

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

FPSC DOCKET NO. 991267-TP

STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

POD NO. 1

PROPRIETARY

11.30.00
DECLASSIFIED

Note: pages retained from
DN 01616-00

(Exh. 8 = pages 46 & 47)
(Exh. 9 = pages 15 & 16)

0161600

Susan H. Claytor /AL,BRHM07 10/24/97 10:33

IST →

4

Page

MESSAGE

Subject: procedures
Sender: Larry E. Glover /AL,BRHM06

Jim needs to develop policy

Dated: 10/24/97 at 9:4

Contents:

- me get with Jim to ensure he is including

Item 1

FROM: Larry E. Glover /AL,BRHM06

TO: Susan H. Claytor /AL,BRHM07 { Undisplayable address parts }

Item 2

Barbara got a 58 funded in the work brief.

Susan

This process has some big holes but I can not offer an alternative at this time. Just because a number shows up on one of these directories does not mean that it is actually an ISP. Wayne has not documented any part of the verification process. I will talk to Bob Cunningham about documenting this area.

The Source IV section has the word "guarantee" and I am not sure we will ever get in a position to say the list is 100% accurate and complete. If that is the expectation we should set the record straight now. Do we need to draft a letter to legal on the accuracy of the process and the affect on any PSC/FCC testimony?

On your service order proposal - can we expect the customer to tell us how he plans to use the line? Some customers would tell us that it is none of our business.

Thanks.

Larry G.

Item 3

MESSAGE

Subject: procedures
Creator: Susan H. Claytor /AL,BRHM07

Dated: 10/23/97 at 13:26

Contents: 3

Item 3.1

TO: Larry E. Glover /AL,BRHM06 { Undisplayable address parts }
David L. Hollett /AL,BRHM07

Item 3.2

Larry,

Per our discussion today, attached is an Email I just received. My concern with these procedures is that it seems to recognize there are still gaps, it seems that it could change daily as the internet changes (how would you ever know what is on the Directory.Com vs other places), and it leaves that potentially big unknown in procedure IV.

I also have questions about a call to an 800 number. I would think the 800 number would be published, which may be ok for invoice verification (assuming

they are including originating 800 service on our data base), but our terminations for billing would need the associated POTS number. It also focuses totally on Internet providers but does not address other ESP like 976 calling or N11.

To me the procedure needs to have rationale included which gets blessed by those who decided to pursue this process.

I would have a tough time if put on the witness stand to testify to the accuracy and completeness.

Any thoughts or concerns from you?

Item 3.3

MESSAGE

Subject: procedures

Creator: James H. Childress /AL,BRHM07

Dated: 10/23/97 at 12:29

Contents: 3

Item 3.3.1

TO: Susan H. Claytor /AL,BRHM07 { Undisplayable address parts }

Item 3.3.2

Susan,

Attached are the procedures that Wayne Fleming provided for determining ISP/ESP numbers. Your thoughts?

Jim

Item 3.3.3

MESSAGE

Subject: procedures

Creator: Wayne N. Fleming /AL,BRHM03

Dated: 10/20/97 at 11:54

Contents: 3

Item 3.3.3.1

FROM: Wayne N. Fleming /AL,BRHM03 { Undisplayable address parts }
TO: Bob J. Cunningham /AL,BRHM09 { Undisplayable address parts }
CC: Barbara Z. Bradley /AL,BRHM07 { Undisplayable address parts }
James H. Childress /AL,BRHM07

Item 3.3.3.2

see attachment for your copy.

Item 3.3.3.3

Date: March 5, 1998

To: Allan Price
Bill Stacy

Copy to: Bill McNair
Scott Schaefer
Jim Childress
Leo Shoemaker
Fred Hamff

From: Dave Hollett

Subject: North Carolina and Florida Orders Concerning ISP

We understand that the North Carolina commission issued an order related to ISP calls between BellSouth and US LEC, and the Florida commission issued a similar order for WorldCom. To my knowledge, CBS has not been notified formally of the NC ruling, though billing is impacted by the order. We did receive a copy of the FL ruling.

We need to know who will be responsible for coordinating implementation of these orders. We are currently facing serious resource constraints in the CABS billing area of IT, so any necessary billing changes will need to be submitted soon to even be a candidate for Release 98.3, currently scheduled for implementation in 4th quarter, 1998. We also have a pending request for bill format changes related to ISP. That work request is based on the assumption that ISP is not billable. If the ISP billing policy is likely to be changing because of the North Carolina and Florida orders, we should probably defer this current bill format request to allow other critical billing work to be done instead.

Attached are concerns and questions specific to the billing of ISP that we believe need to be addressed by someone in ICS and/or Regulatory.

Please let me know as soon as possible how you assess the impact of these rulings on billing for local interconnection. If you have questions, please call me at 205-321-3736.

ISP Issues to be Addressed

1. Do the rulings apply to all CLECs or only to US LEC in North Carolina and WorldCom in Florida?
2. We quit billing for calls terminated to an ISP, but we held that usage. Should that held usage be billed? If so, would billing guarantee apply, and should the usage be billed or should a debit adjustment be made to the bill?
3. Does the pending billing change request submitted by the local interconnection project team need to be suspended? This request, to detail the non-billed ISP usage on the bill, is currently targeted for CABS Release 98.2, which has serious resource jeopardies.
4. Does a new request to begin billing ISP usage in North Carolina and Florida need to be submitted? If so, what is the priority in light of the resource contention in CABS?
5. Will BellSouth change the policy regarding billing for ISP on a state by state basis, or is it likely we will change the policy for all states at the same time?