PENNINGTON, MOORE, WILKINSON & DUNBAR, P.A. ATTORNEYS AT LAW

BARBARA D. AUGER ROBERT CINTRON, JR. ROBERT S. COHEN PETER M. DUNBAR MARTHA J. EDENFIELD JOHN T. LEADBEATER DAVID K. MINACCI (Also admitted in Georgia) EDGAR M. MOORE E. MURRAY MOORE, JR.
JOHN C. PELHAM
CARL R. PENNINGTON, JR., P.A.
C. EDWIN RUDE, JR.
GARY A. SHIPMAN
CYNTHIA S. TUNNICLIFF
WILLIAM E. WHITNEY
BEN H. WILKINSON
CATHI C. WILKINSON

OF COUNSEL
HERBERT F. CLARK
(Admitted in New Jersey, New York & Wisconsin Only)
R. STUART HUFF, P.A.
Coral Gables, Florida
CHRISTOPHER W. KANAGA
(Admitted In Massachusetts & Colorado Only)
WILLIAM VANDERCREEK
(Admitted in Texas & Iowo Only)

SPECIAL CONSULTANTS
RANDY MILLER*
DAVID L. SWAFFORD*
"NOT A MEMBER OF THE FLORIDA BAR

215 SOUTH MONROE STREET 2ND FLOOR TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

(850) 222-3533 FAX (850) 222-2126 E-Mail Phlaw@Supernet.net

REPLY TO: P.O. BOX 10095 TALLAHASSEE, FL 32302-2095

July 31, 1997

Ms. Blanca Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 via Hand Delivery

Re: In Re: Consideration of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s entry into InterLATA services pursuant to Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications

Act of 1996; Docket No. 960786-TL

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing please find an original and fifteen copies of Time Warner AxS of Florida, L.P. d/b/a Time Warner Communications and Digital Media Partners, Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibit of Bob Gaskins. You will also find a copy of this letter enclosed. Please date-stamp the copy of this letter to indicate that the original was filed and return to me.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours

Robert S. Cohen

EG 2

LIN 5700 SC:da

enclosures

SEC /

OTH ____

07765 JUL 31 5

EPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING



BEFORE THE

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Consideration of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s entry into InterLATA services pursuant to Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996

Docket No. 960786-TL

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

OF

BOB GASKINS

ON BEHALF OF

TIME WARNER AXS OF FLORIDA, L.P.
AND
DIGITAL MEDIA PARTNERS

July 31, 1997

07765 JUL 31 5 EPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

	Fla. PSC Docket No. 960786TP BOB GASKINS						
1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF BOB GASKINS					
2							
3	Q.	Please state your name, position and business address.					
4							
5	A.	My name is Bob Gaskins. I am employed by Time Warner Communications as					
6	4.	Vice President, Operations and Implementation. My business address is 160					
7		Inverness Drive West, Englewood, Colorado 80112.					
8							
9	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?					
10							
11	Α.	I have been authorized to speak on behalf of Time Warner AxS and Digital Media					
12		Partners (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Time Warner") to present testimony					
13		concerning Time Warner's experience in attempting to implement telephone service					
14		through its interconnection agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.					
15		("BellSouth").					
16							
17	Q.	Please give a brief description of your educational background and experience in					
18		the telecommunications industry.					
19							

20

21

A.

I graduated from the University of Southern California with a Bachelor of Science

Degree in Accounting and Finance, and from the University of Southern California

BOB GASKINS

with a Masters of Science Degree in Business Taxation. I have eighteen years of experience in the cable television and telecommunications industry, and I am currently responsible for the complete implementation of all aspects of business switched telephony services in eighteen markets, and for operational implementation of interconnection arrangements with other carriers in each market. I am licensed as a Certified Public Accountant in the State of Colorado and previously served as Chairman of the National Accounting Committee of the National Cable Television Association from 1989-1992. In addition to my cable television and telecommunications experience, I previously served in public accounting for Price Waterhouse, Deloitte & Touche, and in private practice.

Q. Have you been involved in Time Warner's efforts to enter local exchange telecommunications service markets as a competing provider?

15 A. Yes.

Q. Does your experience with BellSouth in Tennessee give you concern regarding its ability to perform under your interconnection agreement in Florida?

20 A. Yes. In dealing with BellSouth in Memphis, Tennessee, our initial meetings 21 regarding the process were good. The documentation for the process was

BOB GASKINS

understandable and contained information on how and where to send the order.

No documentation was received, however, that addressed intervals, firm order commitment (FOC) appearance, or the escalation process. Time Warner orders

have conformed to the details outlined in BellSouth's procedures.

The first order for interim number portability (INP) in Memphis was sent to BellSouth with a due date to our account manager, Kim Reid. No acknowledgement was received from the BellSouth account manager that she had received those orders. After numerous calls to the BellSouth account manager, the order was turned over to a different representative of BellSouth, Neil Holden, who informed us that "complex" orders required a negotiated due date and would have to be scheduled through a project manager. The matter was then turned over to the local customer service center (LCSC) for BellSouth in Birmingham. After numerous changes to the due date, the order was turned over to a project manager who coordinated the cut on the final revised due date. Most of our work has been completed on verbal agreements.

Subsequent orders have been sent directly to the LCSC. No FOCs have been received in a timely manner relative to the orders. Verbal confirmations have been received only when the LCSC manager has been called or paged. We have experienced great difficulty in getting BellSouth to admit they have received, let alone are working on, an order we have sent them. We have had at least two cases where Purchase Order Numbers (PONs) have been sent which were lost

only one was installed by BellSouth.

BOB GASKINS

and which required us to resend them thereby delaying the implementation.

In another instance, the correct number of paths for an INP order were not installed, causing an overload to one of our customer's numbers that were set up for remote call forwarding. We had requested two paths for that customer and

Q. Do you have an explanation for why these problems have occurred?

A. There seem to be communications gaps between different groups at BellSouth.

We had another instance where a customer due date (DD) was changed one day prior to the original DD. This DD seemed to have been communicated to the people in the LSR group, but failed to reach the central office people. On the original DD BellSouth pulled the jumpers and channel units feeding the existing circuits. Another twelve hours were needed to re-establish the connections to the customer. These BellSouth mistakes cause Time Warner to lose credibility with our customers.

Q. Have you experienced any issues concerning directory assistance?

20 A. We also sent a directory order (no INP), but failed to reach directory assistance
21 (DA) until full Time Warner escalation procedures were invoked. Again, no FOC

BOB GASKINS

was received from the LCSC. After repeated calls which were answered by stating that the person receiving our local service request (LSR) was on vacation and no one else at BellSouth was able to locate the paperwork, we resent the LSR, and escalated the request within BellSouth (to Diane Meyers and Kim Reid). Finally, five days after the initial sending of the LSR, the directory listing was finally put in place.

Q. Has Time Warner attempted to negotiate performance standards with BellSouth in Florida?

11 A. Yes.

Q. Has Time Warner been successful in negotiating performance standards with BellSouth as of the date of this testimony?

A. No. It was Time Warner's intent to complete the negotiations for performance standards prior to July 17, 1997. In the course of these negotiations, when the issue of firm order commitments (FOC) came up, BellSouth inquired as to whether Time Warner wanted a "good" FOC (one with a facilities verification) or a "fast one" (one within 24 hours, but without the facilities check). We sought to enforce provision 11.02 of our interconnection agreement with BellSouth which requires

BOB GASKINS

both a "good" and "fast" FOC within 5 business days. BellSouth responded that it would not be able to comply with the interconnection agreement until the end of this year at the earliest. This information was communicated to Time Warner in a letter from Susan M. Arrington, Manager-Interconnection Services/Pricing with BellSouth to Carolyn Marek. That letter is attached to my rebuttal testimony as Exhibit A.

Q. Has Time Warner experienced any additional problems with respect to FOCs?

A. BellSouth has been lax in providing FOCs to Time Warner with respect to LSR requests for interim number portability. It is important to note that the term "LSR" was invented by BellSouth after the signing of the interconnection agreement with Time Warner so that no performance standards on FOCs were negotiated for LSRs. Additionally, BellSouth has been in default of the interconnection contract with Time Warner since BellSouth has not completed the disconnect and provision of RCF for INP within 24 hours of BellSouth's receipt of the service order as provided in Provision 6.17 of the Interconnection Agreement. A copy of the provision of the Interconnection Agreement is attached to my testimony as Exhibit B.

Q. Do you believe the Florida Public Service Commission should allow BellSouth to

Fla.	PSC	Docket	No.	9607	'86TP
ı iti.	-		110.	0001	0011

BOB GASKINS

continue with its application for interLATA authority at this time?

A. No. BellSouth, is not prepared to supply something as fundamental as an FOC with a facilities verification--something that is critical for new entrants to have in order to give their customers a firm due date. Accordingly, BellSouth is not yet ready to go forward with this proceeding from an operational standpoint. It is Time Warner's position that BellSouth should withdraw its petition or the Commission should dismiss or abate these proceedings until such time as BellSouth can demonstrate it is fully operational and ready to perform in accordance with the interconnection agreements it has previously entered into.

Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

14 A. Yes, it does.

BatiSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Room 34591 BatiSouth Center 675 West Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30375

July 16, 1997

VIA FACSIMILE

Carolyn Marek
Time Warner Communications
P.O. Box 210706
Nashville, Tennessee 37221

Re: Performance Measures

Dear Carolyn:

Mary Jo Peed and I are in receipt of the revised Performance Measures between BellSouth and Time Warner based on discussions held during our conference call on July 10, 1997.

At this time, BellSouth cannot agree with the language submitted in 3.1 regarding the proposed intervals on Rejection Notices and Firm Order Confirmations with respect to Access Service Requests (ASRs). As I mentioned to you in my voice mail on Friday, July 11, BellSouth does not currently have such intervals for ASRs. However, these intervals are appropriate for Local Service Requests (LSRs).

I feel that I must clarify once again that the Firm Order Confirmation does not include a verification that facilities are available on either an ASR or LSR. As I may have mentioned to you before, BellSouth is currently reviewing this issue and may include this type of information on an ASR FOC by the end of the year. However, at this time, BellSouth cannot commit to measuring any intervals on a FOC that includes a verification of available facilities. Because facilities verification is not currently included on the FOC, I do not have any proposed intervals to offer Time Warner at this time. BellSouth does not provide facilities verification information on any FOC or perform facilities verification when providing due dates to BellSouth's retail cusomters, and therefore Time Warner is being treated at parity with BellSouth as well as with other CLECs.

BellSouth is basically in agreement with the remaining provisions of these Performance Measures with the following two proposed revisions:



DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

- 1. Section 3.2, the second paragraph, last sentence states "BellSouth shall measure the average time it takes to restore service for itself, its affiliates and other ALECs." BellSouth proposes to delete "its affiliates" in accordance with previous discussions regarding this issue.
- 2. BellSouth proposes that we change the heading on the measurements to reflect that these are in fact measurements and not Standards. BellSouth's proposal is that we change "Standard/Interval" to "Measurement/Interval".

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (404) 927-7513.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Arrington

Manager - Interconnection Services/Pricing

cc: Jerry Hendrix Mary Jo Peed Jerry Moore

Chuck Welch