|                  | STATE  | OF   | GEORGIA |  |
|------------------|--------|------|---------|--|
| COUNTY OF FULTON | COLUMN | , 01 | THE MON |  |

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, duly commissioned and qualified in and for the State and County aforesaid, personally came and appeared Ken L. Ainsworth, who, being by me first duly sworn deposed and said that:

He is appearing as a witness on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., before the Kentucky Public Service Commission in connection with the Investigation Concerning The Propriety of InterLATA Services By BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Pursuant To The Telecommunications Act of 1996 and if present before the Commission and duly sworn, his testimony would be set forth in the annexed testimony consisting of 2 pages and Ø exhibits.

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME this

alst day of

MICHEALE F. HOLCOMB Notary Public, Douglas County, Georgia My Commission Expires November 3, 2001

| 1  |    | BEFORE THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  |
| 3  |    | SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF KEN L. AINSWORTH  |
| 4  |    | ON BEHALF OF   |
| 5  |    | BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.   |
| 6  |    | CASE NO. 2001-105  |
| 7  |    | AUGUST 29, 2001  |
| 8  |    |  |
| 9  |    |  |
| 10 | Q. | STATE YOUR NAME, YOUR BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND YOUR POSITION WITH                             |
| 11 |    | BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH").  |
| 12 |    |  |
| 13 | A. | My name is Ken L. Ainsworth. My business address is 675 W. Peachtree Street, Atlanta,      |
| 14 |    | Georgia 30305. I am a Director - Interconnection Operations for BellSouth. I have          |
| 15 |    | served in my present position since December 1997.   |
| 16 |    |  |
| 17 | Q. | DID YOU PREVIOUSLY FILE TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?                                      |
| 18 |    |  |
| 19 | A. | Yes. I have previously filed direct testimony in this proceeding on May 18, 2001 and       |
| 20 |    | rebuttal testimony on July 30, 2001.   |
| 21 |    |  |
| 22 | Q. | WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY TODAY?   |
| 23 |    |  |
| 24 | A. | I am filing this supplemental rebuttal testimony because two statements that I made in my  |
| 25 |    | original reply testimony are no longer correct. I stated that ROS, like DOE and SONGS,     |
|    |    | is a non-leverageable legacy system that is on the sunset list and that ROS has never been |

| 1  |    | programmed to do anything but the most simple of the "complex" services for retail.       |
|----|----|---|
| 2  |    | These statements are incorrect since ROS has been removed from the sunset list and has    |
| 3  |    | been programmed to handle additional "complex" services for retail.                       |
| 4  |    |   |
| 5  | Q. | ON WHAT PAGE OF YOUR REPLY TESTIMONY WERE YOUR ORIGINAL                                   |
| 6  |    | RESPONSES LOCATED?  |
| 7  |    |   |
| 8  | A. | My original responses were located on page 14 starting on line 8 and stated "ROS is, like |
| 9  |    | DOE and SONGS, a non-leverageable legacy system that is on the sunset list" and "Even     |
| 10 |    | now after 3 years, ROS has never been programmed to do anything but the most simple       |
| 11 |    | of the "complex" services for retail".  |
| 12 |    |   |
| 13 | Q. | SHOULD THESE SENTENCES BE TOTALLY REMOVED FROM YOUR REPLY                                 |
| 14 |    | TESTIMONY?  |
| 15 |    |   |
| 16 | A. | Yes. These statements should be removed since they are no longer correct.                 |
| 17 |    |   |
| 18 | Q. | DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?  |
| 19 |    |   |
| 20 | A. | Yes.  |
| 21 |    |   |
| 22 |    |   |
| 23 |    |   |
| 24 |    |   |
| 25 |    |   |

1