



**Qwest**  
1801 California Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Phone 303 383 6643  
Facsimile 303 296 3132  
Melissa.Thompson@qwest.com

**Melissa Thompson**  
Senior Attorney

January 21, 2005

Ms. Ilona Jeffcoat-Sacco  
Executive Secretary  
North Dakota Public Service Commission  
600 East Boulevard Avenue -- 12th Floor  
Bismarck, ND 58505-0480

Re: Qwest/1-800-Reconex Inc. dba USTel QPP™ Agreement

Dear Ms. Jeffcoat-Sacco:

Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") and 1-800-Reconex Inc. dba USTel recently executed a commercial agreement relating to the provisioning of switching and shared transport. The agreement is entitled "Master Services Agreement" and includes, marked as Exhibit 1, the "Qwest Platform Plus™ Service" (together hereinafter, the "QPP™ Agreement").

I am submitting with this letter a courtesy copy of the QPP™ Agreement for informational purposes only. The reason that I am submitting the QPP™ Agreement for informational purposes only is because Qwest believes that section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 252(e), does not require filing of the QPP™ Agreement for approval with state commissions.

As you are likely aware, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in what has been termed *USTA II* became effective on June 16, 2004.<sup>1</sup> In *USTA II*, the D.C. Circuit vacated various rules promulgated by the FCC including, but not limited to, the requirement pursuant to section 251(c)(3) that incumbent local exchange carriers unbundle certain network elements, including switching and shared transport. As stated by the FCC, the section 252(e) filing obligation applies to "an agreement that creates an *ongoing* obligation pertaining to resale, number portability, dialing parity, access to rights-of-way, reciprocal compensation, interconnection, unbundled network elements, or collocation."<sup>2</sup> Combining the impact of the D.C. Circuit's opinion with the FCC's Declaratory Ruling regarding section 252(e), there are no section 251(c)(3) obligations on the incumbent to provide switching and shared transport as unbundled network elements and, thus, there are no section 252(e) filing obligations associated with the QPP™ Agreement.

---

<sup>1</sup> *United States Telecom Ass'n. v FCC*, Case No. 00-1012, (Decided March 2, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> *In the Matter of Qwest Communications International Inc. Petition for Declaratory Ruling on the Scope of the Duty to File and Obtain Prior Approval of Negotiated Contractual Arrangements under Section 252(a)(1)*, para. 8 (emphasis that of the FCC).


The QPP™ Agreement is posted on the Qwest Wholesale website in its entirety and is available to all carriers that agree to all of the terms and obligations assumed by Midcontinent Communications. Further, Qwest has filed the QPP™ Agreement with the Federal Communications Commission under 47 U.S.C. § 211(a).

Contact information for 1-800-Reconex Inc. dba USTel is as follows:

William E. Braun, Vice President & General Counsel  
1-800-Reconex, Inc.  
2500 Industrial Avenue  
Hubbard, OR 97032  
Telephone: 503-982-5573

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter.

Sincerely,



Melissa K. Thompson

Enclosure

cc: Mel Kambeitz (w/o enclosures)  
William E. Braun (w/o enclosures)