

1 not received any complaints.

2 Q. I'm sorry, you indicated some CLECs have indicated
3 they cannot process the information in the format
4 that Ameritech has provided?

5 A. They would like to receive it in a different
6 format than the format we are providing.

7 Q. Which CLECs have made that complaint?

8 A. The only one I know for sure is MCI.

9 Q. As it relates to the problem that AT&T is having
10 as to its bill, do you know what the source of
11 that problem is?

12 A. No, I do not.

13 Q. Has anyone in your organization advised you that
14 the problem is caused by changes to Ameritech's
15 billing software that it would not share with
16 AT&T?

17 A. No, that has not been relayed to me.

18 Q. If I can turn your attention back to what we have
19 marked as Exhibit 3 which is Ameritech-Wisconsin's
20 executive summary submitted in this docket.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. On Exhibit 10 which is the exhibit that everybody
23 is having difficulty reading, and we're having it
24 recopied, on that exhibit Ameritech-Wisconsin has
25 provided the staff certain volume information as

1 it relates to each interface. I note there that
2 under the ordering of resold services total
3 volumes at least according to this exhibit are a
4 little under 500. Does that sound about right
5 based on your understanding of orders processed?

6 A. I'm sorry, Counsel, where is that at?

7 Q. The very first page of Exhibit 10.

8 EXAMINER JAMES: Exhibit 10 of Exhibit
9 3.

10 MS. MARSH: Correct.

11 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I see it now.
12 No, I do not believe that that's the case. That's
13 somewhere close to two days with a volume from
14 AT&T.

15 BY MS. MARSH:

16 Q. I'm sorry, what was your answer to that?

17 A. No, I do not believe that if it says it's 500 or
18 some odd orders that were accepted through this
19 interface, I would tend to disagree with that.

20 Q. According to the notes that were provided in
21 connection with the exhibit, these volumes purport
22 to be only from the period of January 1st, 1997
23 through January 31st, 1997?

24 A. Okay. For that period this could be correct.

25 Q. Could you explain, also, according to this

1 exhibit, there were in excess of 1600 preordering
2 transactions which I understand would have all
3 been requests for customer service records?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. Could you explain why there were in excess of 1600
6 request for customer service records but only
7 approximately 500 orders processed?

8 A. No, I cannot.

9 Q. Under the volume information for the ordering of
10 the resold service, if I'm reading this correctly,
11 it indicates that there were 43 orders which were
12 CLEC to ILEC orders? Do you see that, it's the
13 last line of the very first category?

14 A. Yes, I do see that.

15 Q. In what circumstances would a CLEC customer be
16 transferred back to an ILEC?

17 A. If they decided they wanted to come back to
18 Ameritech.

19 Q. So it would be in a win back situation?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. Can you think of any other circumstance in which a
22 CLEC would be transferred back to an ILEC?

23 A. No, I cannot.

24 Q. For the record, we are having a better copy of
25 just Exhibit 10 made, and we'll circulate it to

1 everybody when we receive it so it's a little more
2 legible.

3 BY MS. MARSH:

4 Q. Under the page 2 of Exhibit 10, there has been
5 submitted activity -- I'm sorry, volume
6 information for ordering on the unbundled network
7 element line side, do you see that?

8 A. Yes, I do.

9 Q. As I read that, there has been no ordering
10 activity for the ordering of unbundled network
11 elements on the line side, at least for the time
12 period reflected?

13 A. For that time period, that is correct.

14 Q. Has there been any activity since?

15 A. Not to my knowledge.

16 Q. Now, on the trunk side according to the volume
17 information submitted there was in excess of
18 31,000 orders for unbundled loops; is that
19 correct?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. And my understanding of your testimony is that 100
22 percent of those orders would have been processed
23 manually?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q. Now, turn your attention to Exhibit 2 of what we

1 have marked for this hearing as Exhibit 3 which is
2 a letter from Tim Koxlien, K-O-X-L-I-E-N,
3 president of NRS, to Mr. Jim Styf, S-T-Y-F who I
4 believe is with Ameritech.

5 A. That is correct.

6 Q. Prior to your review of this information at the
7 deposition, had you previously seen this letter?

8 A. Yes, I had.

9 Q. In this letter is it not true that Mr. Koxlien
10 indicates that Ameritech's order confirmation
11 process is quote, not quite solid at this time,
12 quote closed?

13 A. Yes. But at the time he also says right under
14 order response, we received a response from
15 Ameritech but in time -- at times included in the
16 response is information such as Ameritech order
17 number, service rep's name and date received. So
18 from my reading of this letter, I undertook that
19 they were receiving the data, that they just
20 couldn't process it.

21 Q. Well, isn't it true that Mr. Koxlien indicates
22 that NRS is required to manually review order
23 confirmation?

24 A. Right, but then next he says they're receiving
25 electronically which kind of he leads to the fact

1 that he's not getting it and they have to get it
2 or that they're getting it and they can't -- their
3 systems aren't set to the process.

4 Q. Let me ask you this. Do you know why Mr. Koxlien
5 is of the opinion that the order confirmation
6 process with Ameritech is not quite solid at the
7 time that he wrote this letter?

8 A. No, I do not know why he felt that way.

9 Q. Mr. Koxlien also indicates that Ameritech can
10 quote, at times, quote closed, give NRS a status
11 of an order. Can you identify for me the times at
12 which Ameritech cannot provide NRS with a status
13 of an order that is pending?

14 A. No, I cannot.

15 Q. Do you know -- can you identify for me what
16 percentage of NRS's orders fall into that category
17 of orders that Ameritech cannot provide a status?

18 A. No, I cannot.

19 Q. Mr. Koxlien also indicates under the order
20 response title at the bottom of the page that at
21 times Ameritech is able to provide information
22 with the order response. Can you tell me why NRS
23 may receive an order response that does not
24 include information such as the Ameritech order
25 number or the date it was received?

- 1 A. No, I cannot.
- 2 Q. Can you tell me how many times or what percentage
3 of NRS's orders receive a response that does not
4 include information such as the Ameritech order
5 number or the date received?
- 6 A. No, I cannot.
- 7 Q. As it relates to order confirmation, and I take
8 that to mean an 865 transaction; is that correct?
- 9 A. That is correct.
- 10 Q. Mr. Koxlien indicates that NRS is required to
11 manually review its 865 information at this time.
12 Can you tell me why they are required to manually
13 review 865 information?
- 14 A. No, I can't, Counsel. Just the fact that they're
15 getting it says they're receiving information. I
16 don't know why they can't process it in their
17 system.
- 18 Q. Mr. Koxlien indicates that they are working with
19 Ameritech customer service teams to resolve these
20 issues. Do you know sitting here today if these
21 issues have been resolved?
- 22 A. No, I do not.
- 23 Q. If you could turn, Mr. Rogers, to Exhibit 5 of the
24 document that we have marked as Exhibit 3 for the
25 purposes of this hearing.

- 1 A. Okay.
- 2 Q. In connection with this document we, at least AT&T
3 received only pages 1 and 3 of the attached expert
4 report. Can you tell me how many pages were
5 included in Ms. McLemore's report?
- 6 A. No, I cannot. I only received 1 and 3 myself.
- 7 Q. Did you review this report in connection with your
8 duties and responsibilities as the director of
9 AIIS?
- 10 A. I reviewed it after it was submitted.
- 11 Q. After Ms. McLemore submitted it?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And as my understanding of this report is you
14 believe that Ms. McLemore did a poor quality job
15 in preparing this report?
- 16 A. I believe that the amount of time she spent doing
17 it could be nothing. It was a one day review of a
18 myriad of systems and come out with a report to be
19 able to say how a system works after one day is
20 pretty -- I don't think that's a very qualified
21 statement.
- 22 Q. Isn't it true that at your deposition you
23 characterized this report as shoddy?
- 24 A. Yes, it is.
- 25 Q. Do you know why this report was submitted in this

1 docket?

2 A. No, I do not.

3 Q. Do you know what conclusions, if any, that Ms.
4 McLemore drew that are not included in the
5 materials submitted in this docket?

6 A. No, I don't.

7 MS. MARSH: That's all the questions we
8 have right now. What I would like to do as soon
9 as we're able to get an Exhibit 10 that's legible,
10 to present it in the record so the record is
11 complete which is the volume information provided
12 by Ameritech.

13 EXAMINER JAMES: Do you want to offer
14 your other exhibits as well?

15 MS. MARSH: I'm sorry?

16 EXAMINER JAMES: Do you want to offer
17 your other exhibits?

18 MS. MARSH: Yes. I would offer Exhibits

19 3 --

20 EXAMINER JAMES: 3 through 8 is what you
21 had.

22 MS. MARSH: 3 through 8 as well as
23 Delayed Exhibit 5 which we are preparing right
24 now, Delayed Exhibit 6. I would offer those
25 exhibits into evidence.

1 EXAMINER JAMES: Are there objections?

2 MR. DAWSON: No objections here.

3 MR. KELLEY: No objection.

4 EXAMINER JAMES: Those are received.

5 (Exhibit 3 through 8 received.)

6 EXAMINER JAMES: Is there other
7 cross-examination for Mr. Rogers?

8 MR. BERNS: There is from MCI.

9 Cross-Examination

10 By Mr. Berns:

11 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Rogers. I'm Matthew Berns
12 from MCI. Nice to see you again. Mr. Rogers, I'm
13 sure you'll correct me if I'm mischaracterizing
14 your testimony, but would it be fair to summarize
15 your position, Ameritech's position, that its OSS
16 systems, all of them, are fully tested and
17 operational?

18 A. That is correct.

19 Q. That's Ameritech's position?

20 A. Yes, it is.

21 Q. If you had to pick a point in time when you would
22 say that that was the time when Ameritech's OSS
23 systems became fully tested and operational, what
24 time would you pick?

25 A. Except for the changes that happened as a result

1 of new releases and stuff at the end of the --
2 since the beginning of the year, I would say the
3 end of '97 -- December.

4 Q. End of '96?

5 A. '96, I'm sorry, December 18th or some time frame
6 in there.

7 Q. So when the SGAT was filed in September, not all
8 of the systems were working fully operational,
9 fully tested?

10 A. Well, when it was filed, the products and services
11 and the interfaces that we were supporting were
12 tested at that point. And even in December I
13 think we had a substantive release where we added
14 some more capability to the system. So to say
15 when, you know, they ever are going to be complete
16 to where they're never going to have any
17 additional testing and be fully tested based on
18 the current release or current volume, it's kind
19 of a hard question for me to answer. I was
20 categorizing based on the end of the year which
21 was the last major release we had, and then we
22 have another release coming out in April.

23 Q. Maybe the difficulty we're having then is that we
24 have, you know, it's a common problem between
25 human beings is we have a miscommunication about

- 1 what it means to be fully tested and operational.
2 And so I'm wondering whether it would be
3 consistent with Ameritech's definition of fully
4 tested and operational for there to be, and I
5 think you told me the answer, but for there to be
6 further changes to the system to eliminate
7 errors. The system could still be in your view
8 fully tested and operational when it is still
9 kicking back errors that require further
10 adjustment to your systems?
- 11 A. I'm sorry, kicking back errors, rejects? What are
12 you referring to?
- 13 Q. Well --
- 14 A. Counsel, I would not want to sit here and say that
15 there will never be a bug in this system, this
16 system is 100 percent, you know, bug free. There
17 is hundreds of thousands of lines of codes in this
18 system. As far as whether or not CLECs could do
19 business with them, yes, I would testify they're
20 tested, and they're operational, and we have CLECs
21 out there today, one of them sitting real close to
22 you that's sending us hundreds of orders a day
23 that are being processed to these systems.
- 24 Q. Of course, the inquiry that we're engaged in now
25 is whether or not CLECs could be entitled to rely

1 on these systems and how far along in the spectrum
2 of things Ameritech's systems are, whether they
3 process all functions or some functions. So I
4 will agree with you that your systems might never
5 get to 100 percent error free.

6 And the question we're trying to
7 determine is how far along are you. Are you aware
8 of a situation that's developed with certain MCI
9 orders that when the order after it makes it
10 through the ordering system and the provisioning
11 system, a message is sent back to MCI that
12 suggests that the order is complete but then the
13 order later errors out at the billing stage? Are
14 you aware of that situation that's developed
15 between MCI and Ameritech?

16 A. That is the same situation we were talking about a
17 little bit earlier with the 865 when is an order
18 complete. We've had conversations of whether it
19 was completed when the actual work is done or when
20 the actual billing takes place. And we've been
21 reporting it when the work is done. And there is
22 some concern that says that no, it should be
23 reported when the billing is taking place even
24 though the billing could be proactively backdated.

25 Q. You would agree though that it would be a problem

1 if due to the condition of Ameritech's systems
2 such that a complete notification could be given
3 back to MCI but yet the order subsequently errored
4 out so that it did not make it through the billing
5 change system of Ameritech that there could
6 potentially be a situation where the customer is
7 being billed by both parties and that MCI might
8 not be aware of that?

9 A. That I'm not aware of being able to be billed by
10 both parties.

11 Q. You testified earlier that you had reviewed Ms.
12 Miller's surrebuttal testimony, and you made some
13 comments about one aspect of her testimony. But
14 did you read the part where Ms. Miller testified
15 that in fact that situation had developed where --

16 A. I have not had time to investigate it. I would
17 not -- I do not understand where that would take
18 place. I haven't had --

19 Q. Would you agree though it would be a problem if it
20 were true what Ms. Miller is going to testify to
21 that potentially although Ameritech's retail units
22 think that the customer that had been switched to
23 MCI at the switch level was still an Ameritech
24 customer, and MCI also thinks it's an MCI
25 customer, would you agree that that would be a

1 problem if that were the case?

2 A. If both AT&T or MCI and Ameritech felt it was
3 their customer at the same time, yes, that could
4 potentially be a problem.

5 Q. And you're aware that Ms. Miller has testified
6 that that has occurred and that a complete message
7 was sent back to MCI after it had made it through,
8 the order had made it through the provisioning
9 system but before it had made it to the billing
10 system?

11 A. I have -- I read that in her testimony, yes.

12 Q. So if what Ms. Miller is testifying to, if that
13 had really occurred, it's possible that an error
14 in an order can make it through the provisioning
15 system but only be identified later in the billing
16 system if that's -- if there was a defect in the
17 order that caused it not to be -- the change not
18 to occur in the billing end of the system?

19 A. I'm sorry. I'm not sure the categorization you're
20 giving.

21 Q. If what Ms. Miller is testifying to, that's true,
22 doesn't that necessarily mean that an MCI order
23 for whatever reason made it all the way through
24 the provisioning system before it errored out at
25 the billing system and that for whatever reason,

1 the error catching steps in the processes further
2 upstream did not catch that error?

3 A. Counsel, that's something that happens at
4 Ameritech retail also that there is a lot of -- I
5 don't say a lot of but there is several errors
6 that or several lines that go through completion
7 state, but they get stuck when they get ready to
8 put into the billing system as far as billing
9 usage.

10 But the net effect is that in all
11 systems except for the billing system they are
12 marked as being what's on the line, is just when
13 the usage comes to that usage, end up getting
14 recycled a few times once those errors are
15 collected.

16 Q. You would agree one of the most important things
17 to the end-user customer and certainly a
18 significantly important thing to MCI would be
19 whether or not that customer was being properly
20 billed or whether they were being billed by two
21 different LECs or only one different LEC and when
22 the billing switched over. You would agree that
23 would be important?

24 A. I would agree with you that that would be
25 important.

1 Q. Do you know what steps, if any, Ameritech is
2 taking to investigate that scenario?

3 A. Counsel, I just became aware of it this morning.

4 Q. Okay. You wouldn't believe me if I told you I was
5 going to ask the same number of questions as AT&T,
6 would you? Trying to reduce the double
7 questioning. Turning to the preordering aspect of
8 Ameritech's OSS systems.

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. I've heard conflicting stories, and I just want to
11 nail this down today if we could. Is it your
12 position that the current preordering interface
13 that Ameritech is using, is that an interim
14 solution, or does Ameritech view that as a
15 long-term solution?

16 A. Well, Counsel, I believe, if I had to categorize
17 it, what type of a solution it was, I would say
18 that right now that it is the solution we have.
19 And based on the way standards and things develop,
20 it will determine whether or not it's more
21 long-term. We have no migration plans in place to
22 go to any other interface if that's what you're
23 asking.

24 Q. For example, you have no plans to go to an
25 electronic bonding interface?

1 A. It all depends on how the standard bodies come
2 out. There is discussions in the electronic
3 commerce of using an EC, electronic commerce or
4 CMISE interface for doing this type of
5 transactions. And once that is further along the
6 way and we're participating in them, that's the
7 time to make the decision. We have an interface
8 that is up and working today, and that's where
9 we're focusing now. But we're also focusing
10 people on what's going to be long-term, whether or
11 not it is where we're at or it's something else.

12 Q. But you're aware that the same committee, the ECIC
13 committee which recommended EDI over TC/ --
14 TCP/IP, that that was recommended only as an
15 interim solution for the preordering interface?

16 A. You get to interfaces and you talk about interim
17 solutions, I believe that probably half the
18 standards we have out there are still interim
19 solutions. Get them up and they get them working,
20 and sometimes they change and sometimes they
21 don't. Like I say, we're active to try to help
22 the industry come up with the right long-term
23 solution, but I'm not -- I don't want to -- can't
24 sit here now and say that I can tell you which way
25 the wind is blowing.

1 Q. Now, when your counsel first questioned you this
2 morning, you testified that you didn't know of any
3 differences between the GTE proposal at the ECIC,
4 this is for preordering, as compared to the system
5 that Ameritech is using?

6 A. That is correct.

7 Q. But do you have any reason to dispute if there was
8 a vote taken and there were 25 votes taken or 25
9 votes cast for the GTE proposal and seven votes
10 cast for the Ameritech proposal?

11 A. Am I disputing whether or not there was a vote
12 taken?

13 Q. And that that was the results.

14 A. I believe -- I believe that the body which we're
15 speaking of was an ad hoc committee off of some
16 other group or industry players including vendors
17 of software and hardware got together and decided
18 what was the best interim or long-term solution
19 while they decided whether or not they should go
20 EC, electronic commerce or whatever. And would I
21 dispute whether or not they came up to that vote,
22 no, I'm not going to dispute that. I don't know.
23 I have not seen the results or seen it.

24 Q. But you would agree then that Ameritech certainly
25 is using the GE system, not the GTE system?

1 A. We are definitely using the GE Information System
2 solution. Like I say, the GE Information System
3 solution is an EDI, and it rides on top of
4 TCP/IP. The EDI piece of it is used only to
5 facilitate log-in and transactions.

6 Q. You testified earlier today --

7 MR. DAWSON: Excuse me. Let the witness
8 finish, please.

9 EXAMINER JAMES: Counsel says you were
10 interrupted.

11 MR. DAWSON: Now you can talk if you
12 have anything to say.

13 THE WITNESS: Our interface is EDI over
14 TCP/IP. The GTE from what you said here is EDI
15 over TCP/IP. I don't understand the differences
16 between the two if there are any.

17 BY MR. BERNS:

18 Q. Fair enough. You're aware Ameritech has nearly
19 half a billion dollar investment in the GEIS, the
20 parent company -- excuse me, GEIS, half a billion
21 dollars in GEIS?

22 A. I'm aware we had some investment, but I wasn't
23 aware that was the dollar amount.

24 Q. You didn't know the magnitude?

25 A. No, I didn't.

1 Q. Would it be a fair characterization of your
2 testimony that it shouldn't make any difference to
3 CLECs whether once the orders are received by
4 Ameritech whether it drops to manual handling at
5 that point?

6 A. That is correct.

7 Q. You would agree as a systems designer that it
8 would certainly be preferable in many instances to
9 have computers talk to computers rather than have
10 people intervening in the middle, wouldn't you?

11 A. Counsel, there is computers talking to computers.
12 The CLEC's computer talks to our computer to
13 actually send the order.

14 Q. Once it's past that.

15 A. From a computer, you know, from my perspective
16 whether or not it is desirable to have 100 percent
17 manual or 100 percent mechanized versus manual, I
18 feel that's a business decision. It's not whether
19 or not technology is able to do it. It's whether
20 or not it's cost effective and what is the most
21 efficient way of doing the work.

22 Q. You're not suggesting though that people can do
23 things faster and easier than computers in all
24 instances?

25 A. I'm suggesting that people can sometimes do things

1 cheaper and more efficiently than it takes to do
2 the development and to do the interfacing of the
3 computers, yes.

4 Q. You testified earlier today though that Ameritech
5 is certainly investigating ways to reduce the
6 proportion of orders that require manual
7 intervention?

8 A. Most definitely.

9 Q. You're aware, aren't you, that CLECs pay -- pay
10 for the development of your systems, and CLECs pay
11 service ordering charges and other things that
12 might be based on Ameritech's costs. If a CLEC is
13 ordering loops, for example --

14 A. That is one of the reasons that we took this
15 approach on manual intervention. If we get orders
16 that are very sparse for products that we're only
17 going to get a handful here and there, it is more
18 cost effective to have a person look at those and
19 process it than to have the systems developed and
20 all the time and requirements that are developed
21 to do that mechanically.

22 Q. So it's not completely true to say CLECs have no
23 interest in what happens behind the Ameritech
24 interface?

25 A. Oh, absolutely. Absolutely they do have an

1 interest in how the orders would flow.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. It doesn't -- it won't affect the things, but as
4 far as being able to process things as a market
5 developed enters a lot of what happens downstream.

6 Q. You just suggested that there wouldn't be an
7 effect necessarily about how an order was
8 processed. You would agree, wouldn't you, that a
9 human might be more likely to transcribe a number
10 or to make otherwise a mistake filling in the
11 blanks of a screen or reading something off a
12 paper and retranscribing it and that computers are
13 actually pretty good at moving numbers from one
14 system to another system, wouldn't you?

15 A. Yes, that is correct.

16 Q. So theoretically to the extent your systems depend
17 on accurate information being put into forms or
18 being transferred from system to system, computers
19 could do it in a lot of cases better than a human?

20 A. Counsel, the majority of the cases like, I can't
21 definitively say that, but in many of the cases
22 where we have the manual intervention, manual
23 intervention is not manual processing. So it's
24 not the service reps do not transpose and redo the
25 order. They just assist it down the line. It's

1 not a take the order and it falls off into a
2 printer and they pick it up and type it back into
3 the machine.

4 Q. Still on the preordering interface, I just want to
5 confirm a couple of things with you. You've
6 testified that Ameritech supports five distinct
7 functions in the preordering interface, isn't that
8 true?

9 A. That is correct.

10 Q. Do Ameritech's preordering systems currently
11 support an ability for a CLEC to get directory and
12 listing information for a new customer?

13 A. Directory listing information?

14 Q. Correct.

15 A. It is included in on the ordering. The ordering
16 interface allows, has directory listings on it.

17 Q. What I'm asking, and perhaps I'm not being clear
18 enough, can the CLEC customer service
19 representative, can the CLEC customer service
20 representative view the directory listing as the
21 Ameritech system has it while the customer is on
22 line?

23 A. I still don't understand what you're getting at.
24 The customer service record has the listing
25 information in it. And that is what we provide.

1 What the CLEC gets is what we -- the service rep
2 would get.

3 Q. So it's in the customer service record?

4 A. The listing information, yes.

5 Q. Okay. And just so we're clear about how a CLEC
6 gets access to the CSR, isn't it true that a CLEC
7 needs to send to Ameritech a letter of
8 authorization or somehow electronically transmit
9 authorization to look at that CSR?

10 A. There is three conditions where a CLEC could get a
11 customer service record. The first condition is a
12 truly speculative sale, that it's Mr. Dawson,
13 would you like to come to Joe's Telephone
14 Company. Mr. Dawson says no, Joe, make me up a
15 proposal. And once you give me a proposal, I'll
16 decide. And in that case Joe, me being Joe's
17 Telecommunications Company, would have to get a
18 letter of authorization from Mr. Dawson so I could
19 see his record. In that case, yes, they would
20 have to transmit the CSR -- excuse me, that letter
21 of authorization to us, and we would release or
22 Ameritech would release the customer's service
23 record to the CLEC.

24 In a case of its I call it -- CLEC calls
25 Mr. Dawson and says Mr. Dawson, would you like to