BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 1 2 STATE OF MISSOURI 3 4 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 5 HEARING 6 January 25, 2007 7 Jefferson City, Missouri Volume 3 8 9 In-Camera 10 _____ 11 12 Inc., of Compliance with the Requirement of 4 CSR 240-32 13) 14 15 16 CHERLYN D. VOSS, REGULATORY LAW JUDGE. 17 CONNIE MURRAY, 18 STEVE GAW LINWARD "LIN" APPLING, 19 COMMISSIONERS. 20 REPORTED BY: TRACY L. THORPE TAYLOR, CCR 21 MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES 22 23 24 25

IN-CAMERA PROCEEDINGS 1 2 JUDGE VOSS: Mr. Haas, you may proceed. 3 CALVIN CRAIB testified as follows: 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HAAS: 5 Ο. Mr. Craib, please turn your attention to the 6 MC and Sprint agreement that's been labeled as CC Schedule 1. 7 JUDGE VOSS: Actually, could you wait one second? Do I need to mute the microphone to go in-camera? I 8 9 think so. So just a second. Okay. Please proceed. BY MR. HAAS: 10 Mr. Craib, you signed that agreement on behalf 11 Q. 12 of MCC Telephony. Correct? 13 I believe that's correct, yes. Α. 14 At CC Schedule 1, page 9 under the heading, Q. Federal and State Regulatory Compliance and Support, the 15 16 agreement states, Provider will be responsible for compliance 17 with all federal, state and local regulatory requirements and service quality standards applicable to providers provision of 18 the services. 19 20 First, the word "provider" there is referring 21 to Sprint. Correct? 22 Α. That's correct. 23 Q. What state regulatory requirements and service quality standards is Sprint responsible for under this 24 25 sentence?

A. Seems pretty clear. All federal, state and local regulatory requirements of service quality standards, qualified by applicable to provide as provision of the services.

5 Ο. Can you give me any examples? 6 Α. An example would be if we are -- I guess any 7 of these laws require certain things to happen that have to do 8 with the services they provide to us related to the 9 provisioning of the customer, related to E-911 compliance, directory services listings, any of those things, the services 10 they provide, this -- that would be their responsibility. 11 12 The paragraph then continues, As the retail Q. 13 service provider, Mediacom is responsible for complying with 14 all federal, state and local regulatory requirements applicable to it. 15 16 For what state regulatory requirements is 17 Mediacom responsible for pursuant to this sentence? Well, depending -- you know, I think the 18 Α. sentence makes it clear that whatever is determined are the 19 20 state requirements for Mediacom were -- they're our 21 responsibility. Sprint is not responsible for our compliance 22 with rules that apply to us. 23 Q. This paragraph then continues, Provider will 24 use its commercially reasonable efforts to provide information

requested by Mediacom, which provider is in a better position

25

1 than Mediacom to obtain, to support Mediacom's compliance with federal, state and local regulatory requirements and service 2 3 quality standards applicable to the VoIP offering. 4 Has Mediacom or MCC requested any such 5 information from Sprint? 6 Α. We have had numerous conversations with 7 various people within Sprint to help with an understanding of these kinds of requirements. I don't know if that answers 8 9 your exact question or not. At CC Schedule 1, page 17, under the heading, 10 Ο. Installation Services, the agreement states, The parties will 11 develop a comprehensive implementation plan. The 12 13 implementation plan, which will include installation services, 14 a certification process, commissioning and other services. Have the parties developed the implementation 15 16 plan? 17 Actually not in -- not in that format. Α. We 18 have developed a series of what we call M and Ps, methods and processes, for each company to follow that govern the 19 relationship between our companies. And they cover all of 20 21 these areas. 22 When we wrote this document, it was before we 23 had worked out the details of how exactly we were going to be in this business together. This is suggesting that there will 24

be more detailed plans as we do that and there were.

25

At Schedule 1, page 35, under the heading, 1 Ο. Quality Assurance, the agreement states, Mediacom and provider 2 3 will jointly develop and provider will implement quality 4 assurance and internal control procedures to ensure that the 5 services are performed in accordance with, one, the agreement 6 including the service levels; and two, applicable and legal --7 applicable legal and regulatory requirements. 8 Have the companies developed those control 9 procedures? We have developed control procedures. 10 Α. And do those control procedures ensure that 11 Q. the services are performed in accordance with applicable legal 12 13 and regulatory requirements? 14 They are designed to. Α. Please now turn to CC Schedule 1, page 57. 15 Ο. 16 That page references an activation fee. What is the purpose 17 of the activation fee? The purpose is to document or set up the 18 Α. process by which Sprint gets paid for the services they 19 20 provide. And the reason an activation fee was part of that 21 compensation was in recognition of their out-of-pocket 22 expenses related to individual installations as opposed to the 23 ongoing provision of service. 24 And the amount of the activation fee has been Ο. 25 redacted in this agreement?

1 Α. It appears to be blank. Do you know what that amount is? 2 Q. 3 Α. I do. How much is it? 4 Q. 5 JUDGE VOSS: We're in-camera. 6 THE WITNESS: Can I consult with counsel? 7 MR. COMLEY: First of all, object on grounds of relevancy to the question and second, we have -- first, 8 9 I'll object on grounds of relevancy to the issue before the 10 Commission. 11 JUDGE VOSS: Mr. Haas, would you like to --12 MR. HAAS: I believe the witness said that 13 the -- this fee pays Sprint, at least in part, for its 14 installation in this process. And the testimony has been that perhaps they could meet the standards if they were at a higher 15 16 charge. And I would like to -- I think it's relevant to 17 whether they are able to meet the installation standards as to how they came to this amount and what the amount is. 18 19 MR. COMLEY: Same objection. 20 JUDGE VOSS: Do you think you could get your 21 answer without actually getting the specific dollar amount, 22 which I think is the component that's being objected to? 23 MR. HAAS: I may come back to it, but let me 24 try a different approach. BY MR. HAAS: 25

1 Q. Was the activation fee a negotiated amount? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Ο. And what factors went into negotiating the 4 amount of the activation fee? 5 Α. It was a tradeoff of the total value of what 6 MCC would pay Sprint and the various ways that will be paid to 7 them. And throughout this agreement, there are various 8 economic transactions between the parties, all of which 9 constitute the entire amount of compensation. 10 You may note there are things that go the other way. Sprint contributes to Mediacom some things. That 11 12 whole package is the compensation that we agreed to. And the 13 negotiation was about where the various components would be 14 and did the total package make sense to both of us. 15 And were the time intervals that Sprint would Q. 16 be allowed in installing service to MCC's customers part of 17 that negotiation? Well, to the extent they're part of a fairly 18 Α. extensive document that took literally months to negotiate, 19 20 everything was a part of it. 21 MR. HAAS: I will withdraw my earlier 22 question. 23 BY MR. HAAS: 24 Please turn to CC Schedule, page 72. Under 0. 25 the heading, Service Level Principles, in the middle of the

first paragraph, there's a sentence that reads, In states
where a PUC mandate exists, provider's level of performance
shall comply with the PUC regulations. Without limiting the
generality of the foregoing, provider will comply with the
specific service levels set forth in the agreement. And then
under the items that are covered, one -- the first bullet is
Service Order Processing.

8 What actions, if any, has MCC taken to enforce 9 the sentence that, Provider's level of performance shall 10 comply with the PUC regulations?

Well, I think the intent of this portion of 11 Α. the contract was to state that our preference was to be --12 what's the word here -- you know, in compliance with PUC 13 14 mandates. I mean, there's no question we would like to do that. The question is, what happens when we can't be? 15 16 And we and Sprint have recognized that we have 17 this issue and that's why we applied for a waiver and provided 18 all the documentation we've provided that says why we think that's reasonable. 19

20 Q. Please turn to Schedule page 73. Under the 21 third bullet point, the second sentence reads, Mediacom may 22 audit the service level measurement, monitoring and reporting 23 process up to twice per 12-month period unless otherwise 24 agreed upon by the parties.

25 Has Mediacom audited these processes?

1 Α. Well, the processes are extensive and audit is kind of a technical term. We are in ongoing conversations, 2 3 both we and Sprint, about how to improve all these processes. 4 Q. The agreement then continues in the next 5 paragraph, Periodically, the service levels will be enhanced 6 and improved if requested by Mediacom and/or provider. Semiannually the parties will review the service levels and 7 8 the performance data collected and reported by provider to 9 determine whether the service levels continue to reflect 10 accepted industry norms applicable to the performance of similar services by top-tier telephony service providers. 11 12 Have Mediacom and Sprint conducted this 13 semiannual review? 14 Α. Not specifically. MR. HAAS: Your Honor, those were all of my 15 16 questions for the in-camera portion for the cross-examination 17 of this question. I would now request to go back to the 18 public portion. JUDGE VOSS: Just one second. Are there any 19 20 other questions that should be taken up in-camera? 21 MR. DANDINO: Yes, your Honor. 22 JUDGE VOSS: I'm going to go ahead and do just 23 in-camera questions pertaining to this before we go out of 24 camera. 25 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DANDINO:

I have just a few, Mr. Craib. Counsel was 1 Q. asking you about the activation fee. When that activation fee 2 3 was determined, was it based upon compliance with Missouri's 4 five-day installation rule? 5 Α. No. 6 Q. Was the fee -- was the fee based on 7 installation of more than five days? 8 It was not -- it was based on the -- being a Α. 9 single component of a large agreement. And the service levels 10 that were in the agreement were the service levels that were agreed to as well as that fee being agreed to. 11 12 Ω. Okay. But no one had decided that, well, 13 Missouri has five, we better make this adjustment in this activation fee in order to cover that cost? 14 No. No one made that determination. 15 Α. 16 Q. Okay. And so that wasn't a consideration at all. Is that what you're telling me and this Commission? 17 Yes. There was no specific consideration of 18 Α. the Missouri rule. 19 20 Could you comply with the Missouri rule by Q. increasing that fee? 21 22 Α. I don't know. 23 Q. Never did a study of this? 24 Well, as I stated before, my understanding is Α. 25 that at least as it relates to ported numbers, we cannot

comply with that unless a number of things, including 1 2 performance by LECs, which we have no control over --3 Ο. But you didn't do a study of that? 4 Α. I --5 Ο. That's your general impression? 6 Α. I don't know how to do a study to find out 7 whether AT&T will or will not release their numbers faster. 8 So there was no study done? Q. 9 No. There was no study done. Α. Okay. So you don't know if you speed up the 10 Ο. process, it would just take a little more money of increasing 11 that activation fee? 12 13 I don't know whether it would take a little Α. more money, a lot more money or whether all the money in the 14 world wouldn't do it. 15 16 Okay. So you just don't know? Q. I just don't know. 17 Α. MR. DANDINO: That's all I have, your Honor. 18 Thank you. 19 JUDGE VOSS: Yes. Proceed. 20 MR. JOHNSON: May I ask a question about this 21 22 exhibit while we're in-camera? 23 JUDGE VOSS: Yes, please. 24 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JOHNSON: 25 Q. Mr. Craib, Craig Johnson. Would you turn to

1 the next page, please, page 74 of CC Schedule 1?

2 A. Okay.

Q. And there's a section there that's Service Order Processing Service Levels. And there's a box that has different intervals for new installs whether they're ported or non-ported. Do you see that box?

7 A. I do.

Q. What I can't read is at the top of each one of those boxes there's a -- something that apparently was colored and I can't read the words in there. It looks like the first one is activity something. Can you tell me what those are? A. Quite honestly, I -- my copy's --

13 Q. Just as bad as mine?

14 A. -- probably the same as yours.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. That's all I have.

16 MR. COMLEY: Well, for clarification, the 17 topics are, the top, Activity Feature; the second column is 18 FOC Guidelines; the third column is Total Installation

19 Guideline, Order Target; the next column is One-year

20 Installation Goals.

25

21 JUDGE VOSS: Could you repeat the third 22 column? 23 MR. COMLEY: Installation Guidelines, Order 24 Target.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Comley.

1 BY MR. JOHNSON:

2 Mr. Craib, with that, the only remaining Q. question I have is whether you can tell me what FOC stands 3 4 for? 5 Α. I believe it's firm order commitment. 6 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. That's all I have, 7 Judge. 8 JUDGE VOSS: Thank you. Commissioner Murray, 9 do you have any questions based on this document? Commissioner Gaw? 10 11 COMMISSIONER GAW: Not at the moment. 12 JUDGE VOSS: Then we will -- Mr. Comley, do you have any redirect based on the highly confidential exhibit 13 14 only? 15 MR. COMLEY: Yes, I do. Shall we go ahead and do that right now? 16 JUDGE VOSS: Does it need to be in-camera? 17 18 MR. COMLEY: Yes, it would. JUDGE VOSS: Is it a significant amount or 19 20 just a little? MR. COMLEY: Well, it may be a little, it may 21 22 be a little more than just a little bit. 23 JUDGE VOSS: All right. Then we will go out 24 of camera now and let you address all of your redirect at the 25 same time.

IN-CAMERA PROCEEDINGS 1 2 JUDGE VOSS: We're in-camera. 3 CALVIN CRAIB testified as follows: 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY: 5 Ο. I think there was a portion of your testimony, 6 and I'm not clear exactly what spot, it may be that you can 7 remember this. There was a portion of your testimony where you said that the issue about redaction of CC Schedule 1 had 8 9 been rectified. Do you recall those questions? 10 Α. I do. Let me try to refresh your recollection about 11 Q. a data request that was responded to for the Staff. Do you 12 13 recollect that a copy of this letter of intent was given to the Staff early on before its -- I think it was before its 14 recommendation was filed? 15 16 Α. Yes. What kind of redactions were part of that --17 Q. what kind of redactions were included in that data request 18 response? 19 20 I believe we redacted most things related to Α. 21 numbers, things we considered to be, you know, problematic if 22 they were released to competitors. 23 Were the service order of numbers -- the Q. 24 service order intervals also redacted on that copy? 25 A. I believe they were.

Do you know whether or not the pages of your 1 Q. agreement with Sprint -- I think specifically pages 74 and 2 3 following -- were resubmitted to the Staff? 4 Α. Yes. I believe that is the resolution that 5 was referred to, is we have now provided that data. 6 Q. Thank you. Do you still have a copy of Craib 7 Schedule 1 in front of you? 8 Α. I do. 9 Ο. Mr. Haas referred you to page 4 of the agreement and which is your schedule -- page 9 of the 10 11 Schedule 1, page 9. With respect to the paragraph on federal 12 and state regulatory compliance in support, Mr. Haas led you 13 through the requirements there for both the provider and Mediacom. 14 15 With respect to the application for waiver we 16 have in front of the Commission now, does MCC consider that consistent with the requirements of this paragraph? 17 18 Α. Absolutely. I think you may have answered this before in 19 Ο. 20 terms of quality assurance that's discussed under this 21 agreement. Do MCC and Sprint have regular meetings about the quality assurance under this agreement? 22 23 Α. We do. 24 You were asked questions about an activation Q. 25 fee that was redacted on I think it was page 77. Excuse

1 me --

2

A. It's on page 57.

3 Q. 57. Page 57. What is the purpose of that 4 fee?

A. Well, as I said -- and perhaps I did not answer completely or accurately earlier -- not accurately, but the purpose of that fee is part of a compensation we pay to Sprint. And the difference between this fee and the other fees we pay them is this is a one-time fee paid at the time of installation. And it is paid for each installation as opposed to each ongoing customer.

12 It's merely the part of the compensation. 13 And, you know, when we discussed with Sprint the need for this 14 fee, it wasn't for any specific set of circumstances, it was 15 to recognize that their costs occurred in a couple of 16 different ways. Some of them occurred up front and some of 17 them occurred over time. This was in recognition of some of 18 their costs being incurred at the time of installation.

19 Q. Turn with me to page 74 of your schedule. And 20 just to confirm, can you describe what the service order 21 processing service -- can you describe the graph or table 22 that's on that page, what that represents?

A. Well, it was an early-on effort to create a
process for us to monitor what we're talking about here today,
how long it takes to get installations done. And since this

was written before we started doing business in this or any other state, it was sort of a blueprint for us to follow. MR. COMLEY: I think that's all I have for --I've noticed I have a couple more questions I'd like to ask outside of the closed chamber here, but I wanted to check with counsel to make sure I've covered the questions about this agreement we need to have in-camera. May I do that just briefly? JUDGE VOSS: Yes. That's fine. MR. COMLEY: I'm finished with the questions about the agreement and we can return to open court. JUDGE VOSS: All right. WHEREUPON, the in-camera portion of Calvin Craib's testimony was concluded.

IN-CAMERA PROCEEDINGS 1 2 JUDGE VOSS: Please proceed, Mr. Haas. 3 DARIN LISTON testified as follows: 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HAAS: 5 Ο. I'll start with my earlier question. How many 6 days does the contract allow Sprint to send the LSR? 7 Α. I don't believe that is specifically spelled 8 out in the contract. 9 Ο. How many -- or over what time period does the 10 contract allow Sprint to check the MSAG? 11 Α. Don't believe that that's specifically spelled 12 out in the contract. 13 Would you please turn to the letter of intent Q. attached to Mr. Craib's Direct Testimony as CC Schedule 1? 14 15 Somebody's going to have to bring that to me. Α. 16 Okay. Again, where did you want me to look? Please turn to CC Schedule 1, page 9. The 17 Q. last bullet on that page states that, The provider, meaning 18 Sprint, will be responsible for compliance with all federal 19 20 and state and local regulatory requirements and service 21 quality standards applicable to provider's provision of the 22 services. 23 Can you list specific state regulatory 24 requirements and service quality standards applicable to

25 provider's provision of the service for which Sprint is

1 responsible under this paragraph?

2 I cannot. Unfortunately, I was not party to Α. 3 negotiations for this contract and I'm not familiar with 4 contractual interpretations of what's in this contract so I'm 5 not sure I can answer that question. 6 Q. All right. Let me ask a different question. 7 Α. Okay. Are there state regulatory requirements and 8 Q. 9 service quality standards that Sprint follows in the provisioning of its service to MCC or along with MCC? 10 11 Unfortunately, that's really not my area Α. 12 either as far as understanding and knowing what the Commission 13 or regulatory service levels are. And I -- that's not something that I can answer. 14 15 Please turn to CC Schedule 1, page 72. Under Q. 16 the bullet point Service Level Principles, in the first paragraph, in the second sentence, the agreement provides, In 17 states where a PUC mandate exists, provider's level of 18 performance shall comply with the PUC regulations. 19 20 What steps, if any, has Sprint taken to ensure 21 that its level of performance complies with the Missouri PSC 22 regulations? 23 Α. Not being familiar enough with the PUC 24 regulations, I don't know the answer to that question. 25 Q. Please turn to CC Schedule 1, page 73. Under

1 the bullet point Adjustments to Service Levels, the agreement reads, Periodically the service levels will be enhanced and 2 3 improved if requested by Mediacom and, slash, or provider. 4 Semiannually the parties will review the service levels and 5 the performance data collected and reported by provider to determine whether the service levels continue to reflect 6 7 accepted industry norms applicable to the performance of 8 similar services by top-tier telephony service providers. 9 Has that semiannual review occurred? That is not something I would participate in 10 Α. so I do not know. 11 12 Finally, would you expect that a top-tier Q. 13 telephony service provider would comply with the state commission's quality of service standards? 14 15 I would hope so, but that I'm not sure I'm Α. 16 qualified to answer. MR. HAAS: Your Honor, that concludes my 17 questions both in-camera and for this witness. 18 JUDGE VOSS: Before we go out, does anyone 19 20 else have any in-camera questions for this witness? 21 MR. DANDINO: No, your Honor. 22 JUDGE VOSS: Do you have any --23 MR. DANDINO: Your Honor, I do have a question. It seemed like the last few questions -- and I 24 25 really don't understand what -- the basis of it being

1 in-camera.

JUDGE VOSS: I think the question is simply that the whole schedule is stamped confidential and out of an abundance of caution, it's better to be in-camera than to accidentally let something out that shouldn't. MR. DANDINO: Okay. JUDGE VOSS: That was my take. Did you have any redirect based on in-camera? MR. COMLEY: No. No, I don't. JUDGE VOSS: We will go back live. WHEREUPON, the in-camera portion of Darin Liston's testimony was concluded.