

1                   **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

2                                   **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

3   **OF**

4                                   **CHRISTOPHER M. SCHAFFER**

5                                   **DOCKET NO. 041144-TP**

6  
7   **Q.    Please state your name and address.**

8   A.    My name is Christopher M. Schaffer. My business address is 6550 Sprint  
9          Parkway, Overland Park, Kansas 66251.

10  
11 **Q.    Are you the same Christopher M. Schaffer who submitted Direct Testimony**  
12 **in this docket?**

13 A.    Yes. I submitted Direct Testimony in this docket on February 28, 2005.

14  
15 **Q.    What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?**

16 A.    The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the testimonies of KMC's witnesses  
17          Marva Brown Johnson and Timothy E. Pasonski regarding whether KMC V, Inc.  
18          is a proper party to this complaint (Issue 5) and regarding the charge party  
19          numbers associated with the traffic that is the subject of Sprint's Complaint. I  
20          also address certain SS7 information provided by KMC relating to traffic  
21          terminated to KMC by Sprint.

22  
DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04563 MAY 10 08

FPSC-COMMISSION CI FRK

1 **Q. On pages 6 and 7 of her Direct Testimony, KMC’s witness Ms. Johnson**  
2 **makes representations to support KMC’s position that KMC V and KMC**  
3 **Data are not proper parties to Sprint’s Complaint. Do you agree with Ms.**  
4 **Johnson’s assertions?**

5 A. No. First, as stated in my Direct Testimony on page 2 both KMC V and KMC  
6 Data were or are parties to some or all of the interconnection agreements between  
7 Sprint and KMC that are relevant to Sprint’s Complaint. In addition, KMC’s  
8 records show that KMC V has been integrally involved in the activities that form  
9 the basis of Sprint’s Complaint.

10

11 **Q. What do Sprint’s records show regarding KMC V’s involvement in the**  
12 **activities that form the basis of Sprint’s Complaint?**

13 A. In Ms. Johnson’s Direct Testimony on page 6, lines 14 – 17, she states that “only  
14 KMC III sent the traffic in question”. Again, on page 7 lines 6 – 11, Ms. Johnson  
15 states “that KMC V and KMC Data did not handle any of the traffic in question”.  
16 However, Sprint’s records show that KMC V was instrumental in the ordering  
17 and provisioning of the local interconnection facilities over which the traffic that  
18 is the subject of this Complaint was terminated. Also, as discussed in my Direct  
19 Testimony KMC V is the owner of the two charge party numbers KMC states  
20 were assigned to the PRIs KMC provided to the customer KMC asserts is  
21 responsible for the traffic that is the subject of this Complaint (referred to by  
22 KMC as Customer X).

23

1 In my original testimony, I explained that the two numbers consistently and  
2 repeatedly used to alter the jurisdiction of the traffic are assigned to KMC V.  
3 While KMC originally responded, apparently erroneously, in its Response to  
4 Sprint's Interrogatory No.12 that the numbers were assigned to KMC III, KMC  
5 appears to have corrected this assertion in its Response to Staff's Interrogatory  
6 No. 12, where KMC affirms that both numbers belong to KMC V.

7  
8 In Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 29(b), KMC has identified KMC V's  
9 Operating Company Number (OCN) as 8982. Sprint has identified that this is the  
10 OCN KMC provided on its Access Service Requests (ASRs) when it ordered the  
11 circuits that carried the traffic in question, and Sprint has confirmed that this OCN  
12 is, in fact, assigned to KMC V. KMC's OCN 8982 (KMC V) is the OCN  
13 assigned to the two telephone numbers referenced above. OCN 8982 is registered  
14 to KMC V, per the NECA (National Exchange Carrier Association) national  
15 database. All trunk groups established between Sprint and KMC in Florida were  
16 ordered by KMC with OCN 8982. See Exhibit CMS-3 which contains two screen  
17 prints showing the trunk groups ordered by KMC using the KMC V OCN. The  
18 trunk groups depicted in these screen prints are two of the trunk groups over  
19 which the masked interstate/intrastate traffic was terminated to Sprint on KMC's  
20 Local Interconnection facilities. These screen prints for both TSC's ██████████ in  
21 Tallahassee and ██████████ in Ft. Myers clearly were submitted by KMC with  
22 OCN 8982 on the order. This field is populated by the ordering carrier, and if this  
23 field is not populated Sprint will reject the order and send it back to the ordering

1 carrier to populate that field. By KMC's own admission (in Ms. Johnson's  
2 response to Sprint's interrogatory #27) the OCN 8982 was assigned from KMC  
3 Telecom II to KMC Telecom V. KMC has never submitted ASR's to Sprint to  
4 change the OCN 8982 to a KMC III OCN

5  
6 KMC also has stated, in its Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 29(a), that both  
7 KMC III and KMC V use the ACNA KMM. Sprint bills KMC using the KMM  
8 ACNA. Since the number is used by both KMC III and KMC V, it is clear that  
9 both entities are accountable for Sprint's billings, contrary to Ms. Johnson's  
10 statements on page 6, lines 16 and 17 and in the affidavit she filed in connection  
11 with KMC's Motion to Dismiss KMC V as a party to this proceeding (which was  
12 denied). Clearly, the evidence, as well as KMC's own admissions, support the  
13 inclusion of KMC V, in addition to KMC III, as a proper party to Sprint's  
14 Complaint.

15  
16 **Q. In her Direct Testimony on page 5 line 23 and page 6 lines 1-2, Ms. Johnson**  
17 **states that "only traffic from this former customer [Customer X] is**  
18 **implicated by the Complaint." Does Sprint agree?**

19 **A.** No. Sprint is not claiming the only charge numbers implicated in this complaint  
20 are the two numbers that KMC has identified as belonging to their former  
21 customer. Sprint has identified approximately sixty other telephone numbers that  
22 were used repeatedly as the charge number used to change the jurisdiction of the

1 call. Sprint does not have knowledge as to which of KMC's customers "own"  
2 these numbers.

3 **Q. In Ms. Johnson's Direct Testimony, on page 24 lines 5 – 7, she claims that**  
4 **Sprint Local is routing "toll traffic" in Tallahassee and Ft. Myers over the**  
5 **local interconnection trunk groups. What have Sprint's investigations of Ms.**  
6 **Johnson's allegations revealed?**

7 A. After reviewing the four hours of SS7 data KMC provided to Sprint in Response  
8 to Sprint's POD #19 (represented by KMC to be its SS7 study in their Tallahassee  
9 Central Office dated March 26, 2004), Sprint has completed a thorough analysis  
10 of the call records in this file. Sprint's analysis shows that in no case did Sprint-  
11 Florida originate access traffic that was terminated by Sprint-Florida over its local  
12 interconnection trunks with KMC. For the records that Sprint-Florida could  
13 correlate, none of this traffic was delivered to Sprint-Florida by Sprint IXC, nor  
14 was it delivered to Sprint-Florida over PRI trunks from an enhanced services  
15 provider or other Sprint-Florida end user customer. In fact the majority of the  
16 calls reflected in the call records were interexchange calls that properly traversed  
17 the IXC two-way trunk groups between Sprint and KMC. A smaller subset of the  
18 calls were terminated over the local interconnection trunk groups between the  
19 parties and for a majority of those calls Sprint was acting as the transiting, not the  
20 originating, carrier. Furthermore, the traffic Sprint-Florida sent to KMC was not  
21 modified to alter the jurisdiction. See Exhibit CMS-4.

22

23 **Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?**

1 A.. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Docket No. 041144-TP  
Exhibit No. \_\_ (CMS-3)  
ARMS Order  
(Page 1 of 1)  
Redacted

**\*CONFIDENTIAL\***

Table 1

Interstate tab	<p><u>4374 call records</u></p> <p>Analysis included a review of the TCIC's associated with each call as shown on KMC's file. Sprint was able to utilize SS7 records collected by Sprint's Agilent system to better understand the records provided by KMC in this file.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4185 calls traversed the IXC 2-way trunk groups between Sprint and KMC, as expected.</li> <li>• 189 calls traversed the local interconnection trunk groups between Sprint and KMC.       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 70 of these calls were "redirected" (call forwarded) from the original called number, thus the calls become "local" after the redirect.</li> <li>○ 119 calls fit one of these scenarios:           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Call came into Sprint on a Feature Group D direct end office trunk group un-queried (local number portability [LNP] query was not performed.) Sprint performed the LNP query and determined that the call had to be routed to KMC. Upon routing the call to KMC, the switch does not know that the call originated as a toll call, thus the call is routed to KMC on the local interconnection trunk group. In this case, Sprint Local was acting in a transit network provider capacity.</li> <li>2. Calling party is wireless roaming.</li> <li>3. Call came into Sprint's tandem on another carrier's local interconnection trunk group (local only) bound for KMC. Since the call came into Sprint's tandem on a local trunk group, the switch does not have the capability to discern that the call is toll, therefore, the call was sent to KMC on a local trunk group. In this case, Sprint Local was acting in a transit network provider capacity.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
----------------	---

Table 2

Intrastate tab	<p><u>5198 call records</u></p> <p>Analysis included a review of the TCIC's associated with each call as shown on KMC's file.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3839 calls traversed the IXC 2-way trunk groups between Sprint and KMC, as expected.</li> <li>• 1359 calls traversed the local interconnection trunk groups.       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 91 of these calls were "redirected" (call forwarded) from the original called number, thus the calls become "local" after the redirect.</li> <li>○ 1268 calls fit one of these scenarios:           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Call is EAS (Extended Area Service) route, thus, the call is local. This represented the majority of the 1268 calls.</li> <li>2. Call came into Sprint on a Feature Group D direct end office trunk group un-queried (local number portability [LNP] query was not performed.) Sprint performed the LNP query and determined that the call had to be routed to KMC. Upon routing the call to KMC, the switch does not know that the call originated as a toll call, thus the call is routed to KMC on the local interconnection trunk group. In this case, Sprint Local was acting in a transit network provider capacity.</li> <li>3. Calling party is wireless roaming.</li> <li>4. Call came into Sprint's tandem on another carrier's local interconnection trunk group (local only) bound for KMC. Since the call came into Sprint's tandem on a local trunk group, the switch does not have the capability to discern that the call is toll, therefore, the call was sent to KMC on a local trunk group. In this case, Sprint Local was acting in a transit network provider capacity.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
----------------	--