

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

STEVE BROWNORTH

On Behalf of

ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc.

DOCKET NO. 041269-TP

**GENERIC PROCEEDING TO EXAMINE ISSUES RELATED TO BELLSOUTH'S
OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS**

August 16, 2005

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07957 AUG 16 '05

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1 **Q: PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A: My name is Steve Brownworth. I'm the Vice President of Systems
3 Planning for ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. My business address is
4 1791 O.G. Skinner Drive, West Point, Georgia 31833.

5
6 **Q: PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR BUSINESS EXPERIENCE AND**
7 **BACKGROUND.**

8 A: I received a bachelor's degree with a major in Quantitative Methods from
9 the University of Illinois – Chicago in 1982. I have over 20 years of
10 telecommunications experience. My experience primarily lies in the
11 design and deployment of IXC and CLEC architecture.

12
13 I am responsible for the network architecture of the local and long-
14 distance voice network, data network (ATM/Frame/IP) and our fiber optic
15 transport network. In my role at ITC^DeltaCom, I've assisted other
16 companies in their initial network design and configurations including
17 SoLinc, PowerTel and Mindspring. These responsibilities include off-net
18 vendor management, the negotiation of contracts with ITC^DeltaCom's
19 IXC and CAP providers and determining how to best utilize the facilities
20 offered in the interconnection agreement in the ITC^DeltaCom network.

21
22 Prior to joining ITC^DeltaCom, I spent five years, 1989-1994, with MCI as
23 Sr. Manager, Network Design, managing strategic designs of their SONET

1 transmission deployment, real-time restoration and reliability plans,
2 dynamic switch routing and capital cost justifications. Prior to MCI, from
3 1982 to 1989, I held management positions with Telecom*USA,
4 SouthernNet and Telesphere, in switch network design, traffic
5 engineering, line cost, and provisioning.

6
7 **Q: HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?**

8 A: Yes.

9
10 **Q: WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

11 A: The purpose of my testimony is to direct the Commission's attention to
12 those issues that are critical to DeltaCom's ability to comply with the TRO
13 and TRRO orders while still providing cost efficient telecommunications
14 services to consumers in Florida.

15
16 **Q: WHAT ISSUES ARE CRITICAL TO DELTACOM ?**

17 A: (Issue 11) or in DeltaCom's Petition for Mediation and Dispute Resolution
18 this is Issue 2. My company has proposed a proprietary solution and has
19 asked the Commission to mediate the issue, specifically as presented by
20 DeltaCom. We have existing UNE high capacity loops and transport
21 which are used to serve consumers in Florida including state and local
22 governments as well as private industry. As more fully described in Mr.
23 Watt's testimony, DeltaCom has sought for some time an arrangement

1 whereby DeltaCom could begin moving existing UNE high capacity loops
2 and transport away from BellSouth to a third party provider rather than
3 waiting until the generic change of law case is concluded. BellSouth has
4 refused to negotiate such an arrangement. BellSouth has not only been
5 unwilling to negotiate such an interim arrangement, but it also has raised
6 barriers to discourage DeltaCom from moving such facilities.

7
8 BellSouth has not been willing to consider a reasonable non-recurring
9 charge for the disconnection of the high capacity loop or transport from
10 BellSouth's equipment in the central office to a third parties' equipment in
11 that same central office. In negotiations with BellSouth, its representatives
12 claimed that the non-recurring charge applicable to such changes is
13 contained in BellSouth's access tariff. Applying BellSouth's tariffed non-
14 recurring charges to the migration of high capacity transport or loops from
15 BellSouth to a third party provider results in a windfall to BellSouth.
16 BellSouth will be compensated for work that is not performed. As noted in
17 the attached diagrams (Exhibit SB-1), DeltaCom seeks to migrate existing
18 facilities away from BellSouth to a third party provider where possible. The
19 work performed in this scenario is within the central office and no premise
20 visit to the end user is required. Thus, the CLEC to CLEC conversion
21 charge which is currently contained in a large number of BellSouth's
22 interconnection agreements is the appropriate non-recurring charge:
23 **USOC UREWO \$101.07 (first NRC) \$ 43.04 (second NRC).**

1 Given that we are forced to migrate these services due to a regulatory
2 change, it is highly inappropriate for BellSouth to be permitted to assess a
3 full installation or disconnection non-recurring charge as though a new
4 high capacity loop or transport was installed when in fact we are simply
5 reconnecting existing BellSouth facilities (e.g. a DS1 loop) to a third party
6 provider (e.g. a transport provider) in the same central office.

7 BellSouth offer a "Rearrangement Fee" that appears to apply to the
8 connection of a loop or combination to another carrier's transport.
9 BellSouth's description of a "Rearrangement" states that if there is a
10 change in CFA a Rearrangement fee applies. In the past, BellSouth has
11 applied a very narrow definition of "Change in CFA". BellSouth's definition
12 of a "Change in CFA" generally means a rewiring of a DS1 connection
13 within the same ACTL (or in layman's terms a change for the same
14 company) as opposed to changes whereby DeltaCom could rewire the
15 DS1 connection in that Central Office to a third party. For example, a
16 Change of CFA as defined by BellSouth would not even cover moving
17 DS1s within the same collocation. Worse, this rearrangement fee would
18 not apply when DeltaCom moves a DS1 loop off of BellSouth multiplexing
19 equipment to a DeltaCom collocation site in that same BellSouth central
20 office. BellSouth's position is that the DS1 loop has to be disconnected
21 and then reconnected at full FCC tariffed non-recurring charges.

22
23 Reconnection of a facility from BellSouth to a collocation site is treated as

1 a disconnection of one service and establishment of a new service even
2 though the loop to the end user did not change.

3
4 Again, DeltaCom seeks a non-recurring charge that fits the work activities
5 to be performed and does not allow BellSouth excessive recovery. The
6 CLEC to CLEC non-recurring charge most closely fits the type of charge
7 that should be applied in this migration.

8
9 **Q: DOES DELTACOM SEEK TO START MOVING EMBEDDED**
10 **FACILITIES IN AREAS BELLSOUTH HAS DESIGNATED AS NON-**
11 **IMPAIRED WHERE AN ALTERNATIVE PROVIDER IS AVAILABLE?**

12 **A:** Yes. We have worked in good faith with BellSouth on transitional
13 language, but we need immediate relief and assistance in moving off the
14 BellSouth UNE network now, not after BellSouth converts the loops and
15 transport from UNEs to FCC special access tariffed services or
16 disconnects the service.

17
18 It is no surprise BellSouth is refuses to negotiate an interim solution.
19 BellSouth is in a no-lose situation. If a CLEC wants to move off the
20 BellSouth network, without commingling language, we have to install new
21 services from the end-user customer to a collocation arrangement. We
22 also have to pay full non-recurring charges. The end result is that both
23 DeltaCom and BellSouth duplicate resources and efforts to re-install a

1 service to an end-user that hasn't asked for any changes and does not
2 require any changes to their service. BellSouth can delay cooperation and
3 convert the existing month-to-month UNEs to higher cost FCC tariffed
4 circuits with multi-year commitments. It is clear to me from my negotiations
5 with BellSouth that BellSouth is very willing to move a CLEC from UNE to
6 FCC special access services and is very unwilling to work with a CLEC to
7 move from UNE to a third party provider.

8
9 **Q: BELLSOUTH REQUESTED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR A**
10 **SPREADSHEET BY DECEMBER 9, 2005 IDENTIFYING THE**
11 **EMBEDDED BASE OF DS1 AND DS3 LOOPS TO BE CONVERTED.**
12 **WHAT IS DELTACOM'S POSITION?**

13 A: DeltaCom has tried unsuccessfully to reach terms with BellSouth whereby
14 DeltaCom could begin moving away from BellSouth facilities as soon as
15 possible. What BellSouth does not tell this Commission is that what it
16 really wants is to lock CLECs into long-term volume agreements for FCC
17 special access services such that CLECs won't buy facilities from third
18 parties. BellSouth has not offered DeltaCom a 271 rate for loops and
19 transport. So far, BellSouth has only offered the rates in its FCC access
20 tariffs. By refusing to negotiate an interim arrangement, BellSouth knows
21 that those CLECs will be concerned that they will be caught with extremely
22 high month to month special access rates as of March 11, 2006, and
23 therefore will be forced into signing a volume/term agreement that

1 effectively prevents the CLEC from moving to another provider.

2
3 **Q: IF DELTACOM HAD A REASONABLE NRC FOR THE MIGRATION OF**
4 **HIGH CAPACITY LOOPS AND TRANSPORT AND AN ALTERNATIVE**
5 **PROVIDER WAS AVAILABLE, WOULD DELTACOM SUBMIT ORDERS**
6 **TO MIGRATE TOMORROW ?**

7 A: Yes. DeltaCom has no intention or desire to wait until March 11, 2006 to
8 submit orders to migrate to a third party provider. DeltaCom has very little
9 confidence that Bellsouth would work the orders in a timely manner
10 without outage. However, BellSouth has adamantly refused to negotiate
11 an interim arrangement with DeltaCom (even one subject to true-up)
12 whereby DeltaCom could begin (even before December of 2005) to move
13 high capacity loops and transport off of BellSouth. BellSouth negotiators
14 state that BellSouth won't negotiate "piecemeal" meaning either DeltaCom
15 must sign BellSouth's template language for TRO/TRRO or DeltaCom can
16 pay full FCC non-recurring tariffed charges to migrate these facilities as
17 though an entirely new facility is being installed.

18
19 **Q: HAS BELLSOUTH MADE ANY EFFORT TO ASSIST DELTACOM IN**
20 **MIGRATING UNE FACILITIES TO A THIRD PARTY PROVIDER?**

21 A: No. ITC^DeltaCom has yet to see BellSouth make an attempt of
22 seamlessly transitioning our end-user customers served via high capacity
23 loops and transport. Ms. Conquest addresses the issues related to bulk

1 migration of UNE-P to UNE-L. Today, ITC^DeltaCom continues to
2 transition customers via the establishment of a totally new DS1 service
3 and a disconnection of the old DS1 service to the customer premise. Our
4 BellSouth account team's response to this has been we want you to stay
5 on the BellSouth network, at the full tariffed special access FCC rates.
6 BellSouth is willing to work on processes to move UNEs to the higher
7 FCC tariffed access rates but has been uncooperative in assisting us in
8 moving customers to the other options available to us (i.e. our own
9 collocation or that of another carrier).

10
11 Without Commission intervention, based on our experience, we fully
12 expect complete lack of cooperation from any organization within
13 BellSouth in the migration of our end-users to anything but the higher cost
14 FCC tariffed rates before March 10, 2006.

15
16 **Q: SERVICE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR EELS. WHAT CONCERNS**
17 **DOES DELTACOM HAVE REGARDING BELLSOUTH'S PROPOSED**
18 **LANGUAGE?**

19 **A:** DeltaCom's proposed language regarding the service eligibility criteria for
20 EELs is contained in EXHIBIT SB-2 which highlights that the collocation
21 test can be satisfied by a reverse collocation site. Paragraph 605 of the
22 TRO states: " a requesting carrier satisfies this prong through reverse
23 collocation" and for purposes of this test, "we adopt SNiP LiNK's definition

1 of all mutually-agreeable interconnection methodologies.” As this
2 Commission is aware, from its consideration in the DeltaCom/BellSouth
3 arbitration (Issue 47), DeltaCom has reverse collocation sites with
4 BellSouth. Thirty of those reverse collocation sites are listed in Attachment
5 3 of the approved interconnection agreement. On July 26, 2005,
6 BellSouth stated that it would not permit DeltaCom to use existing reverse
7 collocation sites to meet this prong for purposes of service eligibility.
8 Exhibit SB-1 outlines the configuration that DeltaCom seeks for EELs that
9 are established through reverse collocation. (See Diagrams 3a and 3b).

10
11 **Q: WHAT LANGUAGE DOES DELTACOM PROPOSE FOR EELS?**

12 **A:** Exhibit SB-2 contains DeltaCom’s proposed language which was provided
13 to BellSouth during the negotiations.

14
15 DeltaCom has also provided to BellSouth diagrams and a description of
16 the loop and/or transport configurations it seeks. The documentation
17 provided to BellSouth is attached as confidential Exhibit SB-1 to this
18 Petition. BellSouth has not provided a written response. I have updated
19 the diagrams in response to questions raised by BellSouth from our July
20 26th meeting with them. The revised diagrams were provided to BellSouth
21 on August 5th.

22
23 DeltaCom has included language that incorporates the TRO provisions on

1 EELs. DeltaCom has requested information on how to order under the
2 new TRO provisions. Because DeltaCom has not been able to place
3 orders for EELs under the new TRO Service Eligibility Criteria, DeltaCom
4 is not able to raise any issues or concerns regarding BellSouth's
5 implementation of these requirements. For example, BellSouth currently
6 has several reverse collocations with DeltaCom (See Attachment 3 of the
7 parties current Agreement). These sites should qualify as a "reverse
8 collocation" as outlined by the FCC in the TRO.

9
10 **Q: WHAT OTHER CRITICAL MATTERS MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR**
11 **DELTACOM TO COMPLY WITH THE TRO/TRRO REQUIREMENTS?**

12 A: DeltaCom has commingling language in its existing Georgia
13 interconnection agreement but unfortunately has not been able to include
14 the same language in its Florida interconnection agreement. Commingling
15 is important because DeltaCom cannot convert existing UNE circuits to a
16 mixture of UNE and wholesale/commercial services. Nor can DeltaCom
17 place orders today for new customers with a combination of UNE and
18 wholesale.

19
20 **Q: IS THERE ANY OTHER PROBLEMS WITH MIGRATING HIGH**
21 **CAPACITY LOOPS AND TRANSPORT?**

22 A: Yes. This Commission may recall from my testimony in the DeltaCom arbitration
23 a situation I described where another CLEC sought to place orders to a third

1 party collocation site. BellSouth rejected the orders saying that the CLEC had to
2 order special access not UNEs. BellSouth and DeltaCom ultimately settled Issue
3 11(b) from our arbitration case. At least we thought so at the time. BellSouth
4 agreed to accept a Letter of Authorization (LOA). When DeltaCom tried to use
5 the LOA process to order UNEs to another carrier's collocation site, BellSouth
6 rejected the orders saying that each and every order has to be accompanied by a
7 signed LOA. The problem with BellSouth's position is covered in DeltaCom's
8 Petition for Mediation and Dispute Resolution at Issue 3 (Delivery of UNEs to
9 Third Party Collocation Site)

10
11 Providing a separately signed LOA for each order to the same collocation
12 is unduly burdensome and will prohibit CLECs from utilizing electronic
13 delivery of orders. Frankly, BellSouth's position on this issue is incredible.
14 A blanket LOA accomplishes the same purpose and does not create
15 unreasonable administrative burdens. Language relating to this issue that
16 should be included in the Agreement can be found at Exhibit SB-2.

17
18 **Q: DOES THE TRO REQUIRE BELLSOUTH TO PROVIDE NARROWBAND**
19 **SERVICES OVER IDLC LOOPS? IF OTHER ILECS HAVE IDENTIFIED**
20 **MEANS BY WHICH TO OFFER UNBUNDLED LOOPS CONVERTED**
21 **FROM IDLC WITHOUT ADDITIONAL ANALOG TO DIGITAL**
22 **CONVERSIONS, DOES BELLSOUTH RETAIN THE BURDEN OF**
23 **OFFERING THE SAME METHODS?**

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

A: ITC^DeltaCom included in its arbitration an issue relating to conversions of IDLC loops to unbundled loops wherein the loop provided would not be capable of fax, modem or dial up services. The parties negotiated language that, at the time, captured what BellSouth claimed to be the only identified technically feasible methods of providing the unbundled loop. In reviewing pleadings related to the TRO, ITC^DeltaCom discovered some carriers (including ILECs) filed comments that appear to indicate that this problem has a technical solution and that some manufacturers have redesigned equipment to address the issue. Language covering this issue is at Exhibit SB-2.

Q: SHOULD BELLSOUTH BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE AN UNBUNDLED LOOP USING IDLC TECHNOLOGY TO ITC^DELTACOM THAT WILL ALLOW ITC^DELTACOM TO PROVIDE CONSUMERS THE SAME QUALITY OF SERVICE AS THAT OFFERED BY BELLSOUTH TO ITS CUSTOMERS?

A: Yes. IDLC is very important to ITC^DeltaCom now that UNE-P is no longer available. It is imperative that ITC^DeltaCom be able to order a local loop on behalf of the end user customer and that local loop should receive the same quality of service that BellSouth currently offers that same customer. In other words, BellSouth should not provide a degraded local loop to ITC^DeltaCom. By having access to IDLC technology or ensuring that there are no additional analog to digital (A to D) conversions,

1 the end user consumer will be assured, when they move from one carrier
2 to another, that they will have the same quality local loop.

3
4 **Q: WHY IS THE ANALOG TO DIGITAL (A TO D) CONVERSION CONCEPT**
5 **IMPORTANT?**

6 A: Additional A to D conversions cause problems associated with quality
7 voice call, fax, and dial-up internet services. BellSouth's position seems to
8 be that if the loop meets the minimum voice grade standards for the
9 customer, regardless of quality of the local loop pre-conversion, it has met
10 its obligations to ITC^DeltaCom. However, the customer perceives and
11 experiences a degradation in service. Customers' typical experiences in
12 this regard include problems with modem speed on dial-up internet/data
13 services, fax, noise/static on the line and other quality issues.

14 It is important for the customer to receive the same level of service and
15 quality on the loop with BellSouth as with ITC^DeltaCom. The manner in
16 which BellSouth designs and manages the local network with respect to
17 CLECs does not allow parity at the customer level.

18
19 **Q: DOES THE TRO APPEAR TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE?**

20 A: Yes. Footnote 855 of the TRO states that Telcordia has set forth means
21 by which ILECs can provide unbundled loops to CLEC over DLC systems
22 and that telecom manufacturers have designed equipment to take into
23 account the regulatory obligations. In the recent negotiations for a

1 TRO/TRRO amendment, DeltaCom asked whether BellSouth has
2 identified additional means by which a IDLC loop can be unbundled
3 without additional A to D conversions? BellSouth has not responded.

4
5 **Q: WHAT DO YOU SEEK FROM THIS COMMISSION?**

6 A: I am asking this Commission to adopt an interim non-recurring charge as I
7 proposed earlier for the migration of high capacity loops and transport to
8 third party providers. The Commission should define rearrangements as
9 any rewiring within the central office that does not require outside dispatch
10 of BellSouth resources to the end user customer.

11
12 The Commission should instruct BellSouth to make the migration of these
13 non 251 elements and the commingling of wholesale and UNE services to
14 be as simple as possible. At this point, BellSouth has not assigned or
15 given direction to either the BellSouth account team or other BellSouth
16 personnel the project of working with DeltaCom to move off the BellSouth
17 UNE network to an alternative provider as described in my testimony and
18 as illustrated in my diagrams (Exhibit SB-1).

19
20 **Q: DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

21 A: Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following this 16th day of August, 2005, by U.S. Mail:

Felicia R. Banks, Esq.
Staff Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
Division of Legal Services
25430 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Andrew D. Shore, Esq.
Nancy B. White, Esq.
General Counsel
c/o Nancy Sims
150 S. Monroe Street, Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301

R. Douglas Lackey, Esq.
Andrew D. Shore, Esq.
Suite 4300, BellSouth Center
675 W. Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30375


