

Exhibit No:  
Issues:  
Witness: Michael D. Silver  
Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony  
Sponsoring Party: Southwestern Bell  
Telephone, L.P., d/b/a/  
SBC Missouri  
Case No: TO-2005-0336

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE, L.P.,  
d/b/a SBC MISSOURI

CASE NO. TO-2005-0336

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MICHAEL D. SILVER

Chicago, Illinois  
May 9, 2005

1 project in-depth, and determine specifically all the steps that will be required to  
2 complete the project. Wiltel's proposed requirement that the analysis be  
3 completed in 30 days would create the likelihood that SBC Missouri would not be  
4 able to complete the analysis necessary to properly scope out the project. The  
5 Commission should adopt SBC Missouri's proposal of 90 days (which is the same  
6 as in the expiring M2A) to provide the final BFR quote following acceptance of  
7 the preliminary quote from Wiltel.

8 It should be stressed that SBC Missouri's proposed language is for up to  
9 90 days, which means that if SBC Missouri completes the analysis in a shorter  
10 time frame, it will provide Wiltel the quote at that time. SBC Missouri will not  
11 wait the full 90 days if the quote is available earlier.

12 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THIS WILTEL UNE ISSUE 23?**

13 A. Wiltel is proposing language that would require SBC Missouri to begin the clock  
14 on a BFR request if Wiltel has submitted a BFR that is "materially complete".  
15 SBC Missouri objects to this proposal.

16 **Q. WHY DOES SBC MISSOURI OBJECT TO WILTEL'S PROPOSED**  
17 **LANGUAGE? [WILTEL UNE ISSUE 23]**

18 A. The reference to "materially complete" is much too vague. The submission of a  
19 complete BFR from a CLEC is the basis for starting the clock on the BFR  
20 timeframes. Who makes the determination as to what is materially complete? If  
21 Wiltel leaves off the CLLI code for one end of a UNE loop but has all the other  
22 information necessary to process the request for a commingling arrangement,  
23 would that be materially complete? Omitting such information would be critical  
24 in making a determination if such a facility exist that loop meets the eligibility  
25 requirements, and would render SBC Missouri helpless in completing its