

1		BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
2		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF W. KEITH MILNER
3		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
4		DOCKET NO. 990649-TP
5		June 29, 2000
6		
7	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, YOUR BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND
8		YOUR POSITION WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
9		(BELLSOUTH).
10		
11	Α.	My name is W. Keith Milner. My business address is 675 West Peachtree
12		Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30375. I am Senior Director - Interconnection
13		Services for BellSouth. I have served in my present role since February
14		1996, and have been involved with the management of certain issues
15		related to local interconnection, resale, and unbundling.
16		
17	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME W. KEITH MILNER WHO FILED DIRECT
18		TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
19		
20	Α.	Yes.
21		
22	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
23		
24	Α.	I will respond to portions of the testimony of Supra Telecommunications &
25		Information Systems, Inc. (Supra Telecom) witness David Nilson.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07984 JUN 298

FPSC-RECORDED. 004228

ON PAGE 4 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. NILSON STATES "ONE SUCH 2 Q. FEATURE IS THE ABILITY OF THE PORT (THAT IS THE SWITCH 3 PORTI TO PRODUCE STUTTER DIALTONE, OR ACTIVATE A LIGHT 4 ON THE TELEPHONE SET OF A SUBSCRIBER IN RESPONSE TO A 5 SIGNAL FROM A VOICEMAIL SYSTEM OR PROVIDER TO LET THE 6 TELEPHONE SUBSCRIBER KNOW THERE IS A MESSAGE WAITING. 7 TRADITIONALLY THIS TASK HAS BEEN DONE VIA THE SYSTEM 8 9 MESSAGE DESK INTERFACE (SMDI) AND ENHANCEMENTS TO IT SUCH AS INTER SWITCH VOICE MESSAGING (ISVM) WHICH 10 ALLOWS ONE SWITCH TO PASS MESSAGING REQUESTS ACROSS 11 THE NETWORK TO OTHER SWITCHES WITHOUT THE USE OF A 12 DEDICATED NETWORK." DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. NILSON'S 13 DESCRIPTION OF SMDI AND ISVM? 14 15 Yes, to an extent. I wish to explain, however, that neither SMDI or ISVM 16 Α. are themselves call related databases. Neither are SMDI or ISVM 17 themselves signaling networks, though it is possible to use SMDI or ISVM 18 in conjunction with signaling systems such as Signaling System 7 (SS7). 19 20 Q. ON PAGE 4 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. NILSON STATES HIS 21 APPARENT BELIEF THAT SMDI AND ISVM ARE FUNCTIONS 22 PROVIDED BY THE SWITCH PORT. DO YOU AGREE? 23 24

i

004229

- A. Yes. Both SMDI and ISVM capabilities are available to Supra Telecom or
 any ALEC (Alternative Local Exchange Carrier) when that ALEC acquires
 unbundled local switching from BellSouth.
- Q. ON PAGE 4 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. NILSON ASSERTS THAT IN
 FLORIDA THERE IS NO UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO SMDI OR ISVM.
 DO YOU AGREE?
- 8

No. If I correctly read Mr. Nilson's testimony, he seems to say that Supra Α. 9 Telecom cannot acquire access to SMDI or ISVM on an unbundled basis. 10 He is incorrect. Supra Telecom or any other ALEC need simply acquire 11 unbundled local switching from BellSouth and thus gain access to SMDI or 12 ISVM functionality. If, on the other hand, Mr. Nilson is advocating a new 13 unbundled network element called unbundled SMDI or unbundled ISVM, I 14 believe there is no need for such a new offering since the functionality is 15 already available via unbundled local switching. 16

17

18Q.ON PAGE 5 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. NILSON STATES "BELLSOUTH19DOES NOT PROVIDE UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO THIS SIGNALING20NETWORK, BUT IN THEIR FFC #1 [sic] ACCESS TARIFF LISTS SMDI21AND SOMETHING CALLED ISMDI." IS MR. NILSON CORRECT THAT22BELLSOUTH DOES NOT OFFER UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO ITS23SIGNALING NETWORK?

1	A.	No, he is mistaken. First, the FCC, for example in its decision in
2		BellSouth's second Louisiana 271 application, found that BellSouth offers
3		nondiscriminatory access to its signaling network as required by the
4		Telecommunications Act of 1996. Second, although Mr. Nilson then
5		opines that SMDI is not as cost effective for an ALEC as using ISVM,
6		both SMDI and ISMDI offer advantages to users of those services.
7		BellSouth's Access Tariffs offer a variety of services, and no one service is
8		"best" in every case. BellSouth endeavors to have a wide product range
9		in order to be able to offer customers the services they want. If Supra
10		Telecom wants to purchase SMDI from BellSouth's Access Tariff, Supra
11		Telecom is free to do so. If Supra Telecom prefers ISMDI to SMDI, Supra
12		Telecom is free to purchase ISMDI via BellSouth's Access Tariff.
13		
13 14	Q.	ON PAGE 5 OF HIS TESTIMONY MR. NILSON STATES "NOWHERE IS
	Q.	ON PAGE 5 OF HIS TESTIMONY MR. NILSON STATES "NOWHERE IS THERE ANY MENTION OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE ISVM
14	Q.	
14 15	Q.	THERE ANY MENTION OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE ISVM
14 15 16	Q.	THERE ANY MENTION OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE ISVM SIGNALING, OR UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO ANY SIGNALING
14 15 16 17	Q.	THERE ANY MENTION OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE ISVM SIGNALING, OR UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO ANY SIGNALING REQUIRED TO ACTIVE MWI [THAT IS, MESSAGE WAITING
14 15 16 17 18	Q.	THERE ANY MENTION OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE ISVM SIGNALING, OR UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO ANY SIGNALING REQUIRED TO ACTIVE MWI [THAT IS, MESSAGE WAITING INDICATOR] ON A LEASED LOCAL SWITCHING PORT. THESE
14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	THERE ANY MENTION OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE ISVM SIGNALING, OR UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO ANY SIGNALING REQUIRED TO ACTIVE MWI [THAT IS, MESSAGE WAITING INDICATOR] ON A LEASED LOCAL SWITCHING PORT. THESE OMISSIONS ARE CREATING AN UNUSUALLY HIGH BARRIER TO
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	THERE ANY MENTION OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE ISVM SIGNALING, OR UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO ANY SIGNALING REQUIRED TO ACTIVE MWI [THAT IS, MESSAGE WAITING INDICATOR] ON A LEASED LOCAL SWITCHING PORT. THESE OMISSIONS ARE CREATING AN UNUSUALLY HIGH BARRIER TO ENTRY FOR AN ALEC LIKE SUPRA TELECOM WHO IS EXPECTED BY
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	THERE ANY MENTION OF DIRECT ACCESS TO THE ISVM SIGNALING, OR UNBUNDLED ACCESS TO ANY SIGNALING REQUIRED TO ACTIVE MWI [THAT IS, MESSAGE WAITING INDICATOR] ON A LEASED LOCAL SWITCHING PORT. THESE OMISSIONS ARE CREATING AN UNUSUALLY HIGH BARRIER TO ENTRY FOR AN ALEC LIKE SUPRA TELECOM WHO IS EXPECTED BY TELEPHONE SUBSCRIBERS TO PROVIDE THE SAME SERVICES AS

Α. 1 First of all, I assume that when Mr. Nilson said, "Nowhere is there any mention of direct access..." that he is again referring to BellSouth's Access 2 Tariff. If I am correct, then there is no need in the section of the Access 3 Tariff where BellSouth offers SMDI or ISMDI for the Access Tariff to 4 discuss how an ALEC such as Supra Telecom can gain access to 5 BellSouth's signaling network on an unbundled basis. Likewise, there is 6 no need for BellSouth's Access Tariff discussions of SMDI or ISMDI to 7 inform Supra Telecom as to how to avail itself of unbundled local 8 switching. Thus I believe that Mr. Nilson is mistaken when he says that to 9 not have such discussions in BellSouth's Access Tariffs have the effect of 10 "creating an unusually high barrier to entry for an ALEC such as Supra 11 12 Telecom..." Surely Mr. Nilson is aware of the difference in Access Services and unbundled network elements. If his suggestion is that 13 BellSouth should offer its Access Services at Total Element Long Run 14 Incremental Cost (TELRIC) based rates, he is mistaken. 15

16

· •

Q. ON PAGE 6 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. NILSON STATES "ALEC 17 ACCESS TO THE ISVM SIGNALING 'NETWORK' SHOULD BE 18 DEFINED AS A FUNDAMENTAL COMPONENT OF LOCAL SWITCHING 19 LINE AND TRUNK PORTS AND ALEC ACCESS TO THIS NETWORK 20 **REQUIRED OF AND PROVIDED BY ALL FLORIDA ILECS AS IT IS** 21 ELSEWHERE IN THE COUNTRY." DOES BELLSOUTH OPERATE AN 22 "ISVM SIGNALING NETWORK" AS MR. NILSON PURPORTS? 23 24

004232

No. BellSouth uses SS7 network architecture for its switch-to-switch Α. 1 signaling needs. SS7 networks are multifunctional, and there is no need 2 for a separate ISVM signaling network as Mr. Nilson's statement implies. 3 Instead, BellSouth's SS7 network handles all inter-switch signaling using 4 industry standard signaling message formats. If Supra Telecom wants to 5 acquire unbundled local switching and then use the SMDI and ISMDI 6 functionality of that unbundled local switching, Supra Telecom is free to do 7 so. If Supra Telecom wants to acquire unbundled signaling, it is free to do 8 that as well. BellSouth provides both unbundled local switching and 9 unbundled access to its signaling network to Supra Telecom and every 10 other ALEC in Florida. Thus, I strongly deny Mr. Nilson's assertion that 11 BellSouth has artificially created barriers to competition. To the contrary, 12 BellSouth has unbundled its network according to the requirements of the 13 FCC and this Commission. If Mr. Nilson envisions some new unbundled 14 network element that he believes BellSouth should provide, he has failed 15 in explaining what that new unbundled network element would be. If he is 16 attempting to simply re-price access services at TELRIC based rates, I 17 believe his proposal should be rejected out of hand. 18

19

Q. ON PAGE 7 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. NILSON IMPLIES THAT SOME
NEW FORM OF DIRECT ACCESS TO LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY
(LNP) QUERY SERVICE SHOULD BE PROVIDED AND STATES
"THERE IS NO WAY FOR AN ALEC TO DIRECTLY PROVISION LNP
TRANSLATIONS..." PLEASE RESPOND.

25

A. Mr. Nilson is incorrect. Supra Telecom is free to create its own LNP
database, as have numerous ALECs. Or Supra Telecom is free to
subscribe to the LNP database service offered by commercial providers.
Or Supra Telecom is free to subscribe use BellSouth's LNP Query Service
to meet its call routing responsibilities.

6

BellSouth's LNP Query Service is a call related database service that is 7 used by local carriers and other carriers who do not choose to build their 8 own LNP database. LNP Query Service allows an ALEC to query the 9 BellSouth LNP database on a real time, call related basis to obtain LNP 10 routing information. The information in BellSouth's LNP database is 11 obtained from Nuestar, the National LNP Administrator. This is the same 12 information that is downloaded to all LNP database owners, and Nuestar, 13 not BellSouth, controls distribution. BellSouth does not enter information 14 related to routing ported numbers directly into its own LNP database, but 15 rather receives a download of the information from Nuestar, just as every 16 other LNP database owner does. 17

18

BellSouth's LNP Query Service has nothing to do with the actual porting of
numbers by the switches involved, but rather provides a method for
carriers without an LNP database to be able to fulfill their call processing
responsibilities. BellSouth's LNP Query Service has been offered under
its FCC Tariff Number 1 since the fourth quarter of 1998. BellSouth
currently has thirty-five customers for this service. This service is not
ordered via a Local Service Request (LSR), but rather is ordered using a

specific set of implementation forms available to ALECs and other carriers from their assigned BellSouth Account Manager.

If Mr. Nilson's reference to directly provisioning LNP translations relates to 4 the porting of numbers, I fail to understand his concern. BellSouth must 5 know of Supra Telecom's intentions with regard to individual Supra 6 Telecom end user customers. If Supra Telecom wishes to port a number 7 from BellSouth, Supra Telecom must include that information on its LSR 8 (Local Service Request) to BellSouth, and then perform its responsibilities 9 along with BellSouth in conducting the loop cutover process with LNP, a 10 topic that has been scrutinized in exhaustive detail in other proceedings П before this Commission. 12

13

1

2

3

Q. ON PAGE 7 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. NILSON DISCUSSES THE LINE
 INFORMATION DATABASE (LIDB) AS PART OF HIS EARLIER
 DISCUSSION OF LNP QUERY SERVICE. ARE LNP QUERY SERVICE
 AND LIDB RELATED?

18

A. No. Without explanation, Mr. Nilson jumps to the subject of LIDB access
 so I cannot fathom the relationship to his earlier testimony. He seems to
 be advocating ALEC access to the call related database referred to as
 LIDB (which BellSouth already provides), but I cannot tell what, if any,
 issue Mr. Nilson has regarding BellSouth's provision of access to LIDB.

25 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

004235

· .

2 A. Yes.

004236

· •