consistent with the public interest,
convenience and necessity for the promotion of the
telecommunications industry.7

3See Amendment to Interconnection Agreements ("Amendment to
Agreements") at 1.
4Id. at 2.
5See Amendment to Agreements at 1.
6See SOP at 7.
7Id. at 9.
IV.

Findings and Conclusions

Our review of the Amendment is 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:

(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 the Amendment does not discriminate against other telecommunications carriers and that the implementation of the Amendment is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. We, thus, conclude that the Amendment should be approved.

V.

Orders

THE COMMISSION ORDERS:

1. Amendment No. 1 to the Interconnection Agreement between Verizon and MCI, filed on January 23, 2004, is approved.

2. This docket is closed.
DONE at Honolulu, Hawaii this 22nd day of April, 2004.
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