1		BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
2		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF W. KEITH MILNER
3		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
4		DOCKET No. 980281-TP
5		June 29, 1998
6		
7	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS, AND POSITION WITH
·8	•	BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
9		
10	A.	My name is W. Keith Milner. My business address is 675 West Peachtree
11		Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30375. I am Senior Director - Interconnection
12		Services for BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth" or "the
13		Company"). I have served in my present role since February, 1996, and
14		have been involved with the management of certain issues related to local
15		interconnection, resale and unbundling.
16		
17	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME W. KEITH MILNER WHO EARLIER FILED
18		DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET?
19		
20	A.	Yes.
21		
22	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY BEING
23		FILED TODAY?
24		
25	A.	I will respond to the direct testimony of Mr. Bryan Green and Mr. Ronald

1 Martinez on behalf of MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc. 2 ("MCImetro") as it relates to Issues 8, 10, 12, and 13 of the complaint filed 3 by MCImetro. 4 5 Issue 8: Has BellSouth provided MCImetro with firm order 6 confirmations (FOCs) in compliance with the Telecommunications 7 Act of 1996 and the parties' Interconnection Agreement? If not, what 8 action, if any, should the Florida Public Service Commission (the 9 "Commission") take? 10 11 12 Q. WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO THE TESTIMONY OF MR. GREEN 13 AND MR. MARTINEZ THAT BELLSOUTH IS NOT RETURNING FIRM 14 ORDER CONFIRMATIONS (FOCS) ON A TIMELY BASIS? 15 A. 16 As I explained in my direct testimony, MCI has inappropriately applied the 17 standards applicable under its Interconnection Agreement with BellSouth 18 to Off-Net T-1 lines which are ordered under the provision of the Access 19 Tariff. This is confirmed in a letter dated June 1, 1998 from Mr. Walter J. 20 Schmidt, Senior Manager, Southern Financial Operations - Carrier 21 Agreements, MCI Telecommunications Corporation, to Ms. Pam Lee. 22 Sales Assistant Vice President, MCI Account Team, BellSouth Interconnection Services. At the end of the first paragraph, Mr. Schmidt 23 24 states "....MCIm had to resort to ordering T-1s from BellSouth's Interstate 25 Access Tariff." This letter is attached to my testimony as Exhibit WKM-7.

'		Monnetto's ordering procedures were further clarified by Mr. Martifiez in
2		his testimony in Tennessee (Docket 97-00309, Transcript of Proceeding
3		5/28/98, Volume XI A, Page 5) as follows: "The reason that we use the
4		ASR function for interconnection trunks is that they become really under
5		the jurisdiction of the dedicated account team on the long distance side,
6		who baby-sit and make sure that the trunks go in and everything is done
7		perfectly well."
,8	•	
9	Q.	TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, IS THERE A REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE
10		FOCS ON INTERSTATE ACCESS ORDERS?
11		
12	A.	No.
13		
14	Q.	TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, IS THERE A REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE
15		FOCS ON "OFF-NET T-1s"?
16		
17	A.	No.
18		
19	Q.	COULD MCIMETRO HAVE ORDERED A SERVICE THROUGH THE
20		LCSC WHICH WOULD HAVE BEEN SUBJECT TO THE FOC
21		REQUIREMENT AND ATTAINED THE SAME LEVEL OF TECHNICAL
22		FUNCTIONALITY?
23		•
24		
25		

1	A.	Yes. As I stated at page 4 of my direct testimony, MCImetro may order as
2		a resold service BellSouth's Megalink service at the Commission
3		approved discount rate.
4		
5		
6		Issue 10: Has BellSouth provided MCImetro with local tandem
7		interconnection information in compliance with the
8		Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act") and the parties'
9		interconnection agreement? If not, what action, if any should the
10		Commission take?
11		·
12	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO MR. MARTINEZ'S STATEMENT ON
13		PAGE 18 OF HIS DIRECT TESTIMONY THAT BELLSOUTH HAS
14		FAILED TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY INFORMATION TO PERMIT
15		MCIMETRO TO INTERCONNECT AT LOCAL TANDEMS?
16		
17	Α.	Mr. Martinez is apparently misinformed. As set forth in my direct
18		testimony, BellSouth responded on December 10, 1997 to MCImetro's
19		request for a list of Georgia offices which subtend local tandems.
20		BellSouth is not aware of a similar request for the state of Florida, but, in
21		an effort to be cooperative, the information is shown in Exhibit WKM-8
22		which is attached to my testimony. Further, MCImetro may obtain from
23		Bellcore the Local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG), the national routing
24		data base that contains, among other things, the NPA/NXX's that are
25		associated with local tandems.

•		\cdot
2		ISSUE 12: HAS BELLSOUTH PROVIDED MCImetro WITH ACCESS
3		TO DIRECTORY LISTING INFORMATION IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE
4		TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 AND THE PARTIES'
5		INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT? IF NOT, WHAT ACTION, IF ANY
6		SHOULD THE COMMISSION TAKE?
7		
8	Q.	WHAT IS BELLSOUTH'S RESPONSE TO MR. MARTINEZ'S
9		STATEMENT ON PAGE 22 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT THE
10		TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 BELLSOUTH PROVIDED
11		BELLSOUTH WITH THE AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE THE LISTINGS OF
12		INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE COMPANIES?
13		
14	A.	BellSouth understands MCImetro's desires in this matter. BellSouth
15		wishes it were in a legal position to provide all local service providers'
16		listings. As my direct testimony at page 16 & 17 sets forth, BellSouth has
17		gone to considerable efforts to seek permission to amend its
18		interconnection agreements with those local service providers which
19		prohibit release of their listing information to third parties. Since my direct
20		testimony was filed, AT&T has responded requesting more information or
21		the matter, and Sprint has responded that it does not wish to amend its
22		current interconnection agreement. Their correspondence is attached to
23		my testimony as Exhibits WKM-9 and WKM-10. Thus, at the time of filing
24		this testimony, the following ALECs still have provisions in their

interconnection agreements with BellSouth preventing the inclusion of

1		their listings in Belisouth's DADS and DADAS services:
2		ALLTEL of Florida
3		• AT&T
4		 Golden Harbor of Florida, Ind. d/b/a Hometown Telephone
5		• Sprint
6		
7	Q.	HAS MCImetro ATTEMPTED TO OBTAIN THE LISTINGS OF OTHER
.8	•	COMPANIES DIRECTLY FROM THOSE COMPANIES?
9		
10	A.	Apparently so. In theTennessee 271 proceeding (Docket 97-00309,
11		Transcript of Proceeding, 5/28/98, Volume XI A, Page 21) in response to
12		the question "Has MCI approached these seven or eight CLECs or
13		independents to get access to those customer listings?", Mr. Martinez
14	-	replied "Yes, we have repeatedly. That's one of the problems when we -
15		and I'll draw a parallel to billing contracts that we tried to do with
16		independents. It took us - it's been taking us now five years. We still do
17		not have all independents on billing contracts. We know from experience
18		that this process of going out individually versus through a common
19		database is just lengthy and just prolongs our ability to provide that
20		service to customers."
21		
22		While I understand MCImetro's frustration at not having complete
23		directory information available for its use, the decision by third party
24		companies with regard to the use of their listing information should not be
25		imposed as an issue related to BellSouth's adherence to its

'		interconnection agreement with Monnetto. Rather, McIntello Should
2		support a generic proceeding by this Commission as discussed on page
3		17 of my direct testimony.
4		
5		
6		ISSUE 13: HAS BELLSOUTH PROVIDED MCImetro WITH SOFT DIAL
7		TONE SERVICE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE
8		TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 AND THE PARTIES'
9		INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT? IF NOT, WHAT ACTION, IF ANY,
10		SHOULD THE COMMISSION TAKE?
11		
12	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO MR. MARTINEZ'S
13		RECOMMENDATION ON PAGE 23 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT
14		BELLSOUTH CHANGE THE WORDING ON THE ANNOUNCEMENT
15		PROVIDED ON ITS SOFT DIAL TONE SERVICE?
16		
17	A.	BellSouth believes that its current message, which was edited and revised
18		to address regulatory and competitive concerns, is competitively neutral
19		and is therefore in compliance with its interconnection agreement with
20		MCImetro. As outlined in my direct testimony, the FCC's Order 97-418,
21		Section VII does not prohibit a Bell Operating Company from mentioning
22		its own name. It must be borne in mind that once the ALEC disconnects
23		its subscriber from the line, the ALEC no longer bears any of the costs of
24		maintaining the line. The cost becomes completely the responsibility of
25		BellSouth. Therefore, it is only reasonable that BellSouth retain the

opportunity to mention the availability of its service. Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY? A. Yes. ,8

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
Florida Docket No. 980281-TP
Exhibit WKM-7
Page 1 of 2



MCI Telecommunications Corporation Two Northwinds Corner 2529 Northwinds Furkway Alpharetta, GA 30004

June 1, 1998

Ms. Pam Lee Sales Assistant Vice President, MCI Account Team BellSouth Interconnection Services 1960 W. Exchange Place Suite 420 Tucker, Georgia 30084

Re: Notice that MCIm will be ordering Interconnection T-1s pursuant to the MCIm/BellSouth Interconnection Agreement and demand for credit.

Dear Ms. Lee:

As you know, on November 10, 1997, MCIm requested that BellSouth provide to MCIm combinations of unbundled network elements (UNEs) generally consisting of the following elements: 4-wire DS-1 local loop and DS-1 dedicated transport per mile and per termination. For convenience purposes, I will refer to such combinations as Interconnection T-1s. MCIm made this request pursuant to the provisions of the MCIm/BellSouth Interconnection Agreement which require BellSouth to provide to MCIm UNE combinations at UNE rates. Despite the plain tanguage contained in the Agreement, BellSouth refused to provide these UNE combinations to MCIm. Because MCIm had no other way to order these loops, and thus serve our customers, MCIm had to resort to ordering T-1s from BellSouth's Interstate Access Tarriff.

As you may be aware, the Florida Public Service Commission has recently affirmed MCIm's interpretation of the Agreement on this point, <u>i.e.</u>, BellSouth is under an obligation to provide UNE combinations to MCIm at the sum of the stand alone UNE rates contained in the Agreement. <u>See</u> FPSC Docket No. 971140-TP. Indeed, the Commission ruled that the rates for combinations could be less than the sum of the rates of the component elements since duplicate charges and charges for services not needed should be removed from the combination rates.

Based on the above, this is to officially notify BellSouth that MCIm will be migrating our local T-1s currently ordered from the Interstate Access Tariff to UNE combinations from the Florida Interconnection Agreement. Further, BellSouth should treat all T-1 orders currently being processed as requests for Interconnection T-1s at the interconnection rates. BellSouth should also convert the billing of the existing T-

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Florida Docket No. 980281-TP Exhibit WKM-7 Page 2 of 2

June 1, 1998

1s from the access rate to the Florida interconnection rates. Finally, MCIm is requesting credits for all T-1s ordered from November 10, 1997 to the present. This credit will be the difference between the pricing of the T-1 access rate and the price of the component UNEs at the interconnection prices. (e.g. During this time period, the recurring rates for DS-1 local loops was \$80.00 per month. For DS-1 Dedicated Transport it was \$1.60 per mile and \$59.75 per termination.)

MCIm would like to schedule a meeting to discuss in more detail the processes involved in migrating the existing T-1s to UNEs and ordering Interconnection T-1s in the future. MCIm requests this meeting no later than June 10, 1996.

If you have any questions regarding MCIm's position on this matter please give me a call to discuss. I can be reached at (770) 625-6849.

Sincerely,

Watter J. Schmidt Senior Manager

Southern Financial Operations - Carrier Agreements

2 Schills

CC:

Ilene Barnett
Charlene Keys
Daren Moore
Daniel Fry
Andri Weathersby
Vernon Starr

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Florida Docket No. 980281-TP Exhibit WKM-8 Page 1 of 2

BellSouth Local Tandems and Subtending Offices In Florida

Fort Lauderdale/		do	Miami/Dade	
Plantation				
FTLDFLPL13T	ORLDFLMA34T	SNFRFLMA32T	MIAMEI DRIGT	
DRBHFLMADS0	ALSPFLXA32T	DBRYFLDLDS0	MIAMFLRR1GT HMSTFLHMDS0	
FTLDFLAMCM1	ALSPFLXADS0	DBRYFLMARS1	MIAMFLAEDS0	
FTLDFLCR56E	EORNFLMARS0	GENVFLMARS0	MIAMFLAL63E	
FTLDFLCYDS0	(Effective 7/18/98)	LKMRFLABRS0	MIAMFLAPDS0	
FTLDFLFTCM1	CSLBFLXADS1	LKMRFLMADS0	MIAMFLBA85E	
FTLDFLJADS0	GLRDFLXADS0	ORCYFLXADS0	MIAMFLBCDS0	
FTLDFLMRDS0	KSSMFLXA32T	ORLDFLAPDS0	MIAMFLBRDS0	
FTLDFLNPRSO	KSSMFLXADS0	ORLDFLCLDS0	MIAMFLCADS0	
FTLDFLOADS0	KSSMFLXADS1	ORLDFLMA42E	MIAMFLFLDS0	
FTLDFLPLDSO	LKBNFLXADS0	ORLDFLMADS1	MIAMFLGRDS0	
FTLDFLSGDS0	LKBRFLXADS1	ORLDFLPCDS0	MIAMFLGRDS1	
FTLDFLSU74E	LKMRFLMADS0	ORLDFLPHDS0	MIAMFLHLDS0	
FTLDFLTBCM1	MTLDFLXADS1	ORLDFLSADS0	MIAMFLIC86E	
FTLDFLWNDS0	ORLDFLAPDS0	OVIDFLCADS0	MIAMFLKEDS0	
HLWDFLHA45E	ORLDFLCLDS0	SNFRFLMADS0	MIAMFLME32E	
HLWDFLMADS0	ORLDFLMA42E	SNFRFLMADS1	MIAMFLNMDS0	
HLWDFLPEDS0	ORLDFLMADS1		MIAMFLNSDS0	
HLWDFLWHDS0	ORLDFLPCDS0		MIAMFLOL68E	
PMBHFLCSDS0	ORLDFLPHDSO		MIAMFLPB88E	
PMBHFLFECG0	ORLDFLSADS0		MIAMFLPLDS0	
(To be deleted 9/99)	OVIDFLCADS0		MIAMFLRRDS0	
PMBHFLFEDS0	STCDFLXADS0		MIAMFLSH75E	
(To be added 9/99)	STCDFLXARS0		MIAMFLSO59E	
PMBHFLMADS0			MIAMFLWDDS0	
PMBHFLTADS0			MIAMFLWM26E	
			NDADFLAC94E	
			NDADFLBR62E	
			(CUTS 7/98)	
			NDADFLBRDS0	
*			(NEW SWITCH 7/98)	
*			NDADFLGGDS0	
			NDADFLOL93E	
			(CUTS 11/98)	
			NDADFLOLDS0	
			(NEW SWITCH 11/98)	
			PRRNFLMADS0	

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Florida Docket No. 980281-TP Exhibit WKM-8 Page 2 of 2

BeilSouth Local Tandems and Subtending Offices In Florida

Gainesville	Jacksonville	Pensacola
GSVLFLMA35T	JCVLFLCL55T	PNCYFLMA32T
ARCHFLMARS0	BLDWFLMARS0	PNCYFLCARS0
BRKRFLXADS0	CLHNFLXADS0	PNCYFLMADS0
BRSNFLMARS0	FRBHFLFPDS0	TAFBFLXADS0
CDKYFLMARS0	FTGRFLMARS0	
CFLDFLMARS0	GCSPFLCNDS0	PNSCFLBL32T
CSCYFLBARS0	JCBHFLABR\$0	BRTOALMADS0
GSVLFLMADS0	JCBHFLMA24E	CNTMFLLEDS1
GSVLFLMADS1	JCBHFLMADS0	GLBRFLMCDS0
GSVLFLNW33E	JCBHFLSPRS0	JAYFLMARS0
HGSPFLXADS0	JCVLFLARDS0	MLTNFLRADS0
HWTHFLMARS0	JCVLFLBWDS0	MNSNFLMARS0
KYHGFLMARS0	JCVLFLCLDS0	PACEFLPVRS0
LKBTFLXADS0	JCVLFLCLDS1	PNSCFLBL43E
LVOKFLXADS0	JCVLFLFCDS0	PNSCFLFPDS0
MCNPFLMARS0	JCVLFLIARS0	PNSCFLHCRS0
MLRSFLXADS0	JCVLFLJTRS0	PNSCFLPBDS0
NWBYFLMARS0	JCVLFLLF76E	PNSCFLWADS0
OLTWFLLNRS0	JCVLFLNODS0	
TRENFLMARS0	JCVLFLOWDS0	
WALDFLXADS0	JCVLFLRV38E	
	JCVLFLSJ73E	
	JCVLFLSMDS0	
	JCVLFLWCDS0	
	MCLNFLXADS1	
	MDBGFLPMDS0	
	MNDRFLAVDS0	
	MNDRFLLODS0	
_	MNDRFLLWRS0	
*	MXVLFLMARS0	
	ORPKFLMA26E	
	ORPKFLRWDS0	
	PNVDFLMADS0	
	STAGFLWGRS0	
	YULEFLMARS0	

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Florida Docket No. 980281-TP Exhibit WKM-9 Page 1 of 1



Parnels A. Nelson

Room 12N54 1200 Peachtree St. NE Atlanta, GA 30309 404 810-3100

June 2, 1998

Ms. Susan Arrington
Manager - Interconnection Services/Pricing
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
Room 34S91 BellSouth Center
675 West Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30375

Re: AT&T's Directory Listing information

Dear Susan:

I am responding to your letter dated April 21, 1998, regarding an amendment to the BellSouth/AT&T Interconnection Agreement to allow BellSouth to provide AT&T's Directory Listing Information to third parties.

Before AT&T can determine whether or not to amend Section 21.2 of the General Terms and Conditions of the BellSouth/AT&T Interconnection Agreement, further information is required from BellSouth. According to your letter, BellSouth has received requests from CLECs and other third parties to provide AT&T directory assistance listings in the BellSouth Directory Assistance Database Service (DADS) offering. Specifically, please identify the companies making these requests. Secondly, how will BellSouth plan to compensate AT&T for its portion of the revenue received by BellSouth on each DADS offering.

Your written response to my questions by June 10, 1998 would be appreciated. If you prefer to establish a meeting to discuss my questions, please let me know.

Sincerely.

Jamela afstran

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
Florida Docket No. 980281-TP
Exhibit WKM-10
Page 1 of 1

Susan M. Arrington /AL, BRHM03 6/10/98 7:08

Page 1

MESSAGE

Subject: BST/Sprint Louisiana Agreement

Sender: MClosz@igate.sprint.com

Contents: 3

Dated: 6/9/98 at 10:21

Item 1

FROM: MClosz@igate.sprint.com

TO: Susan M. Arrington /AL, BRHM03

Item 2

ARPA MESSAGE HEADER

Item 3

Susan,

A few more areas to "close" for our Louisiana agreement:

General Terms, 1A- Prices for UNE Combinations Sprint agrees to the BellSouth proposed language given that it is consistent with the arbitration decisions in Louisiana.

General Terms, Section 15- Dispute Resolution I believe we discussed this, but to confirm, Sprint agrees to the Section 15 language with the following added to the end of the last sentence of the paragraph, "...as set forth in Attachment 1." This makes this section consistent with the language/approach for dispute resolutions and the language of Attachment 1.

General Terms, Section 20.1- Provision of Directory Listings to Third Parties
Sprint does not wish to re-open negotiations on this section at this time and agrees to implement the language in our Georgia agreement for this section.

General Terms, Section 27.1- Routing to Directory Assistance/Operator Services
Sprint agrees to the BellSouth proposed language given that it is consistent with the arbitration decisions in Louisiana.

Please let me know if you need any additional clarification. I will be in touch later this week to discuss status of the remaining issues. Thanks, Melissa