Exhibit No: Issues: Residential Voice Witness: Elizabeth Stoia Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony Sponsoring Party: Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. d/b/a SBC Missouri Case No: TO-2005-0035 Date Prepared: January 21, 2005

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE, L.P. D/B/A SBC MISSOURI

CASE NO. TO-2005-0035

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

ELIZABETH STOIA

San Antonio, Texas January 21, 2005

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Second Investigation into the State of Competition in the Exchanges of Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P., d/b/a/ SBC Missouri.

) Case No. TO-2005-0035

AFFIDAVIT OF ELIZABETH STOIA

STATE OF TEXAS

SS

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO

I, Elizabeth Stoia, of lawful age, being duly sworn, depose and state:

My name is Elizabeth Stoia. I am presently Director - SBC Consumer Marketing for SBC Operations Inc.

- 2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my surrebuttal testimony.
- I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Elizabeth Stoia

)

Subscribed and sworn to before this

day of January, 2005 Notary Public

My Commission Expires



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTROD	OUCTIO	ON	
PURPOS	SE		
1.	. A	Access	To Wholesale Information2
2.	. F	Respon	se To OPC Economist Ms. Meisenheimer
SCHEDU	ULES		
S	chedul	e 1 –	Examples Of VoIP Service Advertising
S	chedule		November 8, 2004 AT&T Press Release On Premiere Partner Agreement With Buy.Com And Buy.Com Advertising Supplement With Ad For AT&T Callvantage Service
S	chedul	e 3 –	December 9, 2004 Forbes Article Re: Vonage VoIP Service
S	chedul		Slides From January 11, 2005 Time Warner Investor Briefing Re: Its Voip Service
S	chedul		November 15, 2004 St. Louis Business Journal On Charter VoIP Service
S	chedul		December 16, 2004 AT&T Press Release Re: Enhancements To Its Callvantage Voip Service

1 INTRODUCTION

2	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?
3	A.	My name is Elizabeth Stoia and my business address is 530 McCullough, San
4		Antonio, Texas 78215.
5		
6	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME ELIZABETH STOIA THAT PREVIOUSLY FILED
7		DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?
8	A.	Yes.
9		
10	<u>PUR</u>	POSE
11	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
12	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to:
13		1) Assure the parties that I have not seen any of the highly confidential or
14		proprietary wholesale information presented in this case, and that in my position
15		with SBC Missouri, I do not have access to information about SBC's wholesale
16		customers; and to
17		
18		2) Respond to the comments made by Office of the Public Counsel Economist
19		Barbara Meisenheimer about VoIP and the cost comparisons I made in my direct
20		testimony.

1		1. <u>Access To Wholesale Information</u> .
2	Q.	SOCKET TELECOM WITNESS MATT KOHLY STATES IN HIS
3		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON PAGE 8 THAT SBC RETAIL
4		MARKETING DIRECTORS "CAN NOW FREELY REVIEW ALL OF
5		THE HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION CONTAINED IN
6		SBC'S TESTIMONY" AND THAT THEY MAY "FIND THIS
7		INFORMATION USEFUL IN FULFILLING THEIR RETAIL
8		RESPONSIBILITIES." IS THIS STATEMENT CORRECT?
9	A.	No.
10		
11	Q.	HAVE YOU BEEN GIVEN ACCESS TO THE HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL
12		OR PROPRIETARY WHOLESALE INFORMATION FILED IN THIS
13		CASE BY SBC MISSOURI WITNESS CRAIG UNRUH?
14	A.	No.
15		
16	Q.	IN YOUR PRESENT POSITION AS AN SBC RETAIL MARKETING
17		DIRECTOR, DO YOU HAVE ACCESS TO INFORMATION ABOUT
18		SBC'S WHOLESALE CUSTOMERS?
19	A.	No.

1		2. <u>Responses To Opc Economist Ms. Meisenheimer</u> .
2	Q.	OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL MS. BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER AT
3		PAGE 18 OF HER REBUTTAL TESTIMONY SUGGESTS VOIP IS NOT
4		PREVALENT IN THE MARKET PLACE AND IS OF POOR QUALITY
5		THUS MAKING IT "NOT A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT" FOR
6		TRADITIONAL LANDLINE SERVICE. DO YOU AGREE WITH MS.
7		MEISENHEIMER THAT VOIP IS NOT PREVALENT IN THE
8		MARKETPLACE?
9	A.	No. VoIP is very prevalent in the marketplace. All one must do is turn on the
10		TV, read the newspaper, listen to the radio, get on the Internet or open the mail to
11		understand that VoIP is in the marketplace and available to residents of the state
12		of Missouri. (Examples of VoIP direct mail and pop up advertising from
13		competitors such as AT&T, Charter, Comcast, Time Warner and Vonage
14		targeting residential customers in Missouri are attached as Schedule 1.)
15		
16		As I stated in my direct testimony, AT&T has extensively advertised their new
17		VoIP service, CallVantage, in many forms of advertising media, including during
18		some of the biggest TV events in our nation (e.g., the 2004 Summer Olympics).
19		In addition, AT&T has a national retail presence for CallVantage with Best Buy,
20		Circuit City, Amazon and now the Buy.com, which describes itself as the
21		"Internet Superstore." (Copies of AT&T's November 8, 2004 press release
22		announcing that it has become a Buy.com "Premiere Partner" and an AT&T

3

CallVantage ad from a Buy.com advertising supplement is attached as Schedule
2.)

DO YOU AGREE WITH MS. MEISENHEIMER THAT VOIP SERVICE IS

3

4

Q.

5

OF POOR QUALITY?

6 A. No. And end user customers are apparently finding the service acceptable. 7 Vonage has reported that it is currently adding about 30,000 subscribers per 8 month in the U.S. and Canada to its VoIP service. (A copy of a December 19, 9 2004 Forbes article reporting on a Vonage announcement is attached as Schedule 10 3). At an investor briefing, Time Warner reported that it had more than 200,000 11 VoIP subscribers at the end of 2004 and was signing up about 11,000 VoIP 12 customers each week. (Copies of slides from Time Warner's presentation at the 13 January 2005 Citigroup Media Conference are attached as Schedule 4.) Locally, 14 Charter Communications in November 2004 reported that it had signed up nearly 15 7,000 residential customers to its VoIP telephone service in St. Louis County and 16 St. Louis City. (A copy of an article about Charter Communications from the 17 November 15, 2004 St. Louis Business Journal is attached as Schedule 5). I 18 would also note that Ms. Meisenheimer did not supply any research, articles or 19 documentation to support her assertions concerning the quality of VoIP service. 20 21 HAVE YOU SEEN VOIP PROVIDERS ENHANCING THEIR Q.

22 **OFFERINGS**?

4

1	A.	Yes. In December 2004, AT&T announced that it had introduced several feature
2		enhancements to its residential CallVantage VoIP service, which it calls "AT&T
3		CallVantage Plus." One new feature is a sub-account capability that provides up
4		to nine distinctive telephone numbers (e.g., one for each family member) with the
5		ability to manage the calling experience for each number separately, while sharing
6		the same line. For example, with the separate sub-account feature, each member
7		of a family would be able to configure features like "Do Not Disturb" or "Locate
8		Me" in order to receive calls when they want and where they want. It also
9		provides separate "Call Logs" for each user and personal voicemail. Another
10		feature is a screening capability that allows customers to direct calls based on who
11		is calling (e.g., subscribers might direct calls from friends to voicemail, while
12		allowing calls from their children always to ring through). (A copy of AT&T's
13		December 16, 2004 Press Release is attached as Schedule 6.)
14		
15	Q.	IN HER REBUTTAL TESTIMONY AT PAGE 25, MS. MEISENHEIMER
16		STATES THAT SBC DOES NOT PROVIDE "RESIDENTIAL ACCESS
17		LINE SERVICE." DO YOU AGREE WITH MS. MEISENHEIMER'S
18		RESPONSE?
19	A.	No. SBC does provide Residential Access Line service. Ms. Mesienheimer
20		apparently misunderstood my terminology. I was simply referring to the basic
21		voice service we provide to residential customers and would reference the
22		Missouri General Exchange Tariff, Section 8, Sheet 7, which provides the
23		definition of an access line:

5

1		EXCHANGE ACCESS LINE: Telephone Company-provided and
2		maintained central office equipment and Telephone Company
3		facilities, including the Network Interface which provide access to
4		and from the telecommunications network for message long
5		distance and local calling.
6		
7	Q.	MS. MESEINHEIMER AT PAGE 26 OF HER REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
8		INDICATED THAT YOU DID NOT PROVIDE A COMPARISON OF
9		LOW COST OPTIONS FOR CUSTOMERS IN YOUR TESTIMONY AND
10		THAT YOU FOCUSED ONLY ON BUNDLED OPTIONS. IS THIS
11		CORRECT?
12	A.	No. I did provide direct comparisons of the lowest cost options for local calling
13		in my testimony. Schedule 6 in my direct testimony shows a rate comparison,
14		which includes the lowest cost option, between SBC, Vartec, Sage and AT&T. I
15		also provided a chart on page 16 of my testimony comparing the rates of SBC and
16		Charter. This also includes the lowest cost options.
17		
18	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

19 A. Yes.