# Attachment C

## Uniform Regulatory Framework
## R.05-04-005 Phase II
## Monitoring Report

## Parties' Statements and Question Lists

The Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) responds to Charles Christiansen's December 6, 2006 email as follows:

1. As an overall matter, and consistent with the regulatory goals set forth in the Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) (R.05-04-005), the Phase 1 decision (D.06-08-030) and P.U. Code section 709, DRA intends to ask each carrier participant at the December 12, 2006 workshop to (a) identify the specific existing reports that provide data relevant to each of the goals listed above, including the various subparts of P.U. Code Section 709; and (b) explain if and/ or how the underlying data used to generate existing reports provide more granular detail relating to specific geographic areas of California and demographic groups within the state, so that the reports might be modified to allow the Commission to assess the extent to which "*every person and business in California* has access to modern, affordable, and high quality telecommunications services." (R.05-04-005, mimeo, p. 3, emphasis added).

2. While discovery and analysis are ongoing, and DRA reserves the right to amend this list, DRA currently expects to focus its questions on the following reports, insofar as they relate to specific regulatory goals set forth in the OIR, Phase 1 decision and P.U. Code section 709:

FCC Form 477 – goals: ubiquitous availability of "modern" services, promote competition

FCC Form 499-A – goals: promote competition

FCC Annual Certification of Rate Averaging and Rate Integration, Section 254(g) – goals: ubiquitous service affordability

Inputs for the FCC Reference Book of Rates, Price Indices, and Household Expenditures for Telephone Service – goals: ubiquitous service affordability.

CPUC Affordability study performed by Field Research Corporation on behalf of SBC (now AT&T) and Verizon – goals: ubiquitous service affordability, promote competition

DRA anticipates that it will have questions about some other reports as well, but that these questions will be less extensive than the questions relating to the reports identified above. For the purpose of this workshop, DRA presumes that any potential modification of reports that are related to subsidy compensation will be discussed in a proceeding related to the specific subsidy and that reports relating to service quality will be addressed in the Service Quality OIR or other Commission-designated forum.

3. Finally, DRA expects its questions will include, but not be limited to, the following topics:

- The ability to expand reporting per Form 477 to provide line counts by zip code and/or by zip+4 (9-digit zip code reporting).
- The ability to provide the revenue breakdowns in Form 499-A for California alone and for specific areas of California (such as ILEC service territories and/or other, more granular geographic divisions), as well as for more specific product lines.
- The approach that carriers expect to take in verifying that they can certify any geographic rate deaveraging pursuant to D.06-08-030 to be compliant with Section 254(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.
- The feasibility of expanding or enhancing Residential and Business Rate Review forms provided to the Industry Analysis & Technology Division of the Wireline Competition Bureau for the Reference Book of Rates, Price Indices, and Household Expenditures for Telephone Service.
- The frequency, if any, on which AT&T and Verizon currently plan to conduct the Field Research Corporation affordability study going forward.
- The feasibility of expanding the affordability study to include the SureWest and Frontier service territories.

DRA is also interested in confirming which data are available in standard, electronic format so that the Commission and parties authorized to have access to the data can rapidly compile results for all service providers and compare results across reporting periods.

DRA respectfully requests that each carrier participant have one or more experts available at the workshop to address questions regarding the reports and specific topics identified above. Insofar as carriers are unable to provide specific and complete responses to DRA's questions at the workshop, DRA reserves the right to make record requests during the workshop and expects to receive prompt responses to those record requests. DRA's identification of the reports which it considers to be most relevant does not imply that it has no questions about any of the other reports provided pursuant to the Assigned Commissioner's Rulings.

The Utility Reform Network submits the following in response to Charles Christiansen's December 6, 2006 e-mail.

TURN currently expects its questions to focus on the following reports and/or issues. While some of the reports we wish to address were filed by a specific carrier, we are interested in understanding what information is included in the report and, also, if other carriers file similar reports under different names. Thus, we will have general questions about these reports that will not necessarily limited to the carrier that filed the report. To ensure that the workshop proceeds as expeditiously as possible, we are also including questions that we currently intend to ask with respect to these reports. The list of questions is subject to change as TURN engages in further review of the reports and discovery responses received from the carriers. TURN has not had time to develop detailed questions pertaining to AT&T's Tab 71, Urban Rate Study.

TURN respectfully requests that each carrier participant have one or more experts available at the workshop to address questions regarding the reports and specific topics identified below. Insofar as carriers are unable to provide specific and complete responses to TURN's questions at the workshop, TURN reserves the right to make record requests during the workshop and expects to receive prompt responses to those record requests.

TURN's identification of the reports it considers to be most relevant does not imply that it has no questions about any of the other reports provided pursuant to the Assigned Commissioner's Rulings. TURN anticipates that it may well have follow up questions related to issues addressed by other parties.

## List of Reports

•FCC Form 477. The majority of our questions will address Form 477.

•Verizon Tab A-31, "Eleven year overview of Verizon California Telephone Subscription Rates, 1994-2005.

•Payphone reporting (as a general issue, see questions below).

•Verizon Tab A-6, "Redacted_CA_naruc_spreadsheet_2006.pdf".

•Verizon Tab A-21, "Redacted__OOF_CPUC_Quarterly Rpt 111506.pdf", which purports to show Verizon facilities out of its franchise area.

•Verizon Tab A-20 "Redacted_LnShrRpt3qtr06.pdf".

•AT&T Tab 71, "Urban Rate Study."

## General Questions and Issues

As a preliminary matter, TURN will ask each carrier to briefly present their position regarding which specific reports it believes it is required to provide pursuant to D. 06-08-030 and which reports have been suspended as a result of the URF ruling.

TURN will ask each carrier to provide a brief overview of how reporting is handled at the state and federal level. It would be useful to see a simplified organization chart showing information flows, departments, and information systems involved.

For Verizon, we wish to clarify whether the reports submitted pursuant to the ACR contain data pertaining to the former Contel exchanges; and, if not, we would like to learn which reports (if any) are submitted to the FCC and the CPUC pertaining to those exchanges.

### General Questions for FCC Form 477

Please discuss the number of hours it has taken the carrier to complete each of the FCC Form 477 documents filed for the state of California with the FCC for the past two years.

Please discuss in general the data utilized by the carrier in the generation of the **Part I: Broadband** section of Form 477.

Does the carrier file only one Form 477 for California?

Please explain in general how the carriers systems are accessed in the process of completing Form 477.

Has the carrier implemented automated report generation which is used to retrieve data for use in reporting for Form 477?

Verizon wireless and Cingular wireless have not filed information in response to the Commission's request. Why have these carriers not responded or provided data? Do these companies file Form 477 reports separately from Verizon and AT&T?

## Specific Questions for FCC Form 477

**Form 477 Part I.A.**

Please explain what systems the carrier uses to track the information which is responsive to the requests made in Columns (a) through (j) in the data-reporting table associated with Part I.A.

Is the information in Columns (a) through (j) in the data-reporting table associated with Part I.A. derived from billing records?

Can the information in Columns (a) through (j) in the data-reporting table associated with Part I.A. be disaggregated to the 5-digit Zip Code level? Can it be disaggregated at the 9-digit Zip Code level?

**Form 477 Part IB.**

Please explain how you calculate the percentage of residential end user premises in your state service area to which your broadband connections could be provided using installed distribution facilities.

**Form 477 Part II:**

Can the information regarding voice-grade equivalent lines be reported by 5-digit Zip Code? Can it be reported by 9-digit Zip Code?

Can the information regarding total service resale arrangements be reported by 5-digit Zip Code? Can it be reported by 9-digit Zip Code?

Can the information regarding UNE-loops provision be reported by 5-digit Zip Code? Can it be reported by 9-digit Zip Code?

Can the information regarding UNE-P provision be reported by 5-digit Zip Code? Can it be reported by 9-digit Zip Code?

**Form 477 Part III.**

Part III of Form 477 asks that the carrier report "if you serve one or more mobile voice telephone subscribers in the state over your own facilities."

How does the carrier determine whether a mobile voice telephone subscriber resides in a state for a pre-paid customer?

How does the carrier determine whether a mobile voice telephone subscriber resides in a state for a monthly or contract customer?

Does the carrier have the ability to identify customers by 5-digit Zip Code? By 9-digit Zip Code?

Does the carrier track wireless customers which do not have a "home" wireline telephone or "home" wireline telephone number?

**Form 477 Part V.**

Please explain how you determine the Zip Codes associated with the information provided in columns (a) through (i) (Part I) of the table. Please explain how you determine the Zip Codes associated with the information provided in column (j) (Part II) of the table.

Can the carrier generate similar Zip Code data based on 9-digit Zip Code information?

The instructions in Part V state "Do not provide customer counts by Zip Code."
Can the carrier provide customer counts by 5-digit Zip Code? Can the carrier provide customer counts by 9-digit Zip Code?

---

## Other More Specific Questions

**Subscription Report filed by Verizon:**

Verizon filed a redacted report titled "Eleven year overview of Verizon California Telephone Subscription Rates, 1994 to 2005." This document is in the filed labeled "A-31 Redacted_Telephone Penetration Monitoring Rpt.pdf" which was filed with Verizon's group of reports identified as being filed with the CPUC.

This report is not identified by other carriers as being filed with the CPUC. Please explain the nature of the report.

Do other carriers provide similar information? If so, please identify the report.

Please explain how the data on consumer income is collected and compiled.

Please explain how the data on the consumer's racial characteristics is collected and compiled.

Please explain how the data on geographic area is collected. How are the boundaries of the geographic areas defined?

---

**Payphone Reporting:**

Please explain how the payphone reporting to the CPUC operates. What specific information is provided to the CPUC? Does the information cover both private payphones, competitive payphones, and ILEC owned payphones?

---

**"NARUC" Report Filed by Verizon:**

Verizon has filed a report contained in the file
"A-6 Redacted_CA_naruc_spreadsheet_2006.pdf"

This report does not appear to be filed by other carriers.

What is the source of the data contained in the report?

Are other carriers filing similar data with the Commission under a different name?

---

**Out of Franchise Facilities Document Filed by Verizon:**

Verizon filed a document labeled "A-21 Redacted_OOF_CPUC Qtrly Rpt 111506.pdf" which purports to show Verizon facilities out of its franchise area.

Does any other carrier file this report with the Commission?

Does the Verizon report include assets of MCI which were acquired in the merger?

If other carriers, especially AT&T, files similar information, please identify the relevant report.

If other carriers, especially AT&T, files similar information, please indicate whether it includes legacy AT&T facilities which were acquired by SBC in the merger.

---

**Line Sharing Report Filed by Verizon:**

Verizon filed a document labeled "A-20 Redacted_LnShrRpt3qtr06.pdf". What is the nature of this report? Does any other carrier file this report with the Commission?

---

**Urban Rate Study Filed by AT&T:**

Does any other carrier file a similar report with the FCC?

Do AT&T or other carriers file this report for other states, including states with deaveraged rates, or rates that vary according to rate group?

**From:** Joe Faber [mailto:jfaber@gmail.com]
**Sent:** Friday, December 08, 2006 2:02 PM
**To:** Christiansen, Charles H.; Adam.Sherr@qwest.com; KSaville@czn.com; Margie.Herlth@qwest.com; Norine_Marks@dca.ca.gov; Terrance.Spann@hqda.army.mil; adrian.tyler@att.com; ahanson@o1.com; ahmmond@scu.ed; amsmith@sempra.com; andrew.song@mto.com; anitataffrice@earthlink.net; ann.johnson@verizon.com; astevens@czn.com; barbalex@ctel.net; betsy.granger@att.com; bfinkelstein@turn.org; bnusbaum@turn.org; bruce00cx@aol.com; bsnider@czn.com; carl@wirelessconsumers.org; carrie.deleon@wolterskluwer.com; cbapowers@aol.com; cborn@czn.com; ccarbone@ucan.org; cestewart@jonesday.com; chamill@att.com; channon@aarp.org; charak@nclc.org; christina.tusan@doj.ca.gov; chrisv@greenlining.org; cindy.manheim@cingular.com; ckemp@pillsburywinthrop.com; ckomail@pacbell.net; cmailloux@turn.org; co1864@att.com; Simms, Clyde; Poschl, Christopher; david.discher@att.com; deyoung@caltel.org; Piiru, Dale; dhaddock@o1.com; dlee@snavely-king.com; don@uutlaw.com; doug94119@sbcglobal.net; douglas.garrett@cox.com; drscott@czn.com; dweingard@reedsmith.com; edwardoneill@dwt.com; elaine.duncan@verizon.com; emery.borsodi@att.com; enriqueg@lif.org; ens@loens.com; esprague@pacwest.com; esther.northrup@cox.com; ewallace@jonesday.com; g.gierczak@surewest.com; Adell, Gaylee; gblack@cwclaw.com; george.granger@cingular.com; glenn@stoverlaw.net; gregkopta@dwt.com; gregory.castle@sbc.com; grs@calcable.org; harvey@consumerwatchdog.org; Sastra, Rudy; hgildea@snavely-king.com; Mickiewicz, Helen M.; hnmalone@swidlaw.com; holober@consumerfedofca.orga; huntjp@mto.com; ignacio@buzohernandez.com; isabelle.salgado@sbc.com; jacque.lopez@verizon.com; jaeger4329@earthlink.net; james.boothe@hklaw.com; james.young@att.com; Reed, Jacqueline A.; jarmstrong@gmssr.com; Chandra, Jennie; jbeahn@skadden.com; jchicoin@czn.com; McVicar, James C.; jd3235@sbc.com; jeff.wirtzfeld@qwest.com; jesus.g.roman@verizon.com; jfiles@simercury.com; jim@tobinlaw.us; Simmons, James; Tolbert, Joel; jkenney@consumer.org; john_gutierrez@cable.comcast.com; jojee@igc.org; Lakritz, Jonathan; jsilva@crain.com; jthierio@pacwest.com; judypau@dwt.com; jwiedman@gmssr.com; jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com; katherine.mudge@covad.com; katienelson@dwt.com; kdavis@o1.com; keb@cpuc.ca.gov; kfugere@steefel.com; Bemesderfer, Karl J.; kkirby@mediasportscom.com; klindsay@att.com; kmelville@sempra.com; Miller, Karen; Paull, Karen P.; kristin.l.jacobson@sprint.com; krobinson@mdbe.com; ksritchey@jonesday.com; DeVine, Kyle; lam@cpuc.ca.gov; lbiddle@ferrisbritton.com; ldelacruz@aarp.org; Gasser, Laura E.; litkin@cricketcommunications.com; Tudisco, Laura J.; Woods, Linda J.; ll@calcable.org; lmb@wblaw.net; lori.ortenstone@att.com; lupita.reyes@verizon.com; Tan, Lee-Whei; lynne@rhainc.com; Bushey, Maribeth A.; malcolmy@asianlawcaucus.org; marg@tobiaslo.com; margarita.gutierrez@sfgov.org; marklegal@sbcglobal.net; mash@mpowercom.com; mbrosch@utilitech.net; Amato, Michael C.; mday@gmssr.com; mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com; mhartigan@cwa9400.com; michael.bagley1@verizonwireless.com; michael.sasser@sbc.com; mmattes@nossaman.com; mmoreno@aarp.org; mmulkey@arrival.com; Clairmont, Mark; mp@calcable.org; Nixon, Marcus; mschreiber@cwclaw.com; mshames@ucan.org; mwand@mofo.com; Wales, Natalie; ngriffin@pacwest.com; nlubamersky@telepacific.com; Billingsley, Natalie; pam@consumerwatchdog.org; pamelap@greenlining.org; pcasciato@sbcglobal.net; Hanson, Peter; plewis@seattletimes.com; pthompson@pillsburywinthrop.com; pucservice@dralegal.org; putzi@strangelaw.net; pvicencio@metropcs.com; rcardozo@reedsmith.com; Maniscalco, Richard; rcosta@turn.org; rex.knowles@xo.com; Hernandez, Risa; Kumra, Ravi; rl@comrl.com; robertg@greenlining.org; Smith, Richard; rudy.reyes@verizon.com; Wullenjohn, Robert J.; savama@consumer.org; sbergum@ddtp.org; sblackledge@calpirg.org; Sarvate, Sarita; scratty@adelphia.net; Litkouhi, Simin; Yun, Sindy J.; Sukhov, Michael; Wong, Sue; sleeper@steefel.com; smalllecs@cwclaw.com;

Boles, Sheri; stephen.h.kukta@sprint.com; steve.bowen@bowenlawgroup.com; strange@strangelaw.net; suzannetoller@dwt.com; Prosper, Terrie D.; terry.houlihan@bingham.com; thomas.long@sfgov.org; thomas.selhorst@att.com; Sullivan, Timothy J.; tlmurray@earthlink.net; tmacbride@gmssr.com; tregtremont@dwt.com; vvasquez@pacificresearch.org; wally@wallyroberts.com; weissmannhx@mto.com; why@cpuc.ca.gov; william.weber@cbeyond.net; Witteman, Chris; wmcgee@wafs.com
**Subject:** Re: URF Reporting Workshops

Charles T

This response is on behalf of Cox California Telcom (U-5684-C). With respect to the reports identified in Cox's response to the ACR, Cox believes the most useful discussion at the workshop would address the following:

- CPUC Annual Report (CPCN Appendix A)
- CPUC Affiliate Transaction Report (CPCN Appendix B)
- General Order 133-B

The value of the first two reports has become questionable in light of the Commission's determinations, over the past year, that the California telecommunications market is highly competitive. Since these two reports generally involve financial and corporate information related to the business operations of local exchange companies, it would be valuable for the workshop participants to consider whether such reports are needed any longer.

The third report, having to do with service quality, may be of some continued probative value, though that is somewhat doubtful as well. Given the Commission's findings that the market is fully competitive, it would seem that service quality is a matter to be evaluated by consumers, who would not be inclined to continue to purchase services from companies that provide a poor level of service. However, even if the Commission does see the need to continue to receive information of this type, General Order 133-B is quite outdated. Part of the discussion should address how to make it more current.

In Cox's view, the other CPUC reports identified by Cox in its response to the Commission do not require discussion at the workshop.

Cox does not see any reason to discuss any of the FCC reports. These are submitted in response to federal requirements. There is nothing the Commission or the workshop participants could do at this workshop to influence or affect those federal reporting requirements. Moreover, since there will not be any FCC officials in attendance, the workshop will be lacking in its ability to evaluate whether or not these reports are of value to the FCC, or, for that matter, whether or how they are even used by the FCC in its regulation of the carriers who submit the reports.

Cox looks forward to the discussions at the workshop. Please let me know if you have

any questions.

- Joe Faber

--

**Law Office of Joseph S. Faber**

**(925) 385-0043 (Office)**
**(925) 323-9969 (Mobile)**
**(925) 871-4097 (Fax)**

**This message contains information that is or may be legally privileged and/or otherwise confidential and/or proprietary. Unless you are the proper addressee of this message (or authorized to receive this message), any review, disclosure, reproduction, re-transmission or other dissemination or use of this e-mail communication (or any information contained herein) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender and delete or destroy the message and any copies of it. Thank you.**

From: "Christiansen, Charles H." <CHC@cpuc.ca.gov>
Date: Wed, 6 Dec 2006 14:13:44 -0800
To: "Christiansen, Charles H." < CHC@cpuc.ca.gov>,Conversation: URF Reporting Workshops
Subject: RE: URF Reporting Workshops

To Service List for R.05-04-005:

In order to make the most efficient use of the Workshop time, TD proposes to focus on the reports and issues identified by the parties to be of most interest. Therefore, TD asks that parties identify those reports, and issues related to the reports, that are believed to be the most important for Workshop discussion purposes and to share this information with the service list by close of business on Friday, December 7, 2006.

Based on the reports and issues that are identified by the parties, TD requests that the carriers make arrangements to have the appropriate subject matter experts available.

If you have any questions regarding TD's requests, please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Lee-Whei.

Thank You,
Charles Christiansen

Main Document –
http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/GRAPHICS/63801.PDF
Attachment A -
http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/GRAPHICS/63802.PDF
Attachment B -
http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/GRAPHICS/63803.PDF
Attachment C -
http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/GRAPHICS/63804.PDF