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COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's go back on the record.

I'd like to do two things. Ms. Edwards, would you remind me when Mr. Wood gets on the stand that we will need to swear him in?

MS. EDWARDS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: And I understand that there are errata sheets to depositions. What we'll do is mark that as a composite exhibit. We'll mark it as Exhibit 15, and when we have compiled all those sheets, let's copy them and hand them out. I guess the most important thing is to make sure the court reporter has them and then at that time we will move them into the record, okay? Is that how you wanted to do it?

MS. CALDWELL: Some will be late-filed that we will not have today.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
MS. CALDWELL: Others we will have today.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. We'll make 15 a late-filed exhibit, and it will simply be when we get them altogether, we will --

MS. CALDWELL: We will forward it.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll admit them in the record now subject to objection. I don't imagine there will be one, but if there is, let me or the prehearing officer know, okay? Errata sheets is a Late-filed Exhibit 15, and we'll admit it into the record at this time subject to objection.

I would also like to get some feel for time frames, and I quess it would be appropriate to ask. Bellsouth, how much time do you estimate for each witness of DeltaCom? How much cross examination do you estimate?

MR. ALEXANDER: That's very difficult to do because you don't know about the responses you get, but I would estimate no more than a half hour for probably Mr. Thomas and half a hour probably for Mr. Wood and maybe, maybe between a half an hour to an hour for Mr. Hyde.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Staff, how about you?

MS. CALDWELL: I think that we're along the same lines. Probably a half an hour or so for Mr. Thomas. Mr. Hyde is going to take a while, and Mr. Wood maybe half an hour or less.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Let me ask ITC^DeltaCom. Do you have any estimate on cross
examination for BellSouth's witnesses?

MR. ADELMAN: I can give you very rough numbers, Commissioner. I don't anticipate we will reach them today, and what I'd like to be able to do is look through the testimony and consider what will be stricken, and that will pretty much drive the time estimates.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. I would appreciate that because $I$ think -- and I particularly want to know if there are no questions for a witness. We've had that occur before where we've kept a witness here and it works out that we have no questions for them, and certainly it's probably not efficient to do it that way. I think what $I$ propose to do is not to go too late today, but you might anticipate starting early -- I guess we can't start early tomorrow, can we? We have a breakfast.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We can start at nine if you want to.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a meeting at nine. We'll start tomorrow at $9: 30$, but you can anticipate we will have a full day and possibly go late if it appears we can finish it tomorrow. All right. I see heads nodding, so we're going to go that way.

The next witness is Mr. Thomas; is that

```
    correct?
        MR. ADELMAN: That is correct, Your Honor.
        COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
        MR. ADELMAN: We call Michael Thomas to the
        stand.
        Mr. Thomas, you've previously been sworn,
        correct?
        WITNESS THOMAS: That's correct.
```



```
Whereupon,
                                MICHAEL E. THOMAS
was called as a witness by ITC^DeltaCom and, after being
first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
    DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ADELMAN:
    Q Can you please state your full name for the
record?
    A Michael E. Thomas.
    Q And by whom are you employed?
    A ITC^DeltaCom.
    And are you the same Michael Thomas that caused
```

to be prefiled on August 16 th, 1999 in this docket 19 pages of question and answer direct prefiled testimony?

A That's correct.

Q And did you have one exhibit -- excuse me, two exhibits attached to that testimony?

A That's correct.
MR. ADELMAN: Commissioner Clark, what I'd like
to do at this time is spend just a moment going
through the portions of Mr. Thomas's direct
testimony that the parties agree, based on the
Commission's previous ruling, should not be
considered in this case.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go ahead.

BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):
Q If I could ask you to turn to Page 5 of your direct testimony, beginning at Line 4 , immediately after the colon, "ability to," that first item, Number 1 , "Parse Customer Service Records, (CSRs), should be deleted -- or stricken, I should say.

Skipping down to Line 8 , the sentence beginning "By having" should be deleted, so through the word "information," which is in the middle of Line 10. Same page, at Line 15 , in the sentence that begins on that line, the new sentence should read: "The production of the RSAG has already been ordered," so that the words
"the CSR parsing specifications and" should be deleted, and the word "have" should, I think, be changed to the word "has."

On Page 17 -- excuse me, on the bottom of Page 5 in the question, particular on Line 24 , the words "CSR" and the word "and" should be deleted. So that the sentence would read: "With the RSAG information."

Page 6, beginning at Line 16 , through Page 7 , ending at Line 4, should be struck from the record.

Page 12, beginning at Line 5, through Page 15 at Line 2.

MR. ALEXANDER: David?
MR. ADELMAN: Yes.
MR. ALEXANDER: Did you on Page 6 strike the first of the sentence at Lines 12 and 13, "By requesting the CSR?"

MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry, I missed that, but you're correct, Mr. Alexander.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: What was that again?
MR. ADELMAN: It should be on Line 12, Page 6, the words "The CSR and" should be deleted. That's Line 12, Page 6, so that it should read, "By requesting RSAG information." I guess it should be "the RSAG information."

MR. ALEXANDER: Where were you on Page 12?
MR. ADELMAN: Page 12, Line 5, all the way through to Page 15, Line 2 , and picking up again at Page 15 at Line 18, through Page 18, Line 8. And that does it.
BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):
Q Mr. Thomas, considering what's been stricken, do you have any corrections or modifications you'd like to make to what remains of your prefiled direct testimony?
A No, I do not.
Q If I asked you the questions contained in that remaining prefiled testimony today would your answers from the stand be the same?
A Yes, they would.
MR. ADELMAN: Commissioner, I'd ask that Mr. Thomas's remaining prefiled testimony be read into the record as if given orally from the stand today.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: It will be read in the record as though -- it will be inserted in the record as though read.
MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.

Q: PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
A: My name is Michael Thomas. I am Director - Information Services for ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc., ("ITC^DeltaCorn"), and my business address is 8830 U.S. Hwy 231, Arab, Alabama 35016.

Q: PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR BUSINESS EXPERIENCE AND BACKGROUND.

A: I hold a Bachelor of Electrical Engineering from Auburn University. My responsibilities with ITC^DeltaCom include management and oversight for all information systems resources, electronic interfaces to trading partners and the LAN/WAN irfrastructure. I joined ITC^DeltaCom in 1996 as Senior Manager of Information Services Development. I have held various positions in management and software development since 1986.

## Q: WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A: The purpose of my testimony is to describe ITC^DeltaCom's position concerning its requirements for access to BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s ("BST's") Operational Support Systems ("OSS") and related issues. ;

Q: HAVE ANY OF THE ISSUES ADDRESSED IN YOUR TESTIMONY BEEN RESOLVED?

A: Yes. I believe some of the issues have been resolved. Please refer to Exhibit CJR-1 in Mr. Rozycki's Testimony for a list of the issues that

ITC^DeltaCom believes have been resolved. I have included a discussion of these issues in my Testimony because the parties have not formalized the resolution of these issues.

## Q: PLEASE DESCRIBE ITC^DELTACOM'S STATUS WITH BELLSOUTH ON DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING OSS THAT SUPPDRT RESALE AND UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENT ("UNE") ORDERS.

A: ITC^DeltaCom has implemented an expensive, customized version of Electronic Data Interchange ("EDI") in order to send electronic orders for unbundled network elements and certain resale services to BellSouth. ITC^DeltaCom implemented the EDI interface based on BellSouth's affirmations that EDI is its nondiscriminatory OSS interface. As of April 1, 1999, ITC^DeltaCom began sending every order that BellSôuth would accept via EDI. Unfortunately, 20-25\% of the orders that ITC^DeltaCom currently places via EDI are not yet accepted by BellSouth's electronic systems. For instance, EDI does not accept any loop orders that are in a hubbing area. In addition, in areas where permanent local number portability is not available, and an end-user switches to ITC^DeltaCom, ITC^DeltaCom assigns the end-user with an ITC^DeltaCorn telephone number. To ensure that the customer continues to receive his or her telephone calls, an intercept message must be placed on the line. However, EDI does not allow an intercept message to initially be placed on the loop order in this scenario. Therefore, the customer may potentially not receive telephone calls. Due to this limitation in EDI,

ITC^DeltaCom is forced to submit such orders via facsimile. Further, of the $75-80 \%$ of ITC^DeltaCom's orders that are submitted electronically, $62 \%$ of these orders fall out for manual handling by BellSouth. This means that BellSouth's electronic systems are incapable of totally processing approximately $70 \%$ of ITC^DeltaCom's orders. As stated above, ITC^DeltaCom developed EDI, the national standard interface, based on BellSouth's affirmations that EDI is its nondiscriminatory interface. To develop a new BellSouth interface at this point would be cost prohibitive and senseless. ITC^DeltaCom has spent many hours and dollars developing the national industry standard EDI interface.

## ACCESS TO OSS

Q: IS BELLSOUTH PROVIDING NONDISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TOITS OSS?

A: No. BellSouth is not providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS systerns and databases. BellSouth is required by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act"), Federal Communication Commission ("FCC") Orders, and State Commission Orders to provide nondiscriminatory access to OSS functions. Absent an integrated, fully functional EDI interface, BellSouth cannot provide nondiscriminatory access. For instance, ITC^DeltaCorn needs nondiscriminatory access to the pre-ordering information necessary to subrnit accurate orders to BellSouth. Currently, ITC^DeltaCom uses LENS, a BellSouth proprietary interface, to access pre-ordering information. LENS, however, does not
allow ITC^DeltaCom to integrate pre-ordering information into ITC^DeltaCom's EDI orders. Without such integration, ITC^DeltaCom must re-enter the information from the pre-ordering interface into the EDI ordering interface, which is inefficient, prone to human error, and not at parity with the OSS systems enjoyed by BellSouth. In addressing the importance of incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs") providing competing carriers access to the OSS functions of an incumbent LEC, the FCC states:
...if competing carriers are unable to perform the functions of preordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing for network elements and resale services in substantially the same time and manner that an incumbent can for itself, competing carriers will be severely disadvantaged, if not precluded altogether, from fairly competing. Thus providing nondiscriminatory access to these support systems functions, which would include access to the information such systems contain, is vital to creating opportunities for meaningful competition. ${ }^{1}$

In addition, the FCC states:
Operations support systerns and the information they contain fall squarely within the definition of 'network elernent' and must be unbundled upon request. ${ }^{2}$

[^0]Therefore, ITC^DeltaCom requests that the Commission require BellSouth to provide it with nondiscriminatory access to pre-ordering information. Absent a pre-ordering interface that integrates with EDI, ITC^DeltaCom needs the ability to: (1) parsercustomenService Pecoreds ( $C \mathbb{C R} s$ " $)$; and (2) electronically receive downloads of the Regional Street Address Guide ("RSAG"). Customer Service Records contain such information as the customer's riame, the customer's current products and services and the customer's address. By having the ability parse the CSR, ITEADettaGom can build the GSR information into the EDI order without having to rekoy the information. Similarly, an electronic download of the RSAG database, which contains address and facility availability information, will allow ITC^DeltaCom to incorporate this information into ITC^DeltaCom's back office systems to check the validity of the customer's address, just as BellSouth's systems use the RSAG database to check BellSouth's orders. The production of the CSRparsing. bpecificationseang the RSAG has haveralready been ordered by the Florida Public Service Commission. The Florida Commission Order is attached as Exhibit MT-1. With this information, ITC^DeltaCom will be able to submit orders with fewer errors to BellSouth, and will further be able to develop a more integrated process, which ultimately means efficiency gains for both parties.

## Q: IS BELLSOUTHREQUIRED TO PROVIDEITC^DELTACOM WITHTHE SRANO RSAG INFORMATION?

A: Yes. The FCC recognized that the systems and personnel deployed by the Bell Operating Companies must be sufficient to provide access to each of the required OSS functions. In addition, the FCC required the Bell Operating Companies ("BOCs") to provide Competitive Local Exchange Carriers ("CLECs") with the assistance and training that CLECs need to use the OSS functions. This assistance included providing CLECs with the technical specifications of the interfaces and legacy systems, so that CLECs can modify and design their own internal OSS to communicate with the BOC's systems. ${ }^{3}$ The FCC has further concluded that in order for BOCs to demonstrate nondiscriminatory access to OSS functions, a BOC must "provide the sarne access to competing carriers that it provides to itself. ${ }^{n 4}$ By requesting thend
themRSAG information, ITC^DeltaCom is simply asking BellSouth to provide the same access to the OSS information that BellSouth provides to itself.


A: Yes. As stated above, Bellsouth is required to provide ITC^DeltaCom with the same access to OSS functions as it provides to itself, including access to MSAG. In fact, BellSouth provides the MSAG to THC^DeltaCom today on a monthly basis. ITC^DeltaCom has requested

[^1]that BellSouth provide updates to the MSAG on a daily basis, because accurate MSAG information is critical to maintaining the 911 database. The Commission should require BellSouth to provide ITC^DeltaCom with the MSAB and subsequent updates on a daily basis.

## Q: IS BELLSOUTH REQUIRED TO PROVIDE ORDERING AND

 PROVISIONING SERVICES THAT ARE EQUAL TO BELLSOUTH, ANY AFFILIATES, SUBSIDIARIES OR CLECS?Yes. The Act, as well as FCC and State Commission Orders have required BellSouth to provide ordering and provisioning services to CLECs at parity with itself, and its subsidiaries and affiliates. ITC^DeltaCom believes that this requirement stands without any qualifications. Without nondiscriminatory access and parity of service, CLECs, like ITC^DeltaCom, are severely disadvantaged when competing against BellSouth. According to BellSouth, it only has to provide equal services when it is technically feasible for it to do so.

This essertially would allow BellSouth to pick and choose at its own discretion whether it was "technically feasible" to provide ordering and provisioning services at parity to that which it provides itself, and its affiliates and subsidiaries. Exhibit MT-2 of my testimony marked confidential and proprietary shows the resale ordering and provisioning intervals that ITC^DeltaCom has experienced for the past six months. This Exhibit clearly shows that ITC^DeltaCom has not received ordering and provisioning services that are equal to BellSouth.

## OSS- NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES

## Q: IS BELLSOUTH'S MEDIUM OF NOTIFICATION OF REVISIONS AND

 CHANGES TO ORDERING GUIDES ADEQUATE?A: No. BellSouth provides carrier notifications on its website on a weekly basis, which provide a generalized description of changes BellSouth has made to the BellSouth ordering guides. It is very difficult to discern from this notification whether a change will affect a system, a business rule or both. This makes it difficult to make the necessary modifications or receive the necessary training prior to the implementation of the change by BellSouth. For these reasons, ITC^DeltaCom, and all CLECs, need advance notice of the changes that will affect systerns and business rules via e-mail or other electronic means. Such notice should allow at least 45 days for ITC^DeltaCom, and other CLECs, to receive training or make the necessary changes to their systems. Without such notification, ITC^DeltaCom will continue to expend valuable resqurces sorting through BellSouth's inefficient notification process. For instance, in March 1999 alone, there were 35 notifications sent by BellSouth on various topics. ITC^DeltaCom had to check all 35 notifications to determine which of these notifications affected systems and which affected business rules. This is an extremely burdensome and time-consuming process because the changes are not broken out by topic. In addition, the BellSouth web page is difficult to navigate, in that there is no central location to see what changes have been made that day. To make the change notification

Q:
more efficient, ITC^DeltaCom would like BellSouth to send a list of the changes or revisions electronically to CLECs via e-mail or other electronic means, such as the OSS interfaces. This notification should show the additions or changes made that day, and it should be retained on the web page for thirty days.

PLEASE PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF A BUSINESS RULE CHANGE THAT AFFECTED ITC^DELTACOM.

As stated above, advanced notification of changes to any OSS interface that would affect ITC^DeltaCom's use of that interface is crucial to ITC^DeltaCom's ability to operate. For example, on February 8, 1999, BellSouth made a change that affected resale orders being processed. Until that date, the BellSouth business rules required the LPIC field to be "NA" in the states of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, as defined by BellSouth's LEO error code \#3080. However, on this date, BellSouth inexplicably began rejecting all requests that had "NA" in the LPIC field. This caused all of ITC^DeltaCom's resale orders to be rejected. ITC^DeltaCom immediately contacted BellSouth to determine what was causing the orders to be rejected. BellSouth notified ITC^DeltaCom that the orders were rejected because BellSouth had changed the business rule. The "NEW" rule required either the customer's LPIC or the word "NONE" in all states. "NA" was now an invalid entry in the LPIC field. This change required a system change to ITC^DeltaCom's back office systems which could not
be completed until February 12, 1999. Thus, ITC^DeltaCom was unable to place orders for four days. Needless to say, if ITC^DeltaCom had been given prior notice of this rule change, ITC^DeltaCom would have been able to allocate resources to ensure that there was no disruption to the flow of orders to BellSouth. Not only did this disrupt ITC^DeltaCom's internal ordering ability, but it affected ITC^DeltaCom's customers in every state, as their orders were delayed. This is totally unacceptable. In order to ensure that service disruption such as this does not occur, it is imperative that BellSouth be required to provide 45 days advance notice of any business rule and ordering procedure changes to ITC^DeltaCom via an electronic means.

Q: HAS ITC^DELTACOM EXPERIENCED OTHER INCIDENTS WHERE BELLSOUTH FAILED TO PROVIDE ITC^DELTACOM WITH ADVANCE NOTICE OF THE DISCONTINUANCE OR CHANGE TO ANY OSS INTERFACE?

Yes. ITC^DeltaCom has experienced other incidents where BellSouth failed to provide ITC^DeltaCom with advance notice of changes which affected ITC^DeltaCom's ability to provide service. On February 22, 1999, BellSouth unilaterally made a change that affected the processing of resale orders. Prior to February 22, 1999, the IMPCON (Implementation Contact) field was an optional field, as defined by Issue 7 e (January issue) LEO volume 1, page 101-102. However, on February 22,1999 , BellSouth began rejecting all of ITC^DeltaCom's orders due to
the IMPCON field not being completed. On February 24, 1999, ITC^DeltaCom spoke with BellSouth regarding this issue. Subsequent to that conversation, BellSouth granted ITC^DeltaCom an interim period of two weeks to implement the change. Nevertheless, ITC^DeltaCom experienced two days where all requests were rejected and service could not be ordered. Thus, ITC^DeltaCom was effectively put out of business for six days during the month of February. In April, BellSouth again made a change which affected ITC^DeltaCom's ability to order services. On April 26, 1999, BellSouth made a change that affected the processing of resale orders. Up until April 26, 1999, the EATN (Existing Account Telephone Number) field was not allowed on Full Migration resale orders for any Account Activity, as defined in Issue 7e (January issue) ${ }^{5}$ LEO volume 1, page 132-133. On this date, ITC^DeltaCom began receiving order clarification notices because the EATN field was not completed. ITC^DeltaCom contacted BellSouth regarding this problem on April 28, and again received an interim period of two weeks to allow ITC^DeltaCom to implement the change. Nevertheless, until ITC^DeltaCom contacted BellSouth to determine the cause of the rejected orders, all requests were denied. Such loss of service for days at a time is detrimental to a new entrant's ability to compete. As stated above, BellSouth should be

[^2]required to post revisions or changes in one central clearly identified location on its web page with an electronic notice e-mailed or electronically transmitted directly to the CLEC.

## Q: $\operatorname{YF}$ BELLSOUTH DECIDES TO DISCONTINUE AN OSS INTERFACE ALL TQGETHER, SHOULD BELLSOUTH BE REQUIRED TO NOTIFY

 itc^deltadom in advance and if the discontinuañ ce has A MATERIAL YMPACT ON ITC^DELTACOM, ShOULD THE DISCONTINUANCE RATE BE MUTUALLY AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES?A: Yes. If BellSouth decides to discontinue an OSS interface that ITC^DeltaCom is currently utilizing, BeflSouth must provide at least 90 days advance notice to ITC^Delta Com. Advanced notification that allows enough tirne to seek alternative interfaces essential in order to ensure that ITC^DeltaCom's ability to operate and meet its custorner's needs is not jeopardized. In addition, if the move to a different OSS interface has a material impact on ITC^DeltaCom, the discontinuance date should be set by mutual agreement between the Parties, with contingency work argund solutions set in place. Again, this is necessary to ensure that ITC^DeltaCom's business operations are not interrupted and customer orders and service are not impacted.

Q: SHOULD BELLSOUTH MAINTAIN ONE CURRENT AND, ONE PREVIOUS VERSION OF THE REVISION OR CHANGE MADE TO OSS?
A. Yes. A mandated date, unilaterally set by BellSouth to migrate to interface changes, puts an undue hardship on smal| competitive carriers. ITG^DeltaCom does not have the resources that BellSouth has and cannot migrate to newer versions of OSS interfaces in shorter time frames than that provided to BellSøuth. Essentially, BellSouth may spend monthsdeveloping the next version of an interface, but may leave ITC^DeltaCom with a very short period of time to implement the new version. This could have devastating effects on ITC^DeltaCom's ability to provide services to its customers if the current version of the interface is not retained unti the upgrade can be completed. By maintaining one previous version of an interface, small CLECs, like ITC^DeltaCom, can secure the resources and perform the necessary testing to complete the migration without major disruptions for TC^ $^{\wedge}$ DeltaCom and its customers. \$HOULD BELLSOUTH PROVIDE OSS TRANING WHEN IT MAKES SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES OR INTRODUCES NEW INTERFACES? Yes. The FCC has required BOCs to provide CLECswith the assistance and training that CLECs need to use the OSS functions. ${ }^{6}$ This is

[^3]important because when BellSouth makes substantial changes or introduces new interfaces, ITC^DeltaCom needs the opportunity to regeive the necessary training to understand, develop and implement the new interface specifications. BellSouth provides OSS training today, and in most cases provides ITC^DeltaCom the opportunity to send a limited number of personnel for training at no charge. ITChDeltaCom simply wants to maintain twis training arrangement in the Parties' interconnection agreement.

Q: SHOULDITC^DELTACOMBEREQUIREDTOFOLLOWBELLSOUTH'S ORDERING GUIDES?

A: ITC^DeltaCom believes that both parties should follow and adhere to the ATIS and OBF business rules for the interfaces that comply with national industry standards. It is important to follow such standards in order to ensure that there are clear guidelines and documentation. Adhering to national industry standards also prevents BellSouth from making unilateral changes to the business rules, which could have a significant impact on ITC^DeltaCom. Nevertheless, with adyanced notification of business rule changes which I addressed above, KTC^DeltaCom will agree to follow the BellSouth ordering guides. However by agreeing to follow the BellSouth ordering guides, ITC^DeltaCom in no way waives the ordering and provisioning procedures set forth in Attachment 6 and the Pefformance Standards and Guarantees contained in Attachment 10. ITC^DeltaCom believes that the provisions set forth in Attachment 6 and

10 of the contract shouta control any conflicts which may arise due to changes BellSouth makes to its ordering guides.


Q: SHOULD BELLSOUTH PROVIDE ALL PROVISIONING DATA AND INFORMATION THAT IS AVAILABLE ?

A: Yes. Where available, provisioning data and information should be provided such that ITC^DeltaCom can correctly submit orders to BellSouth. The Firm Order Confirmation ("FOC") should contain appropriate data as defined by the OBF and BellSouth's ordering guides in order for ITC^DeltaCom to track the order in its systems. At a minimum, an FOC should include the due date, purchase order number ("PON"), telephone number, local service request number, service order number, and all other data as defined by the OBF and BellSouth's Ordering Guides. Receiving this information on a FOC is essential in order to accurately track orders placed to BellSouth. The FOC serves as important order coordination and tracking tool.

Q: SHOULDBELLSOUTH PROVIDEITC^DELTACOM WITHELECTRONIC NOTIFICATION OF DISCONNECTS AND WIN-BACKS?
A: Yes. ITC^DeltaCom needs timely notification of disconnects and winbacks in order to know howho acourately bill ITC^DeltaCom's customers. If a custorner loaves ITC^DeltaCom, and no notice is provided, ITC^DeltaCom will not know to cease billing the customer. This results in the customer being double billed for its local services. Therefore, it is
critical that ITC^DeltaCom receive accurate and timely information from BellSouth. Under the parties existing agreement, BellSouth provides ITCMDeltaCom with a report known as the OUTPLOC report. This report is transmitted electronically to ITC^DeltaCom via Connect:Direct. ITC^DeltaCdm requests that the Commission require BellSouth to continue to provide the OUT PLOC report via Connect:Direct to ITC^DeltaCom in the parties' new interconnection agreement.
 RESOLUTION OF ISSUES RELATED TO OSS INTERFACES WITH A TRAINED STAFF TO ANSWER QUESTIONS?

A: Yes. The Commission should require BellSouth to provide a toll-free telephone number for resolution of issues related to OSS interfaces with trained staff to answer questions. Bellsouth has developed proprietary OSS systems and controls changes to kusiness rules. Therefore, only BellSouth, the vendgr and manufacturer pf that OSS interface knows whether the problem is a result of a change, error or defect on its side of the interface. Without BellSouth's assistance, ITC^DeltaCom may not be able to determine what the problem is or how to correct it, especially if a change was made to a business rule and notification was not provided to ITC^DeltaCom. Further, in most industries, manufactukers offer a toll free number to assist in identifying problems with their phoduct. This is especially true in the software industry, where service agreements require a response to a trouble call within a specified period of time. Without the
ability to contact a trained individual who can identify the problem and/or take corrective action to fix the problem, ITC^DeltaCom may be unable to serve its customers.

## Q: SHOQLD BELLSOUTH PROVIDE AFTER HOURS ASSISTANCE FOR

 OSS ANQ PROVISIONING ORDERS?A: Yes. Currently BellSouth provides after houts assistance to its retail customers; therefore, to provide parity, BellSouth should be required to provide after hours assistance for OSS and provisioning orders to ITC^DeltaCom. As it exists today, if ITC^DeltaCom has difficulties because of an OSS related problem or a problem with the provisioning of an order, ITC^DeltaCom and its customer must wait until the UNE Center and the Local Carrier Service Center ("LCSC") are open. The LCSC's hours of operation are 8:02a.rn. to 5:00p.m., and the UNE Center is open from 8:00a.m. to 5:00p.m. Central Standard Time. This severely limits the ability of ITC^DeltaCom to convert business customers to ITC^DeltaCom service after hours, which is when many customers wish to conyert service. For example, when ITC DeltaCom and BellSouth are engaged in a cutover of a customer from Bellsbuth to ITC^DeltaCom, the UNE Center technicians must work jointly with ITC^DeltaCom technicians. When a problem is found that needsto be corrected by the LCSC, and it is after 5:00p.m. CST, the cut has to be rescheduled to a later date. This frustrates the customer who wanted the cutover to take place after business hours, and must now make plans to reschedule the
cutover. To make matters worse, in some instances the customef is left without tone. This certainly does not foster positive customer relations, nor does it allow $1 C^{\wedge}$ DeltaCom to provide the quality customer experience to which we strive to achieve. Therefore, at a minimum, the LCSC and the UNE Center should have the same extended hours of operation so customers are not caught in the midacke. Thus, ITC^Deltacom requests that the Commission require BellSouth to staff the LCSC and the UNE Center from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m., at a minimum.

Q: SHOULDBELLSOUTHBEREQUIREDTO PROVIDE ANELECTRONIC INTERFACE FOR RESALE AND UNE REPAIR ISSUES?

A: Yes. BellSouth should be required to provide ITC^DeltaCom with an electronic interface which provides access to BellSouth's maintenance systems and databases in order to allow ITC^DeltaCom's maintenance personnel and customer service representatives to enter a new customer trouble ticket into the BellSouth maintenance system, retrieve and track the current status of ITC^DeltaCom repair tickets with access to the estimated time to repair, initiate a technician dispatch, receive timely notification if a repair technician is unable or anticipates being unable to meet a scheduled repair, retrieve a list of itemized time and material charges at the time of ticket closure, provide test results, and electronically notify $\operatorname{ITC}$ ^DeltaCom when the trouble is cleared. This information is required in order for ITC^DeltaCom to track the resolution
of its customers' troubles and to be able to inform ITC^DeltaCom customers of the status of their repair. Without this information, ITC^DeltaCom can not provide the level of service which our customers expect us to provide.

## Q: DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A: Yes. However, since the parties intend to continue negotiating after the submission of my testimony, I reserve the right to modify and update my testimony in response to issues raised by BellSouth.

BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):
Q Mr. Thomas, are you the same Michael Thomas that caused to be prefiled on September the 13 th , 1999,
17 pages of question and answer prefiled nebuttal
testimony?

A Yes, I am.
Q And there were -- I believe there was a -COMMISSIONER CLARK: Would you hang on just a
minute? I need to deal with something.
MR. ADELMAN: Sure.
(DISCUSSION OEE THE RECORD)
COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry. Go ahead.
BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing) :
Q Are you the same Michael Thomas that caused to
be prefiled on September the 13 th, 1999,17 pages of
question and answer prefiled rebuttal testimony?
A Yes, I am.
Q And I believe there was one exhibit attached to
that prefiled rebuttal testimony which you had marked as
MT-3; is that correct?
A That's correct.
MR. ADELMAN: And my records indicate,
Commissioner, that there was no testimony in the
prefiled rebuttal testimony which would need to be
stricken; is that correct?

MR. GOGGIN: That's not entirely correct.
There were some --
MR. ADELMAN: Oh, the -- not as a result of the issue, I'm sorry. Not as a result of the Commission's ruling, but there are some issues that have been closed.

MR. GOGGIN: Correct.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Right.
MR. GOGGIN: These are all resolved issues.
MR. ADELMAN: And those begin on Page 3 at Line 10, through Page 5 at Line 2 .

Page 9, beginning at Line 9, through Page 10, concluding at Line 2.

Page 11, beginning at Line 15, through Page 13.
WITNESS THOMAS: 14.
BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing) :
Q Excuse me, through Page 14, Lin@ 20.
Mr. Thomas, considering those portions of your testimony that you understand are not included in this record as a result of the Commission's ruling or as a result of the parties reaching a settlement on those issues, do you have any corrections or modifications you'd like to make to the remaining prefiled rebuttal testimony?

A No, I do not.


MR. ADELMAN: Excuse me.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Identify them for me.
MR. ADELMAN: They are identified as MT-1 and MT-2 in Mr. Thomas's testimony.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We will mark them as Exhibit 16.

MR. ADELMAN: And just to note for the record, MT-2 was filed as a confidential exhibit.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right.
MR. ADELMAN: And I believe there was no objection to that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a question for you, just to make sure it is clear in the record. Do I take it that the footnotes in the testimony are also to be considered sworn testimony?

MR. ADELMAN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

Q: PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
A: My name is Michael Thomas. I am Director - Information Services for ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc., ("ITC^DeltaCom"), and my business address is 8830 U.S. Hwy 231, Arab, Alabama 35016.

Q: ARE YOU THE SAME MICHAEL THOMAS THAT FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A: Yes, I am.

Q: WHAT IS YOUR PURPOSE IN TESTIFYING TODAY?
A : The purpose of my testimony is to respond to some of the arguments made by BellSouth's witnesses in this Docket. I would also like to clarify ITC^DeltaCom's position and provide additional information on a number of issues raised by BellSouth's witnesses in their direct testimony.

Q: WHAT IS YOUR GENERAL REACTION TO BELLSOUTH'S TESTIMONY ON THE ISSUE YOU ADDRESS IN THIS REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A: BellSouth responded to my direct testimony in three basic ways.
(1) For some issues, BellSouth conceded the issue to ITC^DeltaCom. It is unfortunate that it required a formal filing to bring about a resolution of these issues.
(2) For some issues, BellSouth continues to cling to positions that are contrary to and inconsistent with the requirements of the Act, FCC orders or orders of various state regulators.
(3) For sorne issues, BellSouth does not address the issue brought forward in ITC^DeltaCom's filing.
Issue 3(b)(1): [ITC^DeltaCom Issue 2]-Pursuant to the definition
of parity, should BellSouth be required to provide Operational
Support Systems ("OSS")?

Q: DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. PATE THAT BELLSOUTH CURRENTLY PROVIDES NONDISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO ITS OPERATIONAL SUPPORT SYSTEMS AS REQUIRED BY THE ACT AND FCC ORDERS?

A: No. My understanding is that BellSouth must provide OSS to ITC^DeltaCom in a manner that is equal to or at parity with that which BellSouth provides to itself, as discussed in my direct testimony. In addition, Paragraph 520 of the FCC's First Report and Order concludes that nondiscriminatory access to OSS (i.e. the functions of pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing for network elements and resale services) is technically feasible. ${ }^{1}$

[^4]Nondiscriminatory access means that whatever access BellSouth provides to itself, BellSouth must provide "equally" to ITC^DeltaCom. For example, BellSouth cannot require ITC^DeltaCom to fax orders when BellSouth can electronically submit orders on behalf of its own retail customers. ITC^DeltaCom is extremely concerned that BellSouth is now indicating that it may not be technically feasible for ITC^DeltaCom to obtain ordering and provisioning services equal to that which BellSouth provides to itself or others.


PARSING CAPABILITY ITCARLTACOM HAS REQUESTED. PLEASE RESPOND TO BELLSOUTH'S POSITION ON ITC^DELTACOM'S REQUEST.

A: As I explained in my direct testimony, IT< $\wedge$ DeltaCom must be able to parse the LENS CSR, so that ITC^DeltaCdm can build the CSR information into our EDI orders without having to rekey the information. Mr. Pate fails to address ITC^DeltaCom's issue, but instead, argues that BellSouth has developed another interface which will provide the CSR

1
2
parsing capability that will allow ITC^DeltaCom to parse CSRs "just as BellSouth parses CSRs in its own retail operations." Interestingly, BellSouth ignored the fact, as stated in my direct testimony, that ITC^DeltaCom does not use the TAG interface. Should ITCMDeltaCom decide to research, develop and implement TAG, it could take 6 to 12 months, and would require ITC^DeftaCom to expend great resources $I^{1 T C}$ ^DeltaCom has simply requested specifications that BellSouth controls to be provided to ITC^DeltaCom, so that ITC^DeltaCom can do the necessaty work to parse CSRs. BellSouth is in no way prejudiced Dy providing such information to ITC^DeltaCom.


A: Yes. BellSøuth has provided ITC^Delta@om with the CSR parsing specifications that ITC^DeitaCom has been req\&esting since an Alabama Public Service Commission OSS Workshop in Degember of $1997^{2}$. It is y)ffortunate that resolution of this issue required a formal filing, especially since paragraph 516 of the FCC's First Report and Ordef requires that OSS and the information they contain must be unbundled upen request.

[^5]Nevertheless, itcadeltaCom is pleased that this issue has been resolved.

Issue 5: [ITC^DeltaCom Issue 2(a)(i)] Should BellSouth be required to provide a download of the Regional Street Address Guide (RSAG)? If so, how?

Q: PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY ITC^DELTACOM NEEDS THE REGIONAL STREET ADDRESS GUIDE RATHER THAN ACCESS TO THE RSAG through lens or tag as suggested by bellsouth's WITNESS PATE.

A: BellSouth claims that it is providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS in a manner that allows ITC^DeltaCorn and other CLECs to access the RSAG. That broad claim is an attempt to avoid the issue. As stated in my direct testimony, ITC^DeltaCom needs access to the address and facility availability information resident in BellSouth's RSAG. Only with such access can ITC^DeltaCom incorporate this information into its back office systems to check the validity of the customer's address and the facilities available at the customer's location.

ITC^DeltaCom has experienced significant problems with orders being rejected due to the customer's wrong address being keyed into the order. By incorporating the correct address information into our back office systems, ITC^DeltaCom will be able to submit accurate customer
address information to BellSouth. As noted in my direct testimony, BellSouth does not re-key address information into its orders, and ITC^DeltaCom should not be required to do so. Further, as discussed above, ITC^DeltaCom does not use TAG, nor should ITC^DeltaCom be required to implement yet another OSS interface just to receive "nondiscriminatory access" to the OSS information that BellSouth controls.

Q: HAS BELLSOUTH COMMITTED TO PROVIDE THE RSAG TO ITC^DELTACOM?

A: Yes. It is my understanding that during negotiations, BellSouth has stated that it will provide the RSAG to ITC^DeltaCom. In addition, Mr. Pate, on page 8 of his testimony, confirms that BellSouth is willing to provide the RSAG to ITC^DeltaCom. However, it is my understanding that BellSouth has not provided its proposed rates and conditions for the RSAG. ITC^DeltaCom is encouraged that BellSouth is now willing to provide the RSAG, but resolution of this issue cannot take place until ITC^DeltaCom is presented with an acceptable proposal from BellSouth regarding the specific rates, if any, and conditions.

Issue 6: [ITC^DeltaCom Issue 2(a)(ii)] Should BellSouth be required to provide changes to its business rules and guidelines regarding resale and UNEs at least 45 days in advance of such changes being implemented? If so, how?

Q: WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF BELLSOUTH'S POSITION REGARDING THIS ISSUE?

A: BellSouth claims that it attempts to post all business rule and guideline change notifications on its website 30 days prior to the implementation of the change or rule. Further, Mr. Varner states on page 21 of his direct testimony that this is done "as a matter of courtesy." According to Mr. Varner, BellSouth has "no legal or mandated obligation" to provide notification of changes to business rules that will directly affect BellSouth's customers, such as ITC^DeltaCom. The Commission should expressly reject Mr. Varner's contentions.

By not providing sufficient notification, and by not being contractually obligated to do so, BellSouth is able to make changes to its business rules and guidelines at will. Such a practice has severe implications for all CLECs, including ITC^DeltaCom and creates an enormous opportunity for anticompetitive abusive practices. As a customer of BellSouth, ITC^DeltaCom must have sufficient notification of changes to business rules and guidelines in order to ensure that service to our customers is not disrupted. Otherwise, ITC^DeltaCom's business operations are jeopardized.

I urge the Commission to require BellSouth to provide 45 days advance notification of changes to business rules and guidelines for the reasons stated in my direct testimony and enumerated above. Specifically, ITC^DeltaCom requests that BellSouth be required to provide advance notice to designated ITC^DeltaCom personnel of changes to BellSouth business rules and guides that would affect a CLEC's operations via e-mail or facsimile, whichever is more convenient to BellSouth.

Q: DOES BELLSOUTH ALWAYS PROVIDE ADVANCE NOTICE TO BUSINESS RULE CHANGES?

A: No. Although Mr. Varner asserts that BellSouth does provide advance notice, ITC^DeltaCom has found instances where BellSouth does not communicate such changes.

Q: PLEASE PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE.
A: For example, on June 8, 1999, ITC^DeltaCom began receiving clarifications for orders that contained hunting. Hunting is a common feature requested by small and large business customers. Hunting allows a call to roll over to the next available line. The clarification from BellSouth stated that the rotary page did not match the hunting sequence. After investigation, we learned that the rotary page is a screen on the BellSouth proprietary system. The LEO guides do not have any documentation of such a page. Basically, BellSouth implemented a new rule without issuing documentation. This particular
example has been resolved with BellSouth but provides an excellent example to the Commission illustrating the problems associated with BellSouth's approach to business rule change communications. Without advance notice, orders are dropped and result in delays to the end-user. In this case, BellSouth has agreed not to implement this new rule until we have implemented the change in our system. BellSouth should be directed to take this approach in every case.
 quo of two free seats wher OSS training is needed due to a change being implemented by bellsouth. Since this is the current policy that BellSouth and ITC DeltaCom operate under, it unclear why Mr. Varner views this as an "entirely unreasonable" request. I would add that ITC^DeltaCøm is pleased to learn from Mr. Varner thak BellSouth will offer "one free seat for each ALEC in OSS-related courses" and that Bellsouth will be implementing a web based training system for dertain cøurses in the fall. ITC^DeltaCom accepts BellSouth's compromise for providing one free training seat to ITC^DeltaCom, and respectfully
requests that the Commission expressly acknowledge the-parties compromise tor resolution of this issue.

```
Issue 2(g) How should "order flow-through" be defined?
```

Q: beLLSOUTH'S WITNESS, MR. PATE, STATES THAT IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO DEFINE "FLOW-THROUGH" IN THE PARTIES' INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT? PLEASE COMMENT.

A: ITC^DeltaCom believes that order flow-through should be defined in the parties' interconnection agreement. Order flow through is one of the Performance measurements contained in Attachment 10. Put simply, without a definition, this measurement cannot be accurately recorded.

Q: WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF BELLSOUTH'S DEFINITION OF "FLOW-THROUGH"?

A: Apparently, BellSouth has defined order flow-through differently for CLECs than for itself. As defined by BellSouth, order flow through for BellSouth includes taking information directly from its customer, and while the customer is on-line with the BellSouth representative, inputting the information into BellSouth's ordering system. In essence, BellSouth has
created the entire order and completed the pre-ordering and ordering steps while the customer is on-line.

For CLECs, however, BellSouth defines order flow through as starting when "the complete and correct electronically-submitted I_SR is sent via one of the ALEC ordering interfaces (EDI, TAG, or LENS)." Under this definition, BellSouth has ignored the pre-ordering part of this process, as Mr. Pate affirms on page 13 of his testimony. This means that BellSouth is comparing the time it takes itself to complete the preordering and ordering steps verses the time it takes for a "complete and correct" electronic order submitted by ITC^DeltaCom to work its way through BellSouth's systems. By making this comparison, BellSouth cannot demonstrate through performance measures whether or not it is providing parity in order flow-through.

Issue 26: [ITC^DeltaCom Issue 3(d)] Should BellSouth be required
to provide ITC^DeltaCom access to Universal Service Order Codes
("USOCs"), Field Identifiers ("FIDs") and other information
necessary to process orders in a downloadable format?
WHAT IS ITC^DELTACOM'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE?

A: $\quad$ t is my understanding that this issue has been resolved by the parties; hovever, ITC^DeltaCom reserves the right to file supplemental testimony on this issue, should it be further disputed.


A: It is my understanding that this issue has been resolved by the parties; however, ITC^DeltaCom reserves the rightto file supplemental testimony on this issue, should it be further disputed.

Issue 28: [ITC^DeltaCom Issue 3(g)] Should ITC^^peltaCom have at least 90 days advance notice prior to BellSouth discontinuing an OSS interface?

## Q: WHAT IS ITC^DELTACOM'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE?

A: It is my understanding that this issue has been resolved by the parties; however, ITC^DeltaCom reserves the right to file supplemental testimony on this issue, should it be further disputed.


Q: MR. PATE, ON PAGE 22 OF HIS TEStIMONY, STATES THAT THE LCSC HOURS OF OPERATION ARE CURRENTLY 24 HOURS A DAY, 7 days a week, however, these hours will soon be CHANGED TO MONDAY THROUGH SATURDAY FROM 6:OO A.M.TO MIDNIGHT. PLEASE COMMENT.
A: ITC^DeltaCom is encouraged that BellSouth will operate its LCSC Monday through Saturday from 6:00 a.m. to midnight. During the parties' negotiations, BellSopth continually presented hours of operation for the LCSC from 8:00 2.m. to 5:00 p.m. A copy of Bells hours is attached as Exhibit MT-3. Based on Mr Pate's affirmation that BellSouth will, at a minimum, operate its LCSC Monday through Saturday from 6:00 a.m. to midnight, ITC^DeltaCom is willing to noodify Attachment 6, Pofragraph 4.8.1 to include these hours of operation. With this modification, ITC^DeltaCom considers this portion of the issue closed. However, with regard to the UNE Center hours of operation,

ITC^DeltaCom maintains that the appropriate hours of operation are from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m., as stated in my direct testimony.


A: It is my understanding that this issue has been resolved by the parties; however, ITC^DeltaCom reserves he right to file supplemental testimony on this issue, should it be further disputed.


Q: WHAT IS ИTC^DELTACOM'S POSITION ON THISYSSUE?
A: It is my understanding that this issue has been resolved by the parties; however, ITC^DeltaCom reserves the right to file supplemental testimony on this issue, should it be further disputed.


#### Abstract

Issue 34: [ITC^DeltaCom Issue 3(m)] What type of repair information should BellSouth be required to provide to ITC^DeltaCom such that ITC^DeltaCom can keep the customer informed?


Q: ON PAGES 24 AND 26 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. PATE CLAIMS THAT BELLSOUTH PROVIDES ITC^DELTACOM WITH NONDISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OSS. PLEASE COMMENT.

A: ITC^DeltaCom agrees with Mr. Pate that BellSouth's maintenance and repair interfaces must allow ITC^DeltaCom and other CLECs to enter customer trouble tickets into the BellSouth maintenance system, retrieve and track the current status of ITC^DeltaCom repair tickets, and receive an estimated time to repair on a real-time basis. However, it is critical that BellSouth also provide ITC^DeltaCom the ability to receive timely notification if a repair technician is unable or anticipates being unable to meet a scheduled repair, retrieve a list of itemized time and material charges at the time of ticket closure, provide test results, and electronically notify ITC^DeltaCom when the trouble is cleared. It is my understanding that BellSouth agreed that it could provide timely notification if a repair technician is unable or anticipates being unable to meet a scheduled repair, provide test results, and notify ITC^DeltaCom when the trouble is cleared via the TAFI electronic interface. Therefore, it is unclear to me why Mr. Pate omitted these capabilities from the functions he lists in his testimony. In addition, it is also my understanding
that BellSouth's electronic maintenance interfaces can not currently retrieve a list of itemized time and material charges at the time of ticket closure. ITC^DeltaCom is indifferent as to whether BellSouth sends itemized time and material charges for maintenance and repair to ITC^DeltaCom via an electronic interface or some other means. The issue is that ITC^DeltaCom must receive sufficient information in order to verify the charges incurred for maintenance performed by BellSouth. This would include all time and material charges, itemized by time spent, price of materials used, procedures employed, amounts incurred in each such category, and total by customer, per event. Therefore, as stated in my direct testimony, and reiterated above, the information being requested by ITC^DeltaCom is required in order for ITC^DeltaCom to track the resolution of its customers' troubles and to be able to inform ITC^DeltaCom customers of the status of their repair. Further, ITC^DeltaCom must receive timely billing information in order to verify the charges that it incurs for maintenance performed by BellSouth. Without this information, ITC^DeltaCom can not provide the level of service which our customers expect us to provide, accurately bill our end-user and verify BellSouth's charges, nor can BellSouth claim that it is providing non-discriminatory access to maintenance information and interfaces.
Issue 38: [ITC^DeltaCom Issue 6(a)] What charges, if any, should
BellSouth be permitted to impose on ITC^DeltaCom for BellSouth's
OSS?
Q: PLEASE CLARIFY ITC^DELTACOM'S POSITION REGARDING
CHARGES FOR OSS.

A: ITC^DeltaCom's position on this issue is fully addressed by Mr. Wood and Mr. Rozycki. BellSouth does not provide adequate OSS ordering and provisioning to ITC^DeltaCom today and ITC^DeltaCom should not have to pay for something that BellSouth is unable to deliver. Exhibit MT-2 of my direct testimony marked confidential and proprietary shows the ordering and provisioning intervals that ITC^DeltaCom has experienced during the first six months of 1999. These intervals, which are undisputed by BellSouth, clearly show that ITC^DeltaCom is not privy to adequate OSS in the state of Florida.

## Q: DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A: Yes. But I must note that information provided by BellSouth through discovery may have a great impact on my testimony. For that reason, I think it is crucial that I be permitted to incorporate the impact of such information into my final presentation to the Commission.

BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):
Q Mr. Thomas, have you prepared a summary of your prefiled direct and prefiled rebuttal testimony?

A Yes, I have.
Q Can you please provide that to the Commission at this time?

A Yes. Good afternoon. As I stated, I'm Mike Thomas. I'm director of information services at ITC^DeltaCom. I'm responsible for the local area network and wide area network infrastructure, system and application development, and the electronic interfaces to the ILEC, including BellSouth.

I'm here today to talk to you about quality of service, quality of service from BellSouth to ITC^DeltaCom and eventually the consumer in Florida. My first topic today is advanced notification. We are requesting 45 days advance notification of business rule changes that affect our ability to order electronically with BellSouth.

Today we send our orders via EDI, or Electronic Data Interchange. And what that is is a template or boilerplate, if you will, that allows companies such as BellSouth and ITC^DeltaCom to exchange information. In addition to that boilerplate or template, are business rules that determine what data is in there. Is this
field required? Is the pick list on this $A, B, C$ or things of that nature.

From time to time, those business rules change, on both BellSouth's and ITC^DeltaCom's Side. When they change it affects our systems. We have to go in and make changes to our systems so that we can continue to send those orders electronically. That takes time. We can't get those at the last minute and make the changes or it causes us not to be able to order electronically with Bellsouth, basically puts us out of putting new customers in service. It's a customer affecting issue. We're asking for 45 days advance notification via an e-mail and via their Web site so that we can know as soon as the change is out there so we can start working on it.

The next issue is -- this poster was generated before it was resolved. It is resolved. My integrated OSS, what $I^{\prime \prime m}$ referring to here is approximately two years ago BellSouth stated that EDI was their preferred nondiscriminatory ordering interface or electronic ordering interface. And with that directive, we set out to develop an EDI interface. At the time we didn't have an EDI developer or any EDI expertise. We went out, acquired the services of consultants, went to training, bought equipment, software to do this. It took us a little while to get it done, but we have the EDI
interface up and running. In fact, I think we were one of the first CLECs to have the L\&P ordering capability via EDI, one of the first three or four. At any rate, very proud of what we've done with that, and now we're ready for the next step; and that is, to integrate preordering into our ordering capability, and what -Bellsouth says, well, okay. You need to go to TAG. You need to build out to TAG, or Telecommunications Access Gateway

Well, that sounds simple enough to go to TAG. It's a little more complicated. It is -- None of the expertise we gained with EDI is transferable. None of the knowledge is transferable. It's a whole new architecture. It's called Common Object Request Brokering Architecture, or CORBA.

Again, we're back at square one. We don't have the expertise. We are going to have either acquire consultants, employees, or whatever it takes, go to training to be build this interface; and we're going to build out to TAG. We estimate it's going to take up to 12 months to do so.

In the interim, we've requested a couple of things; and before $I$ go on, one of them is CSR parsing, and it's a closed issue. It's up there, but this is -I'm not going to address that, but I'm going to address

TAG. I was shocked to learn just last week in our research on the building out to TAG that TAG does not sparse the CSR. That's contrary to what's been said in these testimonies and $I$ am just in disbelief that -- In fact, I have a formal change request to Bellsouth from AT\&T that is for this capability in TAG, and BellSouth's comments here are they're not going to be in the next release either. Still won't parse the CSR. That is the most fundamental thing in preordering there is, is being able to pull a customer record and use that information to put in an order. That is it. That's the building blocks of preordering, and it's not there.

MR. ALEXANDER: Commissioner Clark, I would like to object to this. This is not in his testimony. This issue is not in this proceeding, and $I$ would ask that those comments regarding parsing the CSR be struck from the record. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Adelman. MR. ADELMAN: Your Honor -- Commissioner, certainly the issue of the integration of preordering an ordering is in the proceeding, and you'll hear testimony from Mr. Pate for Bellsouth who will argue that TAG is the nondiscriminatory interface which is -COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me interrupt vou. The
question is: Is it part of his prefiled testimony?
MR. ADELMAN: The issue of whether TAG is the integrated preordering and ordering interface is in his testimony, yes. This development from next week is not. It is not.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
MR. ADELMAN: From last week, I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: He needs to keep his
summary rooted in the testimony he has filed.
MR. ALEXANDER: Your Honor, may we have that
struck from the record?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I will strike that from the record.

MR. ADELMAN: If I could direct the witness.

BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):
Q If you could just go on to the next issue in your summary.

A What about RSAG?
Q That's in your prefiled testimony. You may discuss that.

A Okay. So we also asked for the download of the RSAG. That is -- the RSAG is the Regional Street and Address Guide. It has a data base of addresses and facilities available at those such addresses, that we can validate our customers' addresses and so that we don't
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have invalid -- have errors in our orders, is basically what that's for. BellSouth has agreed to provide that download of the RSAG and subsequent updates. What we're asking the Commission to decide is a fair way of allowing Bellsouth to recoup their cost of developing the download, not necessarily the data itself, but for developing the capability of having that download. We're asking that that be prorated across all CLECs that request that capability.

My next issue is the definition of flow-through. ITC^DeltaCom wants the definition of the flow-through in our contract. BellSouth -- it's my understanding that Bellsouth does not. When I say flow-through, BellSouth measures flow-through for itself. It's the time the customer representative has the customer on the line, starts keying the order, until the time the customer is in service; but they define that differently for the CLECs or the ALECs. They define that as from the time an accurate and complete LSR is submitted through their electronic gateway, ignoring the preordering piece. The preordering piece is a substantial amount of the time for CLECs, and we believe that those definitions should be consistent, and they should be in the agreement.

My next issue is maintenance and repair.

```
    tender Mr. Thomas for cross examination.
        COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Alexander.
        MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Commissioner Clark.
                                    CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. ALEXANDER:
    Q Good afternoon, Mr. Thomas.
    A Good afternoon.
    Q Let's take the RSAG download issue first.
That's Issue 5 in this proceeding, is it not?
    A Subject to check, I believe so.
    Q Now the RSAG stands for the Regional Street
Address Guide; is that right?
    A That's my understanding, yes.
    Q And is it your understanding that that is used
to perform address validation; is that correct?
    A It's my understanding it's a data base with
addresses in a capability that can be written to -- pull
addresses and validate it. I don't think RSAG itself
provides that capability. It's just data.
    Q Maybe I didn't say it correctly. I apologize.
But the information in RSAG can be used to perform
address validation?
    A That's correct.
    Q And is that why DeltaCom would like to have
access to that database?
```

A That's correct.
Q Okay. When DeltaCom places an order today, it validates addresses by accessing the RSAG data base through LENS interface; is that correct?

A Yes, we use LENS for preordering today.
Q Okay. And the issue that we have here is really that DeltaCom has indicated it's going to move to the TAG, the Telecommunications Access Gateway, T-A-G interface, but you're wanting something in the interim until you do, between using LENS and going to TAG; is that correct?

A Yeah, we're looking to be able to validate our addresses now. Like I said, we're in the process of developing out to $T A G$, and I have reason for concern about the capabilities of TAG; and we certainly need something that will allow us to address, validate addresses. And right now, the only thing we can think of at this point, or the most logical thing for us at this point, is a download of the RSAG.

Q And you indicated, I believe, in your summary that you've estimated -- well, am I correct that you are moving to TAG?

A Yes, we are.
Q And you indicated in your summary, I believe, that you anticipate that implementation effort to take 6
to 12 months?
A That's our estimation, yes.
Q Okay. How long have you been looking at implementing TAG?

A We've, like I said, we've been built out to EDI. That's what we've been concentrating on. We're a small company. We've got a very robust, as far as the CLEC side, capability with EDI. Eor what BellSouth will accept, we send via EDI.

That was no small undertaking for us. I think the characterization here is that we may have been dragging our feet a little bit on building out to TAG, and that's not the case. We're very diligent in our efforts to integrate, and it is now the next logical step for us to build out to TAG, and we are now -- we now have that effort underway.

Q Okay. I guess I'm trying to ascertain, how much of the 6 to 12 months have you already used of this development time?

A Development has not started yet. We are doing research as I -- well, that got stricken. But we are researching and laying the groundwork.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me be clear. It was stricken because it was not rooted in your prefiled testimony. Now that he's asked the question and has
opened it up, you may respond beyond what's in your prefiled testimony.

MR. ALEXANDER: Well, Commissioner Clark, the area that he's about to go into I've asked nothing about.

MR. ADELMAN: I believe he asked about the capability of TAG. Maybe the question --

MR. ALEXANDER: I didn't ask about the capability of TAG. I asked him how far is he in the 12-month -- 6- to 12 -month process. I asked for a time frame.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Be responsive to the question.

WITNESS THOMAS: Okay, we are -- you asked if that's part of the development time frame. It is not part -- We have not started developing. We are weighing our option on whether we develop that from scratch, whether we hire that done, or whether we buy a product that provides an ILEC gateway solution. So, no, the clock -- the clock has probably not started ticking just yet.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing): Q That's my question. So we are still looking at a 6 - to 12 -month window for you? A That's correct.

```
    Q Okay.
    COMMISSIONER CLARK: While I've interrupted
        you, I want to -- will somebody tell me in the
        prehearing order where the parties take a position
        on the definition of flow-through? Is it -- I mean
        you have a --
            MR. ALEXANDER: It's Issue 22.
            COMMISSIONER CLARK: Oh, it's 22. That helps.
            MR. ALEXANDER: I'll ask him some questions
        about it.
            COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, we probably should
        indicate on Page 10, Line 4, that it's Issue 22, not
        2(g), in his rebuttal testimony.
    MR. ALEXANDER: I believe -- Yes, it should be
        Issue 22. What he's used is the issue from the
        petition.
        COMMISSIONER CLARK: I see. Thank you.
        MR. ALEXANDER: They were renumbered.
        COMMISSIONER CLARK: And it is correct, and it
        shouldn't -- Probably clarified it right now.
        MR. ADELMAN: It's Petition Issue 2(g);
        Florida's Issue List, Issue 22.
        COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Thanks.
        MR. ALEXANDER: You're welcome.
            25 BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing):
```

Q Mr. Thomas, I guess, just from a global concept, I understand DeltaCom is, in your words, a small company and has undertaken a number of efforts to get into the local market. Would you agree that these interfaces that BellSouth has developed and that DeltaCom is developing so that it can use those are evolving as both the ALECs and the incumbent carriers are learning how to do this local competition process, that the industry is actually evolving standards?

A Yeah, I think the industry is evolving standards. I think these OSSs, I hope they're evolving because they're right now not providing what we need. So it is my, certainly my hope -- To answer your question, yes, the standards are evolving; and it's my hope that these OSS systems provided -- or access to these oss systems provided by BellSouth are evolving as well.

Q So you are not only hoping, but you expect Bellsouth to continue to improve those interfaces, and DeltaCom, consequently, will have to make changes on its side in order to use those interfaces?

A I guess -- I can only say that I hope that they do.

Q Well, you would expect that because you're saying that they can be improved?

A I think it can be improved.

Q Okay. So when you made the statement that approximately two years ago BellSouth said that EDI, the Electronic Data Interchange interface was its preferred ALEC interface, you knew that BellSouth knew that those were going to be evolving and that was not a static electronic interface?

A I don't think I stated that I took exception to EDI evolving. Now we have to go to yet another architecture called CORBA for the preordering piece, if that was your question.

Q Is that -- Well, I'm just asking, that BellSouth is holding itself out as, here is an interface we have to date, but you do recognize that there will be changes and modifications and improvements made to those interfaces as the industry, for example, continues to develop standards?

A That's the way the software industry works; it's ever evolving.

Q And if you're Microsoft you get to do it about every year or so?

A That's correct.
COMMISSIONER JACOBS: It's my understanding that there is an industry group that's working on a set of standards. Does that cover, or does it encompass the specifications for these electronic
interfaces for interconnection?

WITNESS THOMAS: I guess -- I'm assuming you're referring to the OBF, the Ordering and Billing Forum and ATIS.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Electronic communications -- I'm sorry, it was in one of --

WITNESS THOMAS: The electronic interface change control process?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.

WITNESS THOMAS: Yes, that's where the change requests $I$ referred to earlier evolved from.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's where that --
WITNESS THOMAS: That's a BellSouth committee, Bellsouth and CLEC committee that addresses OSS enhancements and changes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Is -- now -- Allow me a moment just to delve into this.

WITNESS THOMAS: Certainly.
COMMISSIONER JACOBS: How does that work in context to your evolution of EDI or any other interface that might be out there? Is it going to come out of that process and then you adopt it, basically, so that there will be some consistency, or is it basically you respond ad hoc to what Bellsouth institutes in terms of modifying its
systems?
WITNESS THOMAS: That was an issue, in fact, in this arbitration, and it was settled. We agreed, we -- Both parties agreed to accept what came out of the EICCP --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I see.

WITNESS THOMAS: -- as the standard and what both parties would develop to. So, yes, is the answer to your question, $I$ believe.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And then one other question. It's my understanding that TAG requires you to begin wholesale anew in development of your interface. There are no overlapping features between it and EDI?

WITNESS THOMAS: It is on a completely different architecture, that's correct. TAG does address ordering, so we'll have to make the choice, do we stay with our EDI ordering, which is a batch process. What $I$ mean by that is periodically every -- and this may not be accurate, but I'm -For example, I'll say every 15 minutes BellSouth picks up these orders that have been sent EDI and starts processing them. So it is a batch process, and what they have on their side is real time.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I see.

WITNESS THOMAS: So there is some discrepancy there in the time and manner in which that service is delivered, which being the time -- it being a batch process.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Thank you. BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :

Q Just to follow up on one of the questions Commissioner Jacobs asked you. There is a -- BellSouth accepts input from ALECs, such as DeltaCom, right, about these systems, its OSS developments?

A In the EICCP, yes, that's correct.
Q The Change Control Process Committee that you're referring?

A I'm sorry?

Q The Change Control Process Committee?
A Yes, that's correct.
Q Is DeltaCom a participant in that group?
A Yes, we are.

Q So DeltaCom has input about how these interfaces are developed; is that right?

A We have input in that committee, yes, and they take those suggestions. Now the timing for
implementation is up to Bellsouth, but they do take the suggestions.

Okay. Mr. Thomas, the issue on this download
of the RSAG database, right now it's not that DeltaCom just wants access to this database, because it's going to be able to get that through TAG at a later point when you actually develop it, but you're wanting an electronic download of some portion of the RSAG; is that correct?

A I'll address the first part. You said that that capability is available via TAG. I can say that Bellsouth says it is, and we haven't seen that in our -we haven't gotten that far in our research yet. So assuming that's correct, TAG will provide access to the RSAG. To what level I'm not sure yet. So we are requesting a download of the RSAG so that we can validate addresses.

Q Okay. And I believe you testified that you want to validate that for your own -- for DeltaCom's back office system to do those address validations; is that right?

A Yeah, we'll download that to our systems and write the software to check addresses on that data in our system.

Q And if BellSouth is accurate, that you'll be able to access the RSAG database, you won't have any problems with rekeying information, will you, as you claim you have now using EDI?

A I didn't hear -- could you repeat that? I
didn't hear the first part.

Q If you can access the database, the RSAG database through TAG, will you have any issues that you've raised in your testimony concerning rekeying information?

A That's certainly the hope. We hope that TAG -being able to validate addresses via TAG, that we won't have to rekey that information, that's correct.

Q And is it your understanding that TAG has been available since, I believe -- and hopefully you can keep me straight on this, if you've been researching it, but I believe August of 1998 ?

A That's correct.

Q So TAG --
A August of 98 for the preordering piece only.
Q And what about the ordering piece?
A November of 1998.
Q November of 1998. So almost over -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: GO ahead and finish your question.

Q Over a year for the preordering piece and almost a year for the ordering function?

A And like I said before, we were building out the EDI, the interface you said was the nondiscriminatory
interface of choice in 1997. These are complicated interfaces. They're not some -- it's not flipping a switch to implement these interfaces as he's trying to imply there. This is complicated. And we built out to EDI, and we immediately go to the next step.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Kind of takes me to my question. It's my understanding that your need for the address, and you take your order, you put in an address, or actually you verify an address by looking into the database at the time you take your order; is that correct?

WITNESS THOMAS: The way we envision that working is when we key in an address and the screen -- you're on the picture of the customer service representative keying an order, and they type the address of the customer in, or, hopefully, it pulls in from the CSR.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: CSR, okay.
WITNESS THOMAS: But anyway, the address is up there when they go to the next thing or when they click next screen or whatever it is that they do. If something is wrong with the format of that address that's going to cause that order to be rejected when it goes to BellSouth, we automatically, in the backaround, check that and
bring them back and say, no, this is wrong.
COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's the problem you're trying to avoid. That's my question I'm getting at. The problem you're trying to avoid is a later kick out from Bellsouth because of some inadvertent mistype or some missing formatting that might be in the address field.

WITNESS THOMAS: Yeah, and let me elaborate on that a little bit. That's correct. And if, for instance, there were three errors in that, we would send that order to BellSouth, and it would kick it back and say you've got an error. We would correct the error that it said that we had. We would send it back again, and it would give us yet the second error. And then we would send it again, and it would come back again with a third error, so that can -- That's days.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now if -- You don't need to grab that address, put it on your order record and then send it to BellSouth, all you need to do is, at the time you take the order, confirm that that's the correct address, and then when it -WITNESS THOMAS: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm trying to make sure I understand the terminology. When you say a
download, are you saying that you need to actually grab the address off of the database at the time you take the order, put it into your ordering information that you later send to BellSouth; and so then, theoretically, when it gets to BellSouth, it will be simply a copy of what they have in their database that they check off on? Is that what you're anticipating.

WITNESS THOMAS: It would have been validated against a copy that they had.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Originally.
WITNESS THOMAS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. And so you would have entered into it, but it would have been validated at the time you took the input, and so that's why it would clear later on down the process.

WITNESS THOMAS: That's correct. It's to prevent errors downstream and long provisioning intervals for our customers.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing):
Q Let me just try to focus back on -- You can -The question we have before this Commission is BellSouth and DeltaCom -- BellSouth has committed and offered to provide DeltaCom with a download of the RSAG and has
committed and offered to provide DeltaCom with a monthly update for that RSAG database; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q And what we're really talking about here is DeltaCom has got to tell BellSouth what portion of that database it wants; is that correct?

A That's not my understanding. The issue outstanding, that I understand, is: What cost is BellSouth allowed to recoup for producing the download of this database?

Q Mr. Thomas, have you seen the correspondence back and forth during the negotiations between the parties on this issue?

A I have seen in Louisiana, I believe it was, the copy of the -- what BellSouth offered to provide this, the cost. It was basically a paragraph saying we'll provide this for X amount of dollars.

Q Have you been in discussions with BellSouth subject-matter experts regarding the download of the RSAG database?

A I have not. I have got a copy of the schema of that database, and I'm reviewing that now. It's on my desk. So I'm going -- reviewing that to see what it's going to take to populate that into our back-end systems. Do you understand that as a part of determining
the actual price -- BellSouth has made an estimate, the best it could, but determining as a part of the actual price, that it has to know exactly what part of that database DeltaCom desires?

A I would assume that they would give us the whole database since that's what they have access to.

Q And do you realize that a whole database is literally millions and millions of bits of data?

A Millions and millions of bytes of data is, nowadays is not that big an issue. We collect millions and millions of call records everyday and store those in databases. That's --

Q Well, for BellSouth's perspective, this is even a large database; would you accept that?

A I accept that it's large, yes.
Q BellSouth is committed to provide this -- TAG is available to you, correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And Bellsouth has committed, at DeltaCom's request, has offered to provide a download of the RSAG database and has even offered to provide monthly updates; is that right?

MR. ADELMAN: Objection. That's been asked and
answered. That's the third time. The answer is
yes.
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MR. ALEXANDER: Well, every time I ask my question, I get back a different response, but that's all right.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :
Q Is that correct, Mr. Thomas?
MR. ADELMAN: I objected to the question. I
don't know if he responded to my objection or not.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: GO ahead and answer it one more time, but that's it.

WITNESS THOMAS: Yes.
BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :
Q Okay. Now have you not seen the correspondence between Bellsouth and DeltaCom regarding the needs it has to give you an accurate price description?

A I think I told you what correspondence I saw, which was the price that BellSouth was asking for the download. And if you're -- maybe I'm just not understanding your question, but that's what I've seen.

Q Have you seen a letter from BellSouth's counsel for the negotiation team dated September 23 rd regarding the download of the RSAG?

A I don't know. Maybe you can show it to me. MR. ADELMAN: Your Honor, if I could have a look.
(DOCUMENT TENDERED TO MR. ADELMAN)
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MR. ALEXANDER: May I show it to the witness? COMMISSIONER CLARK: Uh-huh.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :
Q Mr. Thomas, take a look at -- what I've handed you is a letter from Parkey Jordan at BellSouth to Nanette Edwards dated September 23, 1999. Do you see that?

A Yes, I do.
Q Have you seen this letter before?
A I think this is the one that the counsel showed me in Louisiana. I have not read it in detail. I was on the stand at that time and just --

Q Have you read it since?
A No, I have not.
Q Has Ms. Edwards ever provided you with this letter?

A No, I don't believe so, but let me say this: I provide the technical -- at DeltaCom I'll provide the technical information: Can we accept this download? Will this work? The technical specifications. It's up to our regulatory department, Ms. Edwards and Mr. Rozycki, to determine a price and do the negotiations with Bellsouth. I'm not involved everyday with that. I was involved a little bit with the negotiations on our interconnection aqreement but just to address technical
issues. So $I$ have seen this and, again, our regulatory
department would have to decide if we wanted to proceed
with an agreement.
Q Okay.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Alexander, did you
want this marked as an exhibit?
MR. ALEXANDER: Yes, I would. Cross
examination exhibit for BellSouth.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
WITNESS THOMAS: I, I -- I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: We will mark as Exhibit 17
a letter to Ms. Nanette Edwards dated September
$23 \mathrm{rd}, 1999$ from Parkey Jordan.
WITNESS THOMAS: I will say that I have heard
of another proposal to MCI, I believe it was, for
yet a different price than this.
BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :
Q Who did you hear that from, Mr. Thomas?
A I heard that from Ms. Edwards.
Q Okay.
A I believe that -- I believe that came from her
conversations with MCI.
Q Okay. Mr. Thomas, looking at Exhibit 17, the
September 23 rd, 1999 letter, does that letter, in the
very first paragraph, reflect that the parties have been
discussing this very matter and that BellSouth agreed to provide DeltaCom with a download of the RSAG, including monthly updates as early as August 13th, 1999?

MR. ADELMAN: Your Honor, I object. If he's asking him to read the letter, so be it. He's not the author of the letter. He wasn't the recipient of the letter. He's only seen it one time. It's been marked as an exhibit. I guess, you know, my objection to his question is that this letter hasn't been authenticated. To the extent they're trying to read passages from the letter in, it's hearsay evidence. I don't know if Ms. Jordan will be here today or not.

MR. ALEXANDER: Ms. Edwards is here today. MR. ADELMAN: Ms. Edwards is counsel today. She's certainly not on the stand, and the letter is addressed to Ms. Edwards, but she's certainly not the author.

MR. ALEXANDER: It's business correspondence between two parties in this proceeding, and this witness has seen this letter before; and, granted, it's not addressed to him, but I'm just asking him questions about the parties' negotiations which he said he participated in some of it. It's clearly correspondence between the two parties on this very
issue.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Adelman, tell me the basis of your objection again.

MR. ADELMAN: It's hearsay evidence. He's asking for hearsay evidence. If he's asking him to read the letter, just to read it, I have no objection; but if the intention is to present statements made in this letter as truth of the matter asserted in the letter, it's hearsay evidence. And it's not a business record; it's correspondence.

MR. ALEXANDER: I would disagree. First of all, the hearsay objection in a regulatory proceeding is, you know, rarely, if ever, made, let alone sustained.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask you this question. This is not being presented for the truth of the assertions made in it, it's only that this offer was made and it was received?

MR. ALEXANDER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. I'm going to allow him to continue questioning.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing)
Q Mr. Thomas, do you want me to repeat it?
A Please.

Q Okay. I was just asking if Exhibit 17 reflects that DeltaCom and BellSouth had negotiations in a meeting on August 13th, 1999 in which Bellsouth offered and actually agreed to provide DeltaCom with the download of the RSAG database and monthly updates?

A Yeah, I mean that's what it says here. The issue is --

Q Mr. Thomas?
A I said yes.

MR. ADELMAN: If the witness could answer
the -- or explain his answer, I believe that's fair?
WITNESS THOMAS: The issue is, we've accepted their offer to download the RSAG and the subsequent monthly updates. What we don't -- what we can't agree on is how this can be -- they can be fairly paid, once, to develop the capability -- to develop the capability to download, not for the data itself, but for the capability of the download. We believe they should be compensated. We don't believe they should be compensated by everybody more than once. That's all.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing):
Q Okay. Well, you said that in your summary as well. I believe you said that DeltaCom is asking that the development cost of providing the download of RSAG be
prorated across all ALECs who request access to this database, the RSAG database. Is that a fair recitation of what you said earlier?

A I believe so, yes.
Q Okay. And to your knowledge, is BellSouth opposed to allowing DeltaCom to the find another ALEC who desires this database to participate in the cost of the development of that?

A I don't know. I can't speak for BellSouth, if they're opposed or not to that. To my knowledge, I don't know.

Q Have you been an active participant in these negotiations on this issue, Mr. Thomas?

A I was there for a few hours.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Alexander, would you
repeat your question for me?
MR. ALEXANDER: I asked him if he has been an active participant in the negotiations regarding this issue, the RSAG download.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
WITNESS THOMAS: Yes, I was in the negotiations when this was brought up. Cost at that time was not discussed, just the capability. They explained that this was a large database and that type thing, and we looked at it, and we said we need the download of
the RSAG. And we left it at that, and they came back and agreed to do it. That's to the extent I was involved in the negotiation. There was no price discussed in those negotiations.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing):
Q Does Exhibit 17 reflect a price that was achieved back in September? Do you see that on here on Page 2 of Exhibit 17 , an estimate of a price?

MR. ADELMAN: Objection to the question. He said he wasn't involved in discussions of the price. Again, if he's asking him to read the letter, I'd suppose the questions --

MR. ALEXANDER: He earlier --
COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry. What --
MR. ADELMAN: This witness has stated that he was not present for any negotiations with regard to the pricing of the RSAG download. I object to the question. He has already indicated he doesn't have personal knowledge of that.

MR. ALEXANDER: That's not consistent with what he said earlier. He said he was aware that there was $X$ price offered for this, and I don't know that we've ever ascertained whether he knows what that $X$ price is, and this Exhibit 17 clearly reflects that, and I'm tryind to ascertain that. I'm going to be
quite surprised --
COMMISSIONER CLARK: I thought you said you were not offering this for the truth of what was stated in the letter, only that it was sent.

MR. ALEXANDER: To the extent that I need to do so, I guess I would ask that $I$ be allowed to. This is business records. It's correspondence between the two parties, and if it's hearsay at all, $I$ think it's clearly an exception to that rule. And $I$ guess I could back up --

MR. ADELMAN: Commissioner, in the interest of, I guess, judicial economy, Mr. Wood is the cost and rate expert. He's scheduled to appear here for ITC^DeltaCom.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm having a little trouble understanding, sort of, the argument over all this thing. The letter has been sent. Perhaps it is hearsay. It appears to be an offer on behalf of Bellsouth. The letter says what it says. I don't know what further you want from this witness. MR. ALEXANDER: Well, let me ask him. BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing):

Q Mr. Thomas, have you heard -- you mentioned earlier in your testimony that Bellsouth had committed to do this and said $X$ price. Do you know what $X$ price is?

A X price is, according to this document, 87 thousand five hundred. I said $X$ price because I didn't remember. I thought it was 80 something thousand, but I couldn't remember exactly.

Q And you knew that independent of this letter, Mr. Thomas?

A I knew this when you -- or not you, but the local counsel in Louisiana showed me this letter. That's what I knew that from.

Q You had not been informed by anyone at DeltaCom before?

A I think we had only received it a few days before the Louisiana hearing, and to do the math -- This is dated September 23rd, less than -- or right at a month ago, and I can't remember how long ago we were in Louisiana. About that long ago.

Q October 4th was the start of the Louisiana hearing; is that correct?

A Subject to check. I don't remember.
Q Now, Mr. Thomas, I guess let me just try to wrap this discussion up. The bottom line is: Do you understand that BellSouth has actually agreed to allow DeltaCom to participate in the sharing prorata, as you've asked, for the development cost if DeltaCom will provide any other person or any other -- excuse me, any other

ALEC who is interested in doing this?
A I guess I wasn't aware of that. Like I said, I'm not the guy that Bellsouth is going to negotiate with over how this is done. I'm here for -- or I'm here for DeltaCom during these things to see if we can actually download this database, and I'm responsible for getting that done. I'm not responsible for negotiating the deal with BellSouth on how it's paid for.

Q Okay. You mentioned that Ms. Edwards told you that MCI had indicated that they had discussed this, getting a download of the RSAG, with BellSouth; is that correct?

A Yeah, I believe it was -- I believe this Commission ordered BellSouth to do that in a proceeding, to provide a download of the RSAG to MCI, yes.

Q And do you know if MCI is still interested in that?

A No, I do not.

Q Okay. Does DeltaCom know of any other ALEC today that's willing to come forward and share in the prorata cost of the RSAG download and monthly updates to that database?

A I'm not aware of any. But, again, I'll say it again, I'm not going to be involved in the negotiations over the price of this download. And that includes
whether another ALEC is involved or not. I'm just saying it's fair -- it's only fair for BellSouth to be compensated once.

Q Okay. You've testified here, Mr. Thomas, that DeltaCom is asking the Commission to prorate these costs with other ALECS, and I'm asking you now: Do you know of any other ALECs, to DeltaCom's knowledge, to your knowledge as the witness on this issue, that is going to come forward and help participate in those costs with DeltaCom?

MR. ADELMAN: Objection. Asked and answered. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sustained. BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :

Q Okay. Let's talk about another issue. Let's talk about flow-through. Mr. Thomas, I believe it's Issue 22. It's in, I believe, your rebuttal, at Pages 10 to 11 , if you'd like to turn there.
(WITNESS COMPLIED)
A Okay, I'm on Page 10.
Q On Page 10 of your rebuttal, you discuss the issue regarding the definition of how order flow-through should be defined?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And DeltaCom believes the definition should include preordering activities; is that correct?

A That's correct. And the reason we believe that is because BellSouth uses preordering. It's our understanding that BellSouth uses the preordering in the definition of flow-through. In fact, I think it's in Mr. Pate's testimony. He says the flow-through starts when the customer service representative has the customer on line. That's the preordering part. That's the intensive part or the time-consuming part. Now they want to say, well, we're only going to count it for ALECs from the time you have a perfect LSR. Well, that leaves a big piece of the pie out, and we don't believe it should be that way.

Q When we talk about the definition of flow-through being included in the interconnection agreement, do you agree that it should be consistent with the FCC's definition of the flow-through?

A I believe it should be consistent with BellSouth's definition of flow-through. If BellSouth is a little bit more specific than the FCC, then DeltaCom should be too. They should be the same.

Q So I guess -- Do you know how the FCC defines flow-through?

A I can't quote it. I've seen it written, but I can't quote it.

Do vou know if BellSouth's proposed definition
of order flow-through for the interconnection agreement mirrors the FCC's definition?

A Yeah, I think maybe it does. It also -- like I said before, to the extent that BellSouth's definition, how they measure it for themselves is more specific than the FCC's, then to that same extent so should DeltaCom's be, and it should be in the agreement.

Q Mr. Thomas, can you tell us anywhere in any ECC order that the FCC has said that order flow-through should include preorder activities?

A No, I can't, but it does say that it should be parity; and parity -- if BellSouth chooses to include preordering, then so should DeltaCom.

Q And you would also propose -- DeltaCom being you -- that the definition of order flow-through would include electronic reports of order status and things like that, correct?

A That's what we've proposed, yes.
Q And are you aware of any FCC order that includes in the definition of order flow-through electronic order status?

A I can't cite it. I don't have it in front of me.

Q Do you know of one?
A I don't know of one.
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Q So DeltaCom is asking the Florida Commission in this arbitration to adopt a definition of order flow-through that the FCC has never agreed to?

A I'm asking this Commission to define a definition of flow-through that is consistent with BellSouth's that includes the preordering piece, just like BellSouth's. That's what I'm asking the Commission to do.

Q Well, with respect to the two items I just mentioned to you, preordering activities and order status, those are not included in the FCC's definition of order flow-through, correct?

A $\quad$ To my knowledge, no.
Q And you are asking that they be included in your interconnection agreement here in front of the Elorida Commission?

A It's a proposal, yes.
Q Do you know BellSouth's definition of order flow-through?

A We can go to Mr. Pate's testimony, and I can read it to you from there. It may take me just a minute to find it.

MR. ADELMAN: If BellSouth could provide a
citation, that might expedite things.
MR. ALEXANDER: I asked Mr. Thomas.

MR. ADELMAN: Oh.

WITNESS THOMAS: I'm getting close here. I'm on the subject anyway. Here it is: "Based upon the ECC's definition, BellSouth contends that a service request flows through --"

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Did you give me a page? Did you give a page?

WITNESS THOMAS: I'm sorry. Let me -- Yeah, Page 13, starting on Line 1.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing):

Q You're in Mr. Pate's?
A Mr. Pate's direct testimony. Are you ready?
Q Page 13?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. What Iine?
A "Based upon the --" Iine 1.
"Based upon the $E C C$ 's definition,
Bellsouth contends that a service
request flows through an electronic
order system only when an ALEC or
Bellsouth representative takes
information directly from an
end-user customer, inputs it directly
into electronic order interface --"
And that's the preordering piece, and I'm outside
the quote here when I say that.
"-- directly from an end-user customer, inputs it directly into an electronic ordering interface without making any changes or manipulating the customer's information and sends the complete and correct request downstream for mechanized order generation."

The only part that they want to define for -- the only part of that that they want to define for the CLECs is, "and sends the complete and correct request downstream for mechanized order generation." That is what they want to define. It's right down there in the next paragraph. That's how they want to define it for the ALECs.

Q And Mr. Thomas, Mr. Pate's testimony reflects that that's consistent with the ECC's definition?

MR. ADELMAN: Objection. Is he just asking what Mr. Pate is saying?

MR. ALEXANDER: He just read that and said it's in Mr. Pate's testimony in the first four words, five words. "Based upon the $E C C$ 's definition, is what he read."

MR. ADEIMAN: Okay. In which case he has asked
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the question and answered it. If he's asking him to reread it --

MR. ALEXANDER: I didn't ask him that question, Mr. Adelman.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Give me your question again.

MR. ALEXANDER: It's going to be a long day. The question was: Is the definition he just read from Mr. Pate's testimony, according to Mr. Pate's own testimony, consistent with the ECC's definition of order flow-through?

MR. ADELMAN: Just so I understand, Commissioner.

MR. ALEXANDER: You want me to repeat it again?
MR. ADELMAN: I object to the question. It's a compound question. Is he asking whether Mr. Pate said it was consistent, or is he asking whether it's consistent --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: He's asking whether Mr. Pate said it was consistent.

MR. ALEXANDER: I thought that was clear.
WITNESS THOMAS: Mr. Pate says, and as I read, "Based upon the FCC's definition." I think -- I mean that's what he said.

BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):

```
true?
```

A I would have to sit down with the ECC's definition and look, but if that's consistent, then let's define that for the ALECs. I'll take that. We'll define that very definition in our contract for the ALECs.

Q And you believe that definition includes preordering activities --

A It absolutely --
Q -- and order status?
A It absolutely includes the preordering. No, not the status. Not the status, but the preordering piece, which is left out of how Bellsouth defines it for the ALECs.

Q Mr. Thomas, let's turn to Pages 15 through 16 in your rebuttal testimony where you deal with Issue 34. Are you familiar with that?

A I'm sorry. I'm flipping, so you're going to have to give me the page number again.

Q Pages 15 through 16 of your rebuttal.
A Okay, I'm on Page 15.
Q And there you're dealing with the repair information that DeltaCom says it needs from BellSouth in order to keep its customer informed; is that correct? A That's correct.

Q You do agree that with respect to repair and trouble reports that DeltaCom and BellSouth used the same electronic access, something called TAFI?

A I agree. That's correct. We do. We use TAFI for our resale troubles. What we're -- the issue at hand in this issue here is the time and material. We accept what we get in TAFI. What we're asking for is time and material.

And I've explained it briefly in my summary that the time is the labor for the technician and the material are the parts that he uses. We're requesting they send us a detailed bill, and then they refuse to agree to that in the contract. They want us to pay it, but they don't want to send us the details of how we're supposed to bill our end user and validate the bill.

I've used the example before. It's like going to the restaurant and the waiter comes to your table when you're through and holds his hand out and says, That's going to be a hundred dollars. And you say, Well, you know, I'd like to see my check. Well, we can't do that. We can't give you a check because I eat here, you know, and I eat here for free. That's part of my salary, and they don't give me a bill, so sorry, sir, you can't have a bill, but it's going to be a hundred dollars. And that's the whole issue here on this trouble. We just
want an itemized bill.
Q Okay. Let me just be clear. Mr. Thomas. Deltacom is not contending that it does not have-- let me take out all the negatives. Is your position that Deltacom receives nondiscriminatory access to TAFI?

A To TAFI? Yes.
Q Okay. And the only issue with regard to this matter is whether or not DeltaCom can get time and material charges, a statement of those, in a manner that DeltaCom believes it needs?

A Just -- Before I say yes, I'm going to ask you to repeat it.

Q Okay. The only issue in dispute here is whether or not Deltacom can have a list of the time and material charges associated with any repair that may happen as a result of a trouble ticket in a manner that DeltaCom believes that it needs?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. You are aware that Bellsouth does not get time and material charges itself through TAFI; is that correct?

A Through TAEI?
Q Yes.
A Yes, that's correct. As I said in my summary, okay, it's not available in TAEI, we'll take it via
another electronic means. We understand that it's not there in TAFI, and we're not asking Bellsouth to develop that in TAFI. We're just asking for them to provide us that information, preferably electronically, so we can validate it.

Q When DeltaCom enters a trouble report in TAFI, is it your position that DeltaCom will have to authorize Bellsouth before it actually initiates or performs a repair?

A I'm not sure. I don't know. I don't submit trouble tickets myself, so I'm not sure if we have to authorize.

Q You're not contending that BellSouth goes out and makes whatever repairs it wants to on its own, do you?

A No, I think they go out and repair the customer as they need to be repaired; and if that takes parts off their truck to do that, it takes parts. And if it takes two hours or four hours or three people two hours or whatever it takes, that's what it takes. We're just asking for a detailed bill.

Q My question was, does DeltaCom authorize, before the repairs are made, the fact that those repairs will be made?

A I don't know. That's more of an issue of

```
who -- our provisioning department, our customer service
department that actually uses -- they're users of TAFI.
I don't know. I wasn't aware that they had to authorize
Bellsouth. I thought the entry in TAFI alone was
authorization, but I'm not the expert on the
authorization. I just don't know the answer.
Q Do you know what percentage of trouble tickets
actually generate a repair, something that would create a
time and material charge to DeltaCom?
```

A I don't have any idea.
Q Would you accept that it's probably a low percentage of overall trouble tickets?

MR. ADELMAN: Objection. He said he doesn't have any idea.

MR. ALEXANDER: Eair enough. BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing):

Q Subject to check, if it's a low percentage, is DeltaCom willing to pay for the development cost of having this capability provided to it? Are you still willing to incur what may be a substantial cost in order to have time and material charges provided to you if it's not a significant amount?

MR. ADELMAN: Objection. You know, I've heard
"subject to check" used when there was a precise
number as a premise for the question. I've never
heard "subject to check" used with a vague and ambiguous premise: It's a low percentage. Perhaps Mr. Alexander could provide the percentage and then ask that it be accepted subject to check.

MR. ALEXANDER: I could, but I'm afraid it gets into your proprietary data, and I'm just asking, trying to avoid proprietary discussion here, confidential information.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing):
Q That the percentage of overall actual repairs compared to overall trouble tickets placed, do you know whether it's high or low?

A I do not know.
Q Okay. Hypothetically, if it's a low amount of actual repairs that are involved, is DeltaCom still willing to pay for the development of the capability to be provided the time and material charges as it's requesting here?

A I don't think we are because this is a fundamental way of doing business. You can go to the hardware store and get an itemized bill. This is ridiculous. If you're going to bill us, we need to know what you're billing us for, period.

Q Mr. Thomas, are you aware that DeltaCom does receive a bill from BellSouth listing charges for time
and materials?
A The time and materials. To my understanding, the time and materials are not detailed out on that bill that we receive.

Q Do you get a bill for time and material charges associated with any repair Bellsouth makes on behalf of DeltaCom?

A Yes, we get a bill, and it is one line, and I think it says "site visit."

Q Has DeltaCom presented BellSouth with a, what used to be known as a BER, Bona Fide Request -- now I believe they're called "New Business Request" -- for the development of this service since BellSouth does not provide it to itself through TAFI?

A As I said before, just because BellSouth doesn't bill itself, doesn't mean it shouldn't bill its customers. No, I don't know if we've submitted -That, again, would be regulatory that works interconnection agreements. I know it was discussed prior to this arbitration case being filed, and BellSouth refused to commit to provide it.

Q You would agree that if Bellsouth does not have that capability today, that there would be a cost involved in developing such a capability?

A I assume that, if BellSouth is sending us a
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bill somehow, they're aggregating that up to a site visit line with a total, they've got that information. They know how many parts they used to repair trouble. They know their man hours. They know this information. They just don't want to provide it to us for some reason. I'm not sure why.

Q You're not sure why, so you don't know whether or not BellSouth explained that there would be a charge associated with developing this capability?

A I don't know if BellSouth has explained there would be a charge. To my knowledge, they've never offered to provide it.

Q Has DeltaCom, again, to your knowledge, Mr. Thomas, not the regulatory group, but to your knowledge, has DeltaCom asked for a New Business Request for BellSouth to provide this capability?

MR. ADELMAN: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. ALEXANDER: I don't think he answered from his knowledge.

MR. ADELMAN: I withdraw my objection. COMMISSIONER CLARK: I need to ask that we take just a short break, five minutes, and $I$ will be right back. MR. ALEXANDER: I was going to say, that's my last question.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have to take a phone call.

MR. ALEXANDER: We'll stop.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'll be back in five minutes.
(BRIEF RECESS)
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. We'll go back on the record. Mr. Alexander, your last question.

MR. ALEXANDER: If it's okay, just to make sure I'm fair, if the court reporter -- Is that going to put you on the spot to read the question back to Mr. Thomas?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, because I wrote on the back of my paper.

MR. ALEXANDER: I'm sorry. I'll try to ask it consistent with the earlier question.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing): Q To your knowledge, has DeltaCom --

MR. ALEXANDER: To be honest with you, I need you to read it back. I was about to go down a path I think was different.
(WHEREUPON, THE COURT REPORTER REREAD THE QUESTION)

WITNESS THOMAS: I don't know is my answer, but we clearly tried to negotiate this into the
contract or it wouldn't be in this arbitration.
Bellsouth refused. That's the answer.
MR. ALEXANDER: No further questions.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Staff.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MS. CALDWELL:
Q Good afternoon, Mr. Thomas.
A Good afternoon.
Q First of all, I'd like you to turn to Issue
Number 5. Do you have that available to you?
A Are you in --
Q I'm in like the prehearing order or anything that has Issue Number 5 in it.

A I don't have it.
MR. ADELMAN: Your Honor, if I could approach,
I can present him a copy of the order.
MS. CALDWELL: That would be fine.
(DOCUMENT TENDERED TO THE WITNESS)
BY MS. CALDWELL (Continuing):
Okay. And I ask that you read Issue Number 5 .
A Okay.
Q On the record.
A "Should BellSouth be required to provide a download of the Regional Street Address Guide, RSAG? If

25 so, how?"


```
When we send orders, and it -- I can't remember the
percentages. X percent. It's confidential. A large
percentage of those don't get FOCs within the 48-hour
time frame, and it goes on and on.
```

MR. ALEXANDER: Commissioner Clark, just because he opened up a subject that didn't get to go in earlier on my cross, am I going to be entitled to ask him questions about how he knows that kind of information he just testified to?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I will -- after staff is finished, I will let you ask additional cross examination, and then we'll go to redirect.

BY MS. CALDWELL (Continuing):
Q Mr. Thomas, you testified in your deposition that ITC is not receiving nondiscriminatory access to BellSouth's preordering capability; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Could you tell me which specific Bellsouth osS interfaces ITC needs in order to receive nondiscriminatory access to Bellsouth's preordering capabilities?

A Well, we -- I don't know if I can name the -I'm not sure. Could you ask that to me one more time? I'm not exactly sure. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Ms. Caldwell, and go
slower because I'm trying to understand your questions too.

BY MS. CALDWELL (Continuing):
Q Which specific BellSouth OSS interface does ITC need in order to receive nondiscriminatory access to BellSouth's preordering capabilities?

A My answer isn't meant to sound smart or short, but the answer is all of them.

Q Does ITC have the required OSS interface to allow ITC to receive nondiscriminatory access to BellSouth's preordering capabilities?

A Not today, no.
Q And why not?
A Again, we can't integrate. Now we're willing to do the integration, I'll just say that up front, of preordering and ordering. We can't do it with the LENS, which is what we're using today. TAG, they say TAG can. They also said TAG could parse the CSR, and it can't. So based on my limited knowledge of TAG, I'd have to say no.

Q You also testified in your deposition that although ITC has the capability to validate addresses in LENS, this capability is not integrated into your system via LENS; is this correct?

A That is correct.
Q By our system, when you were referring to that,
what OSS system are you referring to?
A Eor which part, the address validation?
Q Yes.
A That would be LENS.
Q And did you state earlier that ITC uses LENS for preordering functions?

A Yes, I did.
Q Can LENS also perform ordering functions?
A Yes, for certain simple -- and I -- The last time I checked, it had a limitation of the number of orders. It was resale only. There are limitations on what you can order through LENS. Number of lines, I should say, not number of orders.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What's the limitation, six?

WITNESS THOMAS: Six, I believe, yeah, that's
the best $I$ remember.
BY MS. CALDWELL (Continuing):
Q What OSS interface system does ITC use for its ordering functions?

A EDI. It's a customized EDI solution. And when I say customized, that means that we built it from scratch and tied it to our ordering system; so when we enter an order, it automatically goes via EDI. Is that -- you enter it on your system, and
then it interfaces with the EDI, and then --
A Yeah, I guess I could get into a little of the technical issues if you'd like me to, but we have a service order processing system, and then there's a system that sits in the data center with it that takes information from that, converts it into an EDI format, and then sends it to a value-added network, or VAN service, that BellSouth picks that up.

Q And does this OSS interface system perform preordering and ordering functions?

A No, ma'am, it does not. Excuse me. Our system or the EDI system?

Q I think your system.
A It can't yet because it can't integrate with LENS. We're hoping to do that with TAG. That's what we're after. That's what we're trying to achieve.

Q You testified also in your deposition that BellSouth's TAG preordering capability was made available in August '98. I think -- and I think this question was asked and answered, but let me verify. The TAG preordering was available August of 1998, and the ordering capability was available in December of '98, or was it November?

A I think it was November. But, yes, that's correct.

Q And is it your opinion that BellSouth's TAG interface is capable of integrating preordering and ordering functions?

A I missed the first part of that, I'm sorry.
Q In your opinion, is BellSouth's TAG interface capable of integrating preordering and ordering functions?

A That's what BellSouth says, yes. It's my understanding that TAG can perform the preordering functions, or provide access to the preordering functions as well as the ordering functions.

Q Does TAG actually -- you said it provides access to the functions, so it's a way to interface with the preordering functions, or it actually does the preordering within the TAG system?

A Here's the way I understand it. It is a mechanism to access the capability to validate an address. It gives our system a way to say, here, call this function -- to get into the programming of it, call this function, and then return to me yes or no is this address valid. It is that functionality that hits the back-end, the way I understand it, the back-end BellSouth databases and returns back to our system. That's the way I understand how it's supposed to work.

Okay. And do you know if Bellsouth's TAG is

```
capable of performing error checks?
```

A It's supposed to, from what I understand. We're still in the early stages of looking at all the capabilities, but that's what I understand.

Q All right. And then my last question, I think, goes back to the materials and time. If BellSouth were to provide you with the itemized time and material charges on magnetic media, would it have to be formatted in a specific way so that ITC's systems could use it?

A We would just have to know how it was formatted so that we could write the code on our end to decipher it. They would just have to tell us what format they chose to put it in. There --

Q And would --
A I'm sorry.
Q Go ahead.
A There are lots of industry-standard Bellcore formats for exchanging billing information.

Q And you would be willing to accept a magnetic format?

A Yes, we would.
Q That's all the questions I have.
MS. CALDWELL: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Commissioner Jacobs.
COMMISSIONER JACOBS: No.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Alexander, did you have some additional cross?
MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. Very briefly. CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :
Q Mr. Thomas, you stated that you have a limited knowledge of TAG; is that correct?
A That's what I said, yeah. I guess, relatively speaking, limited.
Q And then you also stated that TAG cannot parse the CSR; is that also correct?
A That's correct. That's my understanding.
Q What is the basis of your understanding?
A This BellSouth Change Request Form submitted by AT\&T. I can read it to you.
Q What's the date of that document?
A It is -- date change request submitted was 8/12/99. It was submitted by Jill Williamson of AT\&T. Title of the change is "Parse CSR. Add functionality. It is a -- originating at CCM, assessment of impact. I'm not what sure CCM is. It's major originating CCM access. Assessment of priority is urgent. Interface impacted, LENS and TAG. Type of change is a software industry standard change. Software being one category; industry standards being another. And then the description says:
"As part of the OSS '99 upgrade, AT\&T, requested that BellSouth deliver a parse CSR as part of the preorder functionality and in alignment with the industry guidelines. BellSouth stated that it could not deliver this capability with OS (sic) '99 but would look at implementing it as part of the second phase --" second phase being in quotes -- "of OS (sic) '99. BellSouth also agreed to develop a project plan to work on implementation of this functionality over the $Y 2 \mathrm{~K}$ window for delivery. Subsequent to the close of the Y2K window, AT\&T is requesting that this functionality be delivered in the first quarter of 2000.

Q Okay. Now that's a letter in August of this year from AT\&T to BellSouth?

A This is part of the EICCP, change request mechanism. This is a change request form that is in the EICCP.

Q Did you obtain that document as a member of that ECCIP (sic)?

A Yes, I did.
Q And it --
A Actually someone that reports to me, but yes.
Q And do you have a response from Bellsouth to that document from August?

A They have acknowledged it. I have an
acknowledgement here. It was acknowledged on 8 -- date of notification says $8 / 16$, by Pat Rand.

Q My question is: Have you seen a response from Bellsouth to a document sent to them in August, mid August of this year, regarding that request?

A I have not seen -- other than the acknowledgement, I've not seen another response from BellSouth.

Q Have you made an independent evaluation of TAG to ascertain whether that's an accurate description by AT\&T or not?

A I have asked a vendor of an ILEC gateway -that vendor's name is Mantis -- if this, in fact, was true; and they verified that, yes, it was true; that TAG does not parse the CSR.

Q Okay. Let's talk about parsing the CSR. Is that simply breaking down information from a customer service record?

A Yes, it's breaking down information into valuable pieces that you can use, such as customer name.

MR. ADELMAN: Commissioner, if I could object at this time. And the ruling you made that allowed cross on top of cross, I believe, was limited to discovering what the reference was, and I think we are now going beyond that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Would you like to respond? MR. ALEXANDER: Yes. He's basically said that he's seen a document in August on one side of the story, and I'm asking him if he has any independent knowledge of that information regarding this, other than that document.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think that's fair.

MR. ADELMAN: I thought he was asking about the $C S R$ and what that means and parsing the CSR.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, I think it is important to know that we have a common understanding of what parsing the CSR means, and I'll allow the question.

MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you.
WITNESS THOMAS: He said one side of the argument. I would say that that is Bellsouth's side of the argument. That's their form.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :
Q Mr. Rozycki, who filled that form out?
A I'm Mister --
Q I'm sorry. Mr. Thomas. I'll get you straight.
A I'll take that as a compliment though.
Q I hope he does.
A He probably doesn't.
Please restate it now that we've had that
exchange.
Q He's shaking his head for our record.
Is that a form that was filled out by AT\&T?
A I'm not sure. I would assume it was the product of an EICCP meeting. This is a form where they take these requests and enter them, so I assume that BellSouth accepted this as valid.

Q But you don't know whether AT\&T filled it out or Bellsouth filled it out, and you don't know whether BellSouth has responded to that either, do you?

A I don't know if they've responded. If they have, I haven't seen anything, and I would assume that AT\&T submitted this request to BellSouth.

Q Thank you.
Back to the parsing of the CSR. You stated that parsing basically is breaking down information from a database; is that correct?

A It's from a file right now in LENS. We can -What we have to do is copy and paste it. Highlight it, copy and paste it off the Web interface, and then -It's data. It's HTML. It's the HTML presentation of the data, or you can just parse out the text and -- or just cut out the text. And what I mean by parse is, you've got to know --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I need -- Yeah, that's
what you need to answer. What does parse mean? WITNESS THOMAS: What does parse mean? It
means to break apart a string of data that's formatted in a certain way so that -- let's, for instance, customer name, and I don't remember exactly what a CSR looks like, but it has like a slash $C N$ for customer name. That's probably not correct. And then it's got Mike Thomas, the name. So it would be looking for those tags, slash CN, and, no, okay, that's customer name. I've got to pull off this many bits or characters and say, okay, there's my customer name. And I pull that off of this electronic screen. Just like in word, Microsoft Word or something where you've got an electronic document. It's just picking apart characters off of the document.

BY MR. ALEXANDER (Continuing) :
Q And given that definition of parsing, do you know whether or not, to your personal knowledge, TAG provides ALECs with a stream of data, to use your information, from the Customer Service Record, the CSR files, that can be broken down by the ALEC using TAG?

A That's the plan, and we've got the CSR parsing rules; but now I'm really concerned that if Bellsouth can't seem to do it, how we're supposed to do it, even if
they've given us their rules. It must -- there's something more to it here. BellSouth says, Here's the rules, but they're not doing it.

Q Mr. Thomas, my question was: Do you know whether or not TAG provides the ALECs with a stream of data from the Customer Service Record files, the CSRs that can be broken down by the ALEC by using TAG?

A It provides a big block of text, that is my understanding, just as LENS does.

Q And can that data be broken down by parsing that information however the ALEC desires?

A That's the plan. Again, it remains to be seen. COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think his question is:

Do you know that it can be done or can't be done? WITNESS THOMAS: I don't know if it can be
done. Bellsouth has given us the rules, but
according to my conversation with this vendor,
Mantis, it only applies, the rules -- because the
way the CSR is formatted, you can't necessarily pull
off all of the features that are associated with
each line. See, you've got a CSR with ten lines and
a variable number of features for each line. I
don't think that the rules are such that in every
case that will work.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, but your information

WITNESS THOMAS: Well, we try to take their rules and tear apart the CSR based on what rules they gave us.
COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.
WITNESS THOMAS: That's just where we are on it.
COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Redirect.
MR. ADELMAN: Briefly, Commissioner.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):
Q Mr. Thomas, I want to -- it's really as much housekeeping as anything, Commissioner Clark. I'm handing you a document. It's three pages. I'd like you to just explain for the record what I've just handed you, please.
MR. ALEXANDER: I'm going to object. This is information that the witness volunteered. He's already read it into the record. I can see no useful purpose in rereading this document, and BellSouth would certainly object to this. Mr. Thomas does not have personal knowledge of this. He said someone that works for him actually provided it to him. He was not in the meetings, and for the very same reasons Mr. Adelman likes to
object to documents, I'll do the same here.
MR. ADELMAN: Commissioner, I've asked him to identify the document.

MR. ALEXANDER: And he did, and I'm not agreeing that by talking about it that it can be admitted into this proceeding.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I understand that. We will identify it as Exhibit 18 , and it is -- it's a document headed BellSouth Change Request Eorm. It consists of -- let's see.

MR. ADELMAN: Commissioner, we can even --
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Two pages are RE-1870, and one page is, it's just -- It's 598. One is a -- it appears to be a request from a Jill Williamson, and it's two pages; and the last one appears to be an acknowledgement notification. We're going to mark that as Composite Exhibit 18.

BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):
Q Mr. Thomas, is that the document you were referring -- Those documents, are those the documents you were referring to in response to questions from Mr. Alexander?

A Yes, it is.
Q And can you please describe for me your understanding, briefly, of what those documents are and,
in particular, in what process or forum those documents would be produced?

MR. ALEXANDER: And I'm going to object. This witness has already testified that he was not there, that he did not personally obtain this, that someone else in his group did. I don't think he's established he has any personal knowledge to be able to describe this document and what its purpose is.

MR. ADELMAN: Commissioner, he was asked questions about the document. He relied on them, and if ever there was a business records exception to the hearsay rule, this is it.

MR. ALEXANDER: And I disagree that I asked him questions about it. He volunteered that and read from it. I allowed him to talk from it. I asked him what was the basis of his knowledge, and he immediately tried to start talking from this document. And now to introduce the document, which I very carefully did not ask to see or to have put in this record because $I$ think it is hearsay and he doesn't have knowledge about it. I did ask him in order to ascertain that. Now he's trying to, on redirect, try to establish some knowledge of this in order to authenticate the document which $I$ would say is very improper.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm going to allow the questions to continue, and then we will deal with admitting it into the record.

MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.
BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing) :
Q Do you want me to repeat the question?
A Please do.
Q Can you please describe those documents, and in particular, could you describe the forum in which those documents would be produced and discussed?

A Okay, this is a BellSouth Change Request Form that is a request form for CLECs to submit changes to electronic interfaces to BellSouth. It is done in the electronic interface change control process which someone that works for me is a member. Unfortunately, I don't get to develop code and do things like that. I run a department, and so, no, I don't personally go to these meetings; but I have representatives there that represent our company and my department. And the other form is BellSouth's acknowledgement of this change request.

Q And I don't know if the previous question was answered, so at the risk of asking a question that's already been answered, are these the documents to which you referred in response to Mr. Alexander's questions? A Yes, they were -- or are.

Q And these documents form, in part, form the basis of your opinion with regard to the capabilities of the TAG, the proposed TAG interface; is that correct?

A That's correct.
MR. ALEXANDER: Objection to leading.
BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):
Q And are there other things that form the basis of your opinion with regard to the capabilities of TAG?

A Yeah, it's --
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just a minute. I'm going to allow him to ask that question in that way, but please do not lead the witness. MR. ADELMAN: Thank you, Commissioner. BY MR. ADELMAN (Continuing):

Q Are there any other factors which have caused you to form your opinion with regard to the capabilities of TAG as it relates to the parsing of CSRs?

MR. ALEXANDER: I'm going to object. He's
asking this witness as though he has been tendered as an expert on TAG. He has already said he has a limited knowledge of that. I went back over that. He testified to that on his own volition. This witness is not an expert and able to form opinions. He has never even used TAG. COMMISSIONER CLARK: I quess I'm getting

MR. ADELMAN: Sixteen is the two exhibits that were attached to his prefiled direct, correct? COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, that is correct. MR. ADELMAN: We do move for admission of those two exhibits.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any objection?
MR. ALEXANDER: No objection.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: No objection, all right.
Exhibit 17 is the letter to Nanette Edwards.
MR. ALEXANDER: I do move for admission.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is there any objection?
MR. ADELMAN: There's no objection.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Exhibit 18.
MR. ADELMAN: We move for the admission of 18.
MR. ALEXANDER: And we object.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. What is the basis of your objection?

MR. ALEXANDER: This witness has no personal knowledge of this document. He couldn't even tell us if BellSouth or AT\&T filled this out. You know, he's reading the cover of it, that it's a BellSouth's form. I'm not sure if it's an electronic document that is in AT\&T's system or whatever it is that they may have gotten from BellSouth. He really has no personal knowledge and
cannot authenticate this document. It is -- you know, he's not even at these meetings where this is discussed. He's just representing that someone from DeltaCom that works for him came back and said, hey, this happened at this meeting back in August. He doesn't know whether they filled it out or Bellsouth did it. He cannot verify this document. It cannot be authenticated.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: It is hearsay?
MR. ALEXANDER: It's hearsay, and it's being offered as though it's -- for the truth of what's in the document.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Now I just want to be clear, the basis of your objection is hearsay and part of that is it is being -- it is hearsay because it is being offered for the truth of what is stated in the document?

MR. ALEXANDER: Absolutely.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Anything else?
MR. ALEXANDER: And also this witness can't authenticate the document.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Would you respond to that?

MR. ADELMAN: Commissioner, this document is clearly a business record. Indeed, it's a record
that relates to a forum, an industry forum that is led by BellSouth. All of Mr. Alexander's arguments go to the weight of the evidence. They don't go to the admissibility of the evidence. As far as authentication of this document, he did state that he did not author this document; however, the doc -no one has challenged whether it is indeed a business form that has been submitted to BellSouth and whether the acknowledgement of that submission was indeed made by BellSouth.

MR. ALEXANDER: I think he's got the cart before the horse. He's got to establish it through authenticating that, and BellSouth does object to it. This witness -- I mean it's double and triple hearsay. He's saying he got it from somebody who got it from somebody else.

MR. ADELMAN: We've got our IS expert who has been asked questions by BellSouth about his understanding of the capabilities of TAG, and then when he goes to respond to the question that was propounded by BellSouth, he's being told he cannot describe the basis of his opinion and it cannot be admitted as evidence. There's already a lengthy discussion of this document. Really, the inclusion of the document in evidence, I think, is required
$\stackrel{ }{+}$
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just for clarity. He's read what was on the face of at least one of the pages. I certainly see no prejudice to allowing the actual page itself to be marked and admitted. We've marked all sorts of things and moved them in depositions and the like. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. Staff, do you have any position on this?
(NEGATIVE INDICATIONS)
COMMISSIONER CLARK: At this point I am going to admit it into the record. I think it does appear to me to be hearsay, but I think that it would certainly go to the weight of the evidence. There's been an acknowledgement by the witness as to what he based his opinion on with regard to the ability of TAG to parse CSR, and it does appear to me that -- I think the APA allows for evidence that people would rely on in the normal course of business. That's my vague recollection of it, so at this point I am going to admit it in the record.

MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. And we ask that Mr. Thomas be excused.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You are excused,
Mr. Thomas. Thank you very much.
All right. We'll go to our next witness.
MR. ALEXANDER: I do believe it will be rather
lengthy.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry?
MR. ALEXANDER: I do believe it will be rather
lengthy. I don't know what time we were going to stop. This is the one that I --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We can get started on him.
MR. ALEXANDER: Okay.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: You are Mr. Hyde?
WITNESS HYDE: Yes, I am.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Why don't we
just take five minutes while you do that.
MR. ADELMAN: And Commissioner, we'll spend the
time -- we have different portions of the testimony that have been stricken, so we'll present that in the same way we did Mr. Thomas. Is that --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.
(BRIEF RECESS)
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