

FairPoint Communications, Inc.
State of New Hampshire
Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent: Michael Haga
Arthur Kurtze
Title: Director of Billing and
Operations Support Systems
Advisor, Capgemini

REQUEST: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff - Rebuttal

DATED: September 17, 2007

ITEM: RDR-25 On page 34, lines 14-19, of the joint rebuttal testimony of Michael Haga and Arthur Kurtze, Mr. Kurtze states that one of the main reasons the FairPoint system development is different from the Hawaiian Telcom development is that Hawaiian Telcom was required to replace former GTE systems and “[m]any of the systems within the old GTE properties are different from the systems used in the Northeast.” Please confirm whether FairPoint agrees that regardless of the differences in the systems used, the system functionality that Hawaiian Telcom was required to replace in Hawaii is the same or very similar to the system functionality that FairPoint must replace in the northeast. If you agree, then please explain why replacing Verizon’s systems in the northeast will be any easier than the effort Hawaiian Telcom underwent to replace Verizon’s systems used in its Hawaii operations.

REPLY: FairPoint agrees that regardless of the differences in the systems used, the system functionality that Hawaiian Telcom was required to replace in Hawaii is the same or very similar to the system functionality that FairPoint must replace in the northeast. FairPoint has made no claims that replacing Verizon’s systems in the northeast would be easier or harder as a comparison to the efforts undertaken by Hawaiiin Telcom.