

>>> Ed Hancock 07/14/04 01:46PM >>>
July 14, 2004

Tricia Wanner - BellSouth

Tricia:

Based on the Frankfort Plant Board's initial review, I believe we can move forward with the revised interconnection agreement. However, I do have some questions/concerns that need to be addressed, primarily related to our need for database access.

1) The rate for a CNAM query is not included in the proposed interconnection agreement for Unbundled Network Elements. I did find the CNAM query listed under what BellSouth termed its proposed "Market Based Agreement", which we have not yet signed. However, the rate in the "Market Based Agreement" is \$.008 per query, or approximately an 800% markup over the current rate (\$.0010348 per query) found in our interconnection agreement which is file with the Kentucky PSC. In your cover letter you maintain this proposal is consistent with BellSouth's commitment not to increase prices.

Is BellSouth willing to continue providing the CNAM query at the previously negotiated and approved contract rate of \$.0010348 per query? If not, please explain why that previously agreed-to rate is no longer valid and the rationale for the proposed increase.

2) A similar situation exists with regard to the LIDB query (1300% price increase) and the LNP query (12% increase). I would request the same information as above.

3) Clarification Please: under the proposed UNE Signaling (CCS7), page 5 of 6, there is no rate shown per TCAP message and per ISUP message as is currently being billed under the interconnection agreement. This is also not indicated in the proposed "BellSouth Market Based" agreement. Is this simply a rate structure modification or is BellSouth indicating that there is some function that is currently provided which will no longer be made available?

There may be additional issues to be addressed, but at this time I would appreciate your response in some detail to the above questions.

Thank you.

Ed Hancock
Frankfort Plant Board
502 352-4330
ehancock@fewpb.com