		,ORIC
1		GTE FLORIDA INCORPORATED
2		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL DREW
3		DOCKET NO. 960980-TP 960847
4		
5	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
6	A.	My name is Michael Drew. My business address is 600 Hidden
7		Ridge, Irving, TX 75038.
8		
9	Q.	BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND WHAT IS YOUR
10		POSITION?
11	A.	I am employed by GTE Telephone Operations as Group Product
12		Manager-Network Interconnection for GTE Telephone Operations.
13		
14	Q.	PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATION AND WORK
15		EXPERIENCE.
16	Α.	I graduated from Harding University with a Bachelor of Science
17		Degree in Business Administration in 1972. After graduation, I joined
18		General Telephone Company of Illinois and held positions of
19		increasing responsibility in the Market Forecasting, business
20		Assessment, Product Development, and Product Management areas
21		of various GTE companies until 1989. In October 1989, I became the
22		Group Product Manager-ONA Implementation. In that capacity, I was
23		responsible for supervising a group that supported the planning and
24		implementation of GTE's Open Network Architecture (ONA)
25		requirements of the Federal Communications Commission and state 10485 SEP 30 %

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

1		public utilities commissions (PUCs) in the states where GTE
2		operates. In August 1993, I was appointed to my current position of
3		Group Product Manager-Network Interconnection.
4		
5	Q.	WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS GROUP PRODUCT
6		MANAGER-NETWORK INTERCONNECTION?
7	Α.	I am responsible for the continued compliance with the FCC and state
8		PUC ONA Orders as well as the planning and implementation of
9		operations support systems (OSS) access requirements. In addition,
10		I am the GTE representative in various industry ONA forums such as
11		the Information Industry Liaison Committee (IILC). As such, I am very
12		familiar with the FCC's previous OSS access requirements under the
13		ONA orders and the issues worked on at the IILC regarding access
14		to OSS functionality for enhanced services providers.
15		
16	Q.	DID YOU FILE DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
17	Α.	No, I did not. However, I am adopting the Direct Testimony of GTEFL
18		witness Rodney Langley in this proceeding. This witness substitution
19		is necessary because the GTE Operating Companies are involved in
20		numerous concurrent proceedings with various companies around the
21		country. Given this situation, it is inevitableas is the case herethat
22		scheduling conflicts will occur for the few witnesses who can testify
23		to a particular subject.
24		
25	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

1	Α.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to MCI's positions
2		associated with Operating Support Systems (OSS).
3		
4	Q.	SHOULD GTEFL BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE SERVICES THAT
5		EXCEED BOTH INDUSTRY AND COMMISSION STANDARDS OF
6		QUALITY AS IMPLIED BY MR. DECAMP IN HIS TESTIMONY ON
7		PAGE 7, LINES 7-9?
8	Α.	No. The FCC Order does not require that GTEFL provide services at
9		a different quality than it provides for itself or its customers. GTEFL
10		abides by the Florida Commission quality requirements and will
11		provide the same for MCI's customers.
12		
13	Q.	WILL GTEFL PROVIDE ACCESS TO ITS OSS FUNCTIONS TO
14		PROVIDE SERVICES TO MCI'S CUSTOMERS IN A NON-
15		DISCRIMINATORY MANNER WITH RESPECT TO THE CONCERNS
16		ADDRESSED BY MR. DECAMP IN HIS TESTIMONY ON PAGE 7,
17		LINES 20-24?
18	Α.	Yes, GTEFL will provide access to its OSS functions. GTEFL will use
19		the same pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and
20		repair and billing systems and databases that it provides to itself or
21		its customers for the unbundled and resold services purchased by
22		MCI.
23		
24	Q.	IN HIS TESTIMONY ON PAGE 8, LINES 2-6, MR. DECAMP USES
25		THE FCC ORDER TO IMPLY THAT ACCESS TO GTEFL'S OSS BY

1JANUARY 1, 1997, FOR THE PROVISION OF LOCAL SERVICE2THROUGH UNBUNDLING AND RESALE, IS TECHNICALLY3FEASIBLE. IS THIS TRUE FOR GTEFL?

No. Access to the OSS functions in the provision of interexchange 4 Α. access services for IXCs cannot be used by GTEFL for the ordering, 5 provisioning, and billing of local services. GTEFL will provide access 6 to its OSS functions for provision of unbundled and resold services 7 8 as described here. The OSS systems and databases used by GTEFL 9 in the provision of local services were built to be accessed by a single 10 provider, not multiple providers. It is not technically feasible to 11 provide direct access to these systems and databases to providers 12 other than GTEFL at this time. If direct access were provided at this 13 time, network security and customer privacy would be compromised. 14 Upon request and payment by an alternative local exchange carrier. 15 GTEFL will develop access to the requested capabilities via a 16 nationally standardized gateway for providers other than GTEFL.

17

Q. DOES GTEFL HAVE CONCERNS SIMILAR TO THOSE
EXPRESSED BY MR. DECAMP IN HIS TESTIMONY ON PAGE 8,
LINES 14-16, THAT THERE IS AN ADVERSE POTENTIAL FOR
MULTIPLE UNIQUE SYSTEM-TO-SYSTEM INTERFACE
GATEWAYS IN THE INDUSTRY?

A. Yes. GTEFL anticipates having to interconnect and interact with
 several competitive local exchange carriers. It would be extremely
 inefficient and costly if GTEFL were required to develop and support

- several different system-to-system interface arrangements. GTEFL
 is very supportive of delaying development of a gateway until the
 industry defines the standards for all local exchange carrier OSS
 interconnections.
- 5

Q. WHEN WILL A NATIONAL STANDARDIZED GATEWAY, FOR USE
BY ALL PROVIDERS OF LOCAL SERVICE AND REFERENCED BY
MR. DECAMP FROM THE FCC ORDER IN HIS TESTIMONY ON
PAGE 8, LINES 21-25, BE AVAILABLE?

- A. It is anticipated at this time that the industry will define the electronic
 bonding standards during 1997.
- 12

13Q.WITH RESPECT TO MR. DECAMP'S CONCERN IN HIS14TESTIMONY ON PAGE 10, LINES 6-9, WILL GTEFL PROVIDE15ACCESS TO THE SAME ORDERING PROCEDURES AND16FUNCTIONS AS IT PROVIDES TO ITSELF?

17 Α. Yes. As described in my testimony, GTEFL has established a 18 dedicated National Open Market Center (NOMC) to place MCI orders 19 into the same ordering and provisioning system that GTEFL uses for 20 itself and its customers. For simple service orders, the NOMC 21 representative will provide MCI the customer's telephone number and 22 installation due date while MCI is on-line with their customer. Service 23 orders, using the standardized Local Service Request (LSR) form 24 developed by the industry at the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF), 25 can be transmitted by MCI to the NOMC via an electronic interface using Network Data Mover (NDM) protocol. The LSR information is
 entered into the ordering system and completed via current GTEFL
 processes.

4

5 For complex orders, the NOMC representative will provide the 6 telephone number(s) and due date to MCI via the firm order 7 confirmation (FOC). This is the same process that GTEFL provides 8 for itself and its customers for complex orders.

9

10Q.WILL GTEFL ESTABLISH AN MCI CUSTOMER ACCOUNT11"IMMEDIATELY" WHILE A CUSTOMER IS ON-LINE WITH THE MCI12REPRESENTATIVE, JUST AS IT WOULD DO FOR ITS OWN13CUSTOMERS, AS DISCUSSED BY MR. DECAMP IN HIS14TESTIMONY ON PAGE 10, LINES 12-14?

A. Yes. As described in my testimony for new service/install requests,
the NOMC representative will create an MCI customer account while
on line with the MCI representative and place the account and order
into the system in suspension until the completed valid LSR is
received from MCI. Once the order is received, the NOMC
representative will release the order for provisioning. This is the
same process that GTEFL performs for itself and its customers.

22 23

24 Q. ON PAGE 10, LINES 15-20 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. DECAMP 25 IMPLIES THAT REAL-TIME DIRECT ACCESS TO GTEFL'S

1 SYSTEMS IS REQUIRED TO PERFORM THIS ORDERING 2 FUNCTION. IS THAT TRUE?

- A. No. The MCI representative will interact with the MCI customer in the
 same way a GTEFL customer interacts with the GTEFL customer
 representative. Direct access to GTEFL's systems is not required to
 take an order from a customer.
- 7

8 Q. WILL GTEFL PROVIDE EFFICIENT ORDERING AND 9 PROVISIONING SYSTEMS IF IT DOES NOT PROVIDE REAL-TIME 10 DIRECT ELECTRONIC INTERFACES TO ITS ORDERING AND 11 PROVISIONING SYSTEMS?

Yes. The fact that MCI is in a middle step in the process is not a 12 Α. serious threat to efficiency. There is a requirement for the MCI 13 representative to interact with the NOMC representative to establish 14 the customer account, obtain a telephone number assignment, and 15 due date assignment. Any time required for the MCI representative 16 to place the customer on hold while conversing with the NOMC 17 representative will be insignificant to the MCI customer. In fact, there 18 are times that the GTEFL representative must place its own customer 19 on hold when contacting facility assignment to obtain telephone 20 21 number and due date assignment when systems cannot provide the information. The GTEFL representative will create an account for the 22 MCI customer's order in the system and will initiate provisioning once 23 a valid Local Service Request (LSR) is received from MCI. 24

25

1	Q.	DOES GTEFL ALSO PLACE ITS CUSTOMERS ON HOLD WHEN
2		DETERMINING TELEPHONE NUMBER ASSIGNMENT AND DUE
3		DATE ASSIGNMENT?

Sometimes. These pre-ordering functions are not mechanized in all 4 Α. areas of GTE and GTEFL must place the customer on hold while 5 these assignments are determined through manual processes. Also, 6 in the areas where these pre-ordering functions are mechanized, at 7 times there is a requirement to place the customer on hold and 8 9 contact manual processes because the telephone number database is exhausted, the customer wants a "vanity" telephone number, or 10 11 there are unique circumstances that alter the automated due date 12 assignment process.

13

14 Q. WHAT IS GTE DOING TO ADDRESS IMPROVEMENTS IN 15 EFFICIENCY FOR PRE-ORDERING?

A. GTE is currently investigating the expansion of its mechanized
 capabilities for telephone number assignment and due date
 assignment nationwide. GTE is also investigating access to these
 mechanized capabilities by alternative local exchange carriers.

20

21 Q. WOULD THIS MECHANIZATION ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR A 22 MCL REPRESENTATIVE TO SPEAK WITH Α NOMC 23 REPRESENTATIVE TO OBTAIN TELEPHONE NUMBER 24 **ASSIGNMENTS AND DUE DATE ASSIGNMENTS?**

25 A. No. These mechanized processes are only effective for simple

single-line services and will not work for complex services. For
 complex services, MCI will be required to submit a valid LSR and
 customer (end-user) data sheet. GTEFL will provide telephone
 numbers and due date on the FOC.

5

Q. MR. DECAMP IMPLIES THAT GTEFL SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO
TRANSFER A GTEFL CUSTOMER'S ACCOUNT TO MCI "AS-IS"
ON PAGE 11, LINES 14-17 OF HIS TESTIMONY. DOES GTEFL
AGREE WITH THIS PROPOSAL?

10 A. No. GTE believes that the customer should be in control of their 11 GTEFL account information and that MCI should work with their new 12 customer to determine the services they desire from MCI. GTEFL will 13 not compromise the customer's privacy and will only provide the 14 customer's account information to MCI upon written authorization 15 from the customer.

16

17Q.ON PAGE 12, LINES 4-7, MR. DECAMP IMPLIES THAT THE18SWITCH OVER OF CUSTOMERS FOR LOCAL SERVICE IS AS19SIMPLE AS THE SWITCH OF END USERS BETWEEN20INTEREXCHANGE CARRIERS (I.E., PIC CHANGE). IS THIS21TRUE?

A. No. A PIC change is controlled through a separate operation support
 system than local services and only involves a change in the switch
 to route the customer's outgoing interexchange calls to the proper
 interexchange carrier's network and the billing information. The

change of a customer's local exchange service is more complicated 1 and involves several GTEFL operation support systems to assign 2 local outside plant facilities, make multiple changes in the switching 3 4 database, and changes in the billing system. 5 WILL GTEFL ALLOW NON-GTE ACCESS TO ITS PROVISIONING 6 Q. 7 SYSTEMS, AS REQUESTED BY MR. DECAMP IN HIS TESTIMONY 8 ON PAGE 12, LINES 14-18, PRIOR TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 9 SYSTEM-TO-SYSTEM STANDARD GATEWAY? 10 Α. No. The FCC Order did not relinquish control of the network to 11 alternative local exchange carriers. GTEFL is responsible for the 12 provision of its network facilities. GTEFL will not provide network 13 control functionality through a system-to-system standard gateway. 14 but may provide access to installation information if requested and 15 paid for by MCI. 16 17 18 Q. IS A NEW GTEFL REPORTING REQUIREMENT NECESSARY TO 19 PROVE NONDISCRIMINATION IN PROVISIONING AS IMPLIED BY 20 MR. DECAMP IN HIS TESTIMONY ON PAGE 12, LINES 22-257 21 Α. No. GTEFL's provisioning processes for single-line services are 22 highly automated with little opportunity for human intervention in the 23 process. This automation precludes the opportunity for discriminatory 24 activity and GTEFL should not be required to develop non-existing 25 reports to prove non-discrimination. GTEFL does not process orders

1		based on customer identity and GTEFL will process MCI's orders in
2		the same manner as it does for itself or its customers.
3		
4	Q.	WILL GTEFL ALLOW A NON-GTE COMPANY TO HAVE ACCESS
5		TO ITS NETWORK VIA REPAIR SYSTEMS AS REQUESTED BY
6		MR. DECAMP IN HIS TESTIMONY ON PAGE 13, LINES 12-14?
7	Α.	No. GTEFL cannot compromise the security of its network or its
8		proprietary customer information by allowing access by companies
9		other than GTE to the network via GTEFL's repair systems. The FCC
10		Order did not relinquish control of the network to alternative local
11		exchange carriers.
12		
13	Q.	WILL GTEFL ALLOW A NON-GTE COMPANY TO HAVE REAL-
14		TIME DIRECT ACCESS TO ITS MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR
15		SYSTEMS, AS REQUESTED BY MR. DECAMP IN HIS TESTIMONY
16		ON PAGE 13, LINES 24-25 AND PAGE 14, LINES 1-2?
17	Α.	No. The FCC Order did not relinquish control of the network to
18		alternative local exchange carriers. GTEFL is responsible for the
19		repair of its network facilities. GTEFL will not provide repair control
20		functionality through a system-to-system standard gateway, but may
21		provide access to repair status information if requested and paid for
22		by MCI.
23		
24	Q.	IS A NEW GTEFL REPORTING REQUIREMENT NECESSARY TO
25		PROVE NONDISCRIMINATION IN MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR AS

1		IMPLIED BY MR. DECAMP IN HIS TESTIMONY ON PAGE 14,
2		LINES 2-6?
3	Α.	No. GTEFL does not process repair tickets based on customer
4		identity and GTEFL will process MCI's tickets in the same manner as
5		it does for itself or its customers. GTEFL's processes preclude the
6		opportunity for discriminatory activity and GTEFL should not be
7		required to develop non-existing reports to prove non-discrimination.
8		
9	Q.	WILL GTEFL USE A CABS-LIKE BILLING SYSTEM FOR
10		CHANGES TO MCI AS REQUESTED BY MR. DECAMP IN HIS
11		TESTIMONY ON PAGE 14, LINES 12-14?
12	Α.	No. As described in my Direct Testimony, GTEFL will provide billing
13		to MCI via the CBSS system which is the same system used by
14		GTEFL to bill its customers for local services. GTEFL will create a
15		bill to MCI for resold services and unbundled elements along with a
16		summary bill master. GTE is working to provide a CABS/CABS-like
17		solution to handle both trunk-side and line-side billing.
18		
19	Q.	WILL GTEFL PROVIDE END USER BILLING INFORMATION IN A
20		TIMELY MANNER AS REQUESTED BY MR. DECAMP ON PAGE
21		14, LINES 21-25 OF HIS TESTIMONY?
22	Α.	Yes. Daily file records on MCI's accounts will be generated and
23		transmitted electronically to MCI.
24		
25		

1	Q.	HAS MCI REQUESTED ACCESS TO THE SPECIFIC GTEFL'S OSS
2		FUNCTIONS AS AN UNBUNDLED ELEMENT LISTED ON PAGES
3		14 -17 OF MR. DECAMP'S TESTIMONY AND EXPRESSED A
4		WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR THE ACCESS OR DEVELOPMENT?
5	Α.	No.
6		
7	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
8	Α.	Yes, it does.
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

•