

**BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

**NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE**

**August 24, 2006**

**IN RE:**

**PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF THE RESALE  
PORTION OF THE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN BELL SOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS,  
INC. AND ERNEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

**DOCKET NO.  
06-00153**

---

**ORDER APPROVING RESALE PORTION OF THE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT**

---

This matter came before Chairman Sara Kyle, Director Eddie Roberson and Director Pat Miller of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (the "Authority"), the voting panel assigned to this docket, at a regularly scheduled Authority Conference held on July 24, 2006 to consider, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252, the Petition for approval of the resale portion of the interconnection agreement negotiated between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth") and Ernest Communications, Inc. filed on June 8, 2006.<sup>1</sup>

Based upon a review of the agreement, the record in this matter, and the standards for review set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 252, the Directors unanimously granted the Petition and made the following findings and conclusions:

- 1) The Authority has jurisdiction over public utilities pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-4-104 (2004).
- 2) The agreement is in the public interest as it provides consumers with alternative sources of telecommunications services within BellSouth's service area.

---

<sup>1</sup> BellSouth and Ernest Communications, Inc. entered into a regional interconnection agreement that applies to all nine states in the BellSouth region. Ernest Communications, Inc. is certificated in Tennessee only as a reseller. Therefore, the parties request approval only of the resale portion of the interconnection agreement.

3) The agreement is not discriminatory to telecommunications service providers that are not parties thereto.


4) 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A) provides that a state commission may reject a negotiated agreement only if it “discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement” or if the implementation of the agreement “is not consistent with the public interest, convenience or necessity.” Unlike arbitrated agreements, a state commission may not reject a negotiated agreement on the grounds that the agreement fails to meet the requirements of 47 U.S.C. §§ 251 or 252(d).<sup>2</sup> Thus, although the Authority finds that neither ground for rejection of a negotiated agreement exists, this finding should not be construed to mean that the agreement is consistent with §§ 251 or 252(d) or, for that matter, previous Authority decisions.


5) No person or entity has sought to intervene in this docket.


6) The agreement is reviewable by the Authority pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 and Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-4-104 (2004).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:**

The Petition is granted, and the resale portion of the interconnection agreement negotiated between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and Ernest Communications, Inc. is approved and is subject to the review of the Authority as provided herein.

  
Sara Kyle, Chairman

  
Eddie Roberson, Director

  
Pat Miller, Director

---

<sup>2</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(B).