

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
Petition to Establish Generic Docket to Consider )  
Amendments to Interconnection Agreements )  
Resulting from Changes of Law )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**Docket No. 041269-TP**  
**Filed: September 22, 2005**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**KRISTIN SHULMAN**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**XO COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC.**

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

09014 SEP 22 '05

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

2 A. My name is Kristin Shulman. My business address is 810 Jorie Blvd., Suite 200,  
3 Oak Brook, IL 60523.

4  
5 **Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

6  
7 A. I am an Executive Director – Regulatory Affairs of XO Communications, Inc.  
8 (“XO”). In this position, I am responsible for all regulatory issues and policies, in  
9 which XO engages, in Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri and Texas.

10  
11 **Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience**  
12 **within the telecommunications industry.**

13 A. I graduated from the State University of New York at Albany (“SUNY Albany”)  
14 where I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in English. I also received a Masters of  
15 Arts degree in Economics from the Pennsylvania State University.

16  
17 I started my career in 1984 as a Manager, Corporate Books at the Rochester  
18 Telephone Company in Rochester NY. Over the next 16 years, I held many  
19 management positions in the regulatory and marketing departments of then Bell  
20 Atlantic and Ameritech, culminating in the position of Vice President of Marketing,  
21 Ameritech Industry Services in the late 1990’s. Subsequent to working for the  
22 regional operating companies, I was principal of Active Strategies, LLC a telecom  
23 consulting firm. In that capacity, I assisted a number of CLECs in entering the  
24 market utilizing UNEs obtained from the Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers. In  
25 2003, I joined Allegiance Telecom, Inc. as Regional Vice President, Regulatory

1 Affairs and handled all regulatory matters in which Allegiance took part in the  
2 Verizon east states. In 2004, Allegiance Telecom, Inc. was acquired by XO  
3 Communications, Inc. and I took on my current job responsibilities as Executive  
4 Director, Regulatory Affairs.

5

6

7 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

8 A. My testimony addresses a number of issues related to the transition plans for high-  
9 capacity loop and transport network elements and an issue related to the definition of  
10 a dedicated transport "route" discussed in the direct testimony of other parties.

11

12 **Q. Please summarize your understanding of the FCC's transition plan for high  
13 capacity loops and transport.**

14 A. In its simplest terms, the FCC adopted a twelve month transition period for DS1 and  
15 DS3 loops and transport beginning on March 10, 2005 and ending on March 10,  
16 2006, and an eighteen month transition period for dark fiber loops and transport  
17 beginning on March 10, 2005 and ending on September 10, 2006. During the  
18 transition period, ILECs are permitted to charge rates equal to the higher of 115% of  
19 the unbundled network element rates in effect on June 15, 2004 or 115% of any UNE  
20 rates established by state commissions between June 15, 2004 and March 10, 2005.

21

22 **Q. Have you reviewed the testimony of CompSouth witness Joseph Gillan  
23 concerning the appropriate implementation of the FCC's transition plan?**

1 A. Yes, I have.

2

3 **Q. Please summarize your understanding of Mr. Gillan's proposal for**  
4 **implementing the FCC's transition plan for high capacity loops and transport.**

5 A. Mr. Gillan contends that the FCC required that CLECs (a) amend the provisions in  
6 their interconnection agreements concerning DS1 and DS3 loops and transport by  
7 March 10, 2006 and place orders by that date to convert their embedded base of DS1  
8 and DS3 loops and transport to alternative arrangements and (b) amend the  
9 provisions in their interconnection agreements concerning dark fiber loops and  
10 transport by September 10, 2006 and place orders by that same date to transition their  
11 embedded base of dark fiber loops and transport to alternative arrangements. He  
12 proposes that the transition rates would become effective only upon amendment of  
13 the interconnection agreement and would remain in effect until BellSouth completes  
14 the conversion of the embedded base.

15 **Q. Have you reviewed the testimony of BellSouth witness Pamela A. Tipton**  
16 **concerning the implementation of the FCC's transition plan?**

17 A. Yes, I have.

18

19 **Q. Please summarize your understanding of Ms. Tipton's proposal for**  
20 **implementing the FCC's transition plan for high capacity loops and transport.**

21 A. Ms. Tipton argues that the transition rates apply to the embedded base of DS1, DS3,  
22 and dark fiber loops and transport as of March 10, 2005, regardless of when a  
23 CLEC's interconnection agreement is amended. She proposes that CLECs be

1 required to submit orders by December 9, 2005 to convert their embedded base of  
2 DS1 and DS3 loops and transport to alternative arrangements and to submit orders by  
3 June 10, 2006 to convert their embedded base of dark fiber loops and transport.  
4 Under Ms. Tipton's proposal, transition pricing for the embedded base would end  
5 when BellSouth completed the conversion in the case of conversions that are  
6 completed before the end of the FCC's transition periods. It would end on March  
7 10, 2006 for DS1 and DS3 loops and transport and on September 10, 2006 for dark  
8 fiber loops in the case of conversions that BellSouth does not complete by the end of  
9 the applicable transition period.

10  
11 **Q. Do you agree with Mr. Gillan or Ms. Tipton concerning the appropriate**  
12 **implementation of the FCC's transition plans?**

13 A. I really can't totally agree with either one.

14  
15 Mr. Gillan is certainly correct that the FCC provided CLECs twelve months from  
16 March 10, 2005 to amend their interconnection agreements concerning DS1 and DS3  
17 loops and transport and eighteen months to amend the provisions concerning dark  
18 fiber loops and transport. At paragraph 143 of its Order, referring to DS1 and DS3  
19 transport, the FCC stated that "carriers have twelve months from the effective date of  
20 this Order to modify their interconnection agreements, including any change of law  
21 processes." In footnote 406, the FCC said that "for dark fiber transport, carriers have  
22 eighteen months from the effective date of this Order to modify their interconnection  
23 agreements, including completing any change of law processes." The FCC said the

1 same things concerning the transition periods for DS1 and DS3 loops in paragraph  
2 196 and for dark fiber loops in footnote 523. Clearly, the FCC intended to provide up  
3 to twelve months for the modification of interconnection agreement provisions  
4 concerning DS1 and DS3 loops and transport and eighteen months to modify the  
5 provisions concerning dark fiber loops and transport.

6  
7 When Mr. Gillan concludes that the FCC intended for its transition rates to become  
8 effective only upon the amendment of a CLEC's interconnection agreement,  
9 however, he is correct as to implementation of the rates, but, in my opinion,  
10 overlooks relatively clear statements regarding the application date of the rates once  
11 such amendment is executed. In footnotes 408 and 524, of the *TRRO*, the FCC stated  
12 that dedicated transport facilities and high capacity loops, respectively, "no longer  
13 subject to unbundling shall be subject to true-up to the applicable transition rate upon  
14 amendment of the relevant interconnection agreements, including any applicable  
15 change of law processes." Thus, the FCC has indicated that, once the parties have  
16 amended their interconnection agreement, a true-up of transition pricing is  
17 appropriate. Of course, as the FCC emphasized at several points in the *TRRO*, its  
18 transition plan should apply only where the parties have not agreed to different terms.

19 For example, if the change of law provisions in a CLEC's interconnection agreement  
20 provide that changes of law will be implemented without true-ups or by some other  
21 means, that provision or other arrangement should be given effect. However,  
22 BellSouth's position on this issue, that only transition pricing, and no other

1 provisions of the FCC's order that have been delayed in implementation, must be  
2 trued-up is not correct and should be rejected, as well.

3  
4 Most importantly, I agree with Mr. Gillan that the FCC did not require CLECs to  
5 convert their embedded base of high capacity loops and transport and UNE-P  
6 arrangements prior to the end of the transition period. In paragraph 143, the FCC said  
7 that "*[a]t the end of the twelve-month period*, requesting carriers must transition the  
8 affected DS1 or DS3 dedicated transport UNEs to alternative facilities or  
9 arrangements." The FCC said the same thing with respect to DS1 and DS3 loops in  
10 paragraph 196. Although CLECs need to place their orders for the conversion of  
11 UNEs before the end of the transition period, Ms. Tipton is simply wrong in  
12 contending that the FCC required CLECs to *complete* the conversion of delisted  
13 UNEs to other arrangements by the end of the transition period. The FCC clearly  
14 intended to give CLECs the full twelve months (or eighteen months for dark fiber  
15 UNEs) to identify the best available alternatives to high capacity loops and transport  
16 that they currently lease on an unbundled basis but cannot retain as UNEs after the  
17 transition period and to place the necessary orders with BellSouth and other vendors  
18 to implement those alternatives.

19  
20 I can't agree with either Mr. Gillan or Ms. Tipton about when the FCC's transition  
21 pricing ends. Mr. Gillan contends that transition pricing should continue until  
22 BellSouth actually converts each delisted UNE, although BellSouth may not even

1 receive CLECs' conversion orders until just before the end of the transition period,  
2 while Ms. Tipton contends that BellSouth should be permitted to charge higher rates  
3 for other arrangements as soon as it converts delisted UNEs when it does so before  
4 the end of the transition period. Yet the FCC clearly stated in paragraphs 145 and 198  
5 that transition rates for high capacity loops and transport would apply "*during the*  
6 *relevant transition period.*" Similarly, 47 CFR §§ 51.319(a)(4)(iii) (DS1 loops),  
7 51.319(a)(5)(iii) (DS3 loops), 51.319(e)(2)(ii)(C) (DS1 transport), and  
8 51.319(e)(2)(iii)(C) (DS3 transport) all provide for transition pricing "for a 12-month  
9 period beginning on the effective date of the Triennial Review Remand Order," while  
10 47 CFR §§ 51.319(a)(6)(ii) (dark fiber loops) and 51.319(e)(2)(iv)(B) apply  
11 transition pricing "[f]or an 18-month period beginning on the effective date of the  
12 Triennial Review Remand Order." In light of these statements, it seems clear that the  
13 FCC intended for transition pricing to end on March 10, 2006 for DS1 and DS3 loops  
14 and transport and on September 10, 2006 for dark fiber loops and transport,  
15 regardless of when the network elements are actually converted to alternative  
16 arrangements, assuming that orders are placed prior to the end of the transition period  
17 for circuits to be converted. While this will result in BellSouth providing special  
18 access circuits at UNE rates if it completes a conversion before the due date, this will  
19 be offset by its ability to charge special access rates for UNEs that it does not convert  
20 by the deadline. Also, it is important to note that, if special access pricing is effective  
21 March 10, 2006 for DS1 and DS3 loops and transport and on September 10, 2006 for  
22 dark fiber loops and transport, even when the actual conversion occurs at a later date,



1 BellSouth should be required to make available special access term pricing on that  
2 same date, regardless of actual conversion date. In other words, BellSouth cannot  
3 have its cake and eat it, too – or have a special access “true-up” back to March 10,  
4 2006, yet refuse to provide plan pricing because the circuits “were not yet converted.”

5  
6 **Q. Please summarize how you believe the transition process should work.**

7  
8 **A.** The FCC intended to provide a period of one year for parties to amend the provisions  
9 of their interconnection agreements concerning DS1 and DS3 loops and transport and  
10 an eighteen month period to amend interconnection agreement provisions concerning  
11 dark fiber loops and transport. CLECs also should have until March 10, 2006 to place  
12 orders to convert DS1 and DS3 loops and transport to alternative arrangements, and  
13 until September 10, 2006 to place orders to convert dark fiber loops and transport.  
14 Once the interconnection agreement is amended, a true-up of all applicable  
15 provisions, consistent with the Commission’s order in this docket, should apply,  
16 unless BellSouth has agreed otherwise with a particular CLEC. For interconnection  
17 agreements amended before the conclusion of this docket, the parties should be  
18 required to comply with the order in this docket unless they have clearly waived their  
19 right to do so. CLECs should not be penalized for working cooperatively with  
20 BellSouth to amend their interconnection agreements prior to the conclusion of this  
21 docket. Transition pricing should end on March 10, 2006 for all delisted UNEs  
22 except dark fiber and on September 10, 2006 for dark fiber loops and transport, no  
23 matter when the CLEC places orders to convert the UNEs as of those dates or when  
24 BellSouth completes the conversions.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**Q. Do you believe that policy considerations support your conclusion?**

A. Yes, I do. Aside from the FCC's clear statements of its intention, setting uniform dates for the commencement and termination of transition pricing is necessary in order to avoid creating inappropriate incentives and promoting discrimination. Delaying the onset of transition pricing until an interconnection agreement is amended would provide an incentive for CLECs to prolong negotiations and would discriminate against CLECs who heed the FCC's exhortations to promptly amend their agreements. Tying the end of transition pricing (or the availability of special access plan pricing) to BellSouth's completion of conversion orders would create an incentive for CLECs to delay placing their conversion orders (or for BellSouth to delay working those orders) and would permit BellSouth to discriminate based upon when it completes those orders. In each case, CLECs who worked cooperatively with BellSouth to amend their interconnection agreements promptly and to place their conversion orders in a timely fashion would effectively be penalized for doing so. On the other hand, if end of transition prices apply in all cases on March 10 or September 10, 2006, as appropriate, CLECs would have to place their conversion orders early in order to give BellSouth more time to complete them and thus minimize the risk of errors as BellSouth works to convert a massive number of network elements in a relatively short period of time.

The Commission also needs to consider incentives in determining whether any other true-ups are appropriate. For example, CLECs have been entitled to commingle

1 UNEs and wholesale services, to use EELs under clearer eligibility criteria, and to  
2 convert commingled services to UNEs at least since the FCC's *Triennial Review*  
3 *Order*, but BellSouth has generally refused to permit such commingling, EEL usage  
4 and conversions until CLECs have amended their interconnection agreements in their  
5 entirety to incorporate provisions that are favorable to BellSouth. If the Commission  
6 were to order a true-up to transition rates for delisted UNEs but not for issues such as  
7 commingling, EELs and conversions, BellSouth would continue to have no incentive  
8 to amend agreements promptly to incorporate provisions that are favorable to CLECs.  
9 Unless a particular interconnection agreement or other agreed upon arrangement  
10 specifies that there will be no true-ups, the Commission should adopt a uniform  
11 policy for truing up all changes that result from implementation of the *TRO* and  
12 *TRRO*, and not just those changes that favor BellSouth.

13  
14 **Q. What about charges for conversions? Do you agree with BellSouth's proposals**  
15 **for charging CLECs to convert delisted UNEs to alternative arrangements?**

16 A. Only partially. BellSouth will incur minimal costs associated with making the record  
17 changes required to convert UNEs to wholesale services, but in many cases the  
18 conversion charges that BellSouth proposes are excessive.

19  
20 **Q. What does Ms. Tipton propose that BellSouth charge to convert a UNE or UNE**  
21 **combination to a wholesale service when the CLEC identifies the UNE or**  
22 **combination to be converted and places an order for the conversion?**

1 A. Ms. Tipton doesn't address this issue directly in her testimony, but Section 1.6 of  
2 BellSouth's proposed contract language attached to her direct testimony states that  
3 BellSouth will charge switch-as-is rates to convert a Network Element or  
4 Combination to an equivalent wholesale service or group of wholesale services upon  
5 the request of the CLEC.

6  
7 **Q. Are such switch-as-is conversion charges appropriate?**

8  
9 A. Conceptually, yes they are. But BellSouth is proposing an excessive switch-as-is rate  
10 for converting UNE loops to wholesale services.

11  
12 **Q. Please explain.**

13  
14 A. In the rate tables included with the proposed interconnection agreement amendment  
15 that BellSouth has provided to CLECs and posted on its web site, BellSouth proposes  
16 to assess Commission-approved switch-as-is charges for converting dedicated  
17 transport UNEs and UNE loop and transport combinations to equivalent wholesale  
18 services. However, for purposes of this docket, BellSouth proposes to charge switch-  
19 as-is rates for conversion of stand alone UNE loops that differ from the conversion  
20 rates for UNE loop and transport combinations. In most states, including Florida,  
21 BellSouth's proposed switch-as-in rate for stand alone UNE loops is much higher  
22 than the switch-as-is rate for UNE loop and transport combinations. In Georgia, for  
23 example, the Commission-approved switch-as-is rate for the conversion of UNE loop  
24 and transport combination is \$5.70. For converting a stand alone UNE loop,  
25 however, BellSouth has proposed in this docket a switch-as-is rate of \$22.06. It

1 cannot possibly cost BellSouth nearly four times as much to make the record change  
2 to convert a UNE loop as it does to convert a combination of that same loop and a  
3 dedicated transport interoffice channel. More importantly, since BellSouth uses the  
4 same service center personnel and the same systems for switch-as-is conversions in  
5 both Florida and Georgia, and other states, for that matter, it should not cost  
6 BellSouth more to make a record change to convert a UNE loop in Florida than it  
7 does to convert a combination of a loop and dedicated transport interoffice channel  
8 in Georgia, or North Carolina, or Louisiana, for example. The "switch as is" charge  
9 for the record change to convert a UNE loop should be no more than the lowest rate  
10 in the BellSouth region for converting a loop and transport combination, or Enhanced  
11 Extended Loop (EEL).

12 **Q. What justification does BellSouth provide for such a charge?**

13  
14 A. To my knowledge, none. BellSouth did not even disclose its proposed switch-as-is  
15 charges in its testimony, much less attempt to justify them.

16  
17 **Q. What is the appropriate switch-as-is charge for converting a UNE loop to a  
18 wholesale service?**

19 A. I don't have enough information to answer that question with specificity, but,  
20 certainly, as I state above, it should be no more than the charge for converting a UNE  
21 loop and transport combination in the same service center using the same systems,  
22 regardless of the location of the facility. Keep in mind that this is a billing change  
23 performed at a centralized location, not physical work done in the field.

24

1 **Q. What do you recommend that the Commission do about this issue?**

2

3 A. Because the record change for a high capacity loop should involve less work than a  
4 record change for both a loop and a transport link, and the same process, systems, and  
5 personnel are used for record changes in the various states, the Commission should  
6 adopt a switch-as-is rate equal to the lowest switch-as-is rate adopted by any state  
7 commission for BellSouth's conversion of a loop and transport combination, which  
8 is \$5.43, the switch-as-is charge for loop and transport combinations in Louisiana and  
9 North Carolina.

10

11 **Q. What about conversion charges when BellSouth identifies the UNEs that need  
12 to be converted, perhaps because a CLEC has not done so in a timely manner?**

13 A. In Ms. Tipton's direct testimony and the attached proposed contract language,  
14 BellSouth proposes that when it identifies a UNE or combination to be converted to a  
15 wholesale service or services, the CLEC would be liable for any charge that the  
16 Commission has approved for disconnection of the applicable UNE plus the full  
17 tariffed nonrecurring charge for the wholesale service to which it is converted.

18

19

20

21 **Q. Do you believe that such charges would be appropriate?**

22

23 A. No. BellSouth may incur a small cost to identify delisted UNEs for which CLECs  
24 have not placed conversion orders, and BellSouth easily would recover such costs in  
25 the first month's higher recurring charges for wholesale services. More significantly,  
26 the nonrecurring charges that BellSouth seeks to impose vastly exceed any possible

1 cost of simply identifying circuits to be converted. For example, the nonrecurring  
2 charge for the installation of a DS1 local channel in Section 7.5.9(A)(1) of  
3 BellSouth's FCC special access tariff, which is the wholesale equivalent of a DS1  
4 loop, is \$650.00. The Commission has approved a nonrecurring charge of \$195.30  
5 (1<sup>st</sup>) and \$165.48 (each additional) for such loops when ordered as a UNE, which the  
6 Commission has determined to be BellSouth's average TELRIC cost of provisioning  
7 the loop. There is no way that BellSouth's cost simply of identifying a loop to be  
8 converted could be as much as almost \$200, not to mention the \$746.86 (\$650  
9 special access nonrecurring charge plus \$96.86 UNE disconnect charge) that  
10 BellSouth proposes to charge for doing so.

11  
12 **Q. What do you recommend that the Commission do about this issue?**

13  
14 A. BellSouth should not be allowed to impose any charges for identifying UNEs to be  
15 converted. However, if the Commission decides to permit BellSouth to impose any  
16 charge for identifying UNEs so that it can convert them to higher-priced wholesale  
17 services, the Commission should require BellSouth to submit a TELRIC cost study  
18 demonstrating its cost of identifying circuits to be converted. Pending the submission  
19 and review of such a cost study, the Commission should set an interim rate of zero.  
20 BellSouth cannot be permitted to impose above-cost charges for identifying UNEs so  
21 that it can convert them to wholesale services at significantly increased recurring  
22 rates.

23

1    **Q.    What has BellSouth proposed concerning the transition of high capacity loops**  
2           **and transport to wholesale services in the future, when additional wire centers**  
3           **exceed the FCC’s business line count and/or collocator thresholds?**

4    A.    None of the BellSouth witnesses directly address this issue in testimony. The contract  
5           language in Exhibits PAT-1 and PAT-2 to Ms. Tipton’s testimony address it in  
6           Section 2.1.4.12 for DS1 and DS3 loops, in Section 6.2.6.10 for DS1 and DS3  
7           transport, and in Section 6.9.1.10 for dark fiber transport.

8  
9           In each case, BellSouth proposes that when it identifies an additional wire center that  
10          meets the FCC’s criteria for delisting a high capacity loop or transport UNE, it would  
11          post a notification on its web site identifying the wire center and the delisted UNE.  
12          Effective ten business days later, BellSouth would not be required to provide the  
13          delisted UNE in that wire center. CLECs would be required to submit orders to  
14          convert the delisted UNEs in that wire center within forty days after BellSouth posted  
15          the notice on its web site, with the conversions to be completed within ninety days  
16          after the tenth business day after BellSouth posted the notice. Similar to its proposal  
17          for the initial transition, BellSouth proposes that the FCC’s transition rates would  
18          apply for the period beginning ten business days after it posted the notice and end on  
19          the earlier of when BellSouth completes the conversion or the end of the ninety day  
20          period. BellSouth proposes to assess switch-as-is charges for the conversion of  
21          circuits identified by CLECs in timely conversion orders and the sum of UNE



1 disconnect charges and tariffed nonrecurring charges for circuits identified by  
2 BellSouth.

3  
4 **Q. Do you believe that those procedures are appropriate?**

5  
6 A. No, I do not.

7  
8 **Q. What transition provisions do you believe the Commission should adopt for the  
9 future delisting of high capacity loops and transport?**

10 A. My testimony concerning the appropriate application of transition rates and  
11 conversion charges for the initial transition period is equally applicable to subsequent  
12 transitions. Transition rates should apply from the beginning to the end of the  
13 transition period, regardless of when conversion orders are placed or completed, and  
14 BellSouth should assess only Commission-approved switch-as-is conversion charges,  
15 with an additional Commission-approved charge to recover its cost of identifying  
16 circuits to be converted, when applicable.

17  
18 The more important issues for subsequent transitions, however, concern the process  
19 for updating the list of wire centers where high capacity UNEs are delisted and the  
20 length of the transition period.

21  
22 **Q. What process do you propose for updating the list of wire centers?**

23  
24 A. I agree with Mr. Gillan's proposal for an annual proceeding to review business line  
25 count data. Because of the incentives for BellSouth to overstate business line counts  
26 in order to minimize its unbundling obligations, it is vitally important for the

1 Commission to review this data before BellSouth is relieved of unbundling  
2 obligations. Since BellSouth's ARMIS data is updated annually, there should also be  
3 an annual update of the business line counts based on that data.

4  
5 It is also important to give CLECs sufficient time to change their business processes  
6 to adjust to the impending loss of high capacity loop and transport unbundling in a  
7 wire center. BellSouth proposes a period of only ten business days from the time it  
8 announces that a wire center has exceeded an applicable threshold and the time when  
9 it would no longer be required to unbundle a high capacity UNE in that wire center.  
10 Many CLECs tailor their marketing to the cost of serving particular customers,  
11 however, and they need significantly more than two weeks' notice that the loop or  
12 transport circuit required to serve a particular prospective customer will not be  
13 available at TELRIC rates. The knowledge that UNEs are likely to be delisted in a  
14 wire center following Commission review of business line counts in that wire center  
15 and the relatively brief time that would be required for such review under Mr.  
16 Gillan's proposal would provide the time that CLECs need to adjust their marketing  
17 and other business processes in anticipation of the delisting of the UNEs.

18  
19 **Q. Mr. Gillan's proposal appears to be limited to an annual review of updated  
20 business line counts. What if a wire center gains a fiber-based collocation and,  
21 as a result, qualifies for delisting of a UNE?**

22 **A.** One approach would be to update the wire center nonimpairment lists only once a  
23 year after the Commission reviews updated business line counts, but that could

1 require BellSouth to continue to provide high capacity loops or transport on an  
2 unbundled basis for a year or more after a wire center exceeded an applicable  
3 collocation threshold.

4 Although annual updates appear to be the only feasible approach to revising wire  
5 center impairment lists based upon line count data, in the case of updates resulting  
6 from new fiber-based collocations a better approach would be to require BellSouth to  
7 post a notice on its web site whenever it receives an order for new or modified  
8 collocation space that might result in a wire center exceeding an applicable  
9 collocation threshold. While BellSouth often would not know at the time it received  
10 the order whether the collocation in question would be fiber-based as defined by the  
11 FCC, the early notification would let CLECs know that a wire center was in jeopardy  
12 of qualifying for reduced unbundling so that they could adjust their business  
13 processes accordingly. BellSouth then should be required to post a second notice as  
14 soon as it has the information necessary to determine whether the new or modified  
15 collocation will in fact result in the delisting of any UNE. Of course, the actual  
16 delisting would not take effect until the collocation was completed, the fiber  
17 installed, and the collocation powered up, and such delisting should be subject to an  
18 appropriate transition period.

19  
20 **Q. You mentioned that the length of subsequent transition periods is also an**  
21 **important issue. Please elaborate.**

22 **A.** The FCC found that CLECs need as much as a full year from March 10, 2005 to  
23 determine how best to transition their DS1 and DS3 UNEs to alternative

1 arrangements and eighteen months to identify and implement alternatives to dark  
2 fiber loops and transport, despite the fact that CLECs have known at least since the  
3 FCC's August 20, 2004 *Interim Order* that high capacity loops and transport were  
4 likely to be delisted in the most dense wire centers. CLECs cannot possibly perform  
5 the analysis required to identify the best alternatives to existing high capacity UNEs  
6 in the ninety days proposed by BellSouth, especially when dark fiber transport is  
7 delisted.

8  
9 **Q. What transition periods do you believe should apply to the subsequent delisting  
10 of high capacity UNEs?**

11 A. Because CLECs would have less advance notice of the likelihood of subsequent UNE  
12 delisting than they did for the initial delisting that took effect on March 10, 2005, it is  
13 arguable that the length of subsequent transition periods should be at least as long as  
14 the one year for DS1 and DS3 UNEs and eighteen months for dark fiber UNEs that  
15 the FCC adopted for the initial transition, if not longer. As long as the Commission  
16 establishes an appropriate process for reviewing updated business line counts and  
17 requires BellSouth to post a notice when it receives a collocation order that may  
18 result in the delisting of UNEs, however, I can agree with US LEC witness Wanda  
19 Montano's proposal for a six month transition period for DS1 and DS3 loop and  
20 transport UNEs that are delisted in the future. Because of the time required to install  
21 fiber, I believe that an eighteen month transition period is the minimum necessary to  
22 permit CLECs to transition from dark fiber transport UNEs.

23

1 Q. Do you agree with Ms. Tipton concerning the correct definition of a “route” for  
2 purposes of determining the availability of high capacity transport under the  
3 FCC’s rules?

4 A. Ms. Tipton accurately paraphrases the FCC’s definition of a “route” contained in 47  
5 CFR §51.319(e). Because of positions taken by BellSouth and other ILECs in the  
6 aborted state proceedings to implement the FCC’s *Triennial Review Order*, however,  
7 it is important to clarify that the definition of a “route” does not limit the ability of  
8 CLECs to obtain high capacity transport UNEs on routes where the FCC has  
9 determined that CLECs are impaired without such UNEs. CLECs need to be able to  
10 collocate in a Tier 2 or Tier 3 wire center and obtain unbundled transport connecting  
11 that collocation to multiple Tier 1 or Tier 2 wire centers.

12 Q. Please elaborate.

13 A. In the state *TRO* proceedings, state Commissions were required to identify the routes,  
14 under the FCC’s definition, where either (a) CLECs had constructed their own  
15 transport facilities or (b) transport facilities were available on a wholesale basis from  
16 sources other than the ILEC. If a CLEC had constructed its own transport facilities  
17 from one wire center to each of two other wire centers, BellSouth and other ILECs  
18 argued that a route existed between the two other wire centers because it would be  
19 possible to cross-connect the individual routes at the wire center where they had a  
20 common end point. Extending this argument, BellSouth could take the position that it  
21 is not required to provide unbundled high capacity transport on two or more routes  
22  
23

1 connecting wire centers in one tier to a single wire center in a lower tier, which  
2 would permit it to avoid unbundling on routes where the FCC has found impairment.

3  
4 For example, the FCC found that CLECs are impaired without the availability of  
5 unbundled DS1 transport between Tier 1 and Tier 3 wire centers, although it found  
6 that they are not impaired without unbundled DS1 transport connecting two Tier 1  
7 wire centers. Thus, a CLEC with a collocation arrangement in a Tier 3 wire center  
8 must be permitted to obtain unbundled DS1 transport from that wire center to each of  
9 two or more Tier 1 wire centers. Applying the argument it employed in the state *TRO*  
10 proceedings, however, BellSouth could argue that because such routes could be  
11 cross-connected within the collocation at the Tier 3 wire center, BellSouth would  
12 only be required to provide one of the requested routes, otherwise the CLEC would  
13 have obtained unbundled DS1 transport on a route connecting two Tier 1 wire  
14 centers, where the FCC found no impairment.

15  
16 **Q. The FCC said something about using a Tier 3 wire center as a “hub” in  
17 paragraph 106 of the *TRRO*. Is that what you are referring to?**

18 **A.** Not exactly. The FCC noted in paragraph 106 that it is unlikely that a CLEC desiring  
19 unbundled DS1 transport connecting two Tier 1 wire centers would collocate in a  
20 Tier 3 wire center and order DS1 transport from the Tier 3 wire center to each of the  
21 Tier 1 wire centers because of the cost of collocating at the Tier 3 wire center and the  
22 distance-sensitive rate for the two DS1 transport links, which likely would make the  
23 arrangement more costly than connecting the two Tier 1 wire centers directly with a

1 special access circuit. The situation that I am concerned with is one where the CLEC  
2 wants unbundled transport from the Tier 3 wire center to each of several Tier 1 wire  
3 centers, perhaps as the transport component of EELs, connected to loops in the Tier 1  
4 wire centers. In Georgia, this issue was identified as a sub-issue under Issue No. 4(iv)  
5 after it was raised by Digital Agent, LLC.

6  
7 **Q. Do any of the BellSouth witnesses address this issue in their testimony?**

8  
9 A. No, and I am not certain that BellSouth disagrees with my position. It is my  
10 understanding that BellSouth has agreed in negotiations that a CLEC may obtain  
11 unbundled DS1 transport on direct routes between a Tier 2 or Tier 3 wire center and  
12 each of two or more Tier 1 wire centers, as well as similar configurations of  
13 unbundled DS3 transport connecting a Tier 3 wire center to two or more Tier 1 or  
14 Tier 2 wire centers, but as far as I know BellSouth has not yet agreed to contract  
15 language stating this. I believe that it is important to include language clarifying this  
16 point so that BellSouth cannot later change its interpretation of the "route" definition.

17  
18 **Q. Do you believe that the FCC intended to prohibit a CLEC from obtaining an**  
19 **unbundled DS1 connection between two Tier 1 wire centers by ordering routes**  
20 **from a Tier 3 wire center to each of them and cross-connecting them at the Tier**  
21 **3 wire center as discussed in paragraph 106?**

22 A. No. The FCC clearly recognized the possibility of such configurations, correctly  
23 concluded that they generally would not make economic sense, and did not expressly  
24 forbid them. If the Commission concludes otherwise, however, it should prohibit the

1 cross-connection at the Tier 3 wire center, rather than permitting BellSouth to deny  
2 unbundled DS1 transport connecting a Tier 3 wire center to more than one Tier 1  
3 wire center.

4

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

6 **A. Yes.**



## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony of Kristin Shulman on Behalf of XO Communications Services, Inc., was served on the following by (\*) hand delivery and U.S. Mail this 22nd day of September, 2005:

\*Adam Teitzman  
Michael Barrett  
Florida Public Service Commission  
Division of Legal Services  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee FL 32399-0850  
[ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us)  
[mbarrett@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:mbarrett@psc.state.fl.us)

Michael A. Gross  
Florida Cable Telecommunications  
Assoc., Inc.  
246 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 100  
Tallahassee FL 32303  
[mgross@fcta.com](mailto:mgross@fcta.com)

\*Nancy White  
c/o Nancy Sims  
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.  
150 S. Monroe Street, Suite 400  
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556  
[Nancy.sims@bellsouth.com](mailto:Nancy.sims@bellsouth.com)  
[Nancy.white@bellsouth.com](mailto:Nancy.white@bellsouth.com)  
[Meredith.mays@bellsouth.com](mailto:Meredith.mays@bellsouth.com)

Norman H. Horton, Jr.  
Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A.  
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701  
P.O. Box 1876  
Tallahassee FL 32302-1876  
[nhorton@lawfla.com](mailto:nhorton@lawfla.com)

John Heitmann  
Garret R. Hargrave  
Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP  
1200 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington DC 20036  
[jheitmann@kelleydrye.com](mailto:jheitmann@kelleydrye.com)  
[ghargrave@kelleydrye.com](mailto:ghargrave@kelleydrye.com)

Kenneth A. Hoffman  
Martin P. McDonnell  
Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman  
P.O. Box 551  
Tallahassee FL 32302  
[ken@reuphlaw.com](mailto:ken@reuphlaw.com)  
[marty@reuphlaw.com](mailto:marty@reuphlaw.com)

Wanda Montano  
Terry Romine  
US LEC Corp.  
6801 Morrison Blvd.  
Charlotte NC 28211  
[wmontano@uslec.com](mailto:wmontano@uslec.com)

Tracy W. Hatch  
Senior Attorney  
AT&T  
101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700  
Tallahassee FL 32301  
[thatch@att.com](mailto:thatch@att.com)

Sonia Daniels  
Docket Manager  
AT&T  
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Atlanta GA 30309  
[soniadaniels@att.com](mailto:soniadaniels@att.com)

Donna Canzano McNulty  
MCI  
1203 Governors Square Blvd.  
Suite 201  
Tallahassee FL 32301  
[donna.mcnulty@mci.com](mailto:donna.mcnulty@mci.com)

De O'Roark  
MCI  
6 Concourse Parkway, Suite 600  
Atlanta GA 30328  
[De.oroark@mci.com](mailto:De.oroark@mci.com)

Floyd Self  
Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A.  
215 Soth Monroe Street, Suite 701  
P.O. Box 1876  
Tallahassee FL 32302-1876  
[fself@lawfla.com](mailto:fself@lawfla.com)

Steven B. Chaiken  
Supra Telecommunications and  
Info. Systems, Inc.  
General Counsel  
2901 S.W. 149<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 300  
Miramar FL 33027  
[steve.chaiken@stis.com](mailto:steve.chaiken@stis.com)

Matthew Feil  
FDN Communications  
2301 Lucien Way, Suite 200  
Maitland FL 32751  
[mfeil@mail.fdn.com](mailto:mfeil@mail.fdn.com)

Nanette Edwards  
ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc.  
7037 Old Madison Pike, Suite 400  
Huntsville AL 35806  
[nedwards@itcdeltacom.com](mailto:nedwards@itcdeltacom.com)

Susan Masterton  
Sprint Communications Company  
Limited Partnership  
P.O. Box 2214  
Tallahassee FL 32316-2214  
[susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com](mailto:susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com)

Alan C. Gold  
Gables One Tower  
1320 South Dixie Highway, Suite 870  
Coral Gables FL 33146  
[sgold@kcl.net](mailto:sgold@kcl.net)

Raymond O. Manasco, Jr.  
Gainesville Regional "Utilities"  
P.O. Box 147117  
Station A-138  
Gainesville Fl 32614-7117  
[manascoro@gru.com](mailto:manascoro@gru.com)

Charles A. Guyton  
Steel Hector & Davis LLP  
215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 601  
Tallahassee FL 32301-1804  
[cguyton@steelhector.com](mailto:cguyton@steelhector.com)

Herb Bornack, CEO  
Orlando Telephone Systems, Inc.  
4558 S.W. 35<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Orlando FL 32811  
[jerry@orlandotelco.net](mailto:jerry@orlandotelco.net)

Adam Kupetsky  
Regulatory Counsel  
WilTel Communications, LLC  
One Technology Center (TC-15)  
100 South Cincinnati  
Tulsa OK 74103  
[adam.kupetsky@wiltel.com](mailto:adam.kupetsky@wiltel.com)

Jonathan S. Marashlian  
The Helein Law Group, LLP  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 700  
McLean VA 22102  
[jsm@thlglaw.com](mailto:jsm@thlglaw.com)

Bill Magness  
Casey Law Firm  
98 San Jacinto Blvd., Suite 1400  
Austin, TX 78701  
[bmagness@phonelaw.com](mailto:bmagness@phonelaw.com)

Charles (Gene) Watkins  
Covad Communications Company  
1230 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 1900  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
[GWatkins@Covad.com](mailto:GWatkins@Covad.com)

C. Everett Boyd, Jr.  
Sutherland Asbill Law Firm  
3600 Maclay Blvd. S., Suite 202  
Tallahassee, FL 32312-1267  
[Everett.boyd@sablaw.com](mailto:Everett.boyd@sablaw.com)

D. Adelman/C. Jones/F. LoMonte  
Sutherland Law Firm  
999 Peachtree Street, NE  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
[David.adelman@sablaw.com](mailto:David.adelman@sablaw.com)

AzulTel, Inc.  
2200 S. Dixie Highway, Suite 506  
Miami, FL 33133-2300

STS Telecom  
12233 S.W. 55<sup>th</sup> Street, #811  
Cooper City, FL 33330-3303  
[jkrutchik@ststelecom.com](mailto:jkrutchik@ststelecom.com)

s/Dana Shaffer

---

Dana Shaffer  
XO Communications, Inc.  
Regulatory Counsel  
105 Molloy Street, Suite 300  
Nashville TN 37201  
Telephone: (615) 777-7700  
Facsimile: (615) 850-0343  
[Dana.Shaffer@xo.com](mailto:Dana.Shaffer@xo.com)