

1 GTE FLORIDA INCORPORATED

2 REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF DONALD W. McLEOD

3 DOCKET NO. 961173-TP 961173

4
5 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

6 A. My name is Donald W. McLeod. My business address is 600 Hidden
7 Ridge, Irving, Texas.

8
9 Q. DID YOU FILE DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

10 A. Yes, I did.

11
12 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

13 A. I will address certain policy areas in which GTE and Sprint have not
14 yet reached an agreement.

15
16 Q. SHOULD THE FINAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPRINT AND GTE
17 IMPOSE MATERIAL AND RECIPROCAL OBLIGATIONS WITH
18 RESPECT TO MATTERS OTHER THAN RECIPROCAL
19 COMPENSATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRANSPORT AND
20 TERMINATION?

21 A. Yes. Reciprocal arrangements will promote competition. Sprint has
22 represented in its petition that it will give the same terms as an ILEC
23 as it receives as an ALEC.

24
25 DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11737 NOV-18

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

1 **Q. SHOULD GTE BE LIABLE FOR NETWORK FRAUD CAUSED BY**
2 **GTE'S NEGLIGENCE?**

3 A. GTE should not be liable for damages incurred as a result of an
4 intentional act of a third party, such as fraudulently gaining
5 unauthorized access to the GTE network. Such risks should rest with
6 Sprint, since the fraud is associated with Sprint's end users. GTE will
7 cooperate with Sprint to investigate, minimize and take corrective
8 action in cases of fraud.

9

10 **Q. SHOULD GTE BE RESPONSIBLE FOR A PASS-THROUGH WHEN**
11 **IT FAILS TO MEET COMMISSION-APPROVED SERVICE**
12 **STANDARDS?**

13 A. Where GTE has been given written notice by Sprint of any known
14 violation of network standards, an adequate opportunity to correct the
15 situation, the opportunity to participate and respond to , Commission actions, and GTE is responsible for the violation, GTE
16 will agree to reimburse Sprint for any fines or forfeitures ultimately
17 imposed by the Commission.

18

19

20 **Q. SHOULD A SEPARATE CONTRACT BE REQUIRED FOR TRAFFIC**
21 **WHERE SPRINT FUNCTIONS AS AN AGGREGATOR OR TANDEM**
22 **PROVIDER?**

23 A. GTE's position on a bill-and-keep method for local traffic is explicitly
24 predicated upon approximately equal Sprint and GTE end user traffic.
25 Therefore, it is inappropriate in a bill-and-keep environment to have

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

non-Sprint end users' traffic terminate to GTE. GTE would require a separate agreement with any third party for local traffic termination.

Q. DOES THAT CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.