

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Investigation into the) DOCKET NO. 940235-TL
rates for interconnection of) ORDER NO. PSC-94-1231-PCO-TL
Mobile Service Providers with) ISSUED: October 11, 1994
facilities of local exchange)
companies.)
_____)

ORDER ESTABLISHING PRELIMINARY ISSUES


By Order No. PSC-94-0881-PCO-TL, the procedure governing this proceeding was established. On September 27, 1994, Commission staff conducted a workshop to identify the preliminary issues relevant to Docket No. 940235-TL. The list of preliminary issues which shall be addressed in prefiled testimony and prehearing statements is attached to this Order as Appendix A.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by Commissioner Diane K. Kiesling, as Prehearing Officer, that the prefiled testimony and prehearing statements shall address the issues set forth in Appendix A. It is further

ORDERED that Order No. PSC-94-0881-PCO-TL is reaffirmed in all other respects.

By ORDER of Commissioner Diane K. Kiesling, as Prehearing Officer, this 11th day of October, 1994.



DIANE K. KIESLING, Commissioner and
Prehearing Officer

(S E A L)

WEW

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

10352 OCT 11 94

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by this order, which is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: (1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.038(2), Florida Administrative Code, if issued by a Prehearing Officer; (2) reconsideration within 15 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by the Commission; or (3) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility, or the First District Court of Appeal, in the case of a water or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF ISSUES

- ISSUE 1:** What types of interconnection are available between a LEC and a mobile carrier? How are such interconnections technically configured?
- ISSUE 2:** Should Mobile Service Provider (MSP) network interconnection rates, terms and conditions be negotiated between individual LECs and MSPs? If so, what criteria, if any, should be followed by the parties.
- ISSUE 3:** Should MSP rates, terms and conditions be established by the Commission? If so, should the usage rates continue to be based on intrastate switched access charges? If not, what criteria should be followed?
- ISSUE 4:** Are the current rates terms and conditions for Type 1 interconnection appropriate? If not, how should they be changed?
- ISSUE 5:** Are the current rates terms and conditions for Type 2A interconnection appropriate? If not, how should they be changed?
- ISSUE 6:** Are the current rates, terms and conditions for Type 2A-CCS7 interconnection appropriate? If not, how should they be changed?
- ISSUE 7:** Should there be a separate rate for Type 2B interconnection? If so, what should be the rates, terms and conditions for Type 2B interconnection?
- ISSUE 8:** Should there be a separate rate for Type 2C interconnection (Direct interconnection to a 911 tandem switch)? If so, what should be the rates, terms and conditions for Type 2C interconnection?
- ISSUE 9:** Should there be a separate rate for Type 2D interconnection (Direct interconnection to a Traffic Operator Position System (TOPS) tandem switch)? If so, what should be the rates, terms and conditions for Type 2D interconnection?
- ISSUE 10:** Are current rates, terms and conditions for NXX establishment charges appropriate? If not, how should they be changed?

APPENDIX A CONTINUED

ISSUE 11: Are current rates, terms and conditions for the Land-to-Mobile option appropriate? If not, how should they be changed?

ISSUE 12: Are current rates, terms and conditions for DID Number Charges appropriate? If not, how should they be changed?

ISSUE 13: What other MSP interconnection tariff structure or rate changes, if any, should be made?

ISSUE 14: What procedures should be put in place to ensure that independent pay telephone providers are timely notified of NXX codes issued by the LECs for the Land-to-Mobile option?

ISSUE 15: Should compensation be paid to mobile carriers by LECs for land originated calls? If so, what form and level of compensation should be paid?

ISSUE 16: Should all LECs be required to implement the Land-to-Mobile calling option?

ISSUE 17: What should be the effective date of tariffs filed as a result of the decisions made in this docket?