

ORIGINAL
FILE COPY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GTE FLORIDA INCORPORATED

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF MARK EUGENE JOHNSON

DOCKET NO. 960980-TP **960847**

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Mark Eugene Johnson. My business address is 600 Hidden Ridge, Irving, TX 75038.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND WHAT IS YOUR POSITION?

A. I work for GTE Telephone Operations as Network Planning Manger-Operator Services.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE.

A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Technology from West Texas State University. I joined Contel in 1981 and worked in the Network Design Organization with Contel (and later, with GTE, following the GTE/Contel merger) until 1993. At that time, I moved into the Product Management-Operator Services Organization and later, during January 1996, I took over the duties I now have.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. I address the operator services (OS) and directory assistance (DA) issues raised by MCI in its Petition and the Direct Testimony of MCI

DOCUMENT NUMBER 10488 SEP 30 1996
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

1 witness Don Price. Specifically, I address issues regarding the
2 feasibility of branding and DA listing access. The issue of routing
3 OS and DA calls to ALECs' respective platforms is discussed in the
4 testimony of GTEFL witness Hartshorn.

5

6 **Q. IS IT TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE FOR GTEFL TO UNIQUELY**
7 **BRAND ALECS' SERVICES IN A RESALE OR UNBUNDLED**
8 **ENVIRONMENT?**

9 A. No. GTE is not currently capable of providing such branding. Before
10 branding can occur, the issue of customized routing must be
11 resolved. As Mr. Hartshorn testifies, the requisite vendor-endorsed
12 solution to the customized routing problem does not yet exist.

13

14 Even if the routing issue is resolved today, the branding process
15 raises its own set of technical issues. There are two types of
16 potential branding--called pre- and post-branding. Put simply, pre-
17 branding occurs at the beginning of a directory assistance call. Post-
18 branding can occur at any time during the recorded announcement on
19 a DA call.

20

21 Pre-branding requires sufficient identification capabilities and
22 branding capacities at the operator service switch. A dedicated trunk
23 group is required to properly identify the OS or DA call for proper pre-
24 branding. Additionally, the quantity of DRAM/EDRAM packs
25 (equipment that stores and plays the branding message) required for

1 any particular OS network switch is determined by the total number
2 of unique phrases requiring storage, total minute of audio phrasing
3 requiring storage, and the number of simultaneous channels required
4 to meet the traffic load. Further, an extensive amount of table work
5 is required of GTE database management personnel within each OS
6 network switch in setting up the unique trunk groups, routing tables,
7 and pointers to individual branding phrasing as may be requested by
8 MCI (and other ALECs) for their customers' OS services. Assuming
9 all the technical problems are solved, GTEFL would, of course, need
10 to recover from MCI (or other requesting ALEC) all of the costs
11 associated with these tasks to provide pre-branding.

12
13 Post-branding on OS is not, in practical terms, technically feasible
14 because MCI would have to have all its customer designated to
15 unique NPA/NXX groups. For resold lines and unbundled ports, of
16 course, ALECs will share many numbers within a single NPA/NXX.
17 GTEFL's Interactive Voice Services (IVS) system can only be
18 equipped to provide custom post-branding for a unique NPA/NXX;
19 therefore, MCI would have to have a unique NPA/NXX for OS post-
20 branding to be possible.

- 21
- 22 **Q. IS IT REASONABLE TO EXPECT GTE TO ROUTE PART OF MCI'S**
23 **OPERATOR TRAFFIC TO MCI AND ANOTHER PART TO GTEFL?**
- 24 **A.** No. To allow for efficient and timely system modifications and
25 augmentation associated with branding capabilities, GTEFL must

1 know whether MCI intends to use MCI or GTEFL operators. GTEFL
2 should not be forced to prepare for both possibilities with no
3 commitment from MCI. Since MCI could order unique branding from
4 GTE and then quickly transition to using its own operator platform,
5 GTEFL would require up-front cost recovery associated with
6 branding.

7
8 The bottom line is that MCI will only implement one option, so GTEFL
9 should only be required to implement one option. It is reasonable
10 to expect MCI to make a decision regarding the source of their
11 operator platform before GTEFL makes any system modifications..

12

13 **Q. IS IT TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE TO PROVIDE DA LISTINGS**
14 **ELECTRONICALLY?**

15 **A.** Yes. GTE intends to provide its end user listings via a general
16 standard offering that is currently under development. The listings
17 could be transferred either by network data mover or by magnetic
18 tape. GTEFL can also, however, provide ALECs access to the
19 database itself. Thus, like the customized routing versus branding
20 issue, GTEFL should not be ordered to offer individual ALECs both
21 database access and electronic transfer of DA listings. MCI will only
22 use one option, so GTEFL should not be ordered to expend time and
23 money implementing both options. MCI must decide which it wants
24 to use.

25

1 **Q. IS OPERATOR SYSTEMS A NETWORK ELEMENT?**

2 A. No single, pat answer to that question is possible, because operator
3 systems includes many different components to which ALECs might
4 request access. There are many variables, depending on the
5 particular ALEC request. GTEFL will look at each on a case-by-case
6 basis to determine whether the requested access is technically
7 feasible.

8

9 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

10 A. Yes. It does.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25