Finally, with respect to compensation for allowing the connections, Mr. Smith testified that hardware costs are typically priced from a price list or product catalog, and AT&T has a sales method of determining this pricing to the PSAP at the time of the original sale. He testified that in some jurisdictions AT&T routinely provides itemized pricing for these types of connection arrangements, many of which are provided under filed, approved tariffs. Mr. Smith testified that INdigital recommends that AT&T be ordered to provide an industry standard connection arrangement through a voice and data connection to the ANI/ALI controllers used by PSAP operators at a reasonable cost that will allow the PSAPs served by AT&T to have the advantages of the new network designed and constructed by the Board.

On cross-examination by AT&T, Mr. Smith testified that INdigital does not hand off traffic to a Verizon selective router but rather to the Verizon ANI/ALI controllers. He acknowledged that the traffic that INdigital hands off to Verizon is not IP, but stated that although there is no place in the State of Indiana that is IP all the way from end to end, there are a couple of places that are very, very close and that are IP up to the phone that is on the desk. Mr. Smith acknowledged that the Siemens Nokia selective router that INdigital has deployed today is not an IP router. Mr. Smith also acknowledged that INdigital is able to deliver the voice component of wireless 911 calls to an AT&T-served PSAP, but stated that the delivery is via the AT&T selective routers. He testified that today all of the wireless carriers serving the State of Indiana are connected to INdigital's network and the wireless carriers have been very receptive to the IWDN project because it reduced their costs and improved their quality of service. This is due to the fact that instead of having to run a dedicated circuit directly to all of the selective routers of all of the 911 service providers, such as AT&T, CenturyLink and Verizon, the wireless carriers now only have to run dedicated circuits to INdigital's two tandems. With respect to Mr. Smith's direct testimony regarding why AT&T has refused to allow the direct connection arrangement, Mr. Smith testified that he has heard AT&T representatives raise concerns and questions at Indiana NENA meetings with PSAPs present.

B. Intervenor – Intrado Communications. ***Testimony of Eric Sorenson.*** Intervenor Intrado's witness Eric Sorensen adopted and presented the written testimony prefiled by Intrado's Director of Carrier Relations, Thomas W. Hicks; and its Vice President of Regulatory and Governmental Affairs, Carey Spence-Lenss. Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado sought interconnection with AT&T for the mutual exchange of 911 traffic, stating that Intrado requested Section 251 interconnection throughout AT&T's 22-state service territory, including Indiana, in May 2007. He testified that Intrado has Section 252 arbitrations pending against AT&T in 5 states, and hearings have been held in 3 of the 5 states.

Mr. Sorensen also testified that Intrado plans to negotiate an interconnection agreement with INdigital for the mutual exchange of 911 traffic. Mr. Sorensen stated that INdigital has expressed an interest in establishing interconnection in Ohio where Intrado has been chosen by the Hamilton County Communications Center PSAP, which borders Indiana, to serve as their designated 911/E911 service provider. He testified that as wireless sites or sectors commonly overlap state boundaries, Intrado anticipates that there will be a need for Intrado-served PSAPs and INdigital-served PSAPs to transfer 911 calls in both directions between their respective PSAPs.

Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado's IP-based network is designed to be interoperable with existing legacy PSAP equipment in existing incumbent networks but makes available more robust capabilities to PSAPs and enables PSAPs to receive calls from newer technologies. He testified that Intrado is a direct competitor of AT&T and INdigital in the 911 marketplace. He testified that the 911/E911 network provided by Intrado increases public safety and the ability to share applications with other PSAPs and authorized agencies over the Intrado network, such as CAD, call loggers/recorders, GIS and other applications normally housed at each PSAP location since they cannot be deployed over the legacy infrastructure.

Mr. Sorensen testified that there are differences between Intrado's 911/E911 network and INdigital's network. He testified that the outcome of this proceeding could have direct impact on the ability of any new entrant to officially and effectively provide a competitive alternative to the incumbent's wireline 911 service offering. Mr. Sorensen stated that E911 is a competitive service that essentially consists of three integrated components that are necessary for the routing and transmission of an E911 call including: (1) the switching element that consists of the selective router or 911 tandem; (2) the database system that retains the ALI records used to make an automatic query through the ANI/ALI controller; and (3) 911 network facility transport infrastructure between the selective router and the PSAP. He testified that a new entrant needs access to these functions to compete in the marketplace.

Mr. Sorensen testified that AT&T itself enjoys direct access to its ANI/ALI controllers in order to provide E911 service to its PSAP customers and that the ANI/ALI controller is a tariffed service that is available through AT&T's Indiana tariffs. He testified that AT&T's network arrangements demonstrate that the direct access to an ANI/ALI controller for the retrieval and display of 911 data during an emergency call is technically feasible and necessary. Mr. Sorensen testified as to the importance of a new entrant into the market like Intrado being able to interconnect with the AT&T-served PSAPs in the same manner that AT&T provides to itself; he opined that in the enactment and implementation of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, the goal of both Congress and the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") was to ensure that new entrants could effectively compete with the entrenched incumbent provider.

He testified that Section 251(c)(2) of the Federal Act therefore entitles Intrado to interconnection that is at least equal in quality to that provided by the incumbent local exchange carrier ("ILEC") to itself or to any subsidiary, affiliate or any other party to which the carrier provides interconnection. Mr. Sorensen then testified that to compete in the State of Indiana, Intrado will require direct access to AT&T's ANI/ALI controllers, as well as to any automated call distributor or PBX system trunks necessary to present Intrado traffic to a PSAP call-taker's position. He testified that neither the Commission nor Congress intended that the opening of the markets to competition would result in less functionality. He further stated that AT&T's assertion that its ANI/ALI controllers and/or PBXs are not currently equipped with an adequate quantity of access ports and their request to deny Indiana PSAPs the ability to deploy statewide 911 wireless call delivery with ALI is groundless.

Mr. Sorensen further testified that there is no technical reason why AT&T cannot permit a competitor to access the ANI/ALI controller in the same manner AT&T currently provides for itself, and there is also no need for AT&T to continue to use its selective router to process wireless 911 calls or to use its ALI system to retrieve ALI information when a competitor has

been chosen to provide these services to the PSAP. He testified that the direct connections, such as those sought by INdigital, eliminate the need to introduce an additional and unnecessary step of processing from the competitive E911 service provider's network to the PSAP responsible for delivering emergency assistance.

Finally, Mr. Sorensen testified that INdigital's proposal is consistent with the NENA guidelines and that, contrary to AT&T's characterization, NENA is not an industry standard-setting body but provides guidelines and makes recommendations to the industry. He testified that AT&T's reliance on NENA in describing call transfers is misplaced, and that NENA is not dictating that only one selective router and one ALI system serve a PSAP. He said that the document cited by Mr. Neinast in his testimony indeed defines how call transfers may be accommodated, but it is Intrado's understanding that call transfer arrangements are not what are being sought from AT&T by INdigital.

On cross-examination by AT&T, Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado has begun informal discussions with INdigital regarding an interconnection agreement for the mutual exchange of 911 traffic to serve Intrado's customer in Hamilton County, Ohio, but it has not made a formal request for interconnection with INdigital.

Mr. Sorensen testified that he does not know who owns the customer premise equipment ("CPE") at Hamilton County's PSAP. Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado seeks interconnection with INdigital because INdigital supports wireless 911 calls for the State of Indiana and there may be a need to exchange wireless calls between PSAPs in Indiana and the Hamilton County, Ohio PSAP.

In response to a cross-examination question as to whether it would be pro-competitive or anti-competitive if INdigital connects to the only remaining unused port at a PSAP's ALI database, Mr. Sorensen testified that the ANI/ALI controller capacity is reasonably sufficient for today's market and that he views it as a challenge to either help the PSAP upgrade or replace its equipment or for Intrado to replace one of the other providers that is currently plugged into that equipment.

When asked for the basis of the direct testimony which states that PSAPs directly connected to the INdigital selective router may already be receiving the benefits of competition in the form of reduced costs associated with concentrating and aggregating wireless trunking from mobile switching centers, Mr. Sorensen testified that in addition to, or in lieu of connecting with all of the selective routers maintained by the local exchange companies, wireless carriers could connect their MSCs to the INdigital selective routers for the purpose of routing 911 mobile calls.

However, Mr. Sorensen also testified that his understanding of the network in Indiana is that AT&T continues to require INdigital to connect through AT&T's selective router. He also testified that where Intrado has sought interconnection with AT&T in other states, Intrado has requested interconnection at AT&T's selective router. In summary, Mr. Sorensen testified that he thinks the direct testimony regarding PSAPs receiving the benefits of competition refers to a reduction of overall costs in a network due to fewer connections needed, and while he is not aware or familiar with the pricing that is charged by INdigital to PSAPs, there may be reduced

costs based on the configuration that INdigital proposes. Mr. Sorensen testified that it might be more efficient for a wireless carrier to be able to connect at fewer points than more points.

With respect to his direct testimony that E911 customers should be empowered to make decisions as to their provider of choice from network services to applications and CPE, Mr. Sorensen testified that the network services associated with 911 have predominantly been provided by ILECs and that the market is just now becoming more competitive. Mr. Sorensen testified that when he speaks of "network services", he refers to selective routers, connectivity to the PSAP, connectivity to the selective routers and some might consider the ALI database a part of the network. Mr. Sorensen testified that the local exchange carriers in Indiana continue to provide ALI database services.

In response to a question about his direct testimony that AT&T's reliance on NENA in describing call transfers is misplaced and that NENA is not dictating that only one selective router and one ALI system serve a PSAP. He testified that the intent of the comment addressed the fact that NENA is not a formal standards body and that while NENA may discuss one scenario, it offers alternatives as well. Mr. Sorensen did acknowledge that Intrado endeavors to comply with NENA standards in most cases.

By his adoption of the testimony prefiled by Intrado's Vice President of Regulatory and Government Affairs, Carey Spence-Lenss, Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado is authorized as a CLEC in Indiana, and the company and its affiliates hold authority to provide competitive local telecommunications services in 40 states, including Ohio. He testified that Intrado has entered into two other Section 251 interconnection agreements with AT&T affiliates in Illinois and California, as well as agreements with Qwest. He testified that Intrado's telecommunications services include ALI services to form the basis for Intrado's intelligent emergency network. He testified that the intelligent emergency network enables the public safety community to transcend the limitations of the nation's legacy 911 infrastructure, making new applications and services available to PSAPs and other public safety entities that will increase their efficiency and effectiveness in responding to emergency calls.

Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado will be a direct competitor of AT&T and will provide an alternative to AT&T's 911 service, sold directly to counties and PSAPs in Indiana. He testified that the demand for competitive 911/E911 services is growing, and that despite significant numbers of competitive providers in the local exchange market, competitive options and choices for the public safety industry do not exist today. He testified that Intrado seeks to change that with its IP-based intelligent emergency network. Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado will also be a direct competitor of INdigital in Indiana, and the outcome of this proceeding will have an impact on Intrado's and other competitive providers' provisioning of 911 service to PSAPs. He testified that Intrado's 911/E911 service will enable PSAPs to better respond in a world that is becoming more complicated as options for communicating explode.

With respect to the importance to Indiana consumers and public safety agencies of innovative 911/E911 systems, he testified that today, consumer expectations, newer and less voice-centric technologies and major world events are necessitating further changes in 911 service capabilities and that the importance of public safety requires looking beyond the existing

legacy structure toward a more robust and secure 911 network that can manage both voice and data delivered from multiple types of service providers.

Mr. Sorensen testified that the PSAP will continue to have a relationship with the ILEC when they select Intrado, INdigital or an alternative provider, if the PSAP continues to purchase service from the ILEC. However, once the PSAP has selected an alternative provider to serve as its selective routing and ALI database service provider, it would be inappropriate for an ILEC like AT&T to continue to bill public safety for selective routing or ALI database services. He testified that, as the Florida Public Service Commission affirmed, in its June 4, 2008 Order in Docket No. 090089-TP, it is unlawful to bill for services not ordered or needed.

Mr. Sorensen testified that the ALI component of a 911 call is integral to a competitor's service offering, because the comprehensive 911 services offered to PSAPs by ILECs today are telecommunications services and treated as telephone exchange services under the law, as evidenced by ILEC tariffs. He testified that the provision of 911 services historically has been managed at the local level by the ILEC, and an effective 911 service requires the caller to be mapped to the closest PSAP, done at the selective router, to ensure emergency personnel closest to the caller can be dispatched. He testified that the Master Street Address Guide ("MSAG") maps the emergency personnel in the area to the relevant PSAP. He testified that the ALI database contains customer information associated with the caller, including the telephone number, location and other supplemental information about the caller to assist the PSAP in making a timely emergency response.

With respect to enhanced 911 calls, Mr. Sorensen testified that direct access to the ANI/ALI controller commonly located at the PSAP is absolutely essential to enable the call-taker to retrieve this critical information, whether served by AT&T or a competitor like INdigital or Intrado. Mr. Sorensen also testified that comprehensive 911 service, as defined by the FCC and tariffed by the ILECs, clearly falls within the definition of "telephone exchange service". He testified that the information service piece of the 911 service, ALI, is an inextricable part of the 911 service provided to PSAPs as demonstrated by the FCC's definition of 911 services and the unbundled access requirement imposed on ILECs to make the 911 databases available as telecommunications services, in the interest of promoting local competition, citing *VoIP 911 Order*, 20 F.C.C.R. 10245, ¶15 (2005); 47 U.S.C. §251(c)(3); 47 C.F.R. §51.319(f)). He testified that, without exception, 911 services are telephone exchange services when the ILECs or a competitor provides them.

Mr. Sorensen testified that the direct access proposed by INdigital to the ANI/ALI controller is similar to the equal access concept, and the primary reason for direct access is service quality to the PSAPs. He testified that as Congress and the FCC recognized, there are numerous operational barriers faced by competitors, which require that all aspects of local services be available to all competitors on an equal basis and that equal access is absolutely necessary for competition in the local market to survive. He stated that Indiana public safety entities must have assurances that 911/E911 service traffic destined for their first responders will be treated equally. He further testified that the delivery of data associated with wireless 911 calls should be provided using the most reliable process available – via direct access to the ANI/ALI controller, and if direct access is denied, competition will be relegated to simply reselling AT&T's ALI services. Finally, Mr. Sorensen testified that service quality and industry standards

call for the use of dedicated connections. He stated as an example that AT&T requires competitive providers to directly interconnect to its selective routers serving the PSAP to which the 911/E911 call is directed and, likewise, AT&T relies on direct access to its ANI/ALI controllers when it is serving its PSAP customers.

With respect to his direct testimony that Intrado will be a direct competitor of AT&T in Indiana, Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado will be in a position to offer both wireline and wireless 911 service, but that the IWB has already contracted with INdigital to provide statewide wireless 911 network. Mr. Sorenson was questioned about how Intrado will be compensated for the services it will provide to the Hamilton County, Ohio PSAP and whether Mr. Sorensen believes that it is appropriate that Intrado will have to compete with a company that is being subsidized by a government agency in Indiana. He testified that any service procured by a government entity is funded through some method of that government raising those funds and 911 is no different. He further testified that he believes it is part of competition for Intrado to compete with a company that is being paid by a government agency for providing a service and that most 911 service providers are currently being paid by government entities through government funds.

When asked to clarify how Intrado will be a direct competitor of INdigital in Indiana, Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado offers a service similar to that which INdigital has sold to the IWB, including wireless 911 support. He testified that he understands that INdigital may have entered into an agreement with a county to provide wireline 911 service and that he does not have any knowledge of whether that wireless 911 service will be provided through the IWDN. Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado has sought to directly connect to customer premise equipment in PSAPs in Virginia and Ohio. Mr. Sorensen further testified that in making those connections, Intrado negotiated with the PSAP and, to the degree that the telephone company might have been the provider of the CPE, he presumes that the telephone company would have to have been aware of and involved in the process. He acknowledged that Intrado sold its services to the public safety entity, and negotiations were essentially between Intrado and the PSAP that had the CPE on its property. On redirect, Mr. Sorensen testified that he does not know who owns the CPE at the Hamilton County PSAP.

On redirect, Mr. Sorensen testified that the reason Intrado did not seek arbitration for its Section 251 interconnection request with AT&T in Indiana is that Intrado had to make choices as to where to use its limited resources in arbitration proceedings and filed for arbitration in six other states. Responding to questions from the bench, Mr. Sorensen testified that Intrado's service offering does not include an ANI/ALI controller but that it does anticipate connecting to the existing ANI/ALI controllers when it works with a legacy PSAP. He further clarified that Intrado does not have ANI/ALI controllers and that it simply connects to other ANI/ALI controllers. On subsequent redirect, Mr. Sorensen responded that if an ANI/ALI controller is owned by a LEC, Intrado would ask to connect with that ANI/ALI controller.

C. Respondent - AT&T Indiana.

i. Testimony of Scott McPhee. Scott McPhee is AT&T's Associate Director – Wholesale Regulatory Policy and Support. Mr. McPhee provided an overview of the evolution of the 911 emergency response system in Indiana, including the introduction of E911 services in the early

1970s. By transmitting ANI and ALI data along with the voice call, E911 allows for a visual display of a caller's telephone number and street address at the PSAP. Mr. McPhee explained that 911 calls from landline telephones are initially routed in the same manner as any other telephone call. The call is initially sent to the end-user's serving end-office. From the serving end-office, the call is routed to a Selective Router, also known as a 911 Tandem.

The Selective Router queries the E911 database maintained by AT&T Indiana to determine the correct PSAP that should receive the call based upon the caller's ANI, and routes the call to that PSAP. Equipment at the PSAP then queries an ALI database to determine the caller's street address or other location information, which will then appear on the call attendant's computer screen.

Mr. McPhee explained that wireless E911 calls require additional call processing steps, because a wireless telephone number is not necessarily associated with a fixed address. When a wireless caller dials 911, the call is sent from the receiving cell tower to a wireless carrier's MSC, which performs similar functions to a landline end office switch. The MSC routes the call to the E911 selective router and, at the same time, queries a Mobile Positioning Center ("MPC"), a third-party database containing information about the wireless telephone number. The MPC then gathers information about the wireless caller's location from separate Position Determination Equipment ("PDE"). This dynamic location information is then passed by the MPC to the ALI database so that the wireless E911 call can be routed to the appropriate PSAP, and the PSAP can obtain appropriate location information for first responders.

Mr. McPhee explained that AT&T Indiana and INdigital currently operate under an ICA approved by the Commission under Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The ICA contains an Appendix Wireless Emergency Services (E911) Traffic Routing that contains the agreed terms and conditions for interconnection of the parties' networks to allow routing of wireless E911 calls from INdigital's selective routers to AT&T Indiana's selective routers for delivery to PSAPs served by AT&T Indiana. Mr. McPhee asserted that this ICA and the parties' operations thereunder belie the claims of the Complainants, and demonstrates conclusively that AT&T Indiana has permitted "a physical connection to be made . . . between its telephone system and the telephone system of INdigital." Mr. McPhee stated that the connections sought by INdigital in this proceeding are not allowed under the parties' ICA.

Mr. McPhee testified that the connections provided for under the ICA between AT&T Indiana and INdigital are consistent with the standards of the National Emergency Numbering Association ("NENA"). Mr. McPhee said that standardizing E911 connections at the selective router is pro-competitive, since it allows for multiple E911 providers to interconnect at what is essentially a tandem switch that has significant capacity to accommodate multiple E911 providers. On the other hand, the capacity for multiple connections at a PSAP is extremely limited and would have to be handled, if at all, on a first-come, first-served basis.

Mr. McPhee's testimony also addressed the ability of the current network architecture to accommodate inter-PSAP transfers with location data, a stated goal of the IWDN. Mr. McPhee pointed out that AT&T Indiana is the system provider for both wireless and wireline E911 calls to 41 Indiana counties, which include 70% of all PSAPs, and an even higher percentage of the State's population. AT&T Indiana already offers its PSAP customers the capability of providing

interagency call transfers – both landline and wireless - among the PSAPs it serves, and supports industry standard solutions to allow inter-agency transfers between the PSAPs it serves and PSAPs served by other providers.

Mr. McPhee pointed out that the Wireless Board's asserted desire to "unify the delivery of wireless 911 calls to the various PSAPs," while understandable given its focus on wireless traffic, would come at the expense of unifying delivery of *all* 911 traffic, including wireless, wireline and VoIP traffic. Today, AT&T Indiana is contractually committed to the unified delivery of *all* 911 calls – both wireless and wireline - to the PSAPs it serves. INdigital's desire to route wireless E911 traffic to PSAPs served by AT&T Indiana over the IWDN without using AT&T Indiana's network cannot alter that contractual commitment.

ii. Testimony of Mark Neinast. Mark Neinast has been employed by AT&T for more than 30 years in various network engineering positions, including managing the conversion of AT&T's E911 network from analog to digital technology. Mr. Neinast testified that AT&T Indiana's E911 network uses industry standard switches, databases and software for the processing and delivery of all E911 calls, including landline, wireless, VoIP and OnStar emergency calls. The network allows for any PSAP on the network to transfer any 911 call to another PSAP on the network and provide the receiving PSAP with the voice, calling telephone number (or ANI), the wireless callback number for wireless calls, and the caller's location information (ALI), including the latitude and longitude of the wireless caller.

Mr. Neinast described the 911 services AT&T provides to Indiana PSAPs as a managed service offering, in which the AT&T 911 Resolution Center acts as the single point of contact for all 911 issues, whether landline, wireless or VoIP, and whether the issue relates to the network or to the call-taking equipment at the PSAP. Mr. Neinast explained that AT&T Indiana's network has the capability to transfer all types of calls, including wireless calls, between different PSAPs served by AT&T Indiana, since its three selective routers are all interconnected with tandem-tandem trunk groups in accordance with NENA standards.

Mr. Neinast stated that the tandem-tandem internetworking functionality is also capable of supporting call transfers with associated data between PSAPs served by different carriers. By using the NENA standard tandem-tandem feature, the transferred call maintains all of the information that was delivered to the original PSAP, including the voice, telephone number, wireless callback number, etc. In September 2007, AT&T entered into a BETA test agreement with the IWB to test these call transfer capabilities. AT&T installed new tandem-tandem circuits between its Crown Point router and INdigital's Ft. Wayne selective router, provided technical resources to update the CPE at the Lake County Sheriff, the test PSAP, and performed numerous database updates, at no cost to the IWB.

Mr. Neinast testified that, in the BETA test, while AT&T Indiana was capable of transferring calls with data to INdigital, INdigital's Nokia-Siemens selective router was not capable of transferring calls to AT&T Indiana without a software upgrade to bring it into compliance with NENA tandem-tandem transfer standards. AT&T Indiana informed the IWB of this solution, but based on INdigital's business decision not to pursue the upgrade, the IWB chose not to pursue the feature upgrade, and the BETA test was terminated.

According to Mr. Neinast, the industry standard tandem-tandem architecture is not only consistent with industry standards, it is a more cost effective solution than constructing direct connections to the CPE in every PSAP. Mr. Neinast also stated that the tandem-tandem architecture is also consistent with the FCC's determination that the 911 selective router is the appropriate demarcation point for allocating E911 implementation costs between wireless carriers and PSAPs. Mr. Neinast testified that the industry standard tandem-tandem interconnections do not limit the functionality of the IWDN. On the other hand, direct connections to the PSAP CPE could create significant problems.

Mr. Neinast stated that not all counties or PSAPs within counties may choose to utilize the IWDN. As an example, he pointed out that only 2 PSAPs chose to join in the instant proceeding. Therefore, Mr. Neinast concluded that it would still be necessary to utilize tandem-tandem trunking to transfer calls between these PSAPs. In addition, because wireless calling is based on Major Trading Areas ("MTAs") that overlap state boundaries, Mr. Neinast stated that it may be desirable to transfer calls between PSAPs in adjacent states. He said that this is possible under the NENA standard tandem-tandem solution, since only a single trunk group between AT&T Indiana's selective routers and the selective routers in adjacent states is required. Mr. Neinast opined that if INdigital was allowed to directly connect its network to the CPE at the PSAPs, it would effectively prohibit any other carriers or competitive E911 provider from obtaining the same type of connection, since approximately 70% (65 of 96) of the ANI/ALI controllers have no unused voice ports and/or ALI ports.

Mr. Neinast explained that the proposed direct connections at the PSAP CPE would also impact call re-routing. He said that currently, if a PSAP served by AT&T needs to abandon its building for any reason, it is able to reroute its traffic through the AT&T Resolution Center. Mr. Neinast stated that AT&T Indiana would have no ability to reroute traffic on the IWDN, requiring additional work by the PSAP. Similarly, Mr. Neinast opined that PSAPs would be required to perform additional trouble shooting before calling the appropriate network company (AT&T or INdigital) to resolve service or equipment related issues. He asserted that PSAPs would lose the single point of contact or "one throat to choke" they enjoy today. Accordingly, Mr. Neinast concluded that the requested direct connections sought by INdigital are neither necessary, nor in the public interest.

Mr. Neinast also testified in sur-reply to the testimony of Intrado's witnesses Hicks and Spence-Lenss. He acknowledged that recommendations put out by the National Emergency Numbering Association are not mandatory, but he recommended that, at least in this particular instance, they be considered. Mr. Neinast asserted that it could cost appreciably more for PSAPs to be able to have the direct connections requested by the Complainants than it would cost INdigital to upgrade its selective router to achieve a similar result.

D. Rebuttal Testimony.

i. Indiana Wireless Enhanced 911 Advisory Board.

(a) Rebuttal of Kenneth Lowden. In his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Lowden pointed out that regardless of AT&T's ability to transfer emergency calls within its own network, there was no dispute that AT&T's preferred connection arrangement lacks the full capability of a direct

connection to the IWDN. He reiterated the IWB's neutrality when it comes to a county's selection of the company to provide E911 service to its PSAPs, but he also noted that the IWB was still responsible for setting minimum standards so that all wireless customers, regardless of their provider or the provider service the PSAP(s) receiving their emergency call, have access to the full benefits of the IWDN.

(b) Rebuttal of David Boyce. Contradicting AT&T's witnesses' assertions that the direct connection sought by the Complainants in this cause does not meet industry standards, Mr. Boyce explained the distinction between the NENA recommendations, on which AT&T focused exclusively, and the best practices promulgated by the National Reliability and Interoperability Council, which the IWDN meets. He directed attention to a separate NENA recommendation calling for delivery of next generation 911 calls directly to PSAPs instead of, as AT&T currently insists, through selective routers. Finally, Mr. Boyce rebutted AT&T's arguments concerning the alleged capacity limitations of AT&T's ANI/ALI controllers and the relative ease with which their capacity could be increased when necessary.

(c) Rebuttal of Dale Hatfield. Mr. Hatfield is the former Chief of the Office of Engineering and Technology at the FCC who remains active in the field of telecommunications policy and regulation, including matters regarding E911. He stated his expert opinion that AT&T's refusal to allow the direct connection sought by the Complainants in this case is contrary to the public interest, and he praised the IWB as a national leader in migrating toward a next generation 911 system. He highlighted the importance of interconnection in determining the structure, scope and performance of competition in the provision of E911 services, and criticized AT&T for bundling the provision of its ANI/ALI controllers to PSAPs so that they became a part of AT&T's E911 call processing network along with its selective routers, data bases and associated trunk and data transmission facilities.

Mr. Hatfield critiqued AT&T's preferred indirect connection through its selective routers as adding unnecessary costs, constrained by the limitations of AT&T's analog, circuit-switched network, and more likely to lead to errors by unnecessarily introducing another network into the data stream.

ii. Rebuttal Testimony of INdigital Telecom. Rebuttal testimony of Mark Grady. Mr. Grady testified that Mr. McPhee's and Mr. Neinast's testimony and exhibits attempt to divert the Commission's attention from what this case is truly about – physical connections subject to the Indiana interconnection statute – and attempt to recast the complaint as an interconnection dispute under the Federal Telecommunications Act, which it is not. He stated in that doing so, AT&T mischaracterizes and misconstrues the Section 251 interconnection agreement ("ICA") that is currently in place between INdigital and AT&T. He stated that AT&T insists that amendment to the ICA is necessary to facilitate the direct connection arrangement sought by the Complainants, but this fails to acknowledge that AT&T has refused to consider any amendment to INdigital's current ICA. Mr. Grady testified that it is INdigital's position that the ICA does not apply to or prohibit the direct connection arrangements sought by Complainants. He stated his belief that the state interconnection statute is specifically applicable to disputes such as the one presently before the Commission.