

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF NEVADA

-oOo-

Schedule JEH-2

In re Petition of Level 3)
Communications, LLC for)
arbitration of an Interconnection)
Agreement with Nevada Bell) DOCKET No. 04-5032
Telephone Company, d/b/a SBC)
Nevada, pursuant to Section 252)
of the Telecommunications Act)
of 1996.)
_____)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

VOLUME 1
HEARING

10:02 a.m., Wednesday January 12, 2005

Offices of the Public Utilities Commission Hearing Room A
1150 East William Street
Carson City, Nevada

Reported by:

JERRY J. SILVEN, CCR #55

1 SBC will exchange that traffic, and about the
2 compensation for that traffic.

3 And it is our view that the rules are
4 already in place, we apply those rules and keep them in
5 place until the FCC puts in place another regime. And
6 there are other proceedings that are out there that we've
7 addressed in our testimony, I'm sure will come up today.

8 I'll save any other comments for the last
9 five minutes.

10 What we're going to do is have Mr. Ducloo
11 now speak for, I think about 20, 25 minutes; Mr. Gates I
12 think about 20 minutes, and I'll wrap up the last five
13 minutes.

14 COMMISSIONER LINVILL: Thank you.

15

16 LEVEL 3 PRESENTATION BY ROGIER DUCLOO

17

18 MR. DUCLOO: Thank you again for allowing
19 us to come up here and present our side of the case, and
20 our side of the disputes in this matter.

21 There's a -- I'll flip over to the next
22 slide.

23 What I thought I'd do is walk through some
24 of the very specific issues that apply to this case, and
25 the disputes that exist and hopefully provide some

1 Moving onto another issue, which is really
2 an issue very similar to what I just talked about and
3 spent an awful lot of time on, which is the issue of SS7
4 quad links and how we connect the networks for signaling
5 purposes.

6 Data voice traffic is exchanged over
7 interconnection trunks. The signaling is exchanged over
8 a separate network called an SS7 network.

9 And what Level 3 is proposing is that
10 similar to the trunk concept, when traffic is exchanged
11 between two switches, and in the case of signaling those
12 are called STPs or signal transfer points, that we do
13 that over the same set of linked sets, quad links as they
14 are referred to.

15 SBC's position, which is a repetition of
16 their position on the trunks, is that you can exchange
17 local and intraLATA toll over one set of quad links, but
18 if you want to exchange interLATA toll you got to do it
19 over a second set of quad links.

20 Skip onto the next slide, which is a
21 picture of what that looks like, I think there's some
22 animation in this and I'll just move on really quickly
23 what that is, what I described earlier, the voice and
24 data traffic is exchanged over the trunks. The signaling
25 is exchanged over a separate network. These are the quad

55

1 links, which are established between Level 3's STP pair
2 and SBC's STP pair.

3 And the difference really is that just like
4 the trunks where we would like to exchange all the trunks
5 over a single interconnection trunk, and it's more
6 efficient and it's doable, we would look to have the same
7 apply to the SS7 quad links. SBC disagrees with that.

8 The final issue - and I'm running out of
9 time - is transit traffic. The issue is that SBC refuses
10 to put transit traffic terms in the interconnection
11 agreements. They would like to move it out of the
12 interconnection agreement and move it into a commercial
13 agreement. And they're saying that that can be done
14 there really -- because it's not an obligation under YAK,
15 and I won't go into that because I'm not an attorney, but
16 what I can tell you is that what they may make you
17 believe is that there are practical alternatives to
18 transits. There are other transit providers in the State
19 of Nevada.

20 Now as a wholesale carrier, I work with a
21 lot of other carriers, and I know that there are
22 transport alternatives maybe in other states, but in
23 select areas of the states.

24 And in Nevada unfortunately at this time