Exhibit No. _____
Issues: Article IX: Maintenance; Article XIII: OSS;
Article VI: Performance Measures
Witness: Kurt Bruemmer
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony
Sponsoring Party: Socket Telecom, LLC
Case No.: TO-2006-0299
Date: April 6, 2006

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PETITION OF SOCKET TELECOM, LLC FOR COMPULSORY ARBITRATION OF INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENTS WITH CENTURYTEL OF MISSOURI, LLC AND SPECTRA COMMUNICATIONS, LLC PURSUANT TO SECTION 252(b)(1) OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996	)))))))	**CASE NO. TO-2006-0299**

REDACTED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

KURT BRUEMMER ON BEHALF OF

SOCKET TELECOM, LLC

William L. Magness
Texas State Bar No. 12824020
CASEY, GENTZ & MAGNESS, L.L.P.
98 San Jacinto Blvd., Suite 1400
Austin, Texas 78701
512/225-0019 (Direct)
512/480-9200 (Fax)
bmagness@phonelaw.com

Carl J. Lumley, #32869
Leland B. Curtis, #20550
CURTIS, HEINZ, GARRETT & O'KEEFE, P.C.
130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200
Clayton, Missouri 63105
(314) 725-8788
(314) 725-8789 (Fax)
clumley@lawfirmemail.com
lcurtis@lawfirmemail.com

ATTORNEYS FOR SOCKET TELECOM, LLC

April 6, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name and address.

A. My name is Kurt Bruemmer. My business address is 1005 Cherry Street, Suite 104, Columbia, MO 65201.

Q. Are you the same Kurt Bruemmer that filed Direct Testimony in this case?

A. Yes.

ARTICLE IX – MAINTENANCE

Issue 1: Should Socket contact CenturyTel to obtain desired information relating to Maintenance matters or should CenturyTel provide the information in advance unsolicited?

CenturyTel Alternative Issue Statement (A): Should Socket contact CenturyTel to obtain desired information relating to maintenance matters or should CenturyTel be required to provide such information in advance and unsolicited?

CenturyTel Alternative Issue Statement (B): How should CenturyTel be required to provide Socket notice of missed repair commitments?

Q. What is the basis for the disagreement on this issue?

A. I believe this issue comes down to a question of parity. CenturyTel witness Ms. Scott explains in her testimony how notifications are sent from the CenturyTel Network Operations Center ("NOC") to CenturyTel personnel in advance of network maintenance and during network outages. At no time are CenturyTel personnel expected to request information from the repair line to learn of an outage, and they are alerted prior to planned maintenance. This is in contrast to CenturyTel's position concerning Socket

on this issue, which requires Socket to make a call after the outage has already occurred and seek information about its anticipated duration.

Q. How does this treatment fit the definition of parity?

A. It does not. It only puts Socket in parity with a CenturyTel residential customer, which is significantly less than what should be expected.

Q. Ms. Scott points out that mere email notification would not be of any value to Socket (Scott Direct at 5). Then why should CenturyTel bother sending it?

A. The notification that is being sent to CenturyTel personnel contains a link to their "Remedy" database. The description of the outage could be included in the notification to Socket or Socket could be provided access to the Remedy data. This would give Socket technicians the same information as CenturyTel personnel. Only then would Socket be at parity with CenturyTel.

Q. How does CenturyTel's proposal put Socket at a disadvantage in trying to serve its customers?

A. It greatly hinders the troubleshooting process during an outage affecting Socket customers. The Socket technician resolving the trouble would have to contact CenturyTel first to determine if there is a network outage affecting the customer or risk performing troubleshooting steps that will cause problems when CenturyTel restores service. Customers, either CenturyTel's or Socket's, have the right to be forewarned of a maintenance outage. CenturyTel has the information available to notify its customers of a planned outage. It is a standard industry practice to notify wholesale customers if there is a known outage. Socket gets this information from both Sprint and AT&T.

Q. Does Socket have an issue with CenturyTel's definition of an outage?

A. According to Ms. Scott's testimony, a major service interruption is "defined as an outage of 50 or more customers for 15 minutes or longer." Socket would be comfortable with this outage definition. Accordingly, Socket will modify its proposed contract language at Section 4.1 to include CenturyTel's proposed definition of an outage.

Q. Why is it reasonable to expect CenturyTel to contact Socket when a repair commitment is missed?

A. I am surprised that this is not a standard practice at CenturyTel. When a business is unable to meet a commitment it has made, it is only appropriate to contact the customer with the status. CenturyTel has this information available to relay to its own customers.

It is also important to note that this expectation and all expectations concerning ticket statuses are only relevant until an electronic trouble ticket system is in place. Ms. Scott mentions that CenturyTel does not provide this information to its own plant managers. In such case, however, a summary status report such as Socket requests would not be necessary because those plant managers already have access to the information electronically.

Q. Are you concerned about "false alarms" due to the "lag" in the update of the ticket as Ms. Scott describes?

A. It appears to me that the risk of false alarms would be no different under CenturyTel's proposal where Socket would have to call the repair center. Ms. Scott claims that the repair center relies on the information from the Remedy system for updates. If CenturyTel's field technician has not yet electronically updated the ticket, the

repair center will also have inaccurate information. Such a lag is possible under both Parties' proposals and is hardly a legitimate reason for adopting CenturyTel's proposal.

Issue 2: Must the single point of contact CenturyTel agrees to provide be a person or organization separate and apart from CenturyTel's existing repair center?

Q. Why does Socket feel the single point of contact for repair reporting and status be apart from the existing retail repair center?

A. While I'm sure that CenturyTel technicians may call the retail repair center at times, as Ms. Scott testifies, I believe it is more the exception than the rule - particularly when it comes to high capacity circuits. The reality is that Socket is using interconnection and 911 circuits, and it has been our experience that the personnel in the retail repair center are not familiar with these types of circuits. Tickets on these circuits have to be placed as "Miscellaneous Tickets" in the CenturyTel system because repair center personnel aren't able to find the circuit IDs in their system. Although I don't doubt that CenturyTel field personnel also call the repair center at times, I would suspect that they often use the ticket creation capability available to the NOC as described in Ms. Scott's testimony, especially for the larger types of circuits equivalent to those that Socket most commonly uses. The fact that the retail repair center personnel are only able to open "Miscellaneous Tickets" (due to either training and/or systems) for these types of circuits highlights the fact that the retail repair center is not the typical vehicle for starting a ticket for higher capacity circuits.

Q. Doesn't this issue relate to parity also?

A. Yes. As I mentioned, according to Ms. Scott's testimony, the NOC personnel have the capability of entering tickets directly into the Remedy system. Access to this system or its equivalent by Socket personnel would be needed for parity. The requirement to call a ticket into the repair center only serves to delay the start of a ticket with the personnel who can resolve the issue.

ARTICLE XIII – OSS And ARTICLE XV – PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Article XIII: Should the Agreement contain an Article addressing Operations Support Systems issues?

Article XV: Should the Agreement contain an Article addressing Performance Measures and Provisioning Intervals issues?

CenturyTel Issue: What Performance Measures should the Agreement contain?

Q. Why are you addressing OSS and performance measure issues at the same time?

A. CenturyTel's witnesses have generally commingled the two issues by claiming that CenturyTel's current level of performance is satisfactory and, therefore, there is no need to provide electronic access to CenturyTel's operations support systems.

Q. Does Socket believe that an electronic, automated OSS will improve the service that CenturyTel provides to CLECs such as Socket?

A. I can only imagine that it would. CenturyTel's reliance on manual processes only lends itself to creating delay and the high likelihood of errors, problems that waste time and energy for both Socket and CenturyTel to resolve and problems that can negatively impact Socket's ability to serve its customers. I would suspect that the existence of an

automated OSS is what allows Sprint and AT&T to provision circuits and services faster and provision orders with fewer errors.

Q. Can you give us an example of some of the problems Socket has encountered in dealing with CenturyTel's insistence on relying upon manual systems?

Yes. One of the frequent problems we face is obtaining accurate Customer Service Record information ("CSR") in the Pre-Order phase.

Q. Can you explain why obtaining a Customer Service Record in a timely manner is so important?

A. Yes. The CSR is record that contains information identifing the customer (such as business name, billing address and telephone number(s) as reflected in CenturyTel's systems, plus a list of all the services that customer is currently receiving from CenturyTel. This information is critical to a competitor who has won the customer and is assembling an order for UNEs or resold services to provide service to that customer.

Inaccurate CSR data makes placing a Local Service Request impossible. If the data on Socket's order does notmatch the data in CenturyTel's system where CenturyTel places the order, Socket's order will be rejected. Each time this happens, Socket is delayed and the provisioning interval starts over. A reject will occur, for example, when we state the customer's address on an LSR using the address of "8th & Cherry" which the customer may have given us, rather than "801 Cherry Street" which is the address in the billing system. We have learned that the billing address in CenturyTel's own systems often does not match the service address contained in another of CenturyTel's internal systems.

We also have experienced numerous instances where even when customer information is placed on an LSR as it is shown on the CSR we received from CenturyTel. it still does not match CenturyTel's internal systems, again resulting in a rejected order. As an example, Socket requested a CSR from CenturyTel for a business customer and provided CenturyTel the main phone number of the business. The CSR came back in the name of the business. Based upon that response from CenturyTel, Socket submitted a service order using the name of the business. The order was rejected on the basis that it contained an invalid end user customer name. Socket then requested a second CSR using the same main phone number. This time, the CSR came back from CenturyTel in the name of the owner of the business. Socket re-assembled its service order for the customer and submitted it a second time to CenturyTel. This time the order was accepted.

Receiving an accurate CSR also is important because when Socket wins a customer and the customer says it wants to "have the same services it has now" Socket must identify all of the telephone numbers assocated with the main number that the customer currently has when Scoket places a Local Service Request. This is problematic: especially with the business customers that we serve, as they may not be able to identify all of the services they currently have or inadvertently fail to remember to tell us about a facsimile line that have.

An additional problem arises when a business has added lines and services over time and as they were added, they were placed on a different account by CenturyTel. When Socket requests a CSR, Socket submits that request by providing a telephone

number on the request, usually the customer's main line. CenturyTel is supposed to provide Socket the CSR information for all telephone numbers on the same account as the telephone number submitted by Socket. If there are phone numbers on a different account, however, Socket will not get that information with CenturyTel's response to Socket's CSR request. Once one of Socket's technicians realizes that he did not receive all of the information, he must submit another request for a CSR. That will take period of time, another response interval to a CSR request. (The interval the Parties have agreed to in settling their disputes on provisioning intervals is six hours.) During that time, Socket's ability to place an order for service to its new customer is delayed.

Q. Do the agreed upon time intervals place Socket at Parity?

A. No. That agreement still does not mean that Socket is receiving pre-order information at Parity with CenturyTel's own systems. CenturyTel's technicians have real-time access to this information so they will instantly have this information. Even if in some cases CenturyTel's information is in paper files, its employees have the advantage of seeing it as soon as it is pulled and the ability to recognize that there may be another account, or different address etc. for the customer record that should be reviewed. Even if a customer's different accounts are not linked in CenturyTel's internal systems, CenturyTel employees will have immediate access to obtain the additional information once they realize there is information missing. Socket has to wait to receive the CSR sent and only knows that something is missing or something more should be tracked down *after* its LSR is rejected.

Q. Did any CenturyTel witness assert that CenturyTel was providing Socket with Parity with respect to Pre-Order functionality?

A. As I went through the testimony, I did not find such an assertions. I can say that Socket is certainly not receiving this information at Parity, as that term was agreed upon by the Socket and CenturyTel.

Q. Does Socket believe that its resale and UNE orders are currently processed and provisioned in Parity with CenturyTel?

A. No. I believe that Pam Hankins answers this in her testimony. In her Process Flow diagrams, Ms. Hankins attempts to show that CLEC orders are treated the same as CenturyTel orders. However, the diagram clearly indicates a delay of up to 48 hours at the start of each order. This is referred to as the 'typing interval.' A real-time OSS would not have this delay processing Socket's service orders. The CenturyTel order diagram does not include this interval. This typing interval is currently added to the standard provisioning interval so that, as an example, the time between Socket submitting its order and CenturyTel provisioning a UNE Loop is actually 17 business days instead of 15 business days. This problem exists for both simple and complex orders. In the example Ms. Hankins gives in her testimony for an "order for a line where facilities work is required, the time from entry of the order into CenturyTel's Ensemble billing system until the line is provisioned is the same, three (3) days, for both retail and wholesale orders,"[1] the *real* interval for an equivalent order from Socket is five days. I don't know of any definition of parity that this situation satisfies.

[1] Direct Testimony of Pam Hankins at 26, lines 8-10.

When this ICA is approved and goes into effect, the 'typing interval' will be removed from the process. The Parties have just reached agreement on intervals that eliminate this two-day discrepancy in treatment of Socket's orders. This does not bring us to 'Parity' as the rest of my testimony reveals, but it is certainly a step in the right direction.

Q. What about Access Orders?

A. Again, Ms. Hankins' testimony and flow charts attempt to show that Socket's orders are treated the same as a CenturyTel order. Apparently she is not aware that Socket's Access Orders are often treated to a "regulatory review." This is an undocumented portion of CenturyTel's process that we are unsure who is performing or what is involved. The length of time this review consumes is usually measured in weeks. Contrary to Ms. Moreau's testimony regarding Article XV that: "Orders for interconnection trunks are seldom, if ever, immediately an issue to an efficient CLEC's performance."[2] the reality is that waiting weeks to get an FOC on an interconnection order has significantly hampered our efforts to serve our customers in the past. I would say the need for interconnection trunks to be timely provided is more acute for a growing CLEC.

This will also be a direct function of the number of POIs that Socket is required to establish. If Socket is required to establish a POI in every Local Calling Area, each new customer we add may create the need to add new interconnection facilities. If, however, Socket is required to establish a single POI per LATA as contemplated by the FCC's

[2] Direct Testimony of Maxine L. Moreau at 59, lines 8-9.

rules, this will be much less problematic, as the addition of a single customer may not have much of an impact on the need for additional interconnection facilities since those facilities are spread across a larger customer base.

Q. Why do you feel there is such disagreement between Ms. Hankins' testimony and yours over whether this meets the parity requirement?

A. Excellent question. I think there are two reasons. I believe the first is that Ms. Hankins is obviously unaware of the delays in the ordering processes as they exist for Socket. I would think it would be pretty difficult to declare that the processes that apply to Socket are in parity with CenturyTel's for its own operations if one were aware of CLEC-specific delays that are sometimes weeks long in getting an order entered in CenturyTel's internal systems. So I assume she is not aware of this.

Second, I feel that the definition of parity changes depending on the question asked of the witness. At the beginning of Ms Hankins' testimony addressing Article XII of the ICA she defines parity as "the provision of access to Socket that is equal to the level of access that we provide ourselves, our customers, or our affiliates, in terms of quality, accuracy, and timeliness."[3] But, when declaring that CenturyTel is meeting the parity requirement she states, that: "One can only conclude that CenturyTel provisions orders in parity with its own customers' orders."[4]

Q. How does this relate to Socket's need for an electronic OSS?

A. The delays mentioned help highlight the detriment in working with substandard systems and processes. They also show how as long as CLECs depend on manual

[3] Direct Testimony of Pam Hankins at p.24, lines 21-23.
[4] P. Hankins Direct at p.30, lines 5-6.

CenturyTel processes there will always be difficulty in achieving parity; particularly CenturyTel's moving definition of parity.

Q. Parity aside, CenturyTel witness Maxine Moreau claims in her testimony that Socket has notdemonstrated a need for an improved OSS or for many of the performance measures it is proposing that involve the ordering process. What is your response?

A. It is my belief that Ms. Moreau is not familiar with the relationship Socket has had with CenturyTel up to this point. This would be expected as she has only been in her position since January and, to my knowledge, has never been involved in any previous discussions with Socket. Also, like Ms. Hankins, her direct testimony reveals her unfamiliarity with the situation. Ms. Moreau mentions that CenturyTel provides a web interface to accept LSRs for Customer Service Records when in fact we were instructed by Carrie Patrick *not* to use the web site for that purpose. Attached to my testimony are Ms. Patrick's email and attachment instructing Socket how to use and get access to the web site. (See KB-1 and KB-2.) Ms. Moreau also states that CenturyTel can provide billing information "online via CenturyTel's 'My Account' application."[5] This was never given as an option to Socket until late in the arbitration.

Ms. Moreau claims that "CenturyTel's existing systems have not been proven to be 'broken.'[6] I am not sure what type of proof Ms. Moreau thinks we need to provide. We have previously raised our concerns about CenturyTel's performance on several occassions. Since CenturyTel has yet to implement any type of wholesale performance

[5] Moreau Direct at 13, lines 3-4.
[6] Moreau Direct at 23, lines 22-23.

measures, it is certainly not in a position to demonstrate that it is providing service at Parity.

Ms. Moreau also repeatedly claims in her direct testimony on Article XIII and her direct testimony on Article XV that Socket is receiving good service or that Socket has not demonstrated a need for performance measures. I disagree. I assume that in the absence of direct knowledge Ms. Moreau may be referring to the information that was submitted to Socket in response to Socket Data Request 14. That response was a table showing order dates, due dates, and completion dates, and I can understand how a person looking only at this data could easily be convinced that CenturyTel's performance has been satisfactory. However, that data comes from a source that does not tell the whole story. It is very important to recognize that the data that exists in the CenturyTel Internet Services Customer Portal where Socket places LSRsdoes not keep any order history. When an order is changed or supplemented, the previous versions of the order that were submitted to CenturyTel simply cease to exist and no changes are logged.

Thus, if Socket supplements a service order because it was placed in jeopardy status, the supplemental order overrides the initial order. The data reported shows the supplemental order date and completion date and it looks like the due dates have been met when in truth the due date was missed. Matching order dates with due dates in the records kept in this data repository does not begin to tell the real story of the troubles Socket has experienced with placing orders and getting them provisioned on time, as requested.

Q. Can you elaborate on the problems with using the data in the Internet Services Customer Portal as an indicator of CenturyTel's performance?

A. Many of the problems Socket experiences are a caused by the inability to obtain CSR data in a timely manner or to obtain accurate CSR data. I have some examples to explain what I mean.

Order No. 439684068 was rejected as unworkable on the day of the number port because there were services related to the customer account that were not accounted for on the order. However, those services were not reflected on either the CSR CenturyTel provided to Socket or on the customer's bill from CenturyTel. Although CenturyTel rejected the number port order, the customer's telephone numbers were still taken out of service on CenturyTel's switch resulting in a two-hour service outage while our technician worked with CenturyTel to get service restored.

Order No. 440923838 was worked on the correct date but the telephone numbers were not routed correctly in the CenturyTel switch until three hours after the scheduled time of the port.

Order 441873448 required that Socket submit two versions of the service order and provisioning was delayed a week because the customer had moved locations. Socket submitted the order the first time with the customer's correct, new address but that information was not reflected in all of CenturyTel's systems and it was rejected. To get the order through the ordering process, it had to be submitted a second time, this time with the customer's old address.

Order No. 438016228 shows on the list as still being unworkable but it was in fact completed on 12/9/05 although the due date was 12/8/05.

Order 438076608 was rejected due to an unannounced change in CenturyTel's policy. Previously, telephone numbers not being ported when a customer moved to Socket could be left with CenturyTel by putting a notation on the order that said 'leave all other numbers as is.' This way of handling non-porting telephone numbers was changed to require and explicit statement as to what was to be done with each number. Socket has no problem with the new policy, had proper notice been received and if CenturyTel would recognize that it can be difficult for CLECs to identify and provide explicit instructions for each and every telephone number a customer has without access to accurate CSRs. As it happened, the change in policy occured with no notice to Socket and the result was a delay in processing this customer's order.

These are just examples that I identified by looking through about 15-20 orders for service that Socket placed. Ms. Moreau says that she does not believe CenturyTel's performance in providing service to wholesale customers is any worse than AT&T Missouri's. I can say that as someone who has been personally involved in placing orders, porting numbers, and resolving customer problems on Socket's behalf with both ILECs that I estimate that there are at least five to ten times the number of problems on our CenturyTel orders as there are on our AT&T and Sprint orders combined, and the order volume is probably lower for CenturyTel.

I also need to point out another big problem with relying on the list CenturyTel provided in response to Socket's Data Request No. 14 that asked CenturyTel to provide

quality of service information and that is that CenturyTel's data does not take into account the due time on a number port order. We estimate that 40-50% of the telephone number ports have service issues primarily related to either the time of the cut over being wrong or the telephone numbers not being taken out of the CenturyTel switch with the result that local calls do not reach the customer's new circuit. It can then take several hours to get the problem corrected for our customer, who is understandably frustrated that local calls are not getting through. What is even more disappointing is that most of our number porting orders have been coordinated hot cuts, which is a process considered by most of the telcom industry to mean that the number port only occurs while a technician from the losing carrier is "live" on the telephone with at technician from the winning carrier.

Q. Does this performance by CenturyTel hurt Socket's ability to serve its customers?

A. Absolutely. Our customers are businesses that rightfully become very angry when their telephone service is not working due to number porting problems. Having this problem creates a negative feeling towards our service from the very beginning of our relationship with them.

Also, the lack of real-time CSR information and accurate CSR information creates numerous delays in getting Socket's service order for a customer accepted, a situation which happens with such frequency that it makes it difficult for us to give customers any kind of firm order date. And, the abnormally large number of orders that go to jeopardy status late in the order process causes constant schedule changes that negatively affect

our ability to efficiently assign resources and cause our customers difficulty in coordinating their business operations with the installation schedule.

Based on the percentage of Socket's orders that CenturyTel states are complex orders * * * **CONFIDENTIAL ***** END CONFIDENTIAL*** and the percentage of complex orders that CenturyTel performs meets the due date* * * **CONFIDENTIAL ******** END CONFIDENTIAL** * * Socket would average below the Public Service Commission's threshold of 90% of orders being installed by the due date if it were not for the number of Socket orders placed with Sprint and AT&T that bring up the average installed by due date number overall.

Q. CenturyTel proposes a PM that 95% of Socket's orders be entered correctly. What problems do you foresee with this proposal?

A. Again, I see the biggest problem with this proposal as being the inaccurate Customer Service Record ("CSR") data that makes placing an Local Service Request "LSR" order a lot like playing a slot machine as order will be rejected if the data on the LSR does not match the information contained on CenturyTel's internal systems. This particular Performance Measurement is particularly troublesome because it puts in place a system where CenturyTel is judge and jury of what orders are successful. It has been our experience with all of the LECs that people reviewing orders interpret the standards differently.

Q. Have you had a chance to review CenturyTel's cost estimate for developing an electronic, automated OSS system?

A. Because of the time constraints -- the cost information was presently only recently and there is limited detail in the specifications -- I have only been able to conduct a

cursory review. That review certainly raised concerns about the credibility of the estimate. For example, CenturyTel's lists a * * * **CONFIDENTIAL** ****** **END CONFIDENTIAL** * * * server in its estimate and shows a cost for that server of ***CONFIDENTIAL ********* END CONFIDENTIAL * * * . I was able to find that identical server with CenturyTel's provided specifications available at a current cost of * * * **CONFIDENTIAL** ********* **END CONFIDENTIAL*** * *.

Every other server listed in the estimate is no longer in production. If a particular server were needed, refurbished ones are available at a fraction of the cost of what is shown in Ms. Wilke's estimate. For example, CenturyTel's estimate includes a HP 8410 server at cost of $346,000. A refurbished is available and would cost $73,000. The three E420 servers included in CenturyTel's estimate were listed as costing $50,000 each. These were taken out of production in 2003. Refurbished ones are available for less than $2,500 a piece.

Clearly, this outdated estimate raises serious concerns and certainly should not be use for any type of cost recovery.

Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?

A. Yes.

EXHIBIT KB-1

From: Carrie Patrick [carrie.patrick@CenturyTel.com]
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2004 8:34 AM
To: rmkohly@sockettelecom.com
Subject: RE: request for information about Internet ordering system

CLEC-Online Ordering Process.r...

Your user name will be mkohly, password sock5798, either can be changed at your request. I have attached the basic guide for using the web site. The site is very basic and is the same LSR form that is currently used. Your company will be using the order types of; Port Only, Loop Only, and Loop Service with Number Portability. The other order types are used by our Resellers that are not facility based. If there is a section on the LSR form that is marked as required, but does not apply to your company, please place N/A in the field. If you place any test orders,(that are not true orders) please place TEST in comments. If you have any questions or problems, you can contact either me at 318-340-5108 or my supervisor LaCondra at 318-330-6204, and either of us can help you with the web site. Thanks Carrie

-----Original Message-----
From: Matt Kohly [mailto:rmkohly@sockettelecom.com]
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2004 8:19 AM
To: Carrie Patrick
Subject: request for information about Internet ordering system

This is the e-mail that you requested. I can be reached at 573.777.1991, ext. 551.

Matt Kohly
Socket Telecom

EXHIBIT KB-2

CLEC-Resale Online Ordering Process

Log on to http://centurytelorderprocessing.centurytel.net

Type user name and password and click authenticate.

To Place an Order

1. Go to left side of screen, click on Start Order
   Select State from drop down box
   Select type of order from drop down box

Note: The necessary form for your order type will appear.

2. Enter order information the appropriate fields (all fields marked in red are mandatory fields).
3. After the completion of each page, you will click Submit Form (if there are any required fields that are incomplete, an error message will be displayed, and you will not be able to advance to the next page without correcting the error).

Note: Once submitted, the system will automatically display the next page to complete the order.

Once you have completed all forms of the LSR, the system will then take you back to the Main Page, there will be a message on the left side of the screen that shows the order completed.

Note: A new order can be started from this page by using the same method as above.

To Check an Order Status

1. Go to left side of screen, click on Search Orders.
2. System will take you to the Search Orders screen.
   Orders can be searched by:
   - Date range
   - PON
   - State
   - Order Type
   - Order Number
   - Status
3. Choose search type, and click Search, all orders that meet specified criteria will be displayed.
   Information listed will include:
   - Order date
   - Order type
   - Order status
   - Order number
   - Due date
   - User (rep that issued order to CenturyTel)

Definitions of Order Status

- Pending: order will show pending once submitted by CLEC or Reseller
- Provisioned: order has been entered into CenturyTel's service order processing system by a CenturyTel rep, a tentative due date is scheduled, a confirmation or order number will be listed with all Provisioned order status.

- Jeopardy: order that was scheduled has a due date change due to facilities etc, (original due date will not be met).
- Unworkable: order is unworkable; this will be due to invalid information such as address, incorrect customer etc.
- Complete: order has been completed, and all services are working.

This online ordering site will not allow you to validate addresses, submit CSR request or submit suspend and restoral orders. These orders will still have to be processed using the current procedures.

STATE OF MISSOURI)
) SS.
COUNTY OF BOONE)

VERIFICATION

Kurt Bruemmer, being first duly sworn, deposes and say that he is the witness who sponsors the accompanying testimony entitled "Rebuttal Testimony"; that said testimony was prepared by him and under his direction and supervision; that if inquiries were made as to the fact in said testimony and schedule, he would respond as therein set forth; and that the aforesaid testimony is true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.

Kurt Bruemmer

On this 6th day of April, 2006, before me, a Notary Public, personally appeared Kurt Bruemmer, and being first duly sworn upon his oath stated that he is over twenty-one years, sound of mind and authorized to represent Socket Telecom, LLC in this matter, he signed the foregoing document as an authorized representative of Socket Telecom, LLC and the facts contained therein are true and correct according to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal in the County and State aforesaid, the day and year above-written.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

SHEILA M. LYNCH
Notary Public-Notary Seal
State of Missouri
Boone County
My Commission Expires Apr 28, 2008