ORIGINAL

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF W. KEITH MILNER

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 000649-TP

SEPTEMBER 7, 2000

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, YOUR BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND YOUR POSITION WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH").

A. My name is W. Keith Milner. My business address is 675 West Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30375. I am Senior Director - Interconnection Services for BellSouth. I have served in my present role since February 1996, and have been involved with the management of certain issues related to local interconnection, resale, and unbundling.

Q. ARE YOU THE SAME W. KEITH MILNER WHO FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. Yes.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY BEING FILED TODAY?

A. I will respond to portions of the testimony of MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC and MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. (collectively referred to as "MCIW") witnesses Olson, Messina, and Price with respect to Issues, 5, 8, 11, 15, 19, 29, 37, 56, 59-61, 63-66, 68, 92, 97, and 99 through 103.

Issue 5: Should BellSouth be required to provide OS/DA as a UNE?

Q. ON PAGE 5 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. MESSINA SUGGESTS THAT MCIW WOULD BE WILLING TO AGREE TO LANGUAGE PROVIDING THAT BELLSOUTH IS NOT REQUIRED TO PROVIDE OS/DA AS A UNE AS LONG AS IT IS ABLE TO ROUTE OS/DA TRAFFIC SUCCESSFULLY TO MCIW'S OS/DA PLATFORM USING A COMPATIBLE SIGNALING PROTOCOL. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. First of all, FCC's Rule 319(f) makes clear that BellSouth is not required to unbundle OS/DA where it provides Alternative Local Exchange Carriers (ALECs) "with customized routing or a compatible signaling protocol," and BellSouth provides customized routing in accordance with the FCC's rules.

Second, as to using a compatible signaling protocol, BellSouth has tested and makes available various methods for providing Feature Group D signaling in conjunction with customized routing, which is the "compatible signaling protocol" to which I believe Mr. Messina is

referring. I described these three methods in my direct testimony on pages 16 and 17. Thus, BellSouth's work in making a compatible signaling protocol available to MCIW has resulted in developing techniques to provide the signaling Mr. Messina states MCIW desires.

BellSouth stands ready to develop contract language that will facilitate MCIW's use of customized routing functionality. However, whether or not MCIW is interested in doing so, BellSouth provides MCIW and other Alternative Local Exchange Carriers (ALECs) with customized routing consistent with the FCC's rules.

Issue 11: Should MCIW access the feeder distribution interface directly or should BellSouth be permitted to introduce an intermediate demarcation device?

Q. MR. MESSINA INDICATES, ON PAGE 9 OF HIS TESTIMONY, THAT THE FCC RULES PROVIDE THAT THE FEEDER DISTRIBUTION INTERFACE (FDI) IS AN "ACCESSIBLE TERMINAL," MEANING THAT IT IS A POINT WHERE TECHNICIANS CAN ACCESS THE WIRE OR FIBER WITHIN THE CABLE WITHOUT REMOVING A SPLICE CASE TO REACH THE WIRE OR FIBER WITHIN; THEREFORE THE FDI CAN BE ACCESSED DIRECTLY BY MCIW PERSONNEL. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. The issue here is not whether the FDI is an "accessible terminal".

BellSouth agrees that it will provide unbundled access to its loop feeder facilities or its loop distribution facilities. The issue in dispute is the manner in which BellSouth must provide access to such unbundled sub-loop elements. Nothing in any FCC rule requires that BellSouth permit MCIW to connect to the FDI directly. Nor is there any FCC rule that prohibits the insertion of an access terminal, such as that ordered by this Commission in Docket No. 990149-TP and the Georgia Commission in Docket No. 10418-U. BellSouth is willing to provide MCIW with access to unbundled sub-loop elements but not in the manner proposed by MCIW.

Q. ON PAGE 8 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. MESSINA STATES "IN ADDITION, THE INTERMEDIATE DEMARCATION DEVICE CREATES AN ADDITIONAL FAILURE POINT AND MAY CREATE UNNECESSARY RIGHT OF WAY, ZONING, AND POWER SUPPLY PROBLEMS THAT WOULD NOT OCCUR (OR WOULD BE MINIMIZED) WITH DIRECT ACCESS." PLEASE RESPOND.

A. While BellSouth's form of access to unbundled loop feeder requires additional cross connections (though I believe he is incorrect that additional power supplies would be required), that is not the real issue. The real issue is that any additional burdens created by MCIW having to access loop feeder through an access terminal are outweighed by the need to maintain high levels of network reliability and security. Further, MCIW should not be allowed to put its own self interests

above those of others (including the end user customers of both BellSouth and the end user customers of ALECs making use of resold services, unbundled loops or unbundled sub-loop elements acquired from BellSouth) by reducing the reliability and security of the network.

Q. WHAT DECISION DID THIS COMMISSION REACH REGARDING BELLSOUTH'S NTW PROPOSAL?

A. This Commission found that the access terminal performs a useful purpose. In its Order No. PSC-99-2009-FOF-TP issued October 14, 1999, the Commission stated the following:

> "Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, we believe that it is in the best interests of the parties that the physical interconnection of MediaOne's network be achieved as proposed by BellSouth. We find from the record that at least one other ALEC in Florida and an unknown number of ALECs in other states have been able to provide service based on BellSouth's NTW proposal."

Q. WHAT DECISION DID THE GEORGIA COMMISSION REACH REGARDING ACCESS TO UNBUNDLED SUB-LOOP ELEMENTS?

A. In its Order in Docket 10418-U at page 10, the Georgia Commission

stated:

> As stated in the prior section, to the extent there is not currently a single point of interconnection that can be feasibly accessed by MediaOne, consistent with the FCC's Third Report and Order, BellSouth must construct a single point of interconnection that will be fully accessible and suitable for use by multiple carriers. Such single points of interconnection shall be constructed consistent with MediaOne's proposal such that MediaOne shall provide its own cross connect (CSX) facility in the wiring closet to connect from the building back to its network. MediaOne would then be able to connect its customers within the MDU [that is, the Multiple Dwelling Unit] by means of an "access CSX".

Q. WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE GEORGIA COMMISSION'S ORDER IN THE MEDIAONE ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS?

A. This Commission decided that BellSouth will construct an "access CSX" to which it will terminate all of the network terminating wire pairs. MediaOne, and any other interested ALEC, will then have access to any network terminating wire pair on the access CSX that is not being used by BellSouth or another ALEC, pursuant to the terms of the

parties' interconnection agreement. What the Georgia Commission did not allow was for BellSouth to require the use of its technicians to perform the cross-connects between the parties' networks on a pair by pair basis.

The access terminal establishes a clear demarcation point between BellSouth's facilities and those of the ALEC. Thus, it is easy to determine in cases of trouble conditions, whether the problem is within BellSouth's facilities and thus BellSouth's responsibility to repair or instead is in the ALEC's facilities and thus the responsibility of the ALEC. Further, the use of the access terminal makes it clear which ALEC is using BellSouth's facilities and in what quantity. Without such a device, there would be no operationally feasible method by which BellSouth would know which facilities are actually being used, which adversely affects provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing.

Q. MR. MESSINA STATES ON PAGE 8 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT THE USE OF THE ACCESS TERMINAL WOULD ENTAIL THE COST OF A BELLSOUTH DISPATCH TO PERFORM NECESSARY CROSS CONNECTION WORK. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. The installation of the access terminal does indeed cost time and material, and BellSouth is entitled to recover the costs associated with such work. However, to the extent Mr. Messina believes that BellSouth must dispatch its technician each time MCIW wishes to

make use of an individual unbundled sub-loop element (for example, a specific loop distribution pair), he is mistaken. BellSouth is willing to pre-wire connections for MCIW's use such that BellSouth's technician need not be dispatched except at the time of the initial pre-wiring.

Q. ON PAGE 9 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. MESSINA CITES C.F.R. SECTION 319(a)(2) AND THEN CONCLUDES, "THUS, THE FDI CAN BE ACCESSED DIRECTLY." DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. Mr. Messina correctly quotes the FCC's rules but reaches an incorrect conclusion regarding a requirement that BellSouth provide direct access. Indeed, the FCC's rules do not address the form of access to the unbundled sub-loop elements served by the FDI. For the reasons I stated earlier, MCIW's request that it be given direct access to the FDI should be rejected.

Q. ON PAGE 9 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. MESSINA STATES HIS BELIEF THAT ". . . BELLSOUTH MUST PROVIDE ACCESS USING THE METHOD WORLDCOM REQUESTS (I.E., DIRECT ACCESS WITHOUT INTERMEDIATE DEVICES) UNLESS THE REQUESTED METHOD IS NOT TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE." PLEASE COMMENT.

A. The issue of technical feasibility Mr. Messina refers to has already been addressed by this Commission and the Georgia Commission. I believe both Commissions correctly weighed the evidence presented

and concluded that allowing an ALEC direct access to sub-loop elements is not technically feasible because of the negative impact on network reliability and security resulting from such direct access. The FCC's rules embrace the notion of network reliability and security as indicators of whether a given form of access is technically feasible. Thus, in light of the FCC's rules cited by Mr. Messina and the decisions of the Florida and Georgia Commissions, BellSouth will provide access to sub-loop elements, but not using the invasive, risky method proposed by MCIW.

Also, in the deposition of Mr. Messina in Georgia Docket No. 11901-U (pages 37-38), Mr. Messina was asked if BellSouth's proposal would have any impact on the services MCIW would be able to obtain over the loop. Mr. Messina's response was that it should have no effect on the services.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE WHAT IS WRONG WITH MCIW'S PROPOSED FORM OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE BELLSOUTH FDI.

A. Allowing MCIW (or any other ALEC) to have direct access to BellSouth's FDI would adversely affect network reliability and security in several ways. First, MCIW's proposal needlessly increases the risk of customer service interruption, both to BellSouth's retail customers as well as to other ALECs' customers who may be using unbundled loops or sub-loop elements acquired from BellSouth. Under MCIW's

proposal, BellSouth's facilities could be used by MCIW without consent or notice and conceivably could result in service outages for the other ALECs' customers. While I am in no way disparaging MCIW's technicians, examination of MCIW's proposal immediately reveals that MCIW's technicians could, intentionally or unintentionally, disrupt the service provided by BellSouth to its end user customers or the end user customers of ALECs using resold services, unbundled loops or unbundled sub-loop elements acquired from BellSouth.

Second, MCIW's proposal makes it impossible for BellSouth to keep accurate records of which pairs are spare, working, or defective, which is critical to ensuring high quality service, both in provisioning new or additional customer lines and in repairing existing customers' service. The loop facilities terminated at the FDI (that is, the "loop feeder" facilities and the "loop distribution" facilities) are inventoried in BellSouth's mechanized systems, which are not accessible by BellSouth's own field technicians. As inventoried records, individual assignments of cable pairs are made as orders for service are processed. Should particular cable pairs become unusable, a notation is made in the records system so that the pairs are not assigned as the need for additional pairs arise. Thus, a field technician (either BellSouth's technician or the ALEC's technician) has no way of determining the status of particular cable pairs without risking disruption of service to existing end user customers. Using a test set to determine whether the cable pair is in use would disrupt an in-

progress transmission. Utilizing cable pairs at random will result in taking an existing end user customer out of service, or in having the new end user customer's service be inoperable because of a faulty cable pair. Should a technician by chance choose a spare cable pair and successfully install the end user customer's service, there is no means of protecting that service from potential disruptions resulting from the next technician entering that work area, no matter whether that technician is employed by BellSouth, MCIW, or another ALEC. As subsequent technicians enter the work scene, the existing cable pair records would progressively deteriorate, creating an immediate and significant service problem that would be extremely costly and difficult to correct.

The FCC requires that "each carrier must be able to retain responsibility for the management, control, and performance of its own network." (First Report and Order 96-325, ¶ 203) MCIW's proposal, if allowed, would render BellSouth incapable of managing and controlling its network in the provision of service to its end user customers or the end user customers of ALECs acquiring resold services or unbundled loops or unbundled sub-loop elements from BellSouth. How MCIW believes accurate records of cable inventory (that is, cable pairs in use, spare, or defective) might be maintained under its proposal is a mystery to me. Indeed, accurate records could not be maintained under MCIW's proposal and service degradation would result. Thus, while BellSouth is willing to provide MCIW with access to the

unbundled network elements in the FDI, such access should be as proposed by BellSouth.

Issue 15: When a MCIW customer served via the UNE-platform makes a directory assistance or operator call, must the ANI-II digits be transmitted to MCIW via Feature Group D signaling from the point of origination?

Q MR. MESSINA, ON PAGE 11 OF HIS TESTIMONY, STATES THAT IF BELLSOUTH'S SOLUTION TO THIS PROBLEM IS VALIDATED, BELLSOUTH WILL BE ABLE TO TRANSMIT THE ANI-II DIGITS AS MCIW HAS REQUESTED. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. As I discussed previously in Issue 5 in this testimony, BellSouth has already performed tests of customized routing alternatives which resulted in developing techniques to provide the signaling Mr. Messina states MCIW desires. Further, it is my understanding that MCIW has already done its own testing of BellSouth's Line Class Code method of selective routing that confirms that the three methods I discussed in my direct testimony on pages 16 and 17 work. Those methods provide the transmission of ANI-II digits in standard Feature Group D format.

In addition, BellSouth has an AIN based customized routing offering, with the database query done via a Nortel DMS 100 hub office rather than at the access tandem. The ANI-II digits are not passed over to

the hub switch from the end office switch because that leg of the call is considered Feature Group C signaling. BellSouth adopted the hub switching arrangement for two reasons:

1. The Nortel DMS 10 and Stromberg Carlson DCO (two switch types BellSouth uses in its network) do not have the capability of Offhook Delay Triggers necessary to make this offer work from an end office.
2. The Offhook Delay Trigger would cause queries on calls that are not included in the Selective Routing offering thereby creating an unnecessary load on BellSouth's database.

BellSouth is able to convert from conventional Feature Group C signaling to Equal Access Signaling (that is, Feature Group D) in an end office to Access Tandem arrangement, where the end office switch is a Nortel DMS 100 switch. For the Lucent 5ESS end office switch, BellSouth is able to convert the signaling to Feature Group D by using direct trunking to the ALEC's operator services or directory assistance platform. This is due to the technical limitations inherent in the Lucent 5ESS switch manufacturers' designs, In both of these cases, ANI-II digits are successfully provided.

To summarize, BellSouth has identified a number of different ways to accomplish the signaling MCIW has stated it desires. BellSouth is willing to incorporate these methods in MCIW's interconnection

agreement that will allow MCIW to use customized routing functionality with Feature Group D signaling including ANI-II digits. Thus, BellSouth has met its obligation of providing customized routing to MCIW. If MCIW wants Feature Group D signaling in conjunction with customized routing, it need simply order it, and BellSouth will provide it.

Issue 19: How should BellSouth be required to route OS/DA traffic to MCIW's operator services and directory assistance platforms?

Q. MR. MESSINA, ON PAGES 13-14 OF HIS TESTIMONY, SUGGESTS THAT IN ORDER FOR MCIW TO PROVIDE ITS OWN OS/DA SERVICE EFFICIENTLY FOR ITS CUSTOMERS, MCIW MUST BE ABLE TO OBTAIN OS/DA TRAFFIC OVER SHARED TRANSPORT VIA A BELLSOUTH TANDEM, AND OVER DEDICATED TRUNKS THAT CAN OVERFLOW TO SHARED TRANSPORT AS NEEDED. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. I do not believe that BellSouth has such an obligation since it does not use such trunking arrangements for its own operator services traffic. Nevertheless, some sharing of transport is possible where MCIW uses BellSouth's AIN method of customized routing. The AIN method allows for some sharing of trunk groups between the end office switch and the AIN "hub".

Further, MCIW's use of customized routing and the "pseudo code" method of achieving Feature Group D signaling will allow MCIW to route its traffic as it desires including via BellSouth's tandem switches if desired. BellSouth is entitled to be paid for any unbundled tandem switching that it provides to MCIW for the carriage of MCIW's operator services or directory assistance traffic handled in such a manner.

Q. HOW DOES BELLSOUTH ROUTE OPERATOR SERVICES AND DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC FOR ITS OWN END USER CUSTOMERS?

A. As I stated in my direct testimony, BellSouth routes its operator services or directory assistance traffic directly to a BellSouth Traffic Operator Position System (TOPS) platform rather than via a tandem switch. The operator services or directory assistance end office functions offered by BellSouth require dedicated trunk groups from BellSouth end offices to the TOPS platform.

Finally, BellSouth does not overflow its operator services or directory assistance traffic. Thus, there is no requirement that BellSouth do so for MCIW's operator services or directory assistance traffic. However, as I mentioned earlier, if MCIW elects to use customized routing and the "pseudo code" method of achieving Feature Group D signaling, MCIW can acquire unbundled tandem switching from BellSouth and

route MCIW's operator services and directory assistance traffic in the manner MCIW says it prefers.

Q. MR. MESSINA CLAIMS THAT THE FCC RULES REQUIRE THAT OPERATOR SERVICES BE ROUTED OVER SHARED TRANSPORT. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. BellSouth will provide all of the features, functions, and capabilities of tandem switching to MCIW. However, not every type of operator services traffic, such as busy line verification traffic, can be handled by a tandem switch, which is one reason BellSouth does not route its operator services traffic through the tandem.

Q. ON PAGE 16 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. MESSINA STATES THAT BASED ON THE TESTING MCIW HAS DONE TO DATE, IT APPEARS THAT BELLSOUTH IS CAPABLE OF ROUTING OS/DA TRAFFIC AS MCIW REQUESTS. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. As I stated in Issue 15 previously, BellSouth has identified a number of different ways to accomplish the signaling MCIW has stated it desires. Further, the FCC's Rule 319(f) makes clear that BellSouth is not required to unbundle OS/DA where it provides ALECs "with customized routing or a compatible signaling protocol." If MCIW wants to use this signaling protocol in conjunction with its use of customized

routing, MCIW is free to do so. MCIW need only make such a request of BellSouth and BellSouth will provide it.

BellSouth's AIN method of providing customized routing allows for the sharing of trunks among ALECs using that method of customized routing on those trunk groups between BellSouth's end office switches and the AIN hub switch. I believe this to be the sharing of trunk groups that MCIW says it wants. If MCIW wants to use its own OS/DA platform, it is free to do so and either of BellSouth's customized routing methods will accommodate such. Lastly, the trunks to MCIW's own OS/DA platform would not be used by BellSouth (or by another ALEC) since only MCIW's traffic traverses those trunk groups. Thus, dedicated trunking for that portion of the network is an appropriate choice.

Issue 29: Should calls from MCIW customers to BellSouth customers served via Uniserve, Zipconnect, or any other similar service, be terminated by BellSouth from the point of interconnection in the same manner as other local traffic, without a requirement for special trunking?

Q. ON PAGE 38 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PRICE SUGGESTS THAT IN THOSE AREAS WHERE BELLSOUTH HAS DEPLOYED UNISERV® SERVICE, THE DESIGN HAS REQUIRED MCIW TO INSTALL NEW TRUNK GROUPS FROM MCIW's OPERATOR SERVICES

PLATFORM TO THE BELLSOUTH TOPS PLATFORM THEREBY INCREASING MCIW's COST OF DOING BUSINESS TO SUPPORT A BELLSOUTH SERVICE FOR WHICH BELLSOUTH COLLECTS THE REVENUE. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. Because BellSouth UniServ® service utilizes operator services switching functionality, MCIW must bring its own facilities, or lease facilities from BellSouth, to BellSouth's Traffic Operator Position System (TOPS) platform in order for MCIW customers to reach BellSouth's UniServ® service customers. This is consistent with what BellSouth and other telecommunications carriers are required to do.

Mr. Price finds fault with service design decisions made years ago for BellSouth's UniServ®. It appears that what MCIW really wants is to be treated differently than the way BellSouth treats itself and other carriers. For example, by purporting to relieve MCIW of establishing trunks to points other than the Point of Interconnection, MCIW apparently seeks to avoid having to establish a trunk group to the TOPS platform for the routing of its operator services or directory assistance traffic. Routing operator services and directory assistance traffic directly to the TOPS platform is precisely the manner in which BellSouth routes such traffic for its customers, and MCIW should do the same.

Q. ON PAGES 38-39 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR PRICE STATES THAT

REQUIRING MCIW TO DELIVER UNISERV® CALLS TO BELLSOUTH'S OPERATOR SERVICES SWITCH IS IN VIOLATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT WHICH ALLOW MCIW TO INTERCONNECT AT ANY TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE POINT. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. What Mr. Price suggests is that MCIW be free to interconnect at any point within BellSouth's network for access to any service BellSouth offers anywhere. I believe one simple example is sufficient to prove the fallacy of Mr. Price's position. Under Mr. Price's proposal, MCIW should be able to interconnect at BellSouth's directory assistance platform to acquire unbundled loops or resold services. Obviously, BellSouth cannot provide to MCIW what it doesn't have. So, despite Mr. Price's complaints, BellSouth has violated neither the Act nor the FCC's rules regarding network interconnection by requiring that MCIW gain access to customers using BellSouth's UniServ® service the same way as does BellSouth and other local service providers.

Issue 37: Should BellSouth be permitted to require MCIW to fragment its traffic by traffic type so it can interconnect with BellSouth's network?

Q. ON PAGE 30 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. OLSON STATES THAT WITH MCIW's PROPOSED LANGUAGE, BELLSOUTH WOULD HAVE TO PROVISION TRUNKS WITHOUT ANY USER

RESTRICTIONS, SUCH AS OPTION FOR TWO-WAY TRUNKING, AND NO TRUNK GROUP FRAGMENTATION EXCEPT AS SPECIFIED IN THE AGREEMENT. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. My understanding is that part of this dispute between BellSouth and MCIW relates to the provisioning of two-way trunking. As I stated in my direct testimony, BellSouth is not opposed to two-way trunking per se. Under MCIW's proposal in Attachment 4, Section 2.2.6, however, BellSouth would in some cases be prohibited from having separate trunks that carry local and toll traffic, even though BellSouth maintains such separate trunk groups for itself. For example, when enough local traffic exists between two end office switches to justify a direct end office to end office trunk group (approximately one DS1 or 24 voice channels), BellSouth installs a direct end office local trunk group to unload the tandem switch of such local traffic. This is not only sound network engineering but also common industry practice. It unloads the tandem switch of local traffic that can and should be carried more efficiently by a direct end office trunk group. There are no valid engineering reasons to force BellSouth to transport all of MCIW's local traffic via the BellSouth Access Tandem switches. To put local traffic on direct end office trunk groups requires that traffic be fragmented by traffic type (for example, separating the local traffic from toll traffic). Although BellSouth prefers that MCIW place its local traffic on direct end office trunk groups when enough traffic justifies it for network efficiency reasons, BellSouth is willing to continue to switch MCIW's

originated local traffic via the BellSouth tandems if MCIW continues to compensate BellSouth accordingly. However, BellSouth should be allowed to provision its trunks for its originating traffic to be terminated to MCIW in any technically feasible and nondiscriminatory manner without regard to the arbitrary conditions that MCIW seeks to impose.

MCIW proposes language in Attachment 4, Section 2.2.7, whereby BellSouth should provision trunks without any user restrictions, such as no trunk group fragmentation by traffic types. BellSouth does not agree with MCIW's proposal because of both technical reasons and traffic congestion concerns. For example, signaling associated with platforms such as E911 and Operator Services/Directory Assistance (OS/DA) would be affected if there was no trunk fragmentation. Congestion could also occur that would adversely impact completion of 911 calls if the trunk group was overloaded temporarily.

Q. WHEN SHOULD TWO-WAY TRUNKING BE USED?

A. BellSouth believes that the use of one-way trunking or two-way trunking is best determined by the parties on a case-by-case basis. Solely from a traffic engineering perspective, two-way trunks should be used when the traffic patterns in both directions will result in a significant reduction of switch trunk ports over separate one-way trunks.

Q. WHAT WOULD BE THE EFFECT OF MCIW's PROPOSAL ON BELLSOUTH?

A. MCIW's position is that BellSouth should be required to interconnect via two-way trunks whenever MCIW so requests. The net effect is that MCIW would be in sole control of when and if BellSouth is able to use one-way trunking or two-way trunking to interconnect BellSouth's network with MCIW's network. Doubtless, MCIW would always choose the method that is economically beneficial to itself regardless of the effect on BellSouth.

Issue 56: Should BellSouth be required to provide DC power to adjacent collocation space?

Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON MR. MESSINA'S STATEMENTS ON BELLSOUTH'S POSITION AS SHOWN ON PAGE 23 OF HIS TESTIMONY.

A. First, as stated in my direct testimony, the FCC rules do not require BellSouth to provide DC power to an adjacent collocation arrangement. 47 C.F.R. 51.323 (k)(3) only requires that BellSouth provide a power source to an adjacent arrangement, it does not specify the type of power. The National Electric Code (NEC) does not specifically state that DC power cable can not be used in the outdoor environment, but it does state that whatever cable (AC or DC) is to be used has to be

rated for the environment in which it is being used. The cable used in the telecommunications industry for DC power (KS 548201) inside central offices is rated for indoor use, and not for use in an outdoor environment.

Second, in making adjacent collocation available, BellSouth will do so in a nondiscriminatory manner (that is, all ALECs obtaining adjacent collocation will be treated in the same manner) and at parity with itself. At all of BellSouth's remote terminal sites (that is, sites away from BellSouth's central office buildings), AC power runs to the site and BellSouth then "converts" the AC power to DC power inside the remote site. BellSouth has thousands of such arrangements in service today across its nine-state region. Given that this is a normal business practice, BellSouth believes that this method of providing power to adjacent collocation arrangements is likewise appropriate.

Q. DOES REQUIRING ALECS TO CONVERT AC POWER TO DC POWER DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THEM IN ANY MANNER?

A. No. As stated above, BellSouth performs the same function at all of its remote sites and will provision power to all adjacent collocation arrangements in a nondiscriminatory manner.

Issue 59: Should collocation space be considered complete before BellSouth has provided MCIW with cable facility assignments ("CFAs")?

Q. MR. MESSINA STATES ON PAGE 34 THAT BELLSOUTH SHOULD PROVIDE CFAs BEFORE THE SPACE IS CONSIDERED COMPLETED. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. BellSouth believes that the collocation space is complete prior to providing Connecting Facility Assignments (CFAs). Connecting facilities are those cables usually extending from BellSouth's distributing frame to the collocation arrangement. Thus, for example when BellSouth provides an unbundled loop to an ALEC, cross-connections are made on the distributing frame to connect the loop and a cable pair in the connecting facility which provides continuity to the collocation arrangement. BellSouth will complete all work under its control, which includes the preparation of the requested space. At that point, the collocation space is considered complete since it is available for use by MCIW, which can then have its vendor install its equipment and cable runs for connecting facilities. If the space were not to be considered complete once BellSouth finishes its work (and, hence, billing would not start) until after the CFAs are provided, MCIW would be able to occupy the space indefinitely without paying floor space charges until it actually gets around to installing its equipment and provides BellSouth with the information necessary to assign the CFAs. Such an arrangement would be unreasonable, since BellSouth is entitled to be compensated for collocation as soon as the collocation

space is available for use by MCIW, not when MCIW is actually using the space.

Issue 60: Should BellSouth provide MCIW with specified collocation information at the joint planning meeting?

Q. BASED ON READING MR. MESSINA'S TESTIMONY ON THIS ISSUE, WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE REAL AREA OF DISAGREEMENT?

A. It would seem that the area of disagreement is on what information is needed by MCIW. BellSouth has committed to providing MCIW, to the extent it is available, information that MCIW reasonably requires to begin its design plans for collocation space. If the information is not available at the joint planning meeting, BellSouth will provide such information within thirty (30) calendar days thereafter.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MCIW'S REQUEST INCLUDED IN ATTACHMENT 5, SECTION 7.17.2.

A. BellSouth assumes this request to be for cable assignment information for the cables that connect the collocation space to the frame in the central office. If the demarcation point is at the distributing frame, BellSouth will provide the exact cable location termination requirements (e.g., bay/panel and jack location) within the central

office that should be used. If this information is not available at the joint planning meeting, BellSouth will provide it within 30 calendar days of the date of the meeting. For older collocation arrangements where the demarcation point is at the Point of Termination (POT) bay, BellSouth will run the cables from its distributing frame to the POT bay. In such a case, MCIW would not need this information since the work will be done by a BellSouth certified vendor rather than by MCIW's vendor.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MCIW'S REQUEST INCLUDED IN ATTACHMENT 5, SECTION 7.17.4.

A. BellSouth does not believe that MCIW reasonably requires BellSouth to provide this information to them to begin its design plans for collocation space. In the same manner as BellSouth's own power cabling work is done, MCIW would use a certified vendor to perform all power cabling work. MCIW's BellSouth certified vendor has direct access to this information and would be responsible for making these assignments just as the certified vendor would do for BellSouth. If MCIW, out of curiosity, desires this information, they can easily request it from their vendor doing the work.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MCIW'S REQUEST INCLUDED IN ATTACHMENT 5, SECTION 7.17.10.

A. MCIW believes that it should be able to designate, at any technically feasible point, the demarcation point between MCIW's network and BellSouth's network within BellSouth's central offices. There is simply no basis for this belief. Pursuant to 47 CFR 51.323 (d)(1), BellSouth must provide an interconnection point(s) at which the fiber optic cable can enter the premises, provided that BellSouth must designate the interconnection point(s) as close as reasonably possible to the premises. When MCIW chooses physical collocation as the technically feasible method of interconnection, the point of interconnection is dictated by FCC Rule. Where MCIW places its collocated equipment within the BellSouth central office should be determined by BellSouth rather than by the collocator. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals has recognized that to permit an ALEC to pick and choose preferred space within a central office is unlawful and states:

> "The FCC offers no good reason to explain why a competitor, as opposed to the LEC, should choose where to establish collocation on the LEC's property; nor is there any good explanation of why LECs are forbidden from requiring competitors to use separate entrances to access their own equipment; nor is there any reasonable justification for the rule prohibiting LECs from requiring competitors to use separate or isolated rooms or floors. It is one thing to say that LECs are forbidden from imposing unreasonable minimum space requirements on competitors; it is quite another thing, how-

ever, to say that competitors, over the objection of LEC property owners, are free to pick and choose preferred space on the LECs' premises, subject only to technical feasibility. There is nothing in s 251(c)(6) that endorses this approach. The statute requires only that LECs reasonably provide space for "physical collocation of equipment necessary for interconnection or access to unbundled network elements at the premises of the local exchange carrier," nothing more."

BellSouth's right to designate the collocation site and where that collocation arrangement intereconnects with BellSouth's network falls squarely within BellSouth's responsibility and is essential if BellSouth is to control and manage the space within a central office in the most efficient manner and to the benefit of all ALECs.

Issue 61: What rate should apply to the provision of DC power to MCIW's collocation space?

Q. MR. MESSINA STATES THAT THE PRICE FOR POWER SHOULD BE ON A PER USED AMPERE BASIS. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No, as stated in my direct testimony, the charge should be applied to the fused capacity that BellSouth is required to provide to MCIW. Equipment manufacturers provide the rated power consumption for their equipment, and BellSouth builds its power plant accordingly.

Central office equipment is normally turned on all the time, unlike some appliances in one's house. For example, a fiber optic terminal generally pulls the same amount of power every month, regardless of how much actual traffic it carries. BellSouth must build its power plant to assure that the power plant actually built will meet the needs of BellSouth's equipment and the sum of all collocators' equipment.

Q. MR. MESSINA SUGGESTS ON PAGE 38 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT THE COMMISSION HAS PREVIOUSLY ORDERED BELLSOUTH TO MEASURE HOW MUCH POWER EACH ALEC WAS USING AND BILL THE ALEC ACCORDINGLY. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. Mr. Messina does not identify the commission order to which he is referring, so it is difficult for me to respond to his argument. In order to do what MCIW wants, however, BellSouth would have to install monitoring equipment for each collocation arrangement in each central office and would have to have someone read the monitor on each collocation arrangement in each central office in order to obtain the information necessary to bill power to each ALEC. This could be a costly and time-consuming process. Even if such a manual monitoring plan were practical, which I believe it is not, MCIW's proposal fails to take into consideration that BellSouth's costs for its power plant are a function of peak power loads to be handled rather than average or nominal loads. This is because the power plant must be built to withstand peak aggregate power demands for both BellSouth's

equipment and all collocators' equipment. For these reasons, MCIW's proposal should be rejected.

Issue 63: Is MCIW entitled to use any technically feasible entrance cable, including copper facilities?

Q. ON PAGE 40 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. MESSINA STATES THAT BELLSOUTH "ADMITS" THAT THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF COPPER CABLE OWNED BY BELLSOUTH ENTERING ITS CENTRAL OFFICES? IS HE CORRECT?

A. Mr. Messina is correct only in the sense that some copper cables currently enter BellSouth central offices. However, what Mr. Messina fails to mention is that these older cables are associated with BellSouth's loop distribution facilities rather than interoffice facilities or interconnection facilities. In the context of this dispute, entrance facilities are considered to be for interconnection trunks, and all of BellSouth's interconnection trunk cables entering BellSouth central offices are optical fiber facilities. Furthermore, the FCC rules regarding an ILEC's collocation obligation under the Act established by the FCC state that the ILEC should only accommodate copper entrance facilities if such interconnection is first ordered by the state commission. See, 47 C.F.R. 51.323 (d)(3). To my knowledge, MCIW has made no such showing before this Commission or another Commission in BellSouth's nine-state region. The FCC clearly

anticipated that this authority to place non-fiber optic entrance facilities would be granted by a state commission on a location by location basis. For any state commission to permit copper entrance facilities universally would undermine the importance the FCC attributed to this issue and would be to the detriment of other ALECs desiring to collocate in an office with limited entrance space available. Neither MCIW nor any other ALEC should be permitted to place copper entrance facilities in a premises until this Commission has reviewed the particular circumstances of the premises, the specific needs of the requesting ALEC at that location, and has determined that the ALEC's needs override BellSouth's and other ALEC's concerns, if any, with entrance space availability in those premises.

Q. MR. MESSINA PROVIDED INFORMATION ON A FLORIDA COMMISION RULING ON PAGES 40 AND 41 OF HIS TESTIMONY. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THAT RULING?

A. Yes, I note that requests for reconsideration and clarification were made by several parties on this ruling by the Florida Commission in the Florida Collocation Docket (Docket Nos. 981834-TP/990321-TP). The Florida Staff issued a recommendation to the Florida Commission on the request dated July 20, 2000. In the recommendation, the Staff writes:

> Staff recommends that the Commission make the requested clarification regarding the use of copper entrance cabling. The

Order could be misconstrued, as the parties have indicated. As such, the Commission should clarify that the Commission's decision only addresses the use of copper entrance cabling within the context of collocation outside of a CO, but does not reach the issue of copper cabling in other situations. In rendering this clarification, the Commission should also clarify that only collocation between an ALEC's CEV and an ILEC CO was considered in this decision.

As seen from the above, the Florida Staff is recommended to the Florida Commission that they clarify that they were only addressing the cabling from the adjacent collocation arrangement on the ILEC property to the central office. On September 5, 2000, the Staff's recommendation, as outlined above, was approved by the Florida Commission.

Issue 64: Is MCIW entitled to verify BellSouth's assertion, when made, that dual entrance facilities are not available? Should BellSouth maintain a waiting list for entrance space and notify MCIW when space becomes available?

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. MESSINA THAT MCIW SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO "VERIFY BELLSOUTH'S ASSERTION THAT DUAL ENTRANCES ARE NOT AVAILABLE?"

A. Yes. However, this dispute centers on the type of verification that is necessary. In BellSouth's view, when there is only one entrance point, MCIW can visually verify that another entrance point does not exist without any "tour" by BellSouth. This could be done by a cursory review of the central office building floorplan. However, I understand that MCIW insists that BellSouth must provide a formal tour of the premises like the tour BellSouth must conduct under the FCC rules when an incumbent "contends space for physical collocation is not available." BellSouth has agreed to provide documentation to MCIW verifying the lack of dual entrance facilities, which is a reasonable accommodation of MCIW's needs.

Q. IS MCIW'S REQUEST FOR A FORMAL TOUR WHEN DUAL ENTRANCE FACILITIES ARE NOT AVAILABLE SUPPORTED BY ANY FCC RULES?

A. No. As Mr. Messina admits, the FCC rules which obligate an incumbent to provide a tour of its facilities in order to verify an assertion that physical collocation is not available only applies to physical collocation. This rule has absolutely nothing to do with the situation where space is available, but dual entrance points do not exist. Although Mr. Messina claims that obligating BellSouth to permit such a formal tour under such circumstances "is a reasonable conclusion," no FCC rule compels this result. Presumably, if the FCC had wanted to require incumbents to provide formal tours of premises

when dual entrance facilities do not exist, it readily could have done so. It did not do so, however.

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. MESSINA'S STATEMENT ON PAGE 45 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT "IT IS REASONABLE TO EXPECT BELLSOUTH TO MAINTAIN A WAITING LIST FOR DUAL ENTRANCES FACILITIES?"

A. No. Maintaining a waiting list is not as simple a matter as Mr. Messina apparently believes. There is considerable time and expense associated with maintaining a waiting list for each central office in which dual entrance facilities may not be available. No plausible reason exists for BellSouth to engage in such an effort when BellSouth does not have dual entrance facilities available, but MCIW has space available for its facilities. If the FCC had wanted incumbents such as BellSouth to maintain a waiting list for dual entrance facilities (as it did for physical collocation space), it could have done so. However, it did not do so and neither should this Commission.

Issue 65: What information must BellSouth provide to MCIW regarding vendor certification?

Q. MR. MESSINA STATES THAT BELLSOUTH HAS NOT PROVIDED SPECIFIC INFORMATION TO ALLOW MCIW's CHOSEN VENDORS TO BECOME CERTIFIED. DO YOU AGREE?

A. I do not. First, it is clear from the FCC rule that it is BellSouth, and not MCIW, that is responsible for ensuring that a vendor has met the criteria for certification. 47 C.F.R. 51.323(j) states that "An incumbent LEC shall permit a collocating telecommunications carrier to subcontract the construction of physical collocation arrangements with contractors approved by the incumbent LEC..." [Emphasis added.] Second, BellSouth has provided MCIW with precisely the same information that BellSouth provides other vendors concerning the vendor certification process. As stated in my direct testimony, if MCIW has any questions regarding this process, MCIW may contact the BellSouth vendor certification group for further information. BellSouth has several vendors currently certified under this process.

Issue 66: What industry guidelines or practices should govern collocation?

Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON MR. MESSINA'S DESIRE TO INCLUDE EACH OF THE LISTED DOCUMENTS IN THE AGREEMENT AND AS SHOWN ON PAGE 49 OF HIS TESTIMONY.

A. MCIW wants BellSouth to comply with standards that are inapplicable to the relationship BellSouth has with MCIW in providing collocation (vendor relations), and still others that have been deemed inapplicable pursuant to the FCC's Advanced Services Order (Network Equipment-

Building System or "NEBS" performance standards) at paragraph 135. As stated in my direct testimony, BellSouth is willing to comply with generally accepted industry practices to the extent it has control over the subject matter thereof. BellSouth is not the only other occupant of the premises and does not have absolute control over many of the issues addressed in the standards MCIW references. Moreover, these standards include more than generally accepted practices that an ILEC would be required to conform to, and address an array of "suggested" methods, "discussions", etc. BellSouth is willing to comply with generally accepted industry practices, such as the National Electric Code, to the extent BellSouth controls the issue addressed therein, or to discuss any specific portions of the listed documents to determine if the parties can agree to the language. It is not clear to me why MCIW objects to such an approach.

Issue 68: Should BellSouth require that payments for make-ready work be made in advance?

Q. ON PAGE 81 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PRICE SUGGESTS THAT A PRE-PAYMENT REQUIREMENT WOULD DELAY THE WORK AND WOULD NOT BE COMMERCIALLY REASONABLE. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. MCIW should be required to pay in advance for any work MCIW requests BellSouth to perform, as do other ALECs that have signed

BellSouth's standard license agreement. BellSouth should not be required to finance MCIW's business plans. It is not unusual for contractors to require payment in advance. Furthermore there is no harm to MCIW, given MCIW's representation that it will pay BellSouth invoices promptly in any event. MCIW should include in its planning process the time required for BellSouth to perform any needed make-ready work to accommodate MCIW's needs.

Issue 92: Should the parties be required to follow the detailed guidelines proposed by MCIW with respect to LNP orders?

Q. ON PAGE 83 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PRICE STATES THAT "IT MAKES MORE SENSE TO RELY DIRECTLY ON INDUSTRY STANDARDS DEVELOPED BY THE OBF THAN ON A DOCUMENT INCORPORATING BELLSOUTH'S INTERPRETATION OF THOSE STANDARDS." PLEASE COMMENT.

A. BellSouth's guidelines are very detailed, containing elaborate flow charts and ordering procedures agreed to in industry fora. If these guidelines are good enough to pass the scrutiny of industry fora (in which MCIW may participate if it so chooses), I do not understand why they are not good enough for MCIW.

As I stated in my direct testimony, BellSouth is unclear as to why MCIW refuses to consider BellSouth's proposal to use the Local

Number Portability Ordering Guide for CLECs, which outlines both parties' responsibilities for porting of end user numbers. This document provides details of BellSouth's specific processes and "vocabulary" which I believe to be useful for ALECs using number porting and interconnecting their networks with BellSouth's BellSouth is willing to make the document an attachment to the parties' interconnection agreement. Other ALECs have found this document sufficient and some ALECs have made it an attachment to their interconnection agreement with BellSouth.

Issue 97: Should BellSouth be required to provide MCIW with notice of changes to NPA/NXXs linked to Public Safety Answering Points as soon as such changes occur?

Q. ON PAGE 89 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PRICE DISAGREES THAT CERTAIN INFORMATION SUCH AS NPA/NXX CHANGES LINKED TO PSAPS IS PROPRIETARY AND THAT THE INFORMATION IS INCLUDED IN THE OPERATOR SERVICES DATABASE. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. BellSouth provides notices to all ALECs when there is a NPA code change due to an NPA code split or overlay. In these notices BellSouth does not specifically address PSAPs, but rather addresses everything within the NPA code that is affected by the split or overlay. Further, BellSouth does not use its Operator Services platform for the

provisioning of 911 service. Instead, calls are routed to the appropriate municipality via the 911 tandem switch. This means BellSouth does not default 911 calls to an Operator Services tandem. However, if an end user customer dials "0" (Operator) in an emergency instead of dialing "911", the BellSouth operator does have a list of 10-digit numbers to transfer the call to the correct PSAP. If an ALEC is not going to use BellSouth for its Operator Services, the 911 Implementation Manager will provide the ALEC with a BellSouth Operator Services contact who will direct the ALEC to the municipalities for acquiring such a list.

Q. ON PAGE 89 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PRICE DISPUTES BELLSOUTH'S CLAIM THAT TELEPHONE NUMBER INFORMATION FOR PSAPs IS PROPRIETARY AND CANNOT BE DISCLOSED WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE PSAP. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. Emergency Services (E911/911) are offered both by BellSouth and by certain ALECs. The owner of the 911 tandem in each county provides the trunks from its 911 tandem to the PSAP and is responsible for maintaining the associated database. When an ALEC interconnects to BellSouth in a territory where BellSouth provides the 911 tandem, BellSouth furnishes the ALEC with the E911 LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIER GUIDE FOR FACILITY BASED PROVIDERS. This Guide provides the ALEC with the information necessary to submit its customers' information into the 911 database. The ALEC is also given

the means to determine to which E911 tandem the ALEC needs to direct its calls to and where to connect its trunks.

The ALEC is responsible its customers' calls to the correct 911 tandem and for getting accurate customer information into BellSouth's 911 database in accordance with BellSouth procedures. BellSouth is responsible for the trunks between its tandem and the PSAP.

The ALEC is also responsible for making contact with the counties where they will operate. The BellSouth 911 ALEC Implementation Manager will provide to the ALEC a list of County Coordinators for each state in the BellSouth region. It is up to the ALEC to contact the County Coordinator and discuss any information that the ALEC feels it may need from the PSAPs which I believe would include the telephone numbers MCIW says it needs. It is up to the County, rather than BellSouth, to decide what information it will disclose. Mr. Price's suggestion is that it is BellSouth's responsibility to negotiate on behalf of MCIW for getting information that MCIW wants or needs. This suggestion should be rejected. BellSouth should not be required to do MCIW's work for free.

Issue 99: Should BellSouth be required to provide MCIW with 10 digit PSAP numbers?

Q. MR. PRICE STATES ON PAGE 90 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT MCIW

NEEDS TO OBTAIN PSAP NUMBERS SO MCIW CAN REACH THE PSAP WHEN 911 SERVICE IS NOT FUNCTIONING PROPERLY AND THAT THE PSAP DATABASE IS AN OPERATOR SERVICES DATABASE TO WHICH BELLSOUTH MUST PROVIDE ACCESS UNDER RULE 319. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. Contrary to Mr. Price's suggestion that BellSouth should do MCIW's work for free, MCIW can and should obtain PSAP numbers directly from the local 911 or E911 authorities as does BellSouth. The seven-digit or ten-digit "plain old telephone service" (POTS) number of each Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) is a number that the PSAP requests through service order activity with the local exchange carrier providing local service to that PSAP (which may be a service provider other than BellSouth). A PSAP may provide the ten-digit numbers to a local exchange carrier for use in overflow situations or in the rare situation where there are problems in the 911 tandem. BellSouth gets these telephone numbers directly from each PSAP, and MCIW should do likewise. Further, BellSouth does not use the Operator Services platform for the provisioning of 911 service and as such, does not fall under Rule 319 as Mr. Price has indicated. As I stated before, BellSouth should not be required to do MCIW's work for free.

Issue 100: Should BellSouth operators be required to ask MCIW customers for their carrier of choice when such customers request a rate quote or time and charges?

Q. ON PAGE 92 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR.PRICE STATES THAT BECAUSE MCIW IS PAYING BELLSOUTH FOR PROVIDING OPERATOR SERVICES, IT IS REASONABLE THAT BELLSOUTH ASK THE CUSTOMER FOR ITS CARRIER OF CHOICE, RATHER THAN ASSUMING BELLSOUTH IS THE CARRIER OF CHOICE. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. BellSouth's operators may respond to customer inquiries concerning rates and time charges for BellSouth's retail services. However, BellSouth is not obligated to inquire about a customer's carrier of choice, as requested by MCIW.

Q. HOW DOES BELLSOUTH TREAT CUSTOMER REQUESTS FOR A LONG DISTANCE CARRIERS RATES?

A. Customers who inquire about long distance rates are advised they should seek that information from their long distance carrier. If that long distance carrier is an Operator Transfer Service (OTS) customer, BellSouth will offer to transfer the caller to that carrier so that the rate can be quoted immediately by the long distance carrier itself.

MCIW's proposed language would purport to require BellSouth's operators to inquire as to the customer's carrier of choice of long distance carrier and forward the call to that carrier every time a

customer requests a rate quote or time and charges, regardless of whether the long distance carrier subscribes to BellSouth's Operator Transfer Service (OTS). BellSouth is not required to do for free what MCIW has proposed.

Q. ON PAGE 92 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PRICE SUGGESTS THAT MCIW IS WILLING TO PAY BELLSOUTH FOR CALLS HANDLED ON BEHALF OF MCIW. IS THIS PRACTICAL?

A. Despite MCIW's willingness to pay for any calls handled for MCIW, Mr. Price ignores the obvious requirement for BellSouth's operators to determine all end user customers' choice of long distance provider for all such inquiries, not only those bound for MCIW. The cost of such operator worktime for customers not choosing MCIW long distance service would be borne by BellSouth rather than by MCIW.

Issue 101: Is BellSouth required to provide shared transport in connection with the provision of custom branding? Is MCIW required to purchase dedicated transport in connection with the provision of custom branding?

Q. MR. PRICE CLAIMS ON PAGE 95 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT "BOTH BELL ATLANTIC AND SBC HAVE DEVELOPED THE CAPABILITY TO PROVIDE BRANDING FROM OS/DA CALLS USING SHARED TRANSPORT." WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE?

A. While I cannot speak for Bell Atlantic and SBC, the Line Class Code method for providing customized routing requires unique translations in the end office switch to be made at the trunk group level. This means that any one trunk group can only be assigned one unique brand and all traffic received over that trunk group will first be directed to the unique brand before further processing of the call by the chosen operator services platform. In the alternative, a single trunk group can be shared by multiple ALECs who elect their customers' calls to be unbranded or to be branded in the same way. This is an inherent technical requirement imposed by the switch manufacturers' design decisions regarding how Line Class Code translations are made.

However, as I discussed earlier, BellSouth's AIN method of providing customized routing allows the use of shared trunk groups between the end office switch and the AIN hub switch. This appears to me to satisfy what MCIW is asking for. As I discussed earlier, shared transport from the AIN hub to MCIW's OS/DA platform is not appropriate since it is only MCIW's traffic that will be sent to MCIW's OS/DA platform. Thus, from BellSouth's AIN hub to MCIW's OS/DA platform, transport dedicated to MCIW is entirely appropriate.

Issue 102: Should the parties provide "inward operator services" through local interconnection trunk groups using network routable access codes BellSouth establishes through the LERG?

Q. ON PAGES 96 AND 97 OF MR. PRICE'S TESTIMONY, HE STATES THAT MCIW PROPOSES THAT INWARD OPERATOR SERVICES SHOULD BE ORDERED IN TWO WAYS: DIRECT TRUNKS AND THROUGH LOCAL INTERCONNECTION TRUNKS USING NETWORK ROUTABLE CODES BELLSOUTH ESTABLISHES IN THE LERG. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. Dedicated trunks are required for inward operator services between the ALEC's operator services platform (or that of its operator services provider) and BellSouth's operator services platform referred to as TOPS. Inward operator traffic has for years been sent between operator services platforms by the operator dialing a special code. While these codes are commonly used in operator platforms, they are not used in end office switches and there is no need to do so now. MCIW has suggested that inward operator traffic be re-routed and sent over the interconnection trunk groups carrying voice communications between end user customers in cases where the trunk group between the two operator services platforms is congested or a failure condition exists. However, if MCIW interconnects directly with BellSouth's end office switches, this would require that new trunk groups be created in each and every BellSouth end office switch (plus the switch translations required to effect the routing). Further, even if established, these trunk groups would rarely be used. More importantly, the net effect would be to make operator tandem switches out of each and

every BellSouth end office switch, something BellSouth is clearly not required to do. For these reasons, MCIW's proposal to route its operator services traffic through BellSouth's end office switches should be rejected. However, to the extent that it is technically feasible to do so, and subject to MCIW's willingness to acquire and pay for unbundled tandem switching from BellSouth, BellSouth is willing to accommodate MCIW's request to send such operator-to-operator traffic via BellSouth's tandem switch.

Q. ON PAGE 97 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PRICE SUGGESTS THAT MCIW's PROPOSAL WOULD NOT REQUIRE BELLSOUTH TO USE OPERATOR CODES IN ANY END OFFICES AND THAT THE MCIW's ROUTING PROPOSAL HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH BELLSOUTH END OFFICES. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. Mr. Price's own testimony indicates how BellSouth's local tandems and end offices might be required to perform as operator services tandems. On Page 97 of his testimony, Mr. Price's second proposed method is "...through local interconnection trunk groups using network routable access codes...." Assume that MCIW's switch is connected directly to a BellSouth end office switch over a single interconnection trunk group. Further assume that for some reason, MCIW decides to route requests for traditional operator services such as busy line verification or interruption over that trunk group. MCIW's proposal would require BellSouth to handle the operator service request sent to the BellSouth

end office switch and the only way I know that could be accomplished is for the BellSouth end office switch to select a trunk to the BellSouth operator service platform and send that call to the operator services platform on a tandem basis, something end office switches are not arranged to do.

Likewise, were MCIW to decide to send its calls for operator services via a BellSouth tandem switch, that switch would need a trunk group to the BellSouth operator services platform and would have to handle that call on a tandem basis, an arrangement that does not exist.

Issue 103: Should BellSouth operators be required to connect MCIW subscribers dialing "0" and requesting directory assistance to any directory assistance platform designated by MCI WorldCom?

Q. MR.PRICE, ON PAGE 99 OF HIS TESTIMONY, SUGGESTS THAT BELLSOUTH SHOULD ROUTE CALLS FOR DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE FOR MCIW's CUSTOMERS TO MCIW's DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE PLATFORM AS A MATTER OF PARITY. PLEASE COMMENT.

A. BellSouth's operator services platform does not have the technical capability to connect to more than one directory assistance platform (that is, BellSouth's directory assistance platform and an ALEC's directory assistance platform) and BellSouth is not required to enable it

to do so. If MCIW purchases unbundled local switching from BellSouth, MCIW may request and be provided customized routing by which MCIW can determine the operator services platform to which its customers' traffic will be sent.

Q. HOW DOES BELLSOUTH HANDLE CALLS FROM SUBSCRIBERS DIALING "0" AND REQUESTING DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE?

A. BellSouth's operator connects the caller to BellSouth's directory assistance platform via operator transfer functionality. This functionality does not allow the choice of multiple directory assistance platforms. Thus, unless the ALEC has requested and been provided customized routing, MCIW's customers whether served via resale provisions or via unbundled local switching who dial "0" and requesting directory assistance will be routed to BellSouth's directory assistance platform. With customized routing, however, MCIW is free to route its traffic to MCIW's choice of operator services and directory assistance platforms and misdirected calls such as we are discussing here may be handled according to MCIW's choosing.

Q. ON PAGE 99 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PRICE SUGGESTS THAT MCIW IS WILLING TO PAY BELLSOUTH FOR SUCH A TRANSFER FROM BELLSOUTH'S OPERATOR SERVICES PLATFORM TO MCIW'S DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE PLATFORM. IS THIS PROPOSAL PRACTICAL?

A. No. Despite Mr. Price's amusing spider and fly analogy, BellSouth in no way attempts to "snare" traffic from MCIW's customers. However, BellSouth is not required to correct the dialing mistakes of MCIW's customers. As I discussed before, MCIW is only offering to pay for those calls that actually get transferred to MCIW's directory assistance platform. The cost of transfers to any other ALEC's directory assistance platform (if technically feasible, which it is not) would be borne by BellSouth rather than by MCIW. The only way to figure out which calls to transfer is for the operator to query the caller. Even if it were technically feasible to choose alternative paths from the BellSouth operator services platform to each and every ALEC's choice of directory assistance platform (which it is not), the associated cost for operator worktime for determining which platform to which the call should be sent would be borne by BellSouth except for those calls transferred to MCIW.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.