

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).¹ 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) and 65-4-124(a) and (b) (2004), or in the alternative, under Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-5-109(m) (2009).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

The Petition is granted, and the Interconnection and Traffic Interchange Agreement negotiated between Citizens Telecommunications Company of Tennessee L.L.C. d/b/a Frontier Communications of Tennessee and Advantage Cellular Systems, Inc. is approved and is subject to the review of the Authority as provided herein.


Sara Kyle, Chairman


Kenneth C. Hill, Director


Mary W. Freeman, Director

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(B).