Kay Flynn

To:

Kathleen Arant

Cc:

kim pena

Subject:

RE: order in 000742



Thanks, Kathleen. I'll use this to update the docket title and the order WILL be issued today.

-Original Message-

From: Kathleen Arant

Sent: Monday, July 24, 2000 12:47 PM

To: Kay Flynn

Subject: RE: order in 000742

In reviewing the adoption of the GTE/AT&T interconnection agreement by The Ultimate Connection, L.C. d/b/a The Ultimate Connection it was discovered that while the original agreement between GTE/AT&T was in filed as only an interconnection agreement further research provided information that this agreement was in fact an Interconnection, Unbundling, and Resale agreement. As such the adoption was modified to reflect this finding.

THANKS!

----Original Message----From: Kimberley Pena

Sent: Monday, July 24, 2000 12:40 PM

To: Kathleen Arant

Subject: RE: order in 000742

Kathleen can you send her an email sharing your findings. Thanks!

----Original Message----

From: Kay Flynn

Sent: Monday, July 24, 2000 12:39 PM

To: Kimberley Pena

Subject: RE: order in 000742

CMP COM CTR ECR LEG OPC PAL RGO SEC SER

APP CAF

Okay. Looks like we need to amend the docket title in that case.

When staff discovers that kind of thing, we need an e-mail or a memo to amend the title, with a brief explanation. Otherwise the file contains a unexplained discrepancy.

----Original Message----

From: Kimberley Pena

Sent: Monday, July 24, 2000 12:36 PM

To: Kay Flynn

Subject: RE: order in 000742

Original only showed interconnection but after close review of the agreement by new members of staff it was realized that it was in

----Original Message----

From: Kay Flynn

Sent: Monday, July 24, 2000 12:35 PM

To: Kimberley Pena Subject: order in 000742

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Kim, isn't this just adoption of an "interconnection" (not IUR) agreement? Order indicates it's IUR but the original agreement