Ruth Nettles

From:

Slaughter, Brenda [bs3843@att.com]

Sent:

Tuesday, February 10, 2009 3:33 PM

To:

Filings@psc.state.fl.us

Cc:

Culpepper, Robert; Woods, Vickie; Holland, Robyn P; Eure, Micale

Subject:

Docket 000121A-TP Response to CLECs Objections to RCC 02-10-09

Importance: High

Attachments: 000121A-TP Resp to CLECs Objection to RCC 2-10-09.pdf

Brenda Slaughter

Legal Secretary to Robert A. Culpepper, John T. Tyler and Dorian Denburg

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Florida

150 South Monroe, Rm. 400

Tallahassee, FL 32301-1558

(404) 335-0714

brenda.slaughter@att.com

- Docket No. 000121A-TP: In Re: Investigation into the Establishment of Operations Support Systems Permanent Incumbent Local Exchange Telecommunications Companies.
- BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. C. on behalf of Robert A. Culpepper
- 7 pages total in PDF format (including letter, certificate of service and pleading) D.
- E. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Florida's Response to CLEC's Objections to RCC (2/10/09)

<<000121A-TP Resp to CLECs Objection to RCC 2-10-09.pdf>>

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers. GA623

> DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE 01039 FEB 108



February 10, 2009

Ms. Ann Cole Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 000121A-TP

In Re: Investigation into the establishment of operations support systems permanent incumbent local exchange Telecommunications companies

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed is BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Florida's ("AT&T Florida") response to CLECS' Objection to AT&T Florida's Request for Confidential Classification, which we ask that you file in the referenced docket.

A copy of the same is being provided to all parties as reflected in the attached certificate of service.

Sincerely

Robert A. Culpepper

Enclosures cc: All parties of record Jerry D. Hendrix

694934

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation into the Establishment)	Docket No.: 000121A-TP
Of Operations Support Systems Permanent)	
Performance Measures for Incumbent)	
Local Exchange Telecommunications.)	Filed: February 10, 2009
Companies (RellSouth Track)	Í	

RESPONSE TO CLECS' OBJECTION TO AT&T FLORIDA'S REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Florida ("AT&T Florida" or "AT&T") hereby responds to the latest Objection to AT&T's Request for Confidential Classification ("Objection") filed by Cbeyond Communications, LLC, Deltacom, Inc., and NuVox Communications, Inc. (collectively, the "CLECs"). As explained below, the CLECs' Objection serves no legitimate purpose and lacks any merit. Accordingly, the Objection should be denied.

- 1. As background, in December 2008, the Commission's Staff issued a report entitled "A Review AT&T's OSS April 208 Release Analysis and Resolutions" ("Audit Report"). Because the Audit Report contains proprietary confidential business information, AT&T Florida filed a Request for Confidential Classification ("Audit Report RCC") on January 9, 2009. The CLECs' Objection to the Audit Report RCC was filed on January 22, 2009. AT&T Florida filed a response to the CLECs' Objection on January 29, 2009.
- 2. As previously stated, the Audit Report contains proprietary confidential business information that is (i) treated as proprietary by AT&T Florida; (ii) is not generally disclosed; and (iii) the disclosure of such information will harm the business operations of AT&T. Additional information regarding such proprietary confidential business information is set forth in AT&T Florida's Audit Report RCC (filed on January 9, 2009), and in AT&T Florida's response to the



CLECs' objection to the Audit Report RCC (filed on January 29, 2009), both of which are incorporated herein by reference.

- 3. On January 20, 2009, AT&T Florida filed another RCC, this time in connection with its comments regarding the Audit Report ("AT&T's Comments"). Similar to its RCC regarding the Audit Report, AT&T limited its confidentiality claim to those specific aspects of its Comments that addressed AT&T's Key Learning Review process and AT&T's software defect management process, both of which AT&T considers proprietary confidential business information ("Comments RCC").
- 4. On February 3, 2009, in a continuing attempt to harass AT&T and waste the Commission's time, the CLECs filed their most recent RCC Objection. Once again, in objecting to AT&T's Comments RCC, the CLECs conceal the fact that the *CLECs have reviewed the proprietary version of AT&T's Comments* pursuant to nondisclosure agreements executed between the CLECs and AT&T Florida. Since the CLECs have reviewed the proprietary version of the AT&T's Comments, they have no legitimate basis whatsoever to object to the Comments RCC. For example, since the CLECs have reviewed the proprietary version of AT&T's Comments, the CLECs cannot credibly contend that the Comments RCC somehow impedes their ability to review the public version of AT&T's Comments.
- 5. Further evidence that the CLECs' most recent RCC objection lacks any semblance of credibility is the fact that the public (or redacted) version of AT&T's Comments has been posted on the Commission's website. A cursory review of the public version of AT&T's Comments reveals that the overwhelming majority of the Comments are in the public domain. A closer review of the public version of AT&T's Comments unquestionably demonstrates that the

CLECs' claim that AT&T is somehow attempting to conceal "embarrassing facets" of its Comments is claim that is totally devoid of any merit.

6. In any event, AT&T Florida's Comments RCC fully comports and complies with applicable law as the RCC specifically identifies the portions of AT&T's Comments which contain proprietary confidential business information and the RCC sets forth the justification offered in support of such classification. The disclosure of such proprietary confidential business information will harm the business operations of AT&T Florida. For example, disclosure of detailed information about AT&T's Key Learning Review ("KLR") process would harm the tool that AT&T must rely upon to validate and improve upon its OSS software release processes. AT&T uses the KLR process to gather information about what worked and what did not work after every software release. Because the process is purely internal, AT&T managers feel free to speak their minds. In that way, AT&T is much more likely to find issues and quickly resolve them. If the process and specific input and finding were subject to disclosure, employees would no longer feel free to be as critical as they need to be and as a result, the process would no longer be useful as a tool for improvement. The KLR process is effectively an internal auditing control and thus is entitled to be treated as proprietary confidential business information under 364.183(3), Florida Statutes.

In the Comments RCC, AT&T Florida explained the material it has identified as proprietary is confidential business information of a technical nature used by AT&T in conducting its business and is not commonly known by or available to the public. AT&T derives economic value from this information not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by competitors who can obtain economic value from its disclosure. Specifically, this information contains information related to AT&T's Key Learning Review process and/or AT&T's software defect management process. This information is considered proprietary and confidential to AT&T as it describes, among other things, AT&T's internal operations regarding planning, implementing, and managing OSS software releases and the disclosure of such information could cause harm to AT&T.

- 7. Further, the Comments RCC is substantially similar to numerous RCCs filed without objection with the Commission, including RCCs filed without objection in this docket. This strongly suggests that the CLECs' latest RCC objection is nothing more than a continuing harassing maneuver designed to waste the time and resources of AT&T Florida and the Commission's Staff.
- 8. For the reasons set forth herein, AT&T Florida's respectfully requests an Order that: (i) denies the CLECs' Objection; and (ii) declares the portions of AT&T's Comments that AT&T Florida has identified as proprietary confidential business information to be considered and treated as such pursuant to Section 364.183, Florida Statutes and other applicable law.

Respectfully submitted this 10thth day of February 2009.

E. EARL EDENFIELD TRACY W. HATCH MANUAL L. GURDIAN 150 So. Monroe Street, Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301

ROBERT A. CULPEPPER

AT&T Midtown Center

Suite 4300

675 W. Peachtree St., NE

Atlanta, GA 30375

(404) 335-0841

(850) 577-5508

Attorneys for AT&T Florida

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Docket No. 000121A-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via

Electronic Mail and U.S. Mail the 10th day of February, 2009 to the following:

Adam Teitzman
Staff Counsel
Lisa Harvey
Florida Public Service
Commission
Division of Legal Services
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Tel. No. (850) 413-6175
Fax. No. (850) 413-6250
ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us
Isharvey@psc.state.fl.us

Howard E. (Gene) Adams
Pennington, Moore, Wilkinson,
Bell & Dunbar, P.A.
Post Office Box 10095 (32302)
215 South Monroe Street, 2nd Floor
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tel. No. (850) 222-3533
Fax. No. (850) 222-2126
gene@penningtonlawfirm.com
Represents Time Warner

David Konuch
Senior Counsel
Regulatory Law & Technology
Florida Cable Telecomm. Assoc.
246 East 6th Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32303
Tel. No. (850) 681-1990
Fax. No. (850) 681-9676
dkonuch@fcta.com

Douglas C. Nelson
Sprint Nextel
233 Peachtree Street, NE
Suite 2200
Atlanta, GA 30303
Tel. No. 404 649-0003
Fax No. 404 649-0009
douglas.c.nelson@sprint.com

Vicki Gordon Kaufman
Keefe Anchors Gordon & Moyle P.A.
The Perkins House
118 N. Gadsden St.
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tel. No. (850) 681-3828
Fax. No. (850) 681-8788
vkaufman@kagmlaw.com
Represents Cebyond
Represents Deltacom

Dulaney O'Roark III (+)
Vice Pres. & Gen. Counsel – SE Region
Verizon
5055 N Point Parkway
Alpharetta, GA 30022
Tel. No. (678) 259-1449
Fax No. (678) 259-1589
De.ORoark@verizon.com

D. Anthony Mastando
DeltaCom
VP-Regulatory Affairs
Senior Regulatory Counsel
Ste 400
7037 Old Madison Pike
Huntsville, AL 35806
Tel. No. (256) 382-3856
Fax No. (256) 382-3936
tony.mastando@deltacom.com

Beth Keating
Akerman Law Firm
106 East College Avenue
Suite 1200
Tallahassee, FL 32301
beth.keating@akerman.com

Ms. Katherine K. Mudge
Covad Communications Company
7000 N. MoPac Expressway, Floor 2
Austin, TX 78731
Tel. No. (512) 514-6380
Fax No. (512) 514-6520
kmudge@covad.com

Cbeyond Communications, LLC Charles E. (Gene) Watkins 320 Interstate North Parkway Suite 30 Atlanta, GA 30339 Tel. No. (678) 370- 2174 Fax No. (978) 424-2500 gene.watkins@cbeyond.net

Time Warner
Carolyn Ridley
555 Church Street, Ste. 2300
Nashville, TN 37219
Tel. No. (615) 376-6404
Fax. No. (615) 376-6405
carolyn.ridley@twtelecom.com

Susan J Berlin NuVox 2 N Main St Greenville, Sc 29601 Tel No (864) 331 7323 sberlin@nuvox.com

Robert A. Culpepper

(+) Signed Protective Agreement