

Paul G. Lane  
General Counsel-  
Missouri

Southwestern Bell Telephone  
One Bell Center, Room 3520  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101  
Phone 314 235-4300  
Fax 314 247-0014



February 14, 2000

The Honorable Dale Hardy Roberts  
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
301 West High Street, Floor 5A  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

FILED<sup>2</sup>

FEB 14 2000

Missouri Public  
Service Commission

Re: Case No. TO-2000-322

Dear Judge Roberts:

Enclosed, for filing in the above-captioned case, are an original and fourteen copies of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's Response to DIECA Communications, Inc., d/b/a Covad Communications Company's Supplemental Motion for Order Compelling Compliance with Commission's Order and for Sanctions and Reply to SWBT's Response to Covad's Original Motion.

Thank you for bringing this matter to the attention of the Commission.

Very truly yours,

*Paul G. Lane /tm*

Paul G. Lane

Enclosures

cc: Attorneys of Record

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED<sup>2</sup>  
FEB 14 2000

In the Matter of the Petition of DIECA )  
Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad )  
Communications Company for Arbitration )  
of Interconnection Rates, Terms, Conditions )  
and Related Arrangements with Southwestern )  
Bell Telephone Company. )

Missouri Public  
Service Commission

Case No. TO-2000-322

**SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO DIECA  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC., D/B/A COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY'S  
SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR ORDER COMPELLING COMPLIANCE  
WITH COMMISSION'S ORDER AND FOR SANCTIONS AND REPLY TO  
SWBT'S RESPONSE TO COVAD'S ORIGINAL MOTION**

COMES NOW Southwestern Bell Telephone Company ("SWBT") and, for its Response to DIECA Communications, Inc., d/b/a Covad Communications Company's ("Covad's") Supplemental Motion for Order Compelling Compliance with Commission's Order and for Sanctions and Reply to SWBT's Response to Covad's Original Motion ("Covad's Supplemental Motion"), states as follows:

1. In Covad's Supplemental Motion, Covad as much as admits that its Original Motion was neither clear nor specific. This highlights the frivolous nature of that Motion.

2. Realizing that SWBT conclusively demonstrated that there was no basis in law or in fact for Covad's Original Motion, Covad filed its Supplemental Motion. This Supplemental Motion similarly seeks to portray SWBT as not in compliance with this Commission's Order. However, as with Covad's Original Motion, there is no basis in law or in fact for its Supplemental Motion. As will be demonstrated below, SWBT not only fully responded, but provided more information than was required. Specifically,

66

Covad alleges that SWBT did not produce documents responsive to Data Requests 1, 2, 31, 32, 54, 55, 58, and 59. SWBT will address Covad's erroneous allegations with regard to each Data Request.

**Data Request No. 1**

3. Covad alleges that SWBT did not produce documents responsive to Data Request No. 1. Covad fails to set out SWBT's response to this Data Request. Covad did not do so because it is clear that SWBT thoroughly responded to this Data Request.

4. Data Request No. 1 and SWBT's response (omitting the documents that SWBT attached thereto) are attached as Attachment A.

5. A. Subsection (a) asks for specific changes planned relative to SWBT's current engineering methods and procedures. SWBT's answer provides that specific changes have not been determined because Project Pronto is new and many issues must be analyzed before SWBT changes its current engineering methods and practices.

B. SWBT could have stopped its response with the statement that specific changes had not been planned, but in an effort to be more responsive, and, pursuant to the terms of the Protective Order, SWBT not only provided Covad with its current Engineering Guidelines from December 1989, but additionally provided Covad with drafts of potential changes, including Loop Infrastructure Deployment – Revision DRAFT, Planning Guidelines & Methods and Procedures Revised 9/24/99 DRAFT, and TCEP Binder DRAFT. SWBT fully responded by providing more information than was necessary.

6. Subsection (b) asks SWBT for a copy of any existing analysis concerning the affect of its design changes on the cost analysis it previously performed for unbundled loops. SWBT answered that since the announcement concerning "Project Pronto", SWBT is not aware of any cost analysis for unbundled loops that has been prepared concerning the affect of its design changes on the cost analysis previously performed for unbundled loops. SWBT additionally advised that SWBT plans to make subloop elements available using the new architecture and will develop costs for those subloops. The new architecture does not, however, change the cost analysis associated with unbundled loops over the existing infrastructure. Thus, with regard to subsection (b), SWBT produced no documents because there are none to produce.

7. A. Subsection (c) asks SWBT to produce whatever documentation is available within SBC Communications Inc. identifying how SWBT plans to provide access to unbundled DSL-Capable Loops in the "neighborhood broadband gateways." SWBT answered that it has not finalized plans concerning the provision of access to unbundled DSL-capable loops in the Neighborhood Broadband Gateways.

B. Again, SWBT could have stopped its response with the statement that specific plans had not been determined. However, in an effort to be more responsive, and, pursuant to the terms of the Protective Order, SWBT provided Covad with the following drafts: (a) drawing "CLEC Access to Line Shared Data Subloop or Copper Subloop" dated 1/28/2000; (b) Marketing Service Description dated January 24, 2000; (c) Technical Service Description dated January 17, 2000; (d) minutes from COVAD/SBC Executive Meeting dated Tuesday, December 21, 1999; and (e) ADLU Plan Ownership

Options dated January 4, 2000. SWBT fully responded to the request by providing more information than was required.

8. Finally, subsection (d) asks for a description of what forms of conditioning SWBT believes may be required to provide DSL-based services to customers served by its target network architecture. SWBT provided a complete answer to this question.

9. Thus, as indicated by the recent nature of the documents (the most recent of which is dated January 24, 2000—just over two weeks ago), as well as the volume of pages produced (well over 100 pages), SWBT thoroughly responded to this Data Request. Covad's allegation that SWBT failed to produce documents responsive to Data Request No. 1 is simply without merit.

#### **Data Request No. 2**

10. Data Request No. 2 and SWBT's response (omitting the documents that SWBT attached thereto) are attached as Attachment B.

11. As the Commission will note, Data Request No. 2 is specifically limited to SWBT (not Pacific Bell and/or any of SWBT's other affiliates).

12. Data Request No. 2 asks SWBT to confirm or deny that it has claimed that the network plans associated with "Project Pronto" will reduce its network cost structure. If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, it requests SWBT to produce: (a) a copy of all analyses to support this assertion; (b) a copy of any analysis or statements that identify the specific source of the related savings; and (c) a copy of any analysis or statements that estimate the specific magnitude of the related short or long term savings.

13. In response to this document request, SWBT attached 220 pages of documents, which were made available to Covad pursuant to the terms of the Protective

Order that the Commission entered in this case. These documents include: (a) Investor Briefing; (b) Investing in the Future Broadband Initiative Business Case: Pronto dated October 8, 1999, pages 2, 3, 5-8, and 11-14; (c) Investing in the Future Business Case Pages 3, 17-21, 28, 29, 37, and supporting documentation; and (d) VTOA Business Case dated June 16, 1999 DRAFT.

14. Covad's attempt to portray SWBT as improperly redacting information from these documents and/or producing incomplete copies is unfounded.

15. With regard to the Investor Briefing, this document was produced in its entirety and no material was redacted.

16. With regard to Investing in the Future Broadband Initiative Business Case: Pronto dated October 8, 1999, the material that SWBT did not produce pertains to matters other than the reduction of SWBT's network cost structure and involves highly confidential information such as SWBT's revenue forecasts.

17. With regard to Investing in the Future Business Case, the material that SWBT did not produce similarly pertains to matters other than the reduction of SWBT's network cost structure and involves highly confidential information such as demand forecasts and revenue forecasts which was not requested. The only other redacted information is related to Pacific Bell with whom Covad competes in California. As Covad is well aware, redacting information which is beyond the scope of the request is both proper and commonplace when highly confidential information relating to subjects or companies beyond the scope of the request is involved. As SWBT pointed out previously, the only document Covad provided to SWBT was a redacted document, even though it did not involve highly confidential information.

18. Finally, with regard to VTOA Business Case dated June 16, 1999 DRAFT, the only material that SWBT did not produce and/or did redact is related to Pacific Bell, which again is beyond the scope of the question asked. Covad did not request, and is in any case not entitled to, confidential information about its competitor Pacific Bell.

19. In summary, SWBT properly produced only pages that relate to whether Project Pronto would reduce its network cost structure. Pages unrelated to SWBT and/or SWBT's cost savings are beyond the scope of the question asked and this Commission's order. Furthermore, Covad's allegation that SWBT failed to produce documents responsive to Data Request No. 2 is without merit.

**Data Request No. 31**

20. Data Request No. 31 and SWBT's First and Second Supplements are attached hereto as Attachments C and D.

21. As the Commission will note, this question asks whether SWBT is currently analyzing the possibility of expanding the variety of xDSL service types it will make available on a retail basis. If the answer to the question is in the affirmative, it requests SWBT to provide a copy of all documentation related to SWBT's planning effort.

22. SWBT's answer to Data Request Number 31 is, quite simply, "No." SWBT could have ended its answer there; however, SWBT nevertheless expounded on its answer by explaining that pursuant to the FCC's Merger Conditions, SWBT is no longer a provider of retail xDSL services and that as of January 12, 2000, retail DSL services in Missouri are being provided by the structurally separate advanced services affiliate, Advanced Solutions, Inc. ("ASI"). SWBT additionally advised that its parent

company ("SBC Communications Inc.") has publicly announced a major initiative to expand SBC capabilities with broadband services, including the announcement that it intends to offer HDSL services which feature a minimum 1.5 mbps upstream and downstream connections, but that such services will not be provided by SWBT. Because SWBT is not currently analyzing the possibility of expanding the variety of xDSL service types it will make available on a retail basis, it could not provide a copy of documentation relating to that effort. There are no documents to produce. It is that simple.

23. Further, although not included within Data Request No. 31, on February 7, 2000, Covad's counsel asserted that SWBT must provide additional information on whether ASI planned any additional varieties of xDSL services.

24. Although Covad's request is clearly beyond the scope of Data Request No. 31, SWBT's Response to Covad's Original Motion for Sanctions established that ASI is not currently planning to offer any xDSL service types other than those identified in SWBT's response to Data Request No. 31 (HDSL services). As ASI is not currently analyzing the provision of other varieties of xDSL service, there are no documents to provide.

25. SWBT provided far more information than was requested by Data Request No. 31. Thus, Covad's allegation that SWBT failed to produce documents that are responsive to Data Request No. 31 is without merit.



**Data Request No. 32**

26. Data Request No. 32 and SWBT's First Supplement is attached hereto as Attachment E.

27. As the Commission will note, this question asks whether SWBT is currently analyzing the range of customers it can reach with its retail DSL service offerings. If the answer to the question is in the affirmative, it requests SWBT to provide a copy of all documentation related to SWBT's planning effort.

28. SWBT's answer to Data Request Number 32 is, quite simply, "No." SWBT could have ended its answer there; however, SWBT nevertheless expounded on its answer by explaining that pursuant to the FCC's Merger Conditions, SWBT is no longer a provider of retail xDSL services and that as of January 12, 2000, retail DSL services in Missouri are being provided by the structurally separate advanced services affiliate ASI. SWBT additionally advised that SBC announced a major initiative to expand the availability of broadband services, stating that it plans to make DSL services available to approximately 80% of SBC's customers throughout the entire SBC territory. Moreover, SWBT referred to the documents provided in Data Request No. 1 which provides the most current information concerning possible changes to SWBT's network. SWBT has fully answered this request.

29. SWBT provided far more information than was requested by Data Request No. 32. Thus, Covad's allegation that SWBT failed to produce documents that are responsive to Data Request No. 32 is without merit.

**Data Request No. 54**

30. Data Request No. 54 and SWBT's First Supplement are attached hereto as Attachment F (omitting the attached documents). This question seeks supporting detail for the electronics used in SWBT's 1997 loop study.

31. Attached to Data Request No. 54, SWBT produced 9 pages of documentation which provide supporting detail for the specific input cost(s) used in SWBT's unbundled loop study regarding electronics. SWBT explained that the whereabouts of any original source contract or similar supporting documentation is unknown and that the prices that were used in the cost study were obtained directly from Reltec Corporation and Fujitsu in 1996. SWBT has provided all the available information and has fully responded to this Data Request.

32. Covad's allegation that SWBT failed to produce documents that are responsive to Data Request No. 54 is without merit.

**Data Request No. 55**

33. Data Request No. 55 and SWBT's First Supplement are attached hereto as Attachment G (omitting the attached documents).

34. As the Commission will note, this Data Request asks SWBT to provide the most recent price that SWBT actually paid for the specific electronics described in the previous response (i.e. the loop electronics underlying SWBT's 1997 loop study).

35. SWBT provided 65 pages of documents in response to this Data Request. In response, SWBT provided price lists which contain the specific electronics described in Data Request No. 54 and, when available, placed purchase orders directly behind each price list. All of the available information was provided.

36. SWBT did redact from the purchase orders pricing data on equipment that is not the subject of the data request. This information was redacted because it is both irrelevant and highly proprietary. As explained previously: (a) redacting information of this type is appropriate; and (b) Covad itself provided redacted information to SWBT.

37. SWBT devoted substantial resources to organize its answer to this question and to present the documentation (pricing lists and purchase orders) in an organized fashion. Thus, Covad's allegation that SWBT did not produce documents that are responsive to this Data Request is without merit.

#### **Data Request Number 58**

38. Data Request No. 58 and SWBT's First Supplement are attached hereto as Attachment H (omitting the attached documents).

39. As the Commission will note, this Data Request asks SWBT to provide complete supporting detail for the specific input cost(s) used in SWBT's unbundled loop study for the electronics described in Data Request No. 57. The input cost(s) that SWBT used in its unbundled loop study for the electronics described in Data Request No. 57 (a Midspan repeater) were orally obtained from the manufacturer when the cost study was performed. Therefore, SWBT has no documents that are responsive to this Data Request.

40. Rather than ending its answer there, SWBT contacted Adtran, the company from whom SWBT buys its Midspan Repeaters to attempt to gather the information. SWBT indicated to Adtran that SWBT's records reflect that a Midspan Repeater consists of three component parts. By providing the product numbers, Adtran was able to provide SWBT with pricing information for two out of three of the component parts for both 1997 and 1999. SWBT was unable to obtain information

related to the price of the third component part because Adtran did not recognize the third part number. SWBT memorialized the information that it obtained in a document entitled: "Adtran Price List", which was produced to Covad pursuant to the terms of the Commission's Protective Order.

41. In summary, SWBT has no source contract or catalog that was responsive to this Data Request. SWBT, nevertheless went beyond what was required and contacted the manufacturer to obtain information that would be responsive to the Data Request. Thus, Covad's allegation that SWBT did not produce documents that are responsive to Data Request No. 58 is without merit.

**Data Request No. 59**

42. Data Request No. 59 and SWBT's First Supplement are attached hereto as Attachment I (omitting the attached documents).

43. As the Commission will note, this Data Request asks SWBT to provide the most recent price that SWBT actually paid for the specific electronics described in its answer to Data Request No. 58. SWBT attached a current purchase order for one of the three component parts of a Midspan repeater. SWBT does not have current purchase orders for the other two component parts because: (a) as explained above, with regard to one of the three component parts, the manufacturer (Adtran) was unable to identify the part number and, therefore, SWBT could not locate a corresponding purchase order; and (b) with regard to the final component part, SWBT has not ordered that part since approximately January, 1998, and no purchase order that old could be located.

44. Again, SWBT fully responded to the request and Covad's allegation that SWBT did not produce documents that are responsive to Data Request No. 59 is without merit.

### Summary

45. Other than Data Requests Nos. 13 and 14 (which Covad apparently now concedes were properly answered) and Data Requests Nos. 31 and 32, Covad never claimed that the information produced was insufficient prior to filing its Supplemental Motion for Sanctions. Rather, Covad filed not only an unfounded Motion for Sanctions but followed it up with an equally unfounded Supplemental Motion for Sanctions.

46. In both Motions, Covad seeks to portray SWBT as not in compliance with the Commission's Order because SWBT either did not produce documents which SWBT does not have in its possession or redacted certain information in the documents that it produced. As Covad well knows, but chose not to discuss, the redacted material involves financial analysis and discussion of Pacific Bell that is both irrelevant to the request and is extremely sensitive marketing information. Other redacted information concerns highly confidential purchase orders and pricing data on equipment that is not the subject of the Data Requests. Covad's allegations are galling when Covad admits that it redacted information from the documents that it produced on the same grounds as SWBT has i.e. that the redacted information is not relevant to this arbitration (based on geographical scope) and is not requested in SWBT's data request.

47. SWBT has thoroughly responded to each Data Request propounded by Covad that the Commission ordered SWBT to answer. Covad's attempt to paint SWBT

as non-compliant has no basis in law or in fact. To the contrary, the facts demonstrate that SWBT went beyond the request and provided more information than required.

WHEREFORE, for all of the foregoing reasons, SWBT respectfully requests the Commission to deny Covad's Original Motion and Covad's Supplemental Motion, to admonish Covad for filing two frivolous discovery motions, and to grant such further and additional relief as the Commission deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

By Paul G. Lane / TM

PAUL G. LANE	#27011
LEO J. BUB	#34326
ANTHONY K. CONROY	#35199
MIMI B. MACDONALD	#37606

Attorneys for Southwestern Bell Telephone Company  
One Bell Center, Room 3520  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101  
(314) 235-4300 (Telephone)  
(314) 247-0014 (Facsimile)

Q: RELATIVE TO SWBT'S RECENT ANNOUNCEMENTS CONCERNING "PROJECT PRONTO" THAT IT PLANS TO "REARCHITECT ITS NETWORK," PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTATION:

(A) A SUMMARY OF THE SPECIFIC CHANGES PLANNED RELATIVE TO SWBT'S CURRENT ENGINEERING METHODS AND PROCEDURES.

(B) A COPY OF ANY EXISTING ANALYSIS CONCERNING THE AFFECT OF ITS DESIGN CHANGES ON THE COST ANALYSIS IT HAS PREVIOUSLY PERFORMED FOR UNBUNDLED LOOPS.

(C) WHATEVER DOCUMENTATION IS AVAILABLE WITHIN SBC COMMUNICATIONS, INC. IDENTIFYING HOW SWBT PLANS TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO UNBUNDLED DSL-CAPABLE LOOPS IN THE "NEIGHBORHOOD BROADBAND GATEWAYS."

(D) A DESCRIPTION OF WHAT FORMS OF "CONDITIONING" (E.G., REMOVAL OF LOAD COILS AND BRIDGE TAP) SWBT BELIEVES MAY BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE DSL-BASED SERVICES TO CUSTOMERS SERVED BY ITS TARGET NETWORK ARCHITECTURE.

A: Southwestern Bell Telephone considers some of the requested information to be Highly Confidential. Arrangements can be

made to view this information by contacting David Osborn on  
314-331-9600.

- a. Project Pronto is designed to push fiber closer to customers. Thus, the changes relative to current engineering methods and procedures are negligible other than placing more fiber faster in the network. The engineering design intent is to limit the copper portion of loop plant to 12Kft. from the remote terminal (RT). Because SWBT is using Next Generation Digital Loop Carrier (NGDLC) technology, it has expanded its Carrier Service Area concept to a Digital Serving Area (DSA) due to the increased capacity of the newer DLCs. Specific changes planned to SWBT's current engineering methods and procedures have not been finalized. Nevertheless, in an effort to be responsive, SWBT attaches the following documents and current draft documents.

- Engineering Guidelines December 1989
- Loop Infrastructure Deployment-Revision DRAFT



Planning Guidelines & Methods and Procedures

Revised 9/24/1999 (DRAFT)

- TCEP Binder (see response to DR No. 9) (DRAFT)
  
- b. Since the announcement concerning "Project Pronto", SWBT is not aware of any cost analysis for unbundled loops that has been prepared concerning the affect of its design changes on the cost analysis previously performed for unbundled loops. SWBT plans to make subloop elements available using the new architecture and will develop costs for those subloops. The new architecture does not, however, change the cost analysis associated with unbundled loops over the existing infrastructure.
  
- c. SWBT has not finalized plans concerning the provision of access to unbundled DSL-capable loops in the Neighborhood Broadband Gateways. The following documents reflect the most current drafts of those plans.
  - Drawing "CLEC Access to Line Shared Data Subloop or

Copper Subloop" 1/28/2000

- Marketing Service Description January 24, 2000
- Technical Service Description January 17, 2000
- COVAD/SBC Executive Meeting Tuesday, December 21, 1999
- ADLU Plug Ownership Options January 4, 2000
- ADLU Plug Ownership Options January 4, 2000

- d. SWBT does not believe any new forms of conditioning (e.g., removal of load coils and bridge tap) will be required to provide DSL-based services to customers served by its target network architecture.

Responsible Person: Steve Teter  
1010 N. St. Mary's, Room 1409  
San Antonio, TX 78215

Q: PLEASE CONFIRM OR DENY THAT SWBT HAS CLAIMED THAT THE NETWORK PLANS ASSOCIATED WITH "PROJECT PRONTO" WILL REDUCE ITS NETWORK COST STRUCTURE. IF SWBT HAS CLAIMED THAT ITS NETWORK COST STRUCTURE WILL BE REDUCED, PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING:

(A) A COPY OF ALL ANALYSES SWBT HAS PERFORMED TO SUPPORT THAT ASSERTION.

(B) A COPY OF ANY ANALYSIS OR STATEMENTS THAT IDENTIFY THE SPECIFIC SOURCE OF THE RELATED SAVINGS.

(C) A COPY OF ANY ANALYSIS OR STATEMENTS THAT ESTIMATE THE SPECIFIC MAGNITUDE OF THE RELATED SHORT OR LONG TERM SAVINGS.

A: Southwestern Bell Telephone considers part of the requested information to be Highly Confidential. Arrangements can be made to view this information by contacting David Osborn on 314-331-9600.

SWBT has claimed that expense and capital savings will reduce its existing network cost structure. The following documents contain the claims, supporting analysis and magnitude of the savings.

MO PSC Case No. TO-2000-322  
Data Request No. 2  
First Set of Requests  
Covad  
Page 2 of 2  
First Supplement

Attachment B  
Page 2 of 2

- Investor Briefing (Public)
- Investing In the Future Broadband Initiative (HC)  
Business Case: Pronto October 8, 1999  
Pages 2, 3, 5-8, and 11-14
- Investing in the Future Business Case Sections (HC)  
Pages 3, 17-21, 28, 29, 37 and supporting  
documentation
- VTOA Business Case June 16, 1999 Draft (HC)

Responsible Person: Michelle Swanson  
1010 N. St. Mary's, Room 1407  
San Antonio, TX 78215

Q: IS SWBT CURRENTLY ANALYZING THE POSSIBILITY OR DOES IT HAVE ANY PLANS REGARDING EXPANDING THE VARIETY OF XDSL SERVICE TYPES IT WILL MAKE AVAILABLE ON A RETAIL BASIS? IF SO, PLEASE PROVIDE A COPY OF ALL DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO SWBT'S PLANNING EFFORT.

A: No. Pursuant to the FCC's Merger Conditions, SWBT is no longer the provider of retail xDSL services. As of January 12, 2000, retail DSL services in Missouri are being provided by the structurally separate advanced services affiliate, ASI. SWBT states that its parent, SBC Communications Inc., has publicly announced a major initiative to expand SBC capabilities with broadband services, including the announcement that it intends to offer HDSL services which will feature minimum 1.5 Mbps upstream and downstream connections. However, such retail services will not be provided by SWBT. (See Pronto Press Release dated October 18, 1999.)

MO PSC Case No. TO-2000-322

Data Request No. 31

First Set of Requests

Covad

Page 2 of 2

First Supplement

Attachment C

Page 2 of 2

Responsible Person: Lee Culver

530 McCullough, 6-Q-06

San Antonio, TX 78215

Q: IS SWET CURRENTLY ANALYZING THE POSSIBILITY OR DOES IT HAVE ANY PLANS REGARDING EXPANDING THE VARIETY OF XDSL SERVICE TYPES IT WILL MAKE AVAILABLE ON A RETAIL BASIS? IF SO, PLEASE PROVIDE A COPY OF ALL DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO SWET'S PLANNING EFFORT.

A: ASI is not currently planning to offer any xDSL service types other than those identified in SWET's response to Data Request No. 31.

Responsible Person: Lee Culver  
530 McCullough, 6-Q-06  
San Antonio, TX

MO PSC Case No. TO-2000-322  
Data Request No. 32  
First Set of Requests  
Covad  
Page 1 of 2  
First Supplement

Attachment E  
Page 1 of 2

Q: IS SWBT CURRENTLY ANALYZING THE POSSIBILITY OF DOES IT HAVE ANY PLANS TO EXPAND THE RANGE OF CUSTOMERS IT CAN REACH WITH ITS RETAIL DSL SERVICE TYPES OFFERINGS? IF SO, PLEASE PROVIDE A COPY OF ALL DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO SWBT'S PLANNING EFFORT.

A: No. Pursuant to the FCC's Merger Conditions, SWBT is no longer the provider of retail DSL services. As of January 12, 2000, retail DSL services in Missouri are being provided by the structurally separate advanced services affiliate, ASI. SWBT submits that its parent, SBC Communications Inc., announced a major initiative to expand the availability of broadband services, stating that it plans to make DSL services available to approximately 80% of SBC's customers throughout the entire SBC territory. However, SWBT will not be the provider of such retail DSL services. (See Pronto Press Release dated October 18, 1999.) See also information provided in response to DR No. 1.



MO PSC Case No. TO-2000-322  
Data Request No. 32  
First Set of Requests  
Covad  
Page 2 of 2  
First Supplement

Attachment E  
Page 2 of 2

Responsible Person: Lee Culver  
530 McCullough, 6-Q-06  
San Antonio, TX 78215

MO PSC Case No. TO-2000-322  
Data Request No. 54  
First Set of Requests  
Covad  
Page 1 of 1  
First Supplement

Attachment F

Q: PLEASE PROVIDE COMPLETE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SPECIFIC INPUT COST(S) USED IN SWBT'S UNBUNDLED LOOP STUDY FOR THE ELECTRONICS DESCRIBED IN THE PREVIOUS RESPONSE. PLEASE INCLUDE A COPY OF SWBT'S SOURCE CONTRACT, CATALOG OR OTHER SIMILAR DOCUMENT.

A: Southwestern Bell Telephone considers the requested information to be highly confidential. Arrangements can be made to view this information by contacting David Osborn on 314-331-9600.

See the attached list dated 10/28/96. The original source contract or similar supporting documentation is unknown. Prices were obtained direct from Reltec Corporation and Fujitsu in 1996.

Responsible Person: Donald Palmer  
2600 Camino Ramon, 2e300x  
San Ramon, CA 94583

MO PSC Case No. TO-2000-322  
Data Request No. 55  
First Set of Requests  
Covad  
Page 1 of 1  
First Supplement

Attachment G

Q: PLEASE PROVIDE THE MOST RECENT PRICE THAT SWBT ACTUALLY PAID  
FOR THE SPECIFIC ELECTRONICS DESCRIBED IN THE PREVIOUS  
RESPONSE. PLEASE INCLUDE A COPY OF SWBT'S SOURCE PURCHASE  
ORDER OR OTHER SIMILAR DOCUMENT.

A: Southwestern Bell Telephone considers the requested  
information to be Highly Confidential. Arrangements can be  
made by contacting David Osborn on 314-331-9600.

Responsible Person: Donald Palmer  
2600 Camino Ramon, 2e300x  
San Ramon, CA 94583

MO PSC Case No. TO-2000-322  
Data Request No. 58  
First Set of Requests  
Covad  
Page 1 of 1  
First Supplement

Q: PLEASE PROVIDE COMPLETE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SPECIFIC  
INPUT COST(S) USED IN SWBT'S UNEBUNDLED LOOP STUDY FOR THE  
ELECTRONICS DESCRIBED IN THE PREVIOUS RESPONSE. PLEASE  
INCLUDE A COPY OF SWBT'S SOURCE CONTRACT, CATALOG OR OTHER  
SIMILAR DOCUMENT.

A: Southwestern Bell Telephone considers the requested  
information to be highly confidential. Arrangements can be  
made to view this information by contacting David Osborn on  
314-331-9600.

Responsible Person: Donald Palmer  
2600 Camino Ramon, Room 2e300x  
San Ramon, CA 94583

MO PSC Case No. TO-2000-322  
Data Request No. 59  
First Set of Requests  
Covad  
Page 1 of 1  
First Supplement

Q: PLEASE PROVIDE THE MOST RECENT PRICE THAT SWBT ACTUALLY PAID  
FOR THE SPECIFIC ELECTRONICS DESCRIBED IN THE PREVIOUS  
RESPONSE. PLEASE INCLUDE A COPY OF SWBT'S SOURCE PURCHASE  
ORDER OR OTHER SIMILAR DOCUMENT.

A: Southwestern Bell Telephone considers the requested  
information to be Highly Confidential. Arrangements can be  
made to view this information by contacting David Osborn on  
314-331-9600.

A purchase order regarding mid span repeater part DDRPE94 is  
attached. Current purchase orders for DDRPG76 and DDMY8ADA  
could not be obtained.

Responsible Person: Donald Palmer  
2600 Camino Ramon, Room 2e300x  
San Ramon, CA 94583

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing document were served to all parties on the Service List by Facsimile and by Airborne Express on February 14, 2000.

Paul G. Lane /Tm  
Paul G. Lane

WILLIAM HAAS  
MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSISON  
301 WEST HIGH STREET, SUITE 530  
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102

LISA C. CREIGHTON  
MARK P. JOHNSON  
SONNENSCHN, NATH & ROSENTHAL  
4520 MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64111