

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

VOTE SHEET

JUNE 30, 1998

RE: DOCKET NO. 980119-TP - Complaint of Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for violation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; petition for resolution of disputes as to implementation and interpretation of interconnection, resale and collocation agreements; and petition for emergency relief.

Issue 1: Has BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. failed to properly implement the following provisions of its Interconnection, Collocation and Resale agreements with Supra such that Supra is unable to provide local exchange service on parity with that which BellSouth provides:

- a. Billing Requirements
- b. Telephone Number Access
- c. Provision of Dial Tone
- d. Electronic Access to Operational Support Systems (OSS) and OSS interfaces (Ordering and Provisioning, Installation, Maintenance and Repair).
- e. Notification Requirements.
- f. Timeliness of Installation, Repair and Maintenance?

Recommendation: Yes. BellSouth has failed to properly implement certain provisions of its Interconnection, Collocation and Resale agreements with Supra. The provisions discussed in staff's memorandum dated June 18, 1998

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: DS GR JC

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

[Handwritten signatures in majority column]

[Empty lines for dissenting signatures]

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS: Commissioner Garcia participated by *video* telephone. He concurred /dissented in the majority vote and will sign the vote sheet upon his return to Tallahassee.

teleconference.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

06985 JUL -2 98

150-REG-003/REPORTING

VOTE SHEET

JUNE 30, 1998

DOCKET NO. 980119-TP - Complaint of Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for violation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; petition for resolution of disputes as to implementation and interpretation of interconnection, resale and collocation agreements; and petition for emergency relief.

(Continued from previous page)

are Billing Address Information (a.1), USOC Codes (a.3), Telephone Number Access (b.), Address Validation (d.2), Insufficient Ordering Capabilities

VOTE SHEET

JUNE 30, 1998

DOCKET NO. 980119-TP - Complaint of Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for violation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; petition for resolution of disputes as to implementation and interpretation of interconnection, resale and collocation agreements; and petition for emergency relief.

(Continued from previous page)

(d.3), and Inside Wire Maintenance (f.2.b), as explained in staff's analysis. The specific relief that the Commission should grant is addressed in staff's recommendation in Issue 6.

APPROVED

Issue 2: Has BellSouth provided adequate written rules, regulations, codes, instructions, descriptions of procedures, other written materials, technical guidance, and actual support service, or made any modifications of procedures, if necessary, in timely fashion, to permit Supra to understand and utilize effectively BellSouth's procedures for billing, ordering, provisioning, installation, repair, etc., that are essential to Supra's ability to provide local exchange service parity with BellSouth?

Recommendation: Yes. BellSouth has provided adequate written information and support for Supra to provide local exchange service on parity with BellSouth with one exception. If it has not already done so, BST should be required to provide any outstanding documentation requested by Supra, without delay. The specific relief that the Commission should grant is addressed in staff's recommendation in Issue 6.

APPROVED

VOTE SHEET

JUNE 30, 1998

DOCKET NO. 980119-TP - Complaint of Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for violation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; petition for resolution of disputes as to implementation and interpretation of interconnection, resale and collocation agreements; and petition for emergency relief.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: Has BellSouth appropriately applied Sections A2.3.8A and A2.3.8B of its General Subscriber Services Tariff to Supra?

Recommendation: Yes. BellSouth has appropriately applied Sections A2.3.8A and A2.3.8B of its General Subscriber Services Tariff to Supra. Therefore, staff recommends that BellSouth should not be required to modify its tariff or make any adjustments to Supra's bills.

APPROVED

Issue 3: Has BellSouth acted appropriately in its billing of Supra and has Supra timely paid its bills to BellSouth?

Recommendation: Yes. BellSouth has acted appropriately in its billing of Supra. Thus, BellSouth should not be required to refund Supra \$686,512.96 as a result of BST's application of its tariff. While Supra has on occasion not paid its bills to BellSouth in accordance with its agreement, Supra currently has paid its bills to BellSouth in full. Supra should be required to pay all of its bills pursuant to the terms and conditions in its Agreements with BellSouth. The specific relief that the Commission should grant is addressed in staff's recommendation in Issue 6.

APPROVED

VOTE SHEET

JUNE 30, 1998

DOCKET NO. 980119-TP - Complaint of Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for violation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; petition for resolution of disputes as to implementation and interpretation of interconnection, resale and collocation agreements; and petition for emergency relief.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: Has BellSouth responded appropriately to consumer queries regarding Supra?

Recommendation: Yes, with one exception. BellSouth should be required to retrain its employees on the proper procedures for handling ALEC repairs and Inside Wire Maintenance problems. The specific relief that the Commission should grant is addressed in staff's recommendation in Issue 6.

APPROVED

Issue 6: What relief, if any, should the Commission order for Supra or BellSouth?

Recommendation: If issues 1-5 are approved, the following relief should be granted to Supra.

1. BST should provide Supra with CABS formatted bills, rather than CLUB formatted bills;
2. BST should identify which USOC codes are discounted and which are not;*
3. BST should provide Supra with the ability to reserve the same number of telephone numbers through LENS as BST can through RNS. BST should also modify LENS to automatically assign a telephone number to an end user when the customer's address is validated;
4. BST should work with Supra to find a mutually agreeable solution, or BST should provide Supra with all of BST's central office addresses, so that Supra is able to reserve telephone numbers for Remote Call Forwarding service to its end users;
5. BST should modify the ALEC ordering systems so that the systems provide the same online edit checking capability that BST's retail ordering systems provide;
6. BST should retrain its employees on the proper procedures for handling ALEC repairs and Inside Wire Maintenance problems;
7. If contacted by Supra customers regarding any complaints against Supra, BST should direct the customer to Supra. However, if the end user is unable to work out its differences with Supra, nothing precludes the end user from contacting the Commission;
8. BST should provide any outstanding documentation requested by Supra.

* In addition, to the extent that BST's electronic interfaces provide information or automatically populate fields with USOC codes, staff believes that the same capability should be provided through the ordering interfaces available to Supra.

VOTE SHEET

JUNE 30, 1998

DOCKET NO. 980119-TP - Complaint of Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for violation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; petition for resolution of disputes as to implementation and interpretation of interconnection, resale and collocation agreements; and petition for emergency relief.

(Continued from previous page)

If issues 1-5 are approved, the following relief should be granted to BellSouth.

1. Supra should be required to pay all of its bills pursuant to the terms and conditions in its Agreements with BellSouth;
2. Supra should not represent itself as BellSouth, and should discontinue its use of BellSouth's name on its bills to end users.

APPROVED

Issue 7: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If the Commission approves Issues 1-6, no further issues remain for the Commission to address. Therefore, this docket should be closed.

APPROVED