	Q.	Please discuss secret agreement 10A* between SBC and Qwest and explain
2		why it is an interconnection agreement.

A. Part of a broad remedial filing on August 22, 2002 by Qwest, and approved as an
amended interconnection agreement, 10A\* taken in its entirety with the rest of the
filed agreement is a new interconnection agreement. 10A\* provides for an
amendment to the conditions for Qwest provision of <u>line sharing exchange unbundled</u>
network element platform services secretly negotiated with Eschelon (UNE-E).

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Please discuss secret agreement 12A\* between Eschelon and Qwest and explain why it is an interconnection agreement.
  - A. This agreement settles disputes between the parties since the beginning of time through February 28, 2002, in Washington and other states concerning numerous elements of an interconnection agreement: service credits; consulting and network-related services; Carrier access billing for minutes of use; UNE-E line and UNE-E nonrecurring charge credits (UNE-E is defined in the agreement as Unbundled Network Element –Eschelon, a product purchased by Eschelon under its interconnection agreement as amended in November 2000 and August of 2001); and anticompetitive conduct and unfair competition. Because the agreement was filed for approval on August 22, 2002, Staff does not believe there

All interconnection services, interconnections, and unbundled network elements that are necessary are properly considered part of an interconnection agreement subject to pick and choose unless the ILEC can demonstrate that a particular interconnection service, interconnection or unbundled network element cannot be made available on the same terms and conditions individually due to technical or cost-based reasons.

To the extent other CLECs received better pricing of any services, including UNE-P, through discounts or take-or-pay provisions, for example, or shorter intervals for provisioning of services or more attention to the provisioning service, other CLECs should have been able to adopt such provisions. Pricing and provisioning are critical to entry into the local market and any improvement would have made entry easier for a CLEC.<sup>26</sup> To the extent that one CLEC paid more money for wholesale services that were resolved provided more quickly or on an expedited basis for other CLECs who enjoyed the benefits of secret interconnection agreements that were not made available for adoption, the CLEC was harmed. To the extent a CLEC loses customers or reputation because of unavailability of a specific pricing or provisioning term or condition granted in secret to a competitor, it might have sustained harm.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> See MCI response to Colorado 1-2, page 3 of Exhibit No. \_\_\_(TLW\_79).