FILED November 05, 2008 Data Center Missouri Public Service Commission

Exhibit No.: Issue: 4(a), 4(b), 6, 8 and 13 Witness: Peggy Giaminetti Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony Sponsoring Party: Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC Case No.: TO-2009-0037 Date Testimony Prepared: September 30, 2008

)

)

)

)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Petition of Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement Between CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC And Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC.

Case No. TO-2009-0037

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF PEGGY GIAMINETTI ON BEHALF OF CHARTER FIBERLINK-MISSOURI, LLC

September 26, 2008

Case No(s). To - Roog-Date Lo - Ref Rptr -

DWT 11864147v1 0108550-000206

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

)

)

)

In the Matter of the Petition of Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement Between CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC And Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC.

Case No. TO-2009-0037

AFFIDAVIT OF PEGGY GIAMINETTI

STATE OF MISSOURI

COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS

Peggy Giaminetti, being first duly sworn on her oath, states:

) ss.

1. My name is Peggy Giaminetti. 1 am presently Vice President, Fiscal Operations and Financial Planning for Charter Communications.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my direct testimony.

I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to 3. the questions therein propounded are true and correct to the best of my personal knowledge, information and belief.

reaminette

Subscribed and sworn before me this $\frac{30}{20}$ day of September, 2008.

SCharcella County, Missouri

Notary Public for

My Commission expanses Chancellor

Notary Public Notary Seal State of Missouri County of Franklin My Commission Expires 03/21/2010 Commission #06503855

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	I	Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Purpose and Summary of Testimony	3
Ш.	Issue 4(a): Should the Agreement Include Terms That Allow One Party to Terminate the Agreement Without Any Oversight, Review, or Approval of Such Action, by the Commission?	4
IV.	Issue 4(b): Should the Agreement Include Terms That Allow One Party to Terminate the Agreement as to a "Specific Operating Area" Without Any Assurance to the Other Party That the Terms of the Agreement Will Continue Uninterrupted With the New LEC That Acquires the Operating Area?	12
V.	Issue 6: Under What Conditions May One Party Demand That The Other Party Provide Deposits, or Assurance of Payments?	15
VI.	Issue 8(a): Should the Bill Payment Terms Related to Interest on Overpaid Amounts be Equitable?	22
	Issue 8(b): Should the Bill Dispute Provisions Ensure That Neither Party Can Improperly Terminate the Agreement in a Manner That Could Impair Service to the Public?	22
VII.	Issue 13 : Should the Parties Agree to a Reasonable Limitation as to the Period of Time By Which Claims Arising Under the Agreement Can be Brought?	30
VIII.	Conclusion	36

DWT 11864147v1 0108550-000206

,

, I

i.

ļ

.

f

1		I. INTRODUCTION
2 3	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
4	A.	My name is Peggy Giaminetti. My business address is 12405 Powerscourt Drive,
5		St. Louis, Missouri, 63131. I am filing this testimony on behalf of Charter.
6		
7 8 9 10	Q.	BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED, AND WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITHIN THE COMPANY?
11	A.	I am a Vice President, and I am responsible for fiscal operations and financial
12		planning at Charter Communications, Inc., and its subsidiary Charter Fiberlink,
13		LLC, the petitioner in this case (collectively "Charter").
14 15 16	Q.	WHAT ARE YOUR DUTIES AT CHARTER?
17	A.	I am responsible for operational reporting and financial analysis of Charter's
18		voice service line of business. In that role various aspects of my responsibilities
19		include the preparation of annual budgets and projections and participation in
20		decision-making on the day-to-day aspects of Charter's voice service operations,
21		in particular as it relates to voice services cost of sales and capital planning.
22		Additionally, I am directly responsible for the audit and validation of all voice
23		service cost of sales invoices and the generation of monthly carrier access
24		billings. I have held this position since November of 2005 and have been fully
25		involved in Charter's voice services deployment. I therefore have a basis to
26		testify to the facts surrounding the disputed issues between Charter and
27		CenturyTel.

28

,

÷

Ì

I

.

.

.

.

!

.

ł

1Q.PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE AND2EDUCATION.

Prior to my employment with Charter, I was employed by NuVox 4 A. Communications, a Missouri CLEC with operations in 16 states, where I held the 5 position of Vice President of Revenue and Cost Assurance. Before joining 6 NuVox, I was the founding financial officer for CoreExpress, an extranet service 7 provider where I was responsible for all of the financial aspects of the start-up 8 organization. In addition to these positions, my career has included various 9 diverse financial roles for several telecommunications ventures including Savvis 10 Communications and Access America Telemanagement. I have a Bachelor of 11 Science degree in Accounting and also a Masters of Business Administration 12 Degree from Maryville University in St. Louis. Additionally, I am a Certified 13 Public Accountant within the State of Missouri. 14

15

18

3

16 Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE ANY STATE 17 REGULATORY COMMISSION?

Yes. I testified before the Missouri Public Service Commission earlier this year 19 Α. in Case No. LC-2008-0049, a proceeding concerning certain contract and billing 20 disputes between Charter and an incumbent local exchange carrier in Missouri. In 21 addition, I recently submitted testimony on behalf of Charter in an arbitration with 22 Solarus (f/k/a Wood County Telephone) before the Wisconsin Public Service 23 Commission, in Docket No. 05-MA-147. I also intend to submit similar 24 25 testimony in other, concurrent arbitrations between Charter and CenturyTel in Missouri and Wisconsin. 26

1		
2 3		II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY
4	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
5	A.	This testimony is offered to explain Charter's position on disputed issues
6		numbered 4(a), 4(b), 6, 8 and 13 of this arbitration.
7		
8	Q.	DO YOU OFFER TESTIMONY ON OTHER DISPUTED ISSUES?
9	А.	No. My colleagues and experts from QSI Consulting will be submitting separate
10		testimony on other issues.
11 12	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.
13 14	А.	In my testimony, I will explain under what limited circumstances a party should
15		be permitted to terminate the interconnection agreement (the "Agreement"), and
16		why neither party should be able to terminate, as to a specific operating area
17		unless the new LEC that acquires operations assumes the terms of the Agreement.
18		This testimony will also address the conditions upon which a party may
19		reasonably require the other party to provide a deposit, or other assurance of
20		payment. Moreover, I will explain why bill payment terms, and refunds, should
21		be equitable, and how bill disputes should be resolved through the dispute
22		resolution process. Lastly, I will illustrate the history of problems that Charter
23		has with CenturyTel's invoices.
24		
25		

.

;

-

-

.

1

2 3 4

1

- 5
- 6 7

8

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN CHARTER'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE.

Ш.

9 A. Charter's position is that the Agreement should include language that allows for

ISSUE 4(A):

SHOULD THE AGREEMENT INCLUDE TERMS THAT ALLOW ONE

PARTY TO TERMINATE THE AGREEMENT WITHOUT ANY

OVERSIGHT, REVIEW, OR APPROVAL OF SUCH ACTION, BY THE

COMMISSION?

10 the potential termination of the Agreement only under certain circumstances.

11 Specifically, termination should occur only after this Commission has reviewed

- 12 the terms of the potential termination, and its impact on subscribers, and thereafter
- 13 orders, or approves, the termination.
- 14

Q. PLEASE PROVIDE CHARTER'S PROPOSED LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE.

17

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38 39

18 A. Charter's proposed language is as follows:

2.6 <u>Suspension or Termination Upon Default</u>. Either Party may suspend or terminate this Agreement, in whole or in part, in the event of a Default (defined below) by the other Party; *provided, however*, that the non-defaulting Party has complied with the dispute resolution provisions of this Agreement, including Section 20.

- "Default" is defined to include:
 - (a) A Party's insolvency or the initiation of bankruptcy or receivership proceedings by or against the Party; or

(b) The final revocation by the Commission of a Party's Certificate of Operating Authority and transition of End Users to another carrier, or

(c) A decision pursuant to the Formal Dispute Resolution provisions of Section 20 of this Agreement that a Party has materially breached any of the terms or conditions hereof, except that in no event should termination occur unless so ordered by the Commission, or

(d) Failure of a Party to pay undisputed amounts or to properly dispute unpaid amounts in accordance with Section 9, and subject to either Party invoking its rights under Section 20, Dispute Resolution, except that in no event should termination occur unless so ordered by the Commission.

Q. PLEASE PROVIDE CENTURYTEL'S LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE. 2 3 4 A. CenturyTel's proposed language is as follows: 5 2.6 Suspension or Termination Upon Default. Either Party may suspend or terminate this Agreement, in whole or in part, in the event of a Default (defined 6 7 below) by the other Party; provided, however, that the non-defaulting Party notifies the defaulting Party in writing of the Default and the defaulting Party 8 9 does not cure the Default within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of written notice thereof. Following CenturyTel's notice to **CLEC of its Default, 10 CenturyTel shall not be required to process new service orders until the Default 11 12 is timely cured. "Default" is defined to include: 13 14 (a) A Party's insolvency or the initiation of bankruptcy or receivership proceedings by or against the Party; or 15 The revocation by the Commission of a Party's Certificate of Operating 16 (b) 17 Authority, or (c) <u>A Party's violation of any material term or condition of the Agreement;</u> or 18 19 (d) <u>A Party's refusal or failure in any material respect properly to perform its</u> 20 obligations under this Agreement, including but not limited to its refusal or failure to pay undisputed charges (pursuant to Section 9) within thirty (30) 21 22 calendar days after the bill date. 23 24 Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S POSITION DIFFER FROM CENTURYTEL'S 25 **POSITION?** 26 27 CenturyTel proposes that the Agreement allow for termination upon one of 28 Α. 29 several pre-defined events of default, including where one party has "materially breached" any term or condition, or where a bill dispute has arisen. Under this 30 proposal either party could unilaterally terminate the Agreement if that party 31 believed the other party had "materially breached" any term or condition. Thus, 32 CenturyTel does not believe that this Commission should be involved in any 33 event concerning the termination of this Agreement. That is the primary dispute 34 35 between the parties: whether the Agreement should include language that would allow for unilateral termination, as CenturyTel proposes; or, whether it should 36 include terms that ensures the Commission can play a role in any termination 37

1

2

process to so that no actions taken by either party will adversely affect subscribers, as Charter proposes.

3

4

1

ļ

Q. WHAT IS CHARTER'S CONCERN WITH CENTURYTEL'S POSITION?

5 A. Charter's concern with CenturyTel's proposal is that the Agreement could be 6 unilaterally terminated in a manner that could adversely affect subscribers of one, 7 or both, parties. If the Agreement were terminated while subscribers were still 8 relying upon the physical connections used to send and receive calls between the 9 parties' networks, it would be possible that subscribers could lose service 10 altogether, or that some calls would fail because of the termination.

11

12 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

A. To understand Charter's position one must recognize that interconnection agreements are not standard commercial contracts. Instead, these agreements are unique, in that they establish the basis for two carriers to interconnect their respective networks for the express purpose of exchanging voice communications traffic (i.e. voice calls). In addition, these agreements are not the product of typical arms-length negotiations, as is true with commercial negotiations. Instead, interconnection agreements are mandated by Section 251 of the Act.

20

21 Q. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THE BASIC PURPOSE OF THESE **AGREEMENTS?** 22 23 24 Å. Interconnection entails the connectivity of two parties' communications networks

for the purpose of exchanging traffic. Generally speaking, that connectivity

1		entails the physical connection of networks, and the establishment of call paths
2		between the parties' respective switches and related equipment. Once
3		connectivity of the networks is established, the two carriers will begin exchanging
4		traffic. In other words, voice calls will be sent from one carrier's subscribers to
5		the other carrier's subscribers. Practically speaking, this means that CenturyTel
6		subscribers will be calling Charter subscribers, and vice versa.
7		
8	Q.	WHY IS THIS INTERCONNECTION IMPORTANT?
9	A.	Because once the networks are interconnected, each party's subscribers rely upon
10		the physical connection, and call paths, to send calls to and from one another.
11		This basic functionality, the ability to pick up your handset and place a voice call
12		to any other person on the public switched telephone network (PSTN), is one of
13		the most important aspects of physical interconnection mandated by Section 251
14		of the Act.
15		
16 17 18 19 20	Q.	WHY IS IT IMPORTANT THAT THIS AGREEMENT INCLUDE A TERMINATION PROCESS THAT IS DIFFERENT FROM THE PROCESS ONE MIGHT EXPECT TO SEE IN OTHER COMMERCIAL CONTRACTS?
20	А.	Because unilateral termination of an interconnection agreement, without
22		intermediary steps to ensure subscribers are protected, would create serious
23		problems for both parties' subscribers.
24		
25	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN.

i

|

ļ

ł

ł

ī

1

ļ

ł

T.

I

÷.

i.

•

,

- 1 Α. Remember, these agreements establish the framework, and fundamental obligations, that provide both parties' subscribers the ability to send calls to, and 2 3 receive calls from, the PSTN. The parties work hard to ensure that this critical functionality remains in place at all times. That is why this Agreement can not be 4 unilaterally terminated, like most commercial contracts, without some process to 5 ensure calls are not "dropped." Under most commercial contracts, the contracting 6 7 parties recognize that there may be circumstances where one party should be able to unilaterally terminate the agreement, and be excused from any further 8 9 obligation to perform. So, for instance, if a supplier of widgets contracted with a manufacturing firm, the contract may include a clause that allows the widget 10 supplier to discontinue delivery of its products, and unilaterally terminate the 11 agreement, if the manufacturing company failed to fulfill its terms of the bargain. 12 If that happened, then it would not be unreasonable for the widget supplier to 13 cease delivery of its goods, and unilaterally terminate the contract. The result 14 15 would likely have an impact on the manufacturer, and maybe its customers, in that delivery of the product may be delayed, or prices may increase. 16
- 17

20

18 Q. BUT THERE WOULD BE A DIFFERENT RESULT IF THIS 19 INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WERE TERMINATED?

A. Yes, if the same events occurred between two carriers who have *interconnected* their networks, the non-breaching party could not simply unilaterally terminate the agreement and "walk away" – precisely because of the essential PSTN access that is afforded by that interconnection. The reason is clear, if the non-breaching party unilaterally terminated an interconnection agreement, or simply "walked

away" from its obligations under an interconnection agreement, then both parties' subscribers could be affected in a negative manner. In that circumstance, the breaching party's subscribers would lose all access to the PSTN, and the nonbreaching party's subscribers would not be able to call the other party's subscribers. Thus, in this way, subscribers would be harmed, as a result of the actions of one party. That result is precisely what Charter's proposal is intended to avoid.

- 8
- 9 10 11

1

Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S PROPOSAL ENSURE THAT SUBSCRIBERS WILL NOT BE HARMED IF THE AGREEMENT WERE TERMINATED?

A. Charter's proposal on this issue would ensure that each party's subscribers are not 12 harmed, and therefore ensure that in the unlikely event of termination, Missouri 13 consumers are not adversely affected. Under Charter's proposal, any finding of a 14 default by one party would be predicated on the other party's ability to invoke the 15 16 dispute resolution processes of the Agreement. That would trigger a process whereby the parties meet to discuss, and try to resolve, disputes that could lead to 17 service-affecting termination of the Agreement. Moreover, Charter's proposal 18 19 also includes, in certain circumstances, the concept that potential termination of 20 the Agreement will not occur unless, or until, the Commission specifically approved such action. 21

- 22
- 23
- 24

1Q.HOW DOESCOMMISSIONOVERSIGHTENSURETHAT2SUBSCRIBERS WILL NOT BE HARMED?

Charter's proposal would require either party to escalate the most significant 4 Α. 5 disputes to the Commission. If the Commission determined that one party had 6 breached the agreement, and that termination of the Agreement was appropriate, it 7 could so direct the parties to terminate the Agreement in a manner that would not harm subscribers. For example, the Commission might order the breaching party 8 9 to provide notice to its subscribers, so that they could move to a new provider. 10 Or, the Commission might direct the parties to conduct certain pre-termination 11 coordinated activities to ensure that all phone numbers are ported off of the breaching party's network. These are just two examples of the type of action that 12 13 this Commission might take if the Agreement were terminated. Also, I 14 understand that there is a process under existing state law which establishes a process to resolve disputes arising out of interconnection agreements. 15 Our counsel has explained to me that the Commission's regulations (Rule 4 C.S.R. 16 17 240-2.070) establish procedures for the Commission to resolve disputes arising 18 under, or pertaining to, interconnection agreements approved by the Commission. 19 As I understand it, this rule provides for dispute resolution concerning the 20 interpretation of terms and conditions, implementation of activities contemplated in the interconnection agreement (including rates), and enforcement of terms and 21 conditions in such interconnection agreements. 22

23

3

1 Q. WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF CHARTER'S PROPOSAL?

A. The benefits are obvious. First, if the Commission is involved in any termination
process, it would certainly consider the potential impact on Missouri consumers
(including each party's subscribers), and order any necessary intermediary steps
to ensure that those consumers were not adversely affected.

6 Second, Charter's proposal allows for termination of the Agreement (which 7 CenturyTel demands), but at the same time ensures that Missouri consumers will 8 not be harmed by disputes between the parties to the Agreement (which Charter 9 insists upon). In this way, Charter's proposal accommodates CenturyTel's 10 demands, while at the same time ensuring that consumers, especially the parties' 11 subscribers, are not harmed.

Third, Charter's proposal is consistent with the practice in the industry, and the actual experience of both parties. With respect to the experience of both parties, Charter has never terminated any of its interconnection agreements with another carrier. Nor has any other carrier terminated their interconnection agreements with Charter.

17

19

1

18 Q. WHAT RESULT DOES CHARTER SEEK ON THIS ISSUE?

A. Charter seeks the Commission's assent to the principle that it must oversee any potentially subscriber-affecting issues that arise out of the termination of the interconnection agreement between CenturyTel and Charter. Further, to achieve that result, the Commission should order the parties to adopt Charter's proposed contract language for this disputed issue.

IV. ISSUE 4(B): SHOULD THE AGREEMENT INCLUDE TERMS THAT ALLOW ONE PARTY TO TERMINATE THE AGREEMENT AS TO A "SPECIFIC OPERATING AREA" WITHOUT ANY ASSURANCE TO THE OTHER PARTY THAT THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT WILL CONTINUE UNINTERRUPTED WITH THE NEW LEC THAT ACQUIRES THE OPERATING AREA?

10 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN CHARTER'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE.

A. Charter's position is that neither party should be able to terminate the interconnection agreement, as to a specific operating area, or service area, unless the third-party entity that is acquiring operations in that area assumes the terms of the Agreement. In addition, that process should also be subject to a notice process, so that the party that is not involved in the transaction would receive notice of the planned transaction.

18

21

23 24

1

2

3.

4 5

6

7 8 9

11

Q. PLEASE PROVIDE CHARTER'S PROPOSED LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE.

- 22 A. Charter's proposed language is as follows:
 - 2.7 Termination Upon Sale.

25 Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained herein, a Party may 26 terminate this Agreement as to a specific operating area or portion thereof if such 27 Party sells or otherwise transfers the area or portion thereof to a non-affiliate. 28 The right of termination provided herein is expressly conditioned upon, and 29 subject to, unconditional and prompt acceptance of the terms of this Agreement by the non-affiliated Party. The selling or transferring Party shall 30 provide the other Party with at least ninety (90) calendar days' prior written 31 32 notice of such termination, which shall be effective on the date the non-Affiliated Party provides formal, written notice of its acceptance and 33 34 assumption of the rights, obligations, and duties of the Party selling or 35 transferring the area, and the other Party being reasonably satisfied that the 36 Party acquiring the area is able to fulfill the obligations hereunder. Such 37 acceptance and assumption shall be memorialized in a form mutually agreed 38 upon by both Parties. Notwithstanding termination of this Agreement as to a 39 specific operating area, this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect in the 40 remaining operating areas.

1	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE CENTURYTEL'S LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE.
2 3	A.	CenturyTel's proposed language is as follows:
4 5		2.7 <u>Termination Upon Sale.</u>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained herein, a Party may terminate this Agreement as to a specific operating area or portion thereof if such Party sells or otherwise transfers the area or portion thereof to a non-affiliate. The selling or transferring Party shall provide the other Party with at least ninety (90) calendar days' prior written notice of such termination, which shall be effective on the date <u>specified in the notice</u> . Notwithstanding termination of this Agreement as to a specific operating area, this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect in the remaining operating areas. <u>The Parties agree to abide by</u> <u>any applicable Commission Order regarding such sale or transfer.</u>
17	Q.	WHAT IS CENTURYTEL'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE?
18	A.	CenturyTel believes that it should be permitted to "terminate" the agreement "as
19		to a specific operating area, or portion thereof, if it intends to sell off or transfer
20		its operations to a non-affiliate. The only protections (if you can call them that)
21		which CenturyTel would provide is that the selling party must provide 90 days
22		notice of the termination.
23		
24	Q.	WHAT IS THE CONCERN WITH CENTURYTEL'S PROPOSAL?
25	Α.	Charter's concern is that CenturyTel could use this provision to terminate the
26		contract and discontinue interconnection arrangements in certain locations.
27		CenturyTel clearly wants this language in the agreement to allow it to sell certain
28		subsidiaries (or exchanges) to other entities. If this language were accepted, that
29		would mean that CenturyTel could do so, and then simply terminate the
30		agreement with Charter for that particular area.
31		

,

-

I

ł

ļ

I

;

ļ

T

1Q.IF CENTURYTEL'S PROPOSAL IS ADOPTED, WHAT POTENTIAL2PROBLEMS COULD CHARTER FACE?

If CenturyTel's language is adopted, and CenturyTel did sell one of its A. 4 subsidiaries, there are several very problematic potential outcomes. First, if 5 Century Tel relied upon this language to sell the subsidiary, it could terminate the 6 Agreement with Charter. That, in turn, would leave Charter without any 7 connection to the public switched telephone network, and without any means of 8 9 ensuring that its subscribers' phone calls can be delivered to, or received from, other carriers. Second, once the Agreement was terminated, that would also force 10 Charter to have to negotiate a new agreement with the entity that acquired the 11 CenturyTel subsidiary. So, Charter would therefore be forced to negotiate an 12 entirely new agreement, even though it had already committed significant 13 resources negotiating and arbitrating this Agreement. 14

15

3

16 17

18

ł

Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S PROPOSAL PROTECT AGAINST THE POTENTIAL PROBLEMS YOU HAVE JUST DESCRIBED?

Charter's proposal would not lead to these problems because it reasonably 19 Α. conditions CenturyTel's right to sell its subsidiary. The condition that Charter 20 proposes is that the subsidiary must accept the terms of the Agreement (the rights, 21 obligations, and duties of the selling party) as a condition of the sale. In other 22 words, if an entity acquires a CenturyTel subsidiary operating in a specific service 23 area, then that entity would have to agree to continue interconnection 24 arrangements with Charter, under the terms of the Agreement between Charter 25 and CenturyTel. 26

Q. WHAT RESULT DOES CHARTER SEEK ON THIS ISSUE? 1 2 A. Charter requests that the Commission adopt Charter's proposed language 3 requiring that any sale of a subsidiary operating in a specific operating, or service, 4 5 area would be conditioned on the acquiring entity's assumption of the terms of the 6 current agreement between Charter and CenturyTel in that area. That will ensure 7 that CenturyTel can not simply walk away from its contract obligations with Charter such that Charter is unable to interconnect with the PSTN. It will also 8 ensure that Charter is not put in the position of being forced to negotiate a new 9 agreement with the acquiring entity prior to the expiration of this agreement. 10 11 ISSUE 6: **V**. 12 UNDER WHAT CONDITIONS MAY ONE PARTY DEMAND THAT THE 13 **OTHER PARTY PROVIDE DEPOSITS, OR ASSURANCE OF** 14 **PAYMENTS?** 15 16 PLEASE EXPLAIN CHARTER'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE. Q. 17 18 Charter's position is that the deposit provisions of this agreement should be 19 Α. reasonable, and should include specific criteria that will be used to determine 20 when Charter will be required to provide a deposit or assurance of payment, rather 21 than simply leaving those decisions to CenturyTel's discretion. For example, 22 Charter should only be required to provide a deposit upon a specific, pre-defined 23 24 event, not simply when CenturyTel deems it necessary. 25 PLEASE PROVIDE CHARTER'S PROPOSED LANGUAGE ON THIS Q. 26 **ISSUE.** 27 28 Charter's proposed language is as follows: 29 Α.

6. ASSURANCE OF PAYMENT

6.1 To the extent Charter may not have already established and maintained satisfactory credit with CenturyTel affiliates, CenturyTel may request Charter to provide to CenturyTel a deposit for or an adequate assurance of payment of amounts due (or to become due) to CenturyTel hereunder.

6.1.1 When a Deposit/Assurance of Payment Is Requested. Such deposit or assurance of payment of charges may be requested by CenturyTel when Charter fails to timely pay (as defined by Section 9 of this Agreement, an undisputed invoice rendered by CenturyTel) or if Charter has commenced a voluntary case (or has had a case commenced against it) under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code or any other law relating to bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, winding-up composition or adjustment of debts or the like, has made an assignment for the benefit of creditors or is subject to a receivership or similar proceeding. Upon the conclusion of this review, if CenturyTel continues to require an additional security deposit, at Charter's request, CenturyTel will provide a written explanation to Charter.

6.1.2 The Parties will work together to determine the need for or amount of a reasonable initial or increase in deposit. If the Parties are unable to agree, then either Party may initiate dispute resolution proceedings pursuant to Section 20 of this Agreement. The Parties agree that any decision ordered by the Commission will be binding for the state covered by this Agreement. In the case of a disputed initial deposit, the Parties acknowledge that CenturyTel will be required to accept any orders for service during the time in which the deposit dispute is ongoing. CenturyTel may not terminate service to Charter on the basis of any dispute arising between the Parties concerning any security deposits that may be required of Charter.

6.2 <u>Calculating the Amount of Deposit/Assurance of Payment.</u> Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, such deposit will be calculated based on the total of two (2) months of CenturyTel's charges to Charter (including, but not limited to, both recurring and non-recurring charges), from the previous six (6) month period.

6.3 <u>Modifying the Amount of Deposit/Assurance of Payment.</u> CenturyTel reserves the right to request an additional amount of the deposit or assurance of payment required of Charter if Charter is repeatedly delinquent in making its payments, or Charter is being reconnected after a disconnection of service or discontinuance of the processing of orders by CenturyTel due to Charter's previous non-payment. "Repeatedly delinquent" means any non-disputed payment received thirty (30) calendar days or more after the bill due date, three (3) or more times during a twelve (12) month period.

46 Q. PLEASE PROVIDE CENTURYTEL'S LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE.

A. CenturyTel's proposed language is as follows:

6. ASSURANCE OF PAYMENT

6.1 To the extent Charter may not have already established and maintained satisfactory credit with CenturyTel affiliates, CenturyTel may request Charter to provide to CenturyTel a deposit for or an adequate assurance of payment of amounts due (or to become due) to CenturyTel hereunder.

6.1.1 When a Deposit/Assurance of Payment Is Requested. Such deposit or assurance of payment of charges may be requested by CenturyTel <u>based on</u> <u>CenturyTel's analysis of the CenturyTel Credit Application ("Credit</u> <u>Application") and other relevant information regarding Charter's credit and</u> <u>financial condition. In determining whether an additional security deposit is</u> <u>required, CenturyTel may request an updated Credit Application and will review</u> <u>Charter's credit rating and report details, any documentation relative to</u> <u>bankruptcy, insolvency or similar proceeding, Charter's financial information.</u> Upon the conclusion of this review, if CenturyTel continues to require an additional security deposit, at Charter's request, CenturyTel will provide a written explanation to Charter.

6.1.2 The Parties will work together to determine the need for or amount of a reasonable initial or increase in deposit. If the Parties are unable to agree, then <u>Charter must file a petition for resolution of the dispute.</u> Such petition shall be <u>filed with the Commission</u>. The Parties agree that any decision ordered by the Commission will be binding for the state covered by this Agreement. In the case of a disputed initial deposit, the Parties acknowledge that CenturyTel will <u>not</u> be required to accept any orders for service <u>until such time as the requested</u> deposit is <u>paid or the</u> dispute is <u>settled</u>. In the event Charter fails to file a petition with the Commission or pay the disputed deposit within 30 days of the request for an additional deposit, then CenturyTel may terminate service to Charter in accordance with Sec. 2 and any security deposits <u>will be applied to Charter's account</u>.

6.2 Calculating the Amount of Deposit/Assurance of Payment. Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, such deposit will be calculated based on the greater of (1) CenturyTel's estimated two-month charges to Charter (including, but not limited to, both recurring and non-recurring charges) using Charter's forecast of interconnection facilities and any other facilities or services to be ordered from CenturyTel, or (2) \$5,000. If Charter does not provide a forecast of its facility or service demand under this Agreement, Charter shall provide, upon CenturyTel's request, a deposit or assurance of payment of charges in an amount of \$5000.

6.3 <u>Modifying the Amount of Deposit/Assurance of Payment.</u> CenturyTel reserves the right to request an additional amount of the deposit or assurance of payment required of Charter if Charter is repeatedly delinquent in making its payments, or Charter is being reconnected after a disconnection of service or discontinuance of the processing of orders by CenturyTel due to Charter's previous non-payment, or when conditions otherwise justify such action based on actual billing history and/or the credit rating of Charter. "Repeatedly delinquent"

1 2		means any non-disputed payment received thirty (30) calendar days or more after the bill due date, three (3) or more times during a twelve (12) month period.
3 4 5	Q.	WHAT IS CENTURYTEL'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE?
5 6	A.	In contrast to Charter's proposal, CenturyTel has proposed language that would
7		give CenturyTel the unilateral right to decide, and demand: when Charter must
8		provide a deposit; the amount of the deposit; and when the deposit should be
9		modified, or adjusted.
10		
11 12 13	Q.	PLEASE IDENTIFY THOSE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS THAT RAISE THESE CONCERNS.
14	A.	There are various subsections in Section 6 where CenturyTel has proposed
15		language which raises these concerns, specifically Sections 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.2, and
16		6.3.
17		
18 19	Q.	WHAT IS THE CONCERN WITH SECTION 6.1.1?
20	А.	The concern with Section 6.1.1, is that it gives CenturyTel the right to demand a
21		deposit "based on CenturyTel's analysis of the CenturyTel Credit Application and
22		other relevant information regarding Charter's financial condition." Our
23		concern with this language is that it gives CenturyTel undue discretion to
24		determine when a deposit would be required. Although we understand what a
25		credit application entails, CenturyTel gives no additional information concerning
26		what it believes to be "other relevant information." The phrase is so ambiguous,
27		and open-ended, that it could be construed as giving CenturyTel the right to
28		demand any type of additional information which may, or may not, be relevant to

_

٠

1

ı.

1		the assessment of a deposit. Charter's proposal, in contrast, is that the deposit
2		requirement is triggered by specific events which suggest the need for greater
3		assurance. Specifically, Charter proposes that the deposit be keyed to a failure to
4		timely pay, or a bankruptcy event. Both circumstances are concrete, verifiable
5		facts, which are the appropriate criteria for requiring a deposit.
6		
7	Q.	WHAT IS THE CONCERN WITH SECTION 6.1.2?
8 9	А.	This provision raises the question of how the parties should resolve disputes about
10		the amount of any necessary deposit. Charter's view is that disputes concerning
11		deposits should be resolved through the dispute resolution processes in the
12		agreement. CenturyTel, however, proposes that if the parties are unable to agree
13		upon the proper deposit amount, then "Charter must file a petition for resolution
14		of the dispute with the Commission." This language, in a subtle manner, shifts
15		the burden of proof from CenturyTel to Charter. Normally, a company
16		demanding a deposit would be required to explain why the deposit is necessary,
17		and whether the amount is reasonable. However, in this instance, CenturyTel
18		effectively shifts that burden by forcing Charter to prove that a deposit is not
19		required, and that the amount is not reasonable. This language creates an implicit
20		presumption that CenturyTel's deposit amount is reasonable, and forces Charter
21		to disprove that presumption.

22

24

i

ļ

Т

3

i

23 Q. ARE THERE OTHER CONCERNS WITH SECTION 6.1.2?

25 A. Yes, the most significant concern we have with this section is the language at the

end of that section offered by CenturyTel. Specifically, CenturyTel proposes the 1 following language: 2 3 In the event Charter fails to file a petition with the Commission or 4 pay the disputed deposit within 30 days of the request for an additional deposit, then CenturyTel may terminate service to 5 6 Charter in accordance with Section 2 and any security deposits will be applied to Charter's account.¹ 7 8 9 Thus, CenturyTel would have the right to simply stop porting numbers, or including directory listing requests, until Charter pays the deposit (or petitions the 10 11 Commission). In this way, CenturyTel will have built in to the contract preestablished "leverage" because they may simply decline to perform their 12 contractual obligations until Charter provides the deposit, or petitions the 13 Commission. It is not reasonable to allow one party to obtain that kind of 14 15 leverage over these matters. If a dispute did arise, and CenturyTel declined to 16 provide number porting, or some other service to Charter, end users could be adversely affected, and competition thwarted. 17 18 Q. WHAT IS THE CONCERN WITH SECTION 6.2? 19 20

A. The concern here is that CenturyTel is demanding an unnecessarily complicated formula for determining the deposit amount. In contrast, Charter's proposal clearly establishes that the deposit amount will be based on the total of two (2) months of previous billings to Charter, and that those previous two months should be drawn from the last six month period. That formula is simple, easily administered, and represents a fair approximation of the potential quantity of

¹ See Joint DPL, Issue 6 (proposed language of Century Tel).

1

service requests that Charter may submit to CenturyTel.

2

3 4

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCERNS WITH SECTION 6.3?

A. Yes. Our primary concern with CenturyTel's language in that section is that it
would give CenturyTel the unilateral right to modify the amount of deposits that
may be required. CenturyTel's language would give it the right to unilaterally
modify the deposit amount "when conditions otherwise justify such actions..."
That raises the obvious question of what "conditions" would CenturyTel rely
upon? As I explained above, giving one party unilateral rights to modify the

12

15

13Q.HAS CHARTER EVER DEFAULTED ON ANY OBLIGATION TO14CENTURYTEL?

No. Charter has never defaulted on any obligation to CenturyTel or any other 16 Α. carrier. Despite that fact, CenturyTel proposes that it can require a deposit is 17 necessary rests solely within CenturyTel's discretion. This process, or lack of 18 19 process, leaves open the possibility of abuse and arbitrary demands by 20 CenturyTel. Further, such an undefined, open-ended liability does not permit Charter business certainty in dealing with CenturyTel. 21 Consequently, the 22 Commission should adopt Charter's proposal that seeks to identify those specific instances for which a deposit may be required. 23

- 24
- 25
- 26

1		III. ISSUES 8(a) AND 8(b):
2 3 4		TE 8 (A): SHOULD THE BILL PAYMENT TERMS RELATED TO EREST ON OVERPAID AMOUNTS BE EQUITABLE?
5 6 7 8 9	NEI	TE 8 (B): SHOULD THE BILL DISPUTE PROVISIONS ENSURE THAT THER PARTY CAN IMPROPERLY TERMINATE THE AGREEMENT IN A INER THAT COULD IMPAIR SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC?
10 11	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN CHARTER'S POSITION ON THESE ISSUES.
12	A.	Charter's position is that terms for bill payment, and refunds, should be equitable.
13		With respect to Issue 8(a), Charter only seeks the same opportunity for refunds of
14		overpayments, at the same interest rate, that CenturyTel seeks for underpayments.
15		Further, with respect to Issue 8(b), bill disputes should be resolved through the
16		dispute resolution processes built into the interconnection agreement, not via
17		unilateral suspension of service, or termination of the agreement, as CenturyTel
18 19		proposes.
20 21 22	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE CHARTER'S PROPOSED LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE.
23 24	А.	Charter's proposed language is as follows:
25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36		9.4.2 <u>Billing Disputes Related to Paid Amounts</u> If any portion of an amount paid to a Party under this Agreement is subject to a bona fide dispute between the Parties ("Disputed Paid Amount"), the billed Party may provide written notice to the billing Party of the Disputed Paid Amount, and seek a refund of such amount already paid, at any time prior to the date that is one (1) year after the date of the invoice containing the disputed amount that has been paid by the billed Party ("Notice Period"). If the billed Party fails to provide written notice of a Disputed Paid Amount within the Notice Period, the billed party waives its rights to dispute its obligation to pay such amount, and to seek refund of such amount. At the billed Party's request, the billing Party will refund the entire portion of any Disputed Paid Amounts resolved in favor of the billed Party, subject to a rate of interest equal to one and one half (1 ½%) per month or the highest
37		rate of interest that may be charged under Applicable Law, compounded

•

|

ł

;

ι

daily, for the number of days from the Bill Date until the date on which such 1 payment is made. 2 3 9.5 Effect of Non-Payment. 4 5 6 9.5.1 If the billed Party does not remit payment of all undisputed charges on a 7 bill by the Bill Due Date, the billing Party may initiate dispute resolution procedures under Section 20 of this Agreement. 8 9 9.5.2 [INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]. 10 11 12 PLEASE PROVIDE CENTURYTEL'S LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE. 13 **Q**. 14 CenturyTel's proposed language is as follows: 15 Α. 16 9.4.2 Billing Disputes Related to Paid Amounts 17 18 If any portion of an amount paid to a Party under this Agreement is subject to a 19 bona fide dispute between the Parties ("Disputed Paid Amount"), the billed Party 20 may provide written notice to the billing Party of the Disputed Paid Amount, and seek a refund of such amount already paid, at any time prior to the date that is 21 one (1) year after the date of the invoice containing the disputed amount that has 22 been paid by the billed Party ("Notice Period"). If the billed Party fails to 23 24 provide written notice of a Disputed Paid Amount within the Notice Period, the 25 billed party waives its rights to dispute its obligation to pay such amount, and to seek refund of such amount. 26 9.5 Effect of Non-Payment. 27If the billed Party does not remit payment of all undisputed charges on a 28 9.5.1 29 bill by the Bill Due Date, the billing Party may discontinue processing orders for relevant or like services provided under this Agreement on or after the tenth 30 (10th) calendar day following the Bill Due Date. The billing Party will notify 31 the other Party in writing, via email or certified mail, at least five (5) Calendar 32 Days prior to discontinuing the processing of orders for the relevant services. If 33 34 the billing Party does not refuse to accept additional orders for service(s) on the 35 date specified in such notice, and the billed Party's non-compliance continues, nothing contained herein shall preclude the billing Party from refusing to accept 36 any or all additional orders for service(s) from the non-complying Party without 37 further notice or from billing and collecting the appropriate charges from the 38 billed Party. For order processing to resume, the billed Party will be required to 39 40 make full payment of all past and current undisputed charges under this 41 Agreement for the relevant services. Additionally, the billing Party may require a deposit or assurance of payment (or additional deposit or assurance of payment) 42 from the billed Party, pursuant to Section 6. In addition to other remedies that 43 44 may be available at law or equity, the billed Party reserves the right to seek equitable relief, including injunctive relief and specific performance. 45

46

Ì

9.5.2 Notwithstanding 9.5.1 above, if the billed Party does not remit payment 1 2 of all undisputed charges on a bill by the Bill Due Date, the billing Party may at its option disconnect any and all relevant or related services provided under this 3 Agreement following written notification to the billed Party at least seven (7) 4 Business Days prior to disconnection of the unpaid service(s). Such notification 5 may be included in a notification to refuse to accept additional orders so long as 6 7 the appropriate dates for each consequence are listed therein. If the billed Party subsequently pays all of such undisputed charges and desires to reconnect any 8 9 such disconnected services, the billed Party shall pay the applicable charge set forth in this Agreement or in the applicable Tariff for reconnecting each service 10 disconnected pursuant to this paragraph. In case of such disconnection, all 11 applicable undisputed charges, including termination charges, shall become due 12 and payable. If the billing Party does not disconnect the billed Party's service(s) 13 on the date specified in such notice, and the billed Party's non-compliance 14 continues, nothing contained herein shall preclude the billing Party from 15 disconnecting all service(s) of the non-complying Party without further notice or 16 from billing and collecting the appropriate charges from the billed Party. For 17 18 reconnection of the non-paid service to occur, the billed Party will be required to make full payment of all past and current undisputed charges under this 19 Agreement for the relevant services. Additionally, the billing Party may require 20 a deposit or assurance of payment (or additional deposit or assurance of payment) 21 from the billed Party, pursuant to Section 6. In addition to other remedies that 22 23 may be available at law or equity, the billing Party reserves the right to seek equitable relief, including injunctive relief and specific performance, 24 25

26 Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S POSITION DIFFER FROM CENTURYTEL'S 27 POSITION?

28

Α. Century Tel asserts that, with respect to Issue 8(a), Charter is going to "game" the 29 dispute process within the agreement as an investment strategy. According to its 30 position statement in the parties' Joint DPL, CenturyTel alleges that Charter will 31 pay all invoices, and a year later lodge a dispute and demand full repayment plus 32 accrued interest. They apparently believe that we would do so as a means of 33 using CenturyTel as an "investment bank" (their words, not ours), in order to earn 34 interests on money that we would have paid to CenturyTel (for charges that we 35 were not required to pay). With respect to Issue 8(b), CenturyTel believes that it 36 should have the right to discontinue processing all service orders or other 37

- activities the moment Charter fails to pay an undisputed bill, no matter the amount
 of the bill or other circumstances between the parties.
- 3
- 4 5

6

Q. WHAT IS CHARTER'S CONCERN WITH CENTURYTEL'S POSITIONS ON ISSUE 8(a)?

7 Α. With respect to Issue 8(a), Charter's concern with CenturyTel's proposal is that it 8 is one-sided and unfair. Under Section 9.3 of the Agreement CenturyTel is 9 entitled (as Charter has agreed) to assess interest on *underpayments*. And CenturyTel may do so at an interest rate of "one and one-half (1.5%) per month or 10 11 the highest rate of interest that may be charged under Applicable Law." See 12 Section 9.3. Charter has simply taken the same approach to any overpayments it 13 might make during the term of the Agreement under Section 9.4.2. If Charter overpays (including in the circumstance where Charter prevails in a billing 14 15 dispute), Charter proposes to assess the *identical* interest rate to which CenturyTel 16 is entitled for underpayments. Specifically, Charter has proposed that any overpayments would be subject to an interest rate of "one and one-half (1.5%) per 17 month or the highest rate of interest that may be charged under Applicable Law." 18 19 See Section 9.4.2. CenturyTel's response to this proposal is that this language 20 would require CenturyTel to act as Charter's "investment bank." That is simply 21 not accurate.

22

Q. IS CENTURYTEL'S "INVESTMENT BANK" CONCERN BASED ON LIKELY ECONOMIC BEHAVIOR BY CHARTER?

- A. No. CenturyTel's argument seems to be that Charter may choose to tie up its
 capital, here cash, for up to one year in the hopes that the company will prevail in
 a dispute process, and thereby achieve a guaranteed (and implicitly unwarranted)
 return on that capital. CenturyTel's perspective does not reflect economic reality.
- 5

6

7

ł

1

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

8 Α. First, CenturyTel presumes that Charter has otherwise non-working cash assets to 9 dedicate to the scheme CenturyTel imagines. While Charter has more than sufficient cash assets to run its business, the company is not in the mode of 10 11 restricting the use of such assets for several months in the hopes of "making money" from a competitor. Charter has never engaged in the activity CenturyTel 12 has dreamed up, and will not under the Agreement. Second, the dispute 13 14 resolution process under the Agreement simply does not provide the level of 15 assurance that any rational economic actor would seek in order to tie up cash for a 16 year in the manner CenturyTel predicts. How any given dispute will be resolved depends entirely on the on the facts of that dispute, and thus the dispute resolution 17 process does not lend itself to a predictive model that would entice any rational 18 19 company to risk its capital in the way CenturyTel forecasts. Third, it is in 20 Charter's interest to resolve billing disputes within a reasonable period of time. In 21 general, businesses seek operational certainty so that they can concentrate on delivering goods and services to their customers. Charter's core business is 22 23 to sell services to existing and new customers, and Charter works hard every day to manage uncertainties in its business so it can maximize its core business. 24

1 Charter will not introduce operational uncertainty on the off chance that it can 2 achieve a return on its capital at CenturyTel's expense. Fourth, CenturyTel 3 overlooks entirely that if Charter prevails in a particular dispute, *Charter should* 4 *not have paid the amount in dispute in the first place*, meaning that CenturyTel 5 has had free use of Charter's payment (capital). For all these reasons, 6 CenturyTel's concerns are not based on rational economic behavior and the 7 Commission can safely disregard them.

- 8
- 9 10

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

Once a bill dispute process is resolved, the party that prevailed in that dispute Α. 11 should be "made whole." In other words, if at the end of a bill dispute process it 12 is determined that Charter has underpaid CenturyTel for certain invoices, Charter 13 should be required to pay the remaining amounts to CenturyTel. Moreover, 14 Charter is willing to pay interest on any amounts that were underpaid. We have 15 agreed to that approach, which is set forth in Section 9.3 of the agreement. By 16 those same principles, if Charter prevails in a bill dispute, and is found to have 17 overpaid CenturyTel, then Charter should be entitled to request a refund of 18 amounts that were overpaid. In addition, the amounts overpaid should be subject 19 to the same rate of interest that is fair and equitable. That rate should be equal to 20 the rate of interest that would be assessed by the billing Party for any late 21 payment charges (as CenturyTel has proposed, and as Charter has agreed). 22

23

Q. WHAT IS CHARTER'S CONCERN WITH CENTURYTEL'S POSITIONS ON ISSUE 8(b)?

1 As to Issue 8(b), CenturyTel also proposes to *terminate* the Agreement if Charter 2 A. fails to pay any undisputed amounts. As I noted in my testimony on termination, 3 under Issue 4, given the public interest ramifications of unilateral termination, the 4 Commission, not the parties, should have the final say as to when the Agreement 5 terminates. That includes circumstances where a party allegedly does not pay an 6 undisputed amount. I anticipate that CenturyTel will argue that Charter has 7 improperly disputed charges in the past, and that it has not paid all of its invoices. 8 9 It is true that our companies do have a history of billing disputes. But the fact is 10 that Charter has always, and continues to, honor its obligations under interconnection agreements. Where we have disputed charges, and/or withheld 11 payments to CenturyTel, it has been based upon a good faith position that the 12 13 charges were not authorized by the agreement, or where otherwise improper.

14

15 16

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

Charter's position in this proceeding is informed by our experience with Α. 17 CenturyTel in prior bill disputes. In some of those prior disputes CenturyTel 18 19 attempted to unilaterally discontinue operations under the existing interconnection agreement between the parties because Charter had disputed certain invoices. 20 Essentially, CenturyTel used the threat of discontinuing number porting to Charter 21 as a means of gaining leverage over Charter, to try and force Charter to pay 22 invoices that Charter had previously disputed. Not surprisingly, CenturyTel's 23 threats led to further disputes, and ultimately, litigation between the two parties. 24

25

1 2

Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S PROPOSAL ACHIEVE THAT RESULT?

3 Α. Our proposal here represents an attempt to avoid the types of disputes that the parties have had in the past. What we have offered is simple, and direct, contract 4 5 language that will ensure that when a bill dispute arises either Party can seek a 6 resolution of the dispute to avoid litigation. As proposed, Charter believes that 7 the parties should engage in the dispute resolution process set forth in Section 20 8 of the agreement, which includes alternatives to litigation, including informal 9 resolution thru negotiations, and/or business discussions. In addition, that process also allows either party to initiate a formal proceeding that it believes may be 10 necessary for any alleged failures to pay. That process seems like a fair way to 11 adequately protect both parties' interests, and our subscribers from unnecessary 12 13 service interruptions. I would note that under Charter's proposed language for 14 Section 9.4 would also work in conjunction with Section 20.4. As I have explained in a separate part of my testimony, with respect to Issue 13, Charter 15 16 proposes that the parties agree to include contract language that limits the time period by which either Party can bring a claim arising under the Agreement. 17 18 Under Charter's proposal, that period of time would be established as two years 19 from the date of the occurrence of the action that gives rise to the dispute.

20

21 22

Q. HOW DOES THAT CONTRAST WITH CENTURYTEL'S PROPOSAL?

A. In contrast, CenturyTel's proposal simply seeks to impose a process which is
 inequitable and one-sided (in CenturyTel's favor). For example, under
 CenturyTel's proposal it would have the right to discontinue processing orders,

1		and disconnect services and circuits unilaterally, and without Commission
2		authorization. That result could have serious consequences for end user
3		subscribers, as well as for Charter's reputation as a service provider, and is thus
4		contrary to the public interest in stimulating competition.
5		
6		<u>VII. ISSUE 13</u> : SHOULD THE PARTIES AGREE TO A REASONABLE LIMITATION AS
7 8		TO THE PERIOD OF TIME BY WHICH CLAIMS ARISING UNDER
9		THE AGREEMENT CAN BE BROUGHT?
10		
11	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY ON THIS ISSUE?
12		
13	A.	I am testifying on this issue to provide some context to the Commission
14		concerning the history of problems that Charter has with invoices submitted by
15		CenturyTel.
16		
17 18	Q.	WHY IS THAT RELEVANT THIS ISSUE?
19	А.	The history of CenturyTel's billing problems is relevant because this issue
20		requires that the Commission decide who bears the burden of proof in bill
21		disputes that arise between the parties. Charter's position is that where an invoice
22		is first disputed by Charter, and the dispute is not resolved through the dispute
23		resolution procedures of the agreement, then CenturyTel should ultimately be
24		responsible for proving that its invoice is accurate. CenturyTel, on the other hand,
25		proposes just the opposite approach: they believe that their invoices should be
26		treated as presumptively accurate. And, if Charter challenges that presumption,

28

-

٠

;

|

T

.

ł

ī

Q. WHY WOULD IT BE A MISTAKE TO PRESUME THAT CENTURYTEL'S INVOICES ARE ALWAYS ACCURATE?

A. Because our experience is that CenturyTel's invoices are not always accurate. In
fact, CenturyTel's invoices are very frequently *inaccurate*. For example, Charter
and CenturyTel are currently litigating a number of billing invoice mistakes in a
proceeding before the Missouri Public Service Commission. In that case Charter
has put into evidence a variety of problems with CenturyTel's invoices, including
the fact that CenturyTel has billed Charter for "services" that are not specifically
set forth in the interconnection agreement.

In addition, Charter has received invoices from CenturyTel in another state 11 12 whereby CenturyTel has assessed a variety of miscellaneous billing charges which do not have anything to do with Charter's operations in Missouri. 13 Specifically, every month CenturyTel continues to bill miscellaneous charges that 14 15 should be applied to end users (not a co-carrier like Charter) such as: telephone toll (or long distance) charges, directory assistance charges, taxes and surcharges 16 (of varying kinds), caller ID and call forwarding charges, federal universal service 17 fund charges, Yellow Pages advertising, and even local telephone service charges. 18 These are clearly charges that CenturyTel intended to assess against its own 19 subscribers, but which were improperly attributed (and billed) to Charter. 20

21

1

2 3

22 23

24

Q. ARE THERE OTHER EXAMPLES OF BILLING OR INVOICE PROBLEMS WITH CENTURYTEL?

A. Yes, CenturyTel has a practice of crediting Charter for payments made by
 CenturyTel's own end users. The concern here is that CenturyTel is applying
 "credits" to Charter's account which are the result of payments made by

1		CenturyTel's own telephone customer end users. In other words, when their own
2		customers make a payment to CenturyTel (presumably for their monthly
3		telephone service), CenturyTel inexplicably applies those payments to Charter's
4		account. I do not know the reason for it, other than a billing system error. We
5		have certainly never asked them to do so; and, in fact, we have repeatedly told
6		them that they are doing so in error and have asked them to stop this practice.
7		
8	Q.	HOW SIGNIFICANT IS THIS PROBLEM?
9 10	А.	Very significant. By our calculations, CenturyTel has committed this type of
11		billing error on 263 separate occasions. Although they have reversed 232 of those
12		billing errors on the Charter invoices, some of these billing errors have apparently
13		never been corrected. These recurring billing errors suggest that there are serious
14		problems with CenturyTel's billing systems. And, more importantly, it raises the
15		very troubling question of whether CenturyTel's telephone subscribers have not
16		received proper credit for payments they have made to CenturyTel.
17		
18 19	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE EXAMPLES OF OTHER PROBLEMS THAT CHARTER HAS FACED WITH CENTURYTEL INVOICES.
20 21	A.	Another problem that Charter has encountered with CenturyTel invoices is that
22		CenturyTel has, on several occasions, actually billed Charter two different rates
23		for the same functionality. Thus, in another state, when CenturyTel first assessed
24		a charge for a functionality it believed it was entitled to payment (and which
25		Charter disputed), CenturyTel did so because it took the position that a \$19.78

•

÷

1

26 charge for an unbundled network element ("UNE") switch port applied to Charter.

1		Charter does not purchase any UNEs from CenturyTel, because we have our own
2		network and switches. For that reason, we have never leased UNE switch ports
3		from CenturyTel. Despite that fact (which CenturyTel does not dispute), for the
4		last three and a half years CenturyTel has billed Charter the rate for an unbundled
5		network element that Charter has never ordered, and does not use. Then, after
6		repeated bill dispute notices from Charter, CenturyTel modified its rationale for
7		applying the rate to Charter, and then began billing Charter for the very same
8		functionality at a completely different rate of \$23.44. This is yet another example
9		of the types of problems Charter has experienced with CenturyTel's invoices and
10		billings.
11		
12	Q.	DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER NOTABLE EXAMPLES OF ISSUES THAT
13		CHARTER HAS FACED WITH CENTURYTEL INVOICES?
13 14 15	A.	CHARTER HAS FACED WITH CENTURYTEL INVOICES? Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where
14	А.	
14 15	А.	Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where
14 15 16	А.	Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where CenturyTel has billed Charter for an Initial Service Order Charge for LNP (which
14 15 16 17	А.	Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where CenturyTel has billed Charter for an Initial Service Order Charge for LNP (which Charter disputed), CenturyTel has, on numerous occasions, unintentionally billed
14 15 16 17 18	А.	Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where CenturyTel has billed Charter for an Initial Service Order Charge for LNP (which Charter disputed), CenturyTel has, on numerous occasions, unintentionally billed Charter the following categories of charges (for various amounts) instead of the
14 15 16 17 18 19	Α.	Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where CenturyTel has billed Charter for an Initial Service Order Charge for LNP (which Charter disputed), CenturyTel has, on numerous occasions, unintentionally billed Charter the following categories of charges (for various amounts) instead of the Initial Service Order Charge for LNP:
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A.	Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where CenturyTel has billed Charter for an Initial Service Order Charge for LNP (which Charter disputed), CenturyTel has, on numerous occasions, unintentionally billed Charter the following categories of charges (for various amounts) instead of the Initial Service Order Charge for LNP: • Central Office Line Connection – Residence
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A.	Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where CenturyTel has billed Charter for an Initial Service Order Charge for LNP (which Charter disputed), CenturyTel has, on numerous occasions, unintentionally billed Charter the following categories of charges (for various amounts) instead of the Initial Service Order Charge for LNP: • Central Office Line Connection – Residence • Call Restriction – Install
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22	A.	 Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where CenturyTel has billed Charter for an Initial Service Order Charge for LNP (which Charter disputed), CenturyTel has, on numerous occasions, unintentionally billed Charter the following categories of charges (for various amounts) instead of the Initial Service Order Charge for LNP: Central Office Line Connection – Residence Call Restriction – Install Initial Service Order - Unbundled
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A.	 Yes, there have been issues associated with the LNP invoices. In Missouri, where CenturyTel has billed Charter for an Initial Service Order Charge for LNP (which Charter disputed), CenturyTel has, on numerous occasions, unintentionally billed Charter the following categories of charges (for various amounts) instead of the Initial Service Order Charge for LNP: Central Office Line Connection – Residence Call Restriction – Install Initial Service Order - Unbundled Initial Order

٠

÷

į.

ļ

.....

- ----

1		• Additional trip Charge – Business
2		Subsequent Service Order Charge
3		When Charter questioned CenturyTel as to why Charter was being billed for these
4		various non-recurring charges, which were clearly inappropriate, Charter was told
5		that the billing of these charges was due to manual clerical errors when "the
6		CenturyTel Service Representative selected the wrong charges to bill Charter."
7 8 9	Q.	WHAT DOES CHARTER DO WHEN IT RECEIVES INVOICES WITH THESE TYPES OF PROBLEMS?
10 11	А.	Every month Charter sends CenturyTel a notice of its dispute of these charges,
12		and its intentions not to pay charges which clearly are supposed to be assessed
13		against end users (not a co-carrier like Charter).
14		Notably, when Charter disputes these charges, CenturyTel often does credit the
15		charges on future bills to acknowledge its billing errors. However, because the
16		adjustments do not indicate the type of charge being adjusted, and the amounts
17		adjusted do not match amounts disputed, Charter's billing personnel can not
18		determine if full credit has been given for disputes in this category. More
19		troubling, though, is the fact that when CenturyTel makes these adjustments it
20		frequently applies payments made by CenturyTel subscribers to the Charter bill.
21		In other words, CenturyTel is using payments made by its own telephone
22		subscribers to credit Charter's account (when it should be crediting those
23		subscribers' account). Some of these payments have been removed from the
24		Charter account, but others have not. Therefore, it is not possible to calculate and

- ---

•

÷

- -

1

2

balance precisely the actual amounts due against those amounts billed, and later credited or adjusted.

3

7

4 Q. WHAT IS THE FISCAL IMPACT TO CHARTER OF HAVING TO 5 REVIEW AND DISPUTE SO MANY OF CENTURYTEL'S INACCURATE 6 INVOICES?

Charter incurs varied, and widespread, costs associated with responding to Α. 8 9 CenturyTel's inaccurate invoices. Those costs include the time and expense 10 associated with Charter employees reviewing and disputing all of the inaccurate 11 CenturyTel invoices, communications related to these disputes, and other 12 resources spent in an attempt to demonstrate that CenturyTel has no right to 13 assess these charges. One can appreciate the volume of work associated with 14 disputing these charges when considering all of the dispute statements submitted 15 electronically and manually by Charter to CenturyTel. Suffice it to say, the time and expense, is significant. 16

17

18 19

20

Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S PROPOSAL ON THIS ISSUE ADDRESS THESE PROBLEMS?

A. Charter proposes that the parties agree to include contract language that limits the time period by which either Party can bring a claim arising under the Agreement. Under Charter's proposal, that period of time would be established as two years from the date of the occurrence of the action that gives rise to the dispute. In other words, if Charter submits a bill dispute that CenturyTel believes is improper, or unfounded, CenturyTel would have two years to initiate an action to recover those monies from Charter. If CenturyTel did not do so in that two year period, it would have waived its opportunity to receive payment. The same principle would apply to claims that Charter may have against CenturyTel, i.e. claims for payment of monies or the provision of certain services. We would have two years to pursue the claim, and if not initiated within that time period, it would no longer be available.

6 7

8

1

1

2

3

4

5

Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSION ADOPT THIS PROPOSAL?

This proposal has two primary benefits. First, it provides certainty under the 9 A. 10 agreement because it establishes a specific time frame by which either party can make a claim against the other. Upon the expiration of that time period, all 11 potential claims that arose prior to that time would be waived. This will provide 12 both Parties certainty as to when, or if, claims will be brought. Second, greater 13 certainty as to the period in which initiate claims can be brought will, in turn, 14 create a better environment for the business and operations units of each company 15 to plan for operations, roll out new services, and improve and differentiate their 16 17 service offerings. In other words, because this proposal reasonably limits the 18 potential for legal actions between the parties it will afford both parties greater leeway to offer their services, and compete against one another. That result is 19 certainly a benefit to each company, and ultimately end user customers. 20

- 21
- 22 23

VIII. CONCLUSION

- 24 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY**?
- 25 A. Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served by facsimile, hand-delivery, or electronic mail, on the 30th day of September, 2008, on the following:

Thomas J. Moorman WOODS & AITKEN LLP 2154 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Suite 200 Washington, DC 20007

3

ł

τ

Becky Owenson Kilpatrick Manager Government Relations CenturyTel – Missouri 220 Madison Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Paul M. Schudel James A. Overcash WOODS & AITKEN LLP 301 South 13th Street Suite 500 Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Larry W. Dority Fischer & Dority 101 Madison, Suite 400 Jefferson City, MO 65101

General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Office of the Public Counsel P.O. Box 2230 Jefferson City, MO 65102

/s/

Gina Lee

DWT 11722681v1 0108550-000206