## Confidential Release

Case Number: 90-467-TP-ATA

# Date of Confidential Document: <br> MAY 22, 1991 

Today's Date:
July 28, 2009

Public utilities Commission of Ohio

Company: Ohio Bell Telephone Co. Request No. 13
Case No: 90-467-TP-ATA

Date Submitted: 5/22/91

Requested By:
Allen Francis Nadia Solinan Kurt Wesolek
Date Required: 5/30/91

1) Explain in detail why no portion of the sTU Fees, incremental to phase $I$ class services, is allocated to the cost for Caller ID and Automatic Callback?
2) ED should the riv Fees incremental to phase I cLass Services be recovered?
3) Please revise your cost studies for Caller id and Auto Callback to incorporate the RTU Fees for CWASS Services phase I. Indicate how you will allocate these cost among the proposed Phase I CLASS Services and Supply the following source documents:
A) Copies of the invoices showing the RTU fee amounts that were paid by O日T for CLASS features Phase I to each of the vendors of the following technology: lass, ES, DIS 100 and EWSD. Also, show how OBT was charged for the RTU, is it per access line, per switch or per switching module?
B) The most recent data to show how many switches will be upgraded to provide CLASS features phase I during the 5 year planning period with the breakdown * By technology (LAESS, 5ESS, DMS100 and EWSD), * By switch category (Eost/Remote/Stand Alone) and * By access lines (forecaster number of customers will subscribe to these services).
C) To have a better understanding of the costing methodology, when OBT purchases "state-of-aft offices with state-of-art features" as quoted in Data request \#9, question 1.E, does the offices (switches) always come equipped with the software for class phase i features? If Yes, please list those offices, if no, does oast first purchase the switch and later upgrade the software to offer class features? please list those offices.

## (ㄷ)

Ohio Bell

May 30, 1991

To: Allen Frances Nadia Salian Kurt Wesolek

From: Judi Mate


Please find attached; the response to your Data Request of May 22, 1991.
I have provided each of you with a copy.
If there is additional assistance I can provide, please let me know.
Thanks.

Case No.: 90-467-TP-ATA
Date : 5/22/91

Requested By: Allen Francis Nadia Soliman Kurt Wesolek
Date Required: 5/30/91

1) Explain in detail why no portion of the RTU Fees, incremental to Phase I CLASS Services, is allocated to the cost for Caller ID and Automatic Callback?

Only RTU fees that could be avoided if a specific feature were not provided are included in the cost determination for that feature.

## puco Data Request No. 13

| Case No.: $90-467-T P-A T A$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date | $5 / 22 / 91$ |$\quad$ Requested By: | Allan Francis |
| :--- |
|  |

2) How should the RTU Fees incramental to Phase I CLASS Services be recovered?

The expected revenues from the product family should be sufficient to cover product family costs, including RIU lees, over the products' lives.

Case No.: $\quad 90-467$-TP-ATA
Date : 5/22/91
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Reqeusted By: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Alien Francis } \\ \\ \\ \text { Nadia Soliman } \\ \text { Kurt Wesolak }\end{array} \\ \text { Date Required: } & 5 / 30 / 91\end{array}$
3) Please revise your cost gtudies for Caller ID and Auto Callback to incorporate the RTW Fees for CIASS Services Phase I. Indicate how you will allocate these cost among the proposed phase i chass Services and supply the following source documentat
A) Copies of the invoicas showing the RTU fee amounts that were paid by OBT for cLASS teatures phame I to each of the vendora of the following technology: LAESS, 5ESS, DMS100 and EMSD. Also, show how OET was charged for the RTH, is it per access ifne, per switch or per switching module?
B) The most recent data to show how many switches will be upgraded to provide ctass faaturas phase I during the 5 year planning period with the breakdown

* By technology (1AESS, 5ESS, DMS100 and EWSD),
* By switch category (Host/Ramote/Stand Alone)' and
* By access innes (iorecasted number of customers will subscribe to these services).
C) To have a better understanding of the costing methodology, When OBT purchases "state-of-art offlaes with wtateot-art featuras" as quoted in Data request $\% 9$ question 1. F, doas the offices (switchas) always come equipped with the software for Class phasa I features? If yes, please $11 s t$ those offices, If no, does OBT first purchase the switch and later upgrade the software to offer cLAss features? Pleada $118 t$ those offices.

For proposed minimum and price list prices, the attached aumaries show that the expected contribution erom caller ID, Automatic Callback and Repeat Dialing is sufficient to covet ali relevant RTU fees.
A) As discussed with Staff May 23, 1991, the RTI invoicen will be provided to staff in approximately three weeks.
B) The racquasted lists are attached.
C) No. CLASS Phase I fatures are being added to switches within the deployment area as depictad in the schedule provided. This necessitates the purchase of the appropriate software generia progran which provides CLASs features and the specific class feature software.

Whenever a switch within this deployment area is replaced, the new switch will be purchased equipped with the latest software generic program in which the CLASS feature software will be available. The following switches are replacemanta:

## PUCO Data Request Mo. 13



Continuation of Answer to 36.
Other than these 3 switch excaptions; the schedule noted for 38 . is the list of offices where CLASS Phase I features are being added.

|  | Description | Source | Automatic Catlbeck | Repeat <br> Dieling | Cathorb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Customer Forecast (List Price) - 1990 | Marketing | 10,501! | 4.8381 | 2,180 |
| 2 | Customer Forecast (List Price)--1991 | Marketing | 20,643 | 9,081 | 12805 |
| 3 | Customer Forecast (List Price) -1992 | Marketing | 35,861 | 15,846 | 28,935 |
| 4 | Customer Forecast (List Price)- - 1993 | Marketing | 49,2861 | 21,778 | 43,855 |
| 5 | Customer Forecast (List Price) -1994 | Marketing | 67,587 | 29,863 | 59,060 |
| 6 | (PFF, 14.09\%, 1) | SD-6.0; L 1 | 0.876501 | 0.878801 | 0.876501 |
| 7 | (PF, 14.09\%, 2 ) | S0-6.0;12 | 0.768254 | 0.788254 | 0.768254 |
| 8 | (P/F, 14.09\%, 3) | S0-6.0; 13 | 0.873375 | 0.673375 | 0.673375 |
| 9 | (P/F, 14.09\%, 4) | S0-6.0; 14 | 0.550214 | 0.590214 | 0.590214 |
| 10 | (PF, 14.09\%, 5 ) | SO-6,0;15 | 0.517323 | 0.517323 | 0.517323 |
| 11 | Present Value of 1990 Customers | Lixi 6 | 9,204 | 4,083 | 1.911 |
| 12 | Present Vaiue of 1991 Customers | L2x 17 | 15,859 | 6,977 | 9,837 |
| 13 | Present Value of 1992 Customers | L23018 | 24,148 | 10,670 | 19,484 |
| 14 | Present Vatue of 1993 Custorners | L4×19 | 29,089 | 12,854 | 2,884 |
| 15 | Present Value of 1994 Customers | $15 \times 10$ | 34,984 | 15,449 | 30,563 |
| 16 | Present Value of 1990-1994 | L11 thru L15 | 113,264 | 50,013 | 87,669 |
| 17 | Direct Fixed Costs (Upfront Expenses) | Cost Stucdy | \$148,070.84 | \$148,070.84 | \$20,85220 |
| 18 | Annual Fixed Cost per Ling | L17h16 | S1.31 | \$29 | $\$ 275$ |
| 19 | Morithly Fixed Cost per Line | L18/12 | \$0.11 | \$0.25 | \$0.23 |
| 20 | Monthly Vol. - Sensitive Cost per Line | Cost Study | \$1.49 | \$1.87 | \$0.93 |
| 21 | Monthiy Total incr Cost per Line | L19+L20 | \$1.60 | 5212 | \$1.16 |
| 22 | List Price per Line | Pricing List | \$3.50 | \$8.50 | \$8.50 |
| 23 | Monthly Contribution par Line | 122-121 | \$1.90 | \$1.38 | \$5.34 |
| 24 | Present Value of 5 -Year Contribution | $12 \times 16 \times 123$ | \$2,583,857 | \$830,183 | \$5,618,944 |


| 25 | Present Value of 5 -Year Contribution for All Senvices | $\$ 9,032,984$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 26 | Present Value of 5 -Year RTU Fees for All Switches | $\$ 6,678,358$ |
| 27 | Net Present Value (Contribution less RTU Fees) | $\$ 2,354,626$ |


|  | Description | Source | Automatic Catloack | Repeat Dlating | Callato |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Customer Forecast (Tarifin Minimum) - 1990 | Marketing | 11,551! | 5.0991 | 6,104 |
| 2 | Customer Forecast (Tain M Ninimum) - -1991 | Marketing | 227071 | 9,9891 | 17,927 |
| 3 | Customer Forecast (Tariff Minimum) --1992 | Marketing | 30,4471 | 17,400 | 40,509 |
| 4 | Customer Forecast (Tanifi Minimum) - - 1993 | Marketing | 54,2131 | 23,9351 | 61,397 |
| 5 | Customer Forecast (Tarif Minimum) - -1994 | Marketing | 74,3461 | 32,8491 | 82,684 |
| 6 | (PFF, 14.09\%, 1 ) | SD-6.0; 11 | 0.878501 | 0.8765011 | 0.876501 |
| 7 | (PFF, 14.09\%, 2) | SD-6.0;L2 | 0.768254 | 0.768234 | 0.768254 |
| 8 | (PIF, 14.09\%, 3) | SD -6,0.13 | 0.673375 | 0.673373 | 0.673375 |
| 9 | (P/F, 14.09\%, 4) | SD-6.0; L 4 | 0.590214 | 0.550214 | 0.590214 |
| 10 | (P) F, 14.09\%, 5) | SD-6.0;15 | 0.517323 | 0.517323 | 0.51732 |
| 11 | Present Value of 1990 Customers | Lixd 6 | 10,124 | 4,469 | 5,350 |
| 12 | Present Vaiue of 1991 Customers | L20 ${ }^{1}$ | 17,445 | 7.674 | 13,772 |
| 13 | Present Value of 1992 Customers | L3 18 | 26,5531 | 11,737 | 27.278 |
| 14 | Present Value of 1993 Customers | L4x 19 | 31,997 | 14.139 | 36,237 |
| 15 | Present Value of 1994 Customers | L5x-10 | 38,460 | 16,994 | 42.774 |
| 16 | Present Value of 1990-1994 | L11 that L15 | 124,589 | 5,013 | 12,411 |
| 17 | Direct Fixed Cost (Upfront Expenses) | Cost Study | \$148,070,84 | S148,070.84 | \$240,852,20 |
| 18 | Annual Fixed Cost per Line | L17/L16 | \$1.19 | \$269 | \$1.92 |
| 19 | Montuly Fixed Cost per Line | L18/12 | 50.10 | \$0.22 | \$0.16 |
| 20 | Montily Vol. - Sensitive Cost per Line | Cost Sudy | \$1.49 | \$1.87 | \$0.93 |
| 21 | Montthly Total Incrementa Cost por Lina | L19+L20 | \$1.59 | \$209 | \$1.09 |
| 22 | Minimum Price per Line | Tanif | \$250 | \$250 | \$4.50 |
| 23 | Montuly Contribution per Line | 12-L21 | \$0.91 | \$0.41 | \$ 8,41 |
| 24 | Present Value of 5-Year Contribution | $12 \times 16 \times 123$ | \$1,360,512 | \$270,664 | \$3,131,818 |


| 25 | Present Vatue of 5-Year Contibution for All Senvices | $\$ 8,762,94$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 26 | Present Vahue of 5-Year FIU Fees for All Switches | $\$ 6,678,358$ |
| 27 | Net Present Value (Contribution less RTU Fees) | 584,636 |


|  | Description | Source | IAESS | SESS | OMS | EWSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Office Upgraded--1990 | Network Planning | 121 | 191 | 111 | 3 |
|  | Office Upgraded--1991 | Network Planting | 31 | 61 | 31 | 0 |
|  | Office Upgraded--1992 | Network Planning | 121 | 151 | 31 | 0 |
| 4 | Office Upgraded--1993 | Notwork Planning | 41 | 61 | 41 | 0 |
| 5 | Office Upgraded--1994 | Network Planring | 41 | 171 | 01 | 0 |
|  | Total Offices Upgraded | LithruL5 | 351 | 631 | 211 | - 3 |
| 7 | Office Share--1990 | L1/L6 | 34.29\% ${ }^{\text {i }}$ | 30.16\% i | 5238\% | 100.00\% |
| 8 | Office Share--1991 | 12 L 6 | 8.57\% | 9.52\% | 14.29\% | 0.00\% |
| 9 | Office Share--1992 | L3/L6 | 34.29\% | 23.81\% | 14.29\% | 0.00\% |
| 10 | Ofice Share--1993 | L4/6 | 11.43\% | 9.52\% | 19.05\% | 0.00\% |
| 11 | Office Share--1994 | L5/6 | 11.43\% | 26.98\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 12 | Total Joint RTU Fees | Memo | \$3,202500 | \$4,73,693 | 5218,880 | 561,800 |
| 13 | FTU Fees- 1990 | L7x.12 | \$1,098,000 | \$1,439,683 | \$114,651 | \$61,800 |
| 14 | RTU Fees--1991 | LexLl2 | \$274,500 | \$454,637 | \$31,289 | 50 |
| 15 | PTU Fees--1992 | L0xL12 | \$1,098,000 | \$1,136,594 | \$31,269 | 50 |
| 16 | FIU Fees--1993 | L10x 12 | \$366,000 | \$454,637 | 541,691 | S0 |
| 17 | FiU Fees--1994 | LTIXL12 | \$366,000 | \$1,288,130 | So | 50 |
| 18 | (PF, 14.09\%, O) |  | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 |
| 19 | (P/F, 14.09\%, 1) | S0-6.0; L 1 | 0.876501 | 0.876501 | 0.876501 | 0.876501 |
| 20 | (P/F, 14.09\%, 2) | SO-6.0; 2 | 0.768254 | 0.768254 | 0.768254 | 0.788254 |
| 21 | (PFF, 14.09\%, 3) | S0-6.0;13 | 0.673375 | 0.673375 | 0.673375 | 0.673375 |
| 22 | (PFF, 14.09\%, 4) | S0-6.0; 4 | 0.590214 | 0.590214 | 0.500214 | 0.590214 |
| 23 | PV of TTU Fees--1990 | L13xL18 | \$1,098,000 | \$1,439,685 | \$114,651 | S61,800 |
| 24 | PV of RTU Fees--1991 | L14× 19 | \$240,600 | S 538,490 | S27,407 | 50 |
| 25 | PV of RTU Fees--1992 | L15x120 | \$843,543 | \$873,1931 | \$24,023 | 0 |
| 28 | PV of RTU Foes--1993 | L16x 21 | \$246,455 | \$306,141 | \$28,074 | \$ |
| 28 | PV of RTU Fees--1994 | L17xL22 | \$216,018 | 5760,2781 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 29 | PV of 1990-1994 Fees | 123 thru 128 | \$2,644,616 | \$3,777,787 | \$194,155 | \$ 81,800 |

