

**STATE OF INDIANA
INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF BIG RIVER TELEPHONE)	
COMPANY, L.L.C.'S PETITION FOR)	
ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO SECTION)	
252(B) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF)	
1934, AS AMENDED BY THE)	CAUSE NO. 44078-INT 01
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996, AND)	
THE APPLICABLE STATE LAWS FOR)	
RATES, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF)	
INTERCONNECTION WITH INDIANA BELL)	
TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC.)	

**AT&T INDIANA'S RESPONSES TO BIG RIVER'S
THIRD SET OF DATA REQUESTS**

Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Indiana ("AT&T Indiana") hereby submits its objections and responses to Big River Telephone Company's Third Set of Data Requests.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. AT&T Indiana objects to these discovery requests as improper, overbroad, and unduly burdensome to the extent that they purport to impose upon AT&T Indiana any obligations broader than those set forth by the Indiana Rules of Civil Procedure or otherwise permitted by law.
2. AT&T Indiana objects to these discovery requests to the extent they seek documents or information which are neither relevant nor material to the subject matter of this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
3. AT&T Indiana objects to these discovery requests as improper, overbroad, and unduly burdensome to the extent that they improperly seek the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, joint defense privilege, attorney work-product doctrine

or any other applicable privilege or doctrine. Such responses as may hereafter be given shall not include any information protected by such privileges or doctrines, and the inadvertent disclosure of such information shall not be deemed as a waiver of any such privilege or doctrine.

4. AT&T objects to these discovery requests on the ground that they seek access to confidential, competitively sensitive and/or proprietary business information and trade secrets belonging to AT&T Indiana. AT&T has made reasonable efforts to maintain the secrecy of this information and such information has an independent economic value from not being generally known to nor readily ascertainable by proper means by others who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use. The furnishing of responses to these requests is not intended nor should it be construed to waive AT&T Indiana's right to protect from disclosure documents and information containing confidential or proprietary trade secrets or business information. AT&T Indiana reserves the right to redact from the documents it produces or information it provides confidential or proprietary business information or trade secrets not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

5. AT&T Indiana objects to these discovery requests to the extent that any request seeks the disclosure of information or documents that are subject to any obligation of confidentiality owed by AT&T Indiana to any third party.

6. AT&T objects to these discovery requests to the extent that they purport to require AT&T Indiana to provide documents and/or information not in AT&T Indiana's possession, custody or control.

7. AT&T Indiana objects to these discovery requests to the extent they seek an analysis, calculation, or compilation which has not previously been performed and which AT&T Indiana objects to performing.

8. AT&T Indiana objects to these discovery requests insofar as they request the production of documents or information that are publicly available or within Big River's control.

9. AT&T Indiana objects to each and every discovery request that seeks to obtain "all," "any," "each," or "every" document to the extent that such requests are overbroad and unduly burdensome.

10. AT&T Indiana objects to these discovery requests to the extent that they are not limited to any stated time period or identify a stated period of time that is longer than is relevant for purposes of this docket, as such discovery is unduly broad and overly burdensome.

11. AT&T Indiana objects to these discovery request to the extent they are vague, ambiguous, utilize terms that are subject to multiple interpretations but are not properly defined for purposes of these discovery requests, or otherwise provide no basis for which AT&T Indiana can determine what information is sought.

12. To the extent a discovery request calls for information that is not relevant or is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, it would be unduly burdensome to comply with the request given the lack of relevance.

13. The objections and responses contained herein are not intended nor should be construed to waive AT&T Indiana's right to object to other discovery involving or relating to the subject matter of these requests, responses or documents produced in response hereto.

The objections and responses contained herein and the documents produced in response hereto are not intended nor should be construed to waive AT&T Indiana's right to object to these requests, responses or documents produced in response hereto, or the subject matter of such requests, responses or documents, as to their competency, relevancy, materiality, privilege and admissibility as evidence for any purpose, in or at hearing of this or any other proceeding.

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-1: Referencing Mr. McPhee's Rebuttal Testimony at page 2, lines 1 through 7:

- a. For each of the nine ICAs that Mr. McPhee states that Big River entered into with AT&T via a Section 252(i) MFN adoption, please identify the CLEC that was a party to each underlying ICA with AT&T (hereafter referred to as the "Underlying CLEC");
- b. With regard to each of the nine ICAs identified in Request 3-1(a), state whether AT&T performed a traffic study to determine whether traffic between AT&T and the Underlying CLEC was balanced prior to entering into the ICA with the Underlying CLEC. If any study was performed, provide copies of any such studies.

Response:

- a. The testimony of Mr. McPhee does not state Big River entered ICAs with AT&T via Section 252(i) MFN adoptions in nine states. The testimony states there were eight states where Big River adopted ICAs via 252(i) MFN. For individual states, refer to Big River's Response 1-3 to AT&T Indiana's first set of data requests. See also footnote 1 to Mr. McPhee's Rebuttal Testimony.
- b. For the eight states where Big River adopted ICAs via 252(i) MFN, the ILEC did not perform a traffic study.

Responsible Person: Scott McPhee

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-2: Admit that in the nine states governed by the Big River/AT&T ICAs referenced in Request 3-1, AT&T has never billed Big River for reciprocal compensation. If your response is anything other than an unqualified admission, please explain your response in detail and identify the states, dates, Billing Account numbers, 251(b)(5) and ISP-bound MOUs, and amounts for which AT&T has billed Big River Telephone for reciprocal compensation.

Response: With regard to the eight states where Big River adopted ICAs via 252(i) MFN, AT&T admits that it has not billed Big River for reciprocal compensation.

Responsible Person: Scott McPhee

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-3: For all of the reciprocal compensation bills that AT&T sent to Big River for Illinois from the initial bill to the most recent bill, please identify the Billing Account numbers, dates, 251(b)(5) and ISP-bound MOUs, and amounts for which AT&T has billed Big River Telephone for reciprocal compensation.

Response: AT&T does not have a record of billing Big River Telephone for reciprocal compensation in Illinois.

Responsible Person: Stan Mensinger

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-4: Admit that in Missouri, AT&T has never billed Big River for reciprocal compensation. If your response is anything other than an unqualified admission, please explain your response in detail and identify the Billing Account numbers, dates, 251(b)(5) and ISP-bound MOUs, and amounts for which AT&T has billed Big River Telephone for reciprocal compensation.

Response: Reciprocal compensation has not been billed to Big River in Missouri.

Responsible Person: Stan Mensinger

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-5: Admit that no traffic has ever been exchanged across any of the choke trunks established by Big River pursuant to any Big River/AT&T ICA. If your response is anything other than an unqualified admission, please explain your response in detail and identify the states, dates, the specific trunk group(s) involved in any such occurrence and produce documentation of such usage.

Response: *** **BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL** Big River has ordered two (2) choke trunks (i.e., one (1) Choke trunk group) for its Indianapolis interconnection in Indiana. This trunk group has not been put to work—it is still in pending status. This group cannot have traffic on it until it has been put to work and Big River's switch has been translated to route Choke calls to the Choke trunk group.

Big River has eleven (11) Choke trunk groups in the Southwest Region, each with two (2) trunks. Of these eleven (11) trunk groups, Big River has one (1) in Kansas, two (2) in Missouri, two (2) in Oklahoma, and six (6) in Texas.

One of Big River's Texas Choke groups is in the Wichita, Texas exchange. On Monday, December 5, 2011, the most recent servicing data for this group, with two working trunks, was pulled. This data shows that Big River has routed enough traffic over this group to warrant a current trunk requirement of five (5) trunks and a Busy Season Trunk Requirement of five (5) trunks. Big River is the only carrier that is capable of routing traffic to this trunk group.

While none of the other Big River Choke trunks in the Southwestern Region are passing traffic, Big River is routing traffic over its Wichita, Texas Choke group. It is possible that the other ten (10) groups have not been turned on in Big River's switch. **END CONFIDENTIAL *****

Responsible Person: Jim Hamiter

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-6: Admit that under the interim Indiana ICA between AT&T and Big River, AT&T has not provided to Big River any mass calling NXXs for the routing of mass calling traffic. If your response is anything other than an unqualified admission, please state the date when the mass calling NXXs were provided to Big River and provide the documentation evidencing said communication from AT&T to Big River.

Response: Generally speaking, AT&T does not provide the mass calling/choke NXXs, either verbally or in email, unless asked for by the CLEC. However, AT&T does provide resources for the CLEC to obtain mass calling/Choke NPA-NXXs, as well as other network information, via the CLEC Online website. Typically, the CLEC is informed of the CLEC on-line website during the Network Interconnection Team (“NIT”) implementation meeting. If the CLEC specifically requests a listing of the Choke NPA-NXXs—during this meeting or at any other time—AT&T will provide that information.

In addition to providing access to these Choke NXXs via CLEC Online, AT&T also provides this and other information in the Reverse Network Information Sheet (“NIS”), as a convenience. The Reverse NIS is the document that all CLECs use to identify information about the AT&T Network, including AT&T Indiana, so that they may interconnect. It includes things such as CLLI Codes, point codes, and Mass Calling NXXs.

Reverse NIS information for the Midwest Region, which includes AT&T Indiana, is obtainable on the following website:

<https://clec.att.com/clec/hb/shell.cfm?section=2135&hb=1504>

However, Big River must translate its switch for any code its customers might dial. The industry standard for identifying mass calling NXXs for this purpose is the LERG, to which all carriers must refer in order to determine where each NXX should be routed. They are identified properly throughout the Midwest and Southwest Regions as **SSC=M**. AT&T Indiana maintains its NPA-NXXs in the LERG.

On September 15, 2011, Big River met with the AT&T Indiana NIT Lead to discuss Big River’s network architecture and Network Information Sheet (“NIS”). Mr. Schwantner, representing Big River, was in attendance on this call. In this meeting, the NIT Lead discussed the need for a choke group in certain exchanges, and informed Big River of the CLEC On-line website, which lists the information necessary to establishing an interconnection with AT&T Indiana. Big River did not request the Choke NPA-NXX information from the NIT Lead at that time, nor any other person at any other time.

Responsible Person: Jim Hamiter

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-7: Admit that under any existing ICA between any AT&T affiliate and Big River, AT&T has not provided to Big River any mass calling NXXs for the routing of mass calling traffic. If your response is anything other than an unqualified admission, please state the date when the mass calling NXXs were provided to Big River and the documentation evidencing said communication from AT&T to Big River.

Response: Please refer to AT&T Indiana's response to Request 3-6 regarding mass calling NXXs. AT&T has no record of specifically what was verbally conveyed to Big River regarding NPA-NXXs. However, AT&T has provided to Big River the same resources it provides to all CLECs, which enables Big River to ascertain all NPA-NXX information—including Choke NPA-NXXs.

Responsible Person: Jim Hamiter

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-8: State the number of choke trunks established by any CLEC pursuant to an ICA with AT&T in Indiana that have been used for mass calling traffic in the past 12 months.

Response: Four (4) CLECs, not including Big River, have established HVCI Choke trunks within the last 12 months as a result of an ICA with AT&T Indiana—two (2) CLECs in LATA 336 and two (2) CLECs in LATA 330. While each of these CLECs have agreed to established two (2) choke trunks in their respective choke trunk groups for a total of eight (8) choke trunks in Indiana, only two CLECs have issued orders and have working trunks in place at this time. The remaining two CLECs have not yet issued orders for their respective choke groups because they have only very recently had their kick-off meetings.

Of the two working CLEC choke groups that have been establish and are in service, one has been in service since October 2011 and has not had live traffic routed to it yet. The other CLEC choke trunk group has been in service since 2008, and has a record of sporadic choke traffic on it.

Big River, the fifth CLEC to establish choke trunks within the last 12 months, has ordered one choke trunk group. That group is still in pending status.

Currently, there are 38 working CLEC HVCI choke groups (not counting the one Big River has ordered), which were established pursuant to an ICA with AT&T Indiana. There are 98 total trunks working on these groups. Of the 38 working CLEC HVCI choke groups, 5 have carried choke traffic in the last year.

Responsible Person: Jim Hamiter

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-9: State the number of choke trunks established by any CLEC pursuant to an ICA with AT&T in Indiana, the number of CLECs to whom AT&T has provided NXXs for the routing of mass calling traffic, and the amount of gross revenue that AT&T has collected in the past 12 months in Indiana from all CLECs combined for choke trunks.

Response: Regarding the number of choke trunks established by any CLEC pursuant to an ICA with AT&T in Indiana, please refer to the response to Request 3-8.

In regard to the number of CLECs to whom AT&T has provided NXXs for the routing of mass calling traffic, AT&T does not have any record of that beyond the four (4) most recent CLECs with whom AT&T Indiana has interconnected within the last 12 months. Of the four (4) CLECs mentioned in the response to request 3-8, only one CLEC requested a listing of the NPA-NXXs from AT&T Indiana by email. AT&T Indiana responded to this CLEC's request by providing a list of the AT&T Indiana Choke NPA-NXXs. See also response to number 3-6. AT&T Indiana does not separately track gross revenue from mass calling/choke trunk groups and objects to performing a special analysis to obtain such data.

Responsible Person: Jim Hamiter

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-10: Referencing Mr. Currie's Rebuttal Testimony at page 2, lines 6-10, please quantify the following individual costs that are included in the cost-based tandem switching rate element for transit calls in addition to tandem switching costs:

- a. traffic measurement costs
- b. signaling network costs
- c. transit-specific billing costs

Response: See page 4 of "(BR-ATT 1-1) 40611 Compliance Transit (CONFIDENTIAL).pdf," which was previously provided, for the confidential traffic measurement costs, signaling network costs and transit-specific billing costs associated with the tandem switching rate element for transit calling. Traffic measurement costs, identified as "MEAS.," and signaling network costs, identified as "SS7," are associated with call setup and are shown on a per message basis. Transit-specific billing costs, which are shown on a minute basis, consist of four components called "Billing Expense," "Cust. Bill. Account.," "ITAC/CAMPS/M&P," and "ITAC Systems."

Responsible Person: Kent Currie

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Cause No. 44078-INT 01
Big River Telephone Company 3rd Set Of Data Requests To AT&T Indiana

Request 3-11: For each of the costs identified in response to Request 3-10, state the date when each cost was identified and explain how said cost was quantified.

Response: The date when each cost was identified in response to Request 3-10 is unknown. Traffic measurement and signaling network costs were quantified through the use of a cost tool developed by Bellcore called Network Cost Analysis Tool. The quantification of transit-specific billing costs are provided at pages 9-14 of “(BR-ATT 1-1) 40611 Compliance Transit (CONFIDENTIAL).pdf” and are based on the expenses associated with transit billing activities.

Responsible Person: Kent Currie

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I caused copies of the foregoing document to be served 12th day of December, 2011, on the following persons via electronic mail:

Nikki G. Shoultz
Bose McKinney & Evans
111 Monument Circle, Suite 2700
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-684-5242
Fax: 317-223-0242
nshoultz@boselaw.com

Brian C. Howe
12444 Powerscourt Drive,
Suite 270
St Louis, MO 63131
314-225-2215
Fax: 314-225-2521
bhowe@bigrivertelephone.com

Karol Krohn
Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
Indiana Government Center North
100 North Senate Ave., Room N501
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2208
infomgt@oucc.in.gov
kkrohn@oucc.in.gov

/s/ J. Tyson Covey