

RECEIVED

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

NOV 25 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the matter of

Application of BellSouth Corporation,)
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and)
BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., for Provision)
of In-Region, InterLATA Service in the)
State of Louisiana)
_____)

CC Docket
No. 97-231

**COMMENTS OF AT&T CORP.
IN OPPOSITION TO BELLSOUTH'S
SECTION 271 APPLICATION**

APPENDIX - VOLUME II

**ATTACHMENTS 1 - 33 TO THE AFFIDAVIT OF
JAY M. BRADBURY**

**APPENDIX TO COMMENTS OF AT&T CORP.
IN OPPOSITION TO BELLSOUTH'S
SECTION 271 APPLICATION FOR LOUISIANA**

| TAB | AFFIDAVIT | SUBJECT(S) COVERED |
|------------|--|---|
| A | William J. Baumol | Public Interest |
| B | Robert H. Bork | Public Interest |
| C | Jay M. Bradbury | Operations Support Systems |
| D | Jim Carroll | AT&T Entry Plans |
| E | Robert V. Falcone and Michael E. Leshner | Unbundled Network Elements: Combinations |
| F | Jordan Roderick | PCS |
| G | Gregory R. Follensbee | Unbundled Network Elements: Pricing |
| H | R. Glenn Hubbard and William H. Lehr | Public Interest |
| I | Patricia A. McFarland | Resale Restrictions |
| J | Patricia A. McFarland | Section 272 Compliance |
| K | Sharon Norris | Operations Support Systems: Demonstration for La. PSC |
| L | C. Michael Pfau | Performance Measurements |
| M | James A. Tamplin, Jr. | Unbundled Network Elements |

TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS

| ATTACHMENT | DESCRIPTION |
|------------|---|
| 1 | AT&T's Attempts to Secure Nondiscriminatory Access to BellSouth's Operations Support Systems |
| 1a | Letter from W.J. Carroll to F. Duane Ackerman (Apr. 24, 1996) |
| 1b | Letter from W. Scott Schaefer to William J. Carroll (Apr. 26, 1996) |
| 1c | Letter from W. Scott Schaefer to William J. Carroll (Apr. 30, 1996) |
| 1d | Letter from W.J. Carroll to W. Scott Schaefer (May 7, 1996) |
| 1e | Letter from W. Scott Schaefer to William J. Carroll (May 16, 1996) |
| 1f | Letter from W. Scott Schaefer to William J. Carroll (May 30, 1996) |
| 1g | "White Paper - Application Access to Web Server" September 6, 1996 |
| 2 | Testimony of Gloria Calhoun in Docket No. P-55 Sub 1022 (North Carolina Utilities Commission), transcript of September 25, 1997 hearing Vol. 7, pp. 89-96, and transcript of September 26, 1997 hearing Vol. 8, pp. 47-51 |
| 3 | Testimony of Gloria Calhoun in Docket No. 25835 (Ala. PSC), transcript of August 19, 1997 hearing, pp. 526-28 and 686-687 |
| 4 | Electronic Communications Implementation Committee ("ECIC") recommendation of March 1997 |
| 5 | Charts depicting role of the CGI interface |
| 6 | March 20, 1997 CGI Specifications |
| 7 | BellSouth's Report to the GA PSC, "Electronic Interface for the New Local markets," submitted April 15, 1997 |
| 8 | Letter from Cassandra Daniels (BellSouth) to Cindy Clark (AT&T), dated May 19, 1997 |
| 9 | BellSouth's August 11, 1997 response to Item No. AT&T p. 1, in La. PSC Docket No. U-22252 |
| 10 | April 28, 1997 Specifications |
| 11 | Letter from A.J. Calabrese (AT&T) to Mark Feidler (BellSouth), dated May 5, 1997 |
| 12 | Excerpts of Gloria Calhoun Testimony in Kentucky, Alabama, Florida and North Carolina |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 13 | Deposition of William N. Stacy taken August 14, 1997, in Docket No. 960786-TL (Fla. PSC) (excerpts) |
| 14 | AT&T's Response to BellSouth's April 15, 1997 Monthly Surveillance Report for Electronic Interfaces in Docket 6352-U (Ga. PSC) |
| 15 | Letter from A.J. Calabrese (AT&T) to Quinton Sanders (BellSouth), dated July 28, 1997 |
| 16 | Testimony of Gloria Calhoun in Docket No. 97-101-C (South Carolina PSC), transcript of July 7, 1997 (excerpts) |
| 17 | Chart: BellSouth restrictions on reserved numbers |
| 18 | Letter from Pamela Nelson (AT&T) to Jan Buriss (BellSouth), dated September 3, 1997 |
| 19 | Discussion of Why LENS Fails to Provide Non-discriminatory Access as an Interface for Ordering and Provisioning |
| 19a | Chart: BellSouth/Competitive Local Provider Service Order Edits are Discriminatory |
| 20 | Letter from J.M. Baker (BellSouth) to CLEC customers, dated September 2, 1997 |
| 21 | Overview of LENS Pre-Order Functionality |
| 22 | AT&T and BellSouth correspondence regarding the due date issue |
| 23 | Letter from Pamela Nelson (AT&T) to Janice Buriss (BellSouth), dated August 21, 1997 |
| 24 | BellSouth rejection notices |
| 25 | Letter from Beverly Simmons (AT&T) to Martha Romano (BellSouth), dated May 8, 1997; Letter from Beverly Simmons (AT&T) to Margaret Garvin (BellSouth), dated September 18, 1997 |
| 26 | Excerpts of BellSouth's Responses to AT&T's Discovery Requests in Docket No. 960786-TL (Fla. PSC) (various dates) |
| 27 | List of Services Which Cannot be Ordered by a CLEC Using EDI |
| 28 | Excerpts from Deposition of Gloria Calhoun (August 22-23, 1997), Docket No. 960786-TL, Fla. PSC, Vol. 2 (p. 160) and Vol. 3 (pp. 214-215) |
| 29 | Letter from Terrie Hudson (BellSouth) to Pamela Nelson (AT&T), dated May 14, 1997 |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 30 | Comparison of Capability/Functionality -- Trouble Analysis and Facilitation Interface (TAFI) and Electronic Bonding Interface (EBI) |
| 31 | Electronic Communications Conformance and Intercompany Testing |
| 32 | Letter from Margaret Garvin (BellSouth) to Pamela Nelson (AT&T), dated September 15, 1997 |
| 33a | Minutes of the September 9, 1997 AT&T-BellSouth meeting (prepared by AT&T) |
| 33b | Minutes of the September 9, 1997 AT&T-BellSouth meeting (prepared by BellSouth) |
| 34 | BellSouth's List of Errors that will Stop Processing of a Service Request |
| 35 | Letter from Beverly Simmons (AT&T) to Margaret Garvin (BellSouth), dated September 24, 1997 |
| 36 | "BellSouth and AT&T TCIF Issue 7 -- Concerns from 9/15 and 9/18 Meetings," dated Sept. 25, 1997 (BellSouth responses to AT&T questions) |
| 37 | Description of AT&T's Attempts to Obtain the Interfaces, Specifications and Business Rules Necessary for the Ordering of UNE Combinations |
| 37a | Letter from James S. Hill to Robert Echols (Apr. 2, 1997) |
| 37b | Letter from James S. Hill to Robert Echols (Apr. 10, 1997) |
| 37c | Letter from James S. Hill to Robert Echols (May 12, 1997) |
| 37d | Letter from Robert Echols to James S. Hill (May 28, 1997) |
| 37e | Letter from Pamela Nelson to Terrie Hudson (June 4, 1997) |
| 37f | E-mail from James S. Hill to Marcia Moss (June 9, 1997) |
| 37g | Letter from James S. Hill to Marcia Moss (June 27, 1997) |
| 37h | Telephone log of James S. Hill (June 30, 1997) (transcribing voice mail message from Marcia Moss) |
| 37i | Letter from James S. Hill to Margaret Garvin (July 29, 1997) |
| 37j | Facsimile from Margaret Garvin to James S. Hill (Aug. 7, 1997) |
| 37k | Letter from James S. Hill to Margaret Garvin (Aug. 25, 1997) |
| 38 | Letter from Jill Williamson (AT&T) to Jo Sundeman (BellSouth), dated September 16, 1997 |

| | |
|----|---|
| 39 | Memorandum from Jan Buriss (BellSouth) to Jim Carroll and Pam Nelson (AT&T), dated October 24, 1997 |
| 40 | Excerpt of Testimony of William Stacy in Docket No. 97-101-C (South Carolina PSC), transcript of July 8, 1997 proceedings |
| 41 | "Corrections and Enhancements" Needed to LENS, as described by BellSouth Personnel in May 1997 and Current Status as known by AT&T |
| 42 | AT&T Measurements -- Attachment 12, Item 2.4 (BellSouth Report) |
| 43 | Excerpts of Testimony of Robert C. Scheye in Docket 960787-TL (Fla. PSC), transcript of September 2, 1997 proceedings |
| 44 | Reports on BellSouth's Local Carrier Service Center by DeWolff, Boberg and Associates |
| 45 | Letter from Rebecca Bennet (AT&T) to Gary Romanick (BellSouth), dated September 19, 1997 |
| 46 | Recent correspondence between AT&T and BellSouth regarding AT&T's request for business rules for ordering directory listings |
| 47 | Letter from Pamela Nelson (AT&T) to Jan Buriss (BellSouth), dated September 30, 1997 |
| 48 | Late Filed Exhibit No. 10 to Deposition of William N. Stacy, filed by BellSouth on August 14, 1997 in Docket No. 960786-TL (Fla. PSC) |
| 49 | Excerpts of Testimony of William N. Stacy in Docket Nos. 6863-U and 7253-U (Ga. PSC), transcript of July 16, 1997 |
| 50 | "AT&T Monthly Surveillance Report -- Operations Support Systems (OSS) Interfaces" filed August 22, 1997 |
| 51 | Excerpts of Testimony of Gloria Calhoun, Ky. PSC, Case No. 96-608, (Aug. 26, 1997) |
| 52 | Estimated AT&T Order and Inquiry Volumes, dated August 21, 1996 |
| 53 | Chronology of RSAG shutdown |
| 54 | Order, Ala. PSC, Docket No. 25835 (Oct. 16, 1997) |
| 55 | Order, Ga. PSC, Docket No. 7253-U (Oct. 30, 1997) |
| 56 | Order, Fla. PSC, Docket No. 960786-TL (Nov. 19, 1997) |
| 57 | Letter from Jerome Melson (ECIC Chair) to Glen Sirles (OBF Moderator), dated October 31, 1997 |

| | |
|----|---|
| 58 | Letter from Greg Kirby (BellSouth) to Cindy Clark (AT&T), dated November 4, 1997 |
| 59 | LENS Release Notes |
| 60 | BellSouth Website Notices |
| 61 | Memorandum from BellSouth to all Interexchange carriers, dated September 17, 1997 |
| 62 | Letter from A.J. Calabrese (AT&T) to Mark Feidler (BellSouth), dated October 20, 1997 |
| 63 | BellSouth CLEC Forum -- October 30th and 31st, 1997 |
| 64 | Letter from Natasha Ervin (BellSouth) to Beverly Simmons (AT&T), dated October 29, 1997 |
| 65 | Letter from Beverly Simmons (AT&T) to Melvin Porter (BellSouth), dated October 17, 1997 |
| 66 | Charts Depicting BellSouth's Performance |

ATTACHMENT 1

ATTACHMENT 1

AT&T'S ATTEMPTS TO SECURE NONDISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO BELL SOUTH'S OPERATIONS SUPPORT SYSTEM

The establishment of efficient and effective electronic interfaces and procedures for the exchange of information between the operations support systems of BellSouth and AT&T and other CLECs is essential for the development of competition in the provision of local services. AT&T and other CLECs entering local markets on a large scale are highly dependent upon their ability efficiently to obtain local services and unbundled network elements from BellSouth, which requires efficient, real-time exchange of information between CLECs and BellSouth relating to all of the OSS functions. Without nondiscriminatory access to BellSouth's operations support systems, large-scale, broad-based entry by CLECs into local markets will be delayed or foreclosed, and consumers will be denied the intended benefits of competition in local telephone services -- choice, new and innovative services, and lower prices.

Accordingly, AT&T first requested that BellSouth provide electronic access to its OSS more than two years ago. As I explain below, from the time of that request, BellSouth has refused to provide nondiscriminatory access. Initially denying that it had any obligation to provide nondiscriminatory access to its OSS, BellSouth has refused to provide AT&T detailed specifications of the interfaces being developed so that AT&T may engineer its side of the interfaces, has offered only interfaces that required substantial human intervention, and -- without notice to AT&T -- has diverted its efforts from development of electronic interfaces needed to support high-volume competitive efforts and focused on BellSouth's proprietary web-based system, which (by BellSouth's own admission) is designed to support only relatively small CLECs.

As a result, AT&T has been forced to rely on BellSouth's discriminatory, interim processes to support its planned entry into the market.

Since the time of AT&T's first request for access to BellSouth's OSS, AT&T and BellSouth agreed to conduct OSS negotiations on a BellSouth region-wide basis, which is appropriate because BellSouth's OSS are designed to serve the entire region. Thus, although AT&T's dealings with BellSouth with respect to OSS have focused to date on AT&T's plans to enter the local exchange market in Georgia, the course of dealings between the two companies is equally relevant to -- and has affected the availability of -- electronic access to BellSouth's OSS in all states in the BellSouth region, including South Carolina.

On July 1, 1995, local service competition was authorized in Georgia under the Telecommunications and Competition Development Act of 1995 (O.C.G.A. § 46-5-160, et seq.). AT&T immediately began evaluating entry into the Georgia local services market. In August 1995, AT&T and BellSouth had their first executive-level meetings to discuss local interconnection. This was followed by a meeting of AT&T and BellSouth subject matter expert team leaders, including myself, on September 8, 1995.

From the remainder of September 1995 through December 1995, AT&T had at least two dozen meetings with BellSouth on interconnection issues, including access to BellSouth's OSS. During this period, AT&T transmitted to BellSouth: (1) AT&T's "Total Service Resale Requirements," which stressed the need for electronic access to OSS for the resale of BellSouth's services; (2) AT&T's "Loop Resale Requirements" concerning access to, and use of, the unbundled loop in the provision of competitive local exchange services, and (3) a draft of AT&T's "Electronic Communications Interface Provisioning Object Requirements," which

described the data elements and message contents for pre-ordering and ordering transactions between AT&T and incumbent LECs, such as BellSouth.

BellSouth, however, consistently maintained during the September-December 1995 period that AT&T (and other new entrants) did not need electronic interfaces to BellSouth's OSS and that such interfaces were not legally required. In response to AT&T's submissions of its requirements for resale of BellSouth's services and access to the unbundled loop, BellSouth simply sent AT&T a copy of BellSouth's OLEC (Other Local Exchange Carrier) Ordering Guidelines.

The ordering guidelines provided by BellSouth were plainly inadequate, because they provided for manual, rather than electronic, interfaces. Moreover, even if the ordering guidelines were intended for electronic ordering (and they were not), BellSouth's response to AT&T's requests ignored the nature of the process that must be followed before interfaces can be deemed operationally ready. The process necessary to achieve operational readiness is complex and multi-step, requiring extensive negotiations between the parties, development of systems and systems requirements, and comprehensive testing (both internal testing and inter-system testing). Operational readiness cannot be achieved simply by providing a CLEC with an ordering guide.

Because of the lack of progress with BellSouth, AT&T filed a petition with the Georgia PSC on December 21, 1995, asking the PSC to order BellSouth to provide nondiscriminatory electronic interfaces to BellSouth's OSS. While AT&T awaited the results of that petition, it continued to press BellSouth on the need for electronic interfaces. On February 1, 1996, AT&T sent BellSouth updates to its requirements – Standard Access Billing Requirements

(SABR), Local Recording Data Transfer Requirements (LRDTR), and Local Account Maintenance Requirements (LAMR).

Even after the enactment of the 1996 Act on February 8, 1996, BellSouth continued to hold fast to its position that electronic interfaces were neither needed nor legally required. Between February and May 1996, AT&T repeatedly emphasized to BellSouth its need for electronic interfaces, continued to transmit its electronic interface requirements to BellSouth, and advised BellSouth of AT&T's willingness to enter the market with interim electronic interfaces for service order processing and provisioning as a starting point, in order to avoid additional delay in its ability to enter the local service market. Nonetheless, BellSouth would not commit to provide even interim interfaces.

In April of 1996, AT&T continued to press its request for nondiscriminatory access to OSS by notifying BellSouth's Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of AT&T's concern over BellSouth's repeated failure to commit to the development of electronic interfaces.¹ In a letter from W. J. Carroll to F. Duane Ackerman dated April 24, 1996, AT&T reiterated its concern that BellSouth had AT&T's requirements in hand for six months, yet had not committed to develop the necessary interfaces. AT&T requested that BellSouth commit to provide electronic interfaces and be ready for joint testing with AT&T by July 1, 1996. BellSouth responded that it was committed to support AT&T's entry only "using processes in place today." Further, BellSouth stated that it did not believe EDI was a "legal or operational requirement for

¹ Letter from W. J. Carroll (AT&T) to F. Duane Ackerman (BellSouth), dated April 24, 1996 (Attachment 1a).

AT&T to enter the market as a reseller." BellSouth explained that it was still examining whether it would provide the EDI interface to CLECs.²

Four days later, on April 30, 1996, BellSouth changed course and advised AT&T that it was prepared to move forward with EDI implementation.³ Although BellSouth would not commit to an implementation date, it indicated that the overall time frame would be no more than three months from the May 6, 1996 commencement of negotiations on the transaction sets to be used and the detailed definition of data requirements. However, BellSouth's Agreement to proceed with the development of EDI interfaces was coupled with a request that AT&T withdraw its December 21, 1995 petition to the Georgia PSC. AT&T declined to do so, noting among other things that BellSouth's proposal did not meet AT&T's consistently communicated target of interim electronic interfaces by July 1, 1996.⁴

Despite its written commitment to proceed with development of interim EDI interfaces, BellSouth continued to argue that such electronic interfaces were not legally required. As it stated in a May 16, 1996 letter, "BellSouth maintains that the PC to PC fax interface initially proposed [by BellSouth] meets the letter and spirit of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as to

² Letter from W. Scott Schaefer (BellSouth) to William J. Carroll (AT&T), dated April 26, 1996 (Attachment 1b).

³ Letter from W. Scott Schaefer (BellSouth) to William J. Carroll (AT&T), dated April 30, 1996 (Attachment 1c).

⁴ Letter from William J. Carroll (AT&T) to W. Scott Schaefer (BellSouth), dated May 7, 1996 (Attachment 1d).

interface requirements between the incumbent local exchange carrier and other local exchange carriers."⁵ BellSouth reiterated on May 30, 1996, its support for such a fax interface.⁶

On May 29, 1996, the Georgia PSC decided AT&T's petition and ruled that AT&T's request for electronic interfaces was "timely and appropriate in that it is imperative that a reseller have access to the same service ordering provisions, service trouble reporting and informational databases for their customers as does BellSouth."⁷ The Georgia PSC ordered BellSouth to provide the requested interfaces by July 15, 1996.

BellSouth, however, immediately petitioned for reconsideration of the PSC's decision, arguing that it had no obligation under the 1996 Act to provide AT&T electronic access to BellSouth's OSS, and that such electronic interfaces were not feasible.⁸ In a "report" that it filed concurrently with the petition, BellSouth stated that: (1) its initial objective was to provide minimal interfaces that suited the needs of "'Mom and Pop' resellers," postponing the development of "more sophisticated interfaces" (such as those that would be required by AT&T); (2) resellers could enter the local market by faxing service order request forms to BellSouth's service centers; and (3) BellSouth had only begun to design the electronic interfaces required for pre-ordering

⁵ Letter from W. Scott Schaefer (BellSouth) to William J. Carroll (AT&T), dated May 16, 1996 (Attachment 1e).

⁶ Letter from W. Scott Schaefer (BellSouth) to William J. Carroll (AT&T), dated May 30, 1996 (Attachment 1f).

⁷ Docket No. 6352-U, Petition of AT&T for the Commission to Establish Resale Rules, Rates, Terms and Conditions and the Initial Unbundling of Services, (Ga. PSC), Order issued May 29, 1996 ("Georgia Resale Order"), p. 12.

⁸ BellSouth Motion for Reconsideration and Clarification filed June 21, 1996, in Docket No. 6352-U (Ga. PSC), p. 17 n.4.

information in May 1996 (despite AT&T's continuous requests since September 1995 for electronic interfaces).⁹

On July 2, 1996, in response to BellSouth's petition for reconsideration, the Georgia PSC issued a supplemental order which required, among other things, that BellSouth:

- Provide by August 15, 1996, the technical specifications and processes for BellSouth's proposed interactive electronic pre-ordering solution, interactive direct order entry, and TAFI (maintenance and repair) interface;
- Implement by December 31, 1996, but no later than April 1, 1997, BellSouth's proposed interactive electronic pre-ordering solution;
- Make fully operational by December 15, 1996, the Electronic Data Interface ("EDI") capability for receipt and transmission of orders for services in BellSouth's General Subscriber Services and Private Line Tariffs; and
- Implement, and make fully available, an interactive direct order entry capability by March 31, 1997.¹⁰

In response to this order, and without advance consultation or notice to AT&T, BellSouth advised the Georgia PSC on August 15, 1996, that it would not offer AT&T machine-to-machine electronic access to its OSS, but intended to provide only a human-to-machine, web-based interface that would not be integrated with AT&T's own systems.¹¹ AT&T returned to the Georgia PSC, pointing out that BellSouth's web-based architecture was discriminatory because of

⁹ BellSouth's Preliminary Report to the Georgia Public Service Commission, "Operational Interfaces between BellSouth and Resellers," filed June 21, 1996 ("BellSouth Report"), pp. 4, 9, 14.

¹⁰ See Docket No. 6352-U, *supra*, Order issued July 2, 1996, pp. 4-5.

¹¹ See BellSouth's Report To the Georgia PSC, "Electronic Interfaces for Local Service Resellers: Monthly Surveillance Report," filed August 15, 1996, in Docket No. 6352-U (Ga. PSC), pp. 12-23. That web-based interface is BellSouth's Local Exchange Navigation System ("LENS").

its requirement of manual intervention, which inhibits the development of competition in the local exchange market.¹² On December 4, 1996, in the context of the AT&T/BellSouth interconnection arbitration, the Georgia PSC reiterated its requirement that certain EDI ordering interfaces be implemented by March 31, 1997, and certain pre-ordering interfaces by April 1, 1997. The Georgia PSC also determined that BellSouth's web proposal would be adequate only as an interim solution.¹³

Because BellSouth insisted that it would devote its efforts to providing a web-based interface (i.e., LENS), AT&T reluctantly decided to pursue obtaining from BellSouth – as an interim measure – certain of the data streams underlying BellSouth's web page proposal. AT&T hoped that it might be able to develop back office interfaces on its end, such as a Common Gateway Interface (“CGI”), that could integrate LENS with its own system and thus use this information on a machine-to-machine basis. AT&T therefore sought both (1) technical specifications from BellSouth on its LENS web proposal, and (2) follow-up meetings with BellSouth. On September 6, 1996, BellSouth produced a “White Paper” to AT&T outlining two methods, including the CGI interface, that it thought could be used to provide such data streams

¹² See letter from Roxanne Douglas (AT&T) to Terri M. Lyndall, Executive Secretary, Ga. PSC, dated October 30, 1996, and filed in Docket No. 6352-U, supra, pp. 2-3.

¹³ Docket No. 6801, In re: Petition by AT&T for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms and Conditions with BellSouth Telecommunications Inc. Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Ga. PSC), Order Ruling on Arbitration, issued December 4, 1996, pp. 22-23. Because AT&T was negotiating access to BellSouth's OSS on a region-wide basis, this resolution in Georgia effectively applied to BellSouth's provision of OSS access in South Carolina as well. Such OSS access therefore was not an issue in the BellSouth/AT&T arbitration in South Carolina.

separate from the web page data.¹⁴ However, the White Paper by itself did not contain the tag values and specifications needed for AT&T to develop a CGI interface. BellSouth did not provide such specifications to AT&T, and would not even meet with AT&T on the web proposal until January 23, 1997. At the January 23, 1997 meeting, BellSouth advised AT&T that its focus, resources and priority were dedicated to the implementation of the LENS web interface, rather than development of the CGI interface or other methods of integrating LENS with AT&T's systems.¹⁵ As discussed in my affidavit, although BellSouth later purported to supply CGI specifications, it repudiated them in April 1997.

¹⁴ "White Paper -- Application Access to Web Server," dated September 6, 1996 (Attachment 1g).

¹⁵ As will be discussed below, BellSouth did not provide the requested specifications until March 20, 1997 -- and later retracted them.

ATTACHMENT 1a



William J. (Jim) Carroll
Vice President

Room 4170
1200 Peachtree St. NE
Atlanta, GA 30309
404 810-7262

April 24, 1996

Via Hand Delivery

Mr. F. Duane Ackerman
Vice President & Chief Operating Officer
BellSouth Corporation
1155 Peachtree Street, NE
Room 2010
Atlanta, GA 30309

Dear Duane:

On March 6, you replied to our March 4, 1996 request for negotiations under the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. You pointed out that negotiations had been underway for quite some time. In fact, BellSouth has had our requirements for Total Services Resale for over six months without responding to the Electronic Interfaces necessary for pre-service ordering, service order processing and provisioning, and service trouble reporting.

BellSouth continues to delay AT&T's market entry capability. Attached is an escalation request I made to Charlie Coe on April 4, 1996 in connection with this issue. Charlie's response dated April 12, 1996 received April 17, 1996, includes continued delay. We are requesting that BellSouth commit to provide the Electronic Interfaces and be ready for joint testing by July 1, 1996. Please advise.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "J. Drummond". The signature is written over the word "Attachment".

Attachment

cc: J. Drummond
C. Coe

**Status of AT&T/BellSouth Negotiations under the
Telecommunications Act of 1996 (for states of GA, FL, NC, TN)
4/4/96**

TOTAL SERVICES RESALE

| Issue | Status | Action Requested |
|---|--|---|
| <u>Electronic Interfaces - General</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BellSouth has had requirements for over 6 months with no firm long term solutions. • BS Steering Committee expecting interface business case 5/1. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerate completion/analysis of business case to support desired 4/15 interface definitions, etc. • Commit to interim EDI arrangements other RBOCs are agreeing to. • Agree to BellSouth/AT&T technical teams working closely, in parallel, immediately to define/develop interfaces. |
| ⇒ Pre-Service Ordering | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some interim (Phase I) pre-ordering interfaces available for joint testing between 4/15-5/1. • No schedule for delivery of long term (Phase II) interfaces. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commit to define Phase II (electronic) interfaces by 4/15/96 and be ready for joint testing 7/1/96. |
| ⇒ Service Order processing & provisioning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase I interfaces proposed as manual fax/telephone calls. • BellSouth advocating awaiting OBF solution. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commit to define Phase II (electronic) interfaces by 4/15/96 and be ready for joint testing 7/1/96. |
| ⇒ Service Trouble reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial agreement in maintenance area -- agree to provide electronic transfer of Maintenance Trouble Report. • Testing Required. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commit by 4/15/96 to provide electronic interfaces testing by 3Q/4Q 1996. |

ATTACHMENT 1b

April 26, 1996

William J. Carroll
Vice President
Room 4170
1200 Peachtree St., NE
Atlanta, Ga. 30309

Dear Jim:

This letter is in response to your April 24, 1996, letter to F. Duane Ackerman. As you mentioned, AT&T and BellSouth have been jointly and voluntarily discussing AT&T's possible resale of BellSouth services since August of last year. Upon receipt of AT&T's March 4, 1996, letter, BellSouth immediately formed a negotiation team (Attachment I) and our companies began formal negotiations under the Telecommunications Act of 1996. BellSouth has dedicated substantial resources to this effort and continues to add resources as new issues surface. BellSouth has committed to support AT&T's entry into the local market via resale using processes in place today to accommodate all resellers' entry into that market.

We acknowledge AT&T's request for BellSouth to provide certain operational functions via specific methods such as the use of EDI for the delivery of orders to BellSouth. Although BellSouth believes EDI is not a legal or operational requirement for AT&T to enter the market as a reseller in good faith we are investigating the potential implementation of the interface AT&T desires. This investigation will conclude in the next few days and a formal position regarding BellSouth's use of EDI will be provided to AT&T at that time.

Joint AT&T/BellSouth subject matter expert meetings on this and other elements of ongoing negotiations have intensified greatly since negotiations began under the Telecommunications Act of 1996. BellSouth and AT&T are both working to ensure resources involved in negotiations are employed as effectively as possible. Per your request on our phone call April 24, 1996, Attachment II provides two examples of instances where BellSouth was ready to negotiate but AT&T representatives were not prepared.

BellSouth is committed to conducting our negotiations in an expeditious manner and look forward to a successful conclusion. Martha McDonald of my office is working with your assistant to schedule time next week for us to discuss negotiation issues. I look forward to seeing you then.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W. Scott Schaefer". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

W. Scott Schaefer
Acting Vice President
InterConnection Services

cc: F. Duane Ackerman
Charles B. Coe

ATTACHMENT 1c

April 30, 1996

Mr. William J. Carroll
Vice President
Room 4170
1200 Peachtree St., NE
Atlanta, Ga. 30309

Dear Jim:

In a letter dated April 26, 1996, BellSouth advised AT&T that evaluation of AT&T's proposed EDI interface for transmitting local service requests was near completion. Based on the results of that evaluation, BellSouth is now prepared to move forward with EDI implementation, subject to the following parameters:

Scope:

Our discussions to date have centered primarily around resale. However, BellSouth intends to complete both resale and facilities-based ordering scenarios simultaneously. Specifically, we initially will support an interface for residence and business basic exchange services, as well as number portability and listings, that includes service order transmission and firm order confirmation.

Timeline:

As I am sure you are aware, standard EDI implementations generally proceed in phases, the first of which includes the negotiation of the transaction sets to be used and the detailed definition of data requirements. BellSouth is prepared to begin intensive negotiations with AT&T to jointly develop these elements. BellSouth has assigned the necessary technical experts to this project and those experts are available to work with AT&T on a priority basis beginning May 6, 1996. Specific arrangements can be coordinated by the BellSouth/AT&T core negotiating team.