BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of

CONSIDERATION OF BELLSOUTH   DOCKET NO. 960786B-TP
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S
ENTRY INTO INTERLATA SERVICES
PURSUANT TO SECTION 271 OF THE
FEDERAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT
OF 1996. (THIRD PARTY OSS TESTING)

PETITION OF COMPETITIVE CARRIERS   DOCKET NO. 981834-TP
FOR COMMISSION ACTION TO SUPPORT
LOCAL COMPETITION IN BELLSOUTH
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S
SERVICE TERRITORY.
_____/

ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE
A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT
THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING,
THE .PDF VERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY.

VOLUME 2

PROCEEDINGS:	WORKSHOP
BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN LILA A. JABER
	COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON
	COMMISSIONER BRAULIO L. BAEZ
	COMMISSIONER MICHAEL A. PALECKI
	COMMISSIONER RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY
DATE:	Monday, February 18, 2002
TIME:	Commenced at 9:30 a.m.
	Concluded at 6:02 p.m.
PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center
	Room 148
	4075 Esplanade Way
	Tallahassee, Florida
REPORTED BY:	TRICIA DeMARTE
	Official FPSC Reporter
	(850) 413-6736
APPEARANCES:	(As heretofore noted.)

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

P R O C E E D I N G S

1

2   (Transcript continues in sequence from Volume 1.)

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. So as it relates to the

4   ALECs' request to electronically enter all LSRs, I'm assuming

5   they went -- the ALECs went through the CCP process. BellSouth

6   has said, your requests are not technically feasible. So the

7   ALECs are bringing that here for --

8   MR. PATE: Definitely. Well, they're bringing it

9   here to this workshop. They're discussing some of their

10 concerns from this workshop. And the items that are being

11 discussed here today, these are being worked currently through

12 the change control process, and particularly, you've heard

13 someone reference a flow-through task force which has

14 challenged to go and look at items that today are processed

15 manually as well as look at items today that are experiencing

16 system errors to see what we can do for improvement in those

17 areas.

18   CHAIRMAN JABER: So what you're saying is, it's an

19 ongoing process.

20   MR. PATE: Oh, yes, ma'am. This is very much

21 ongoing, and plus some of the transactions we're talking about,

22 particularly some of the ones Covad is mentioning, some of

23 these are new products, new product offerings. So it's part of

24 the process of initially getting that and those ordering

25 procedures in place as well as some of these are impacted by

1   volumes. So we haven't mechanized it because the volumes

2   aren't there at this point in time to justify it from a

3   business standpoint, but that doesn't mean that they won't be

4   mechanized eventually. It's just you work on those in light of

5   all the other things that your resources are working on for

6   improvement of flow-through is putting those in that

7   prioritization in order.

8   CHAIRMAN JABER: Are there items that you've agreed

9   upon through the CCP process?

10   MR. PATE: Well, certainly. The CCP process actually

11 prioritizes these items. You've got two approaches.

12   CHAIRMAN JABER: Are there items that have come to

13 you through requests through the CCP process that you've agreed

14 with the ALECs are possible?

15   MR. PATE: Yes, yes.

16   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Mr. Pate, with that answer in

17 mind, could you take a look at Covad's Page 8 of their handout?

18   MR. PATE: I don't have their handout. I'm sorry.

19   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: And basically I wanted you to

20 address the first four items that Covad claims are not

21 provided, there is no electronic interface provided. And they

22 also state that every other ILEC does, other than BellSouth,

23 provides electronic interface for these items.

24   MR. PATE: Nate, if you can put up this. It's

25 actually Slide 17. It really, I think, addresses these from

1 our presentation. Just go two forward. Two forward, please.

2 One more.

3   Here we talk about -- I think we hit on every one of

4 these items. Let's see if we do not. The unbundled copper

5 loop nondesigned, Covad submitted a request back on November

6 2001, and this is currently in the flow-though task force being

7 evaluated to see what we can do with respect to those types of

8 transactions.

9   On the ADSL and line sharing with conditioning, this

10 actually has some history back to Sprint submitting a change

11 request back in April of 2001. At that time that change

12 request was rejected for being cost prohibitive. That's one of

13 the issues that Covad has raised here as well.

14   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Madam Chair?

15   CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes, Commissioner.

16   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: I've been listening all day,

17 and I do have a question.

18   CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes. Go right ahead.

19   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Has anybody discussed what the

20 actual completion rate is that the -- with the ILECs as it

21 relates to the CLECs and the ALECs in terms of enrollment in

22 the OSS system and actually get getting them up and getting

23 them operational? I'm just trying to figure out that. And is

24 there a percentage out there that we could use to try and get

25 some ideas to what the actual success rate is?

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: Did you hear him, Terry? Let me see

2 if I got the question, Commissioner, because you were fading

3 out on me a little bit. Is your question, has someone measured

4 the completion --

5   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Enrollment rate.

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: -- success rate as compared to,

7 like, the ALEC-to-ALEC migration as opposed to the ILEC-to-ALEC

8 migration?

9   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Well, ALEC to ILEC and CLEC to

10 ILEC, and, you know, as it results to the OSS system, and how

11 many customers have actually been connected, and how many of

12 them are actually up and operational.

13   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Let's give BellSouth an

14 opportunity to address that first, and then we'll get an ALEC

15 response, Commissioner.

16   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Okay.

17   MS. COX: Okay. We have an estimate that as of the

18 end of the year 2001 there were approximately 1.1 million lines

19 being provided by ALECs in the state of Florida. And I believe

20 the Commission's most recent report indicated about 959,000 in

21 their report which I think was as of June 2001 if I'm correct,

22 if that was the question.

23   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Okay. Well, could you break

24 that down in terms of a percentage?

25   MS. COX: The estimates -- I'm sorry -- the estimates

1 from BellSouth would be right around 10 percent of the total

2 lines being served by ALECs and that would be reflective of our

3 service territory. The statewide number from the Commission

4 report, I believe, was about 8 percent which also corresponded

5 with a report the FCC had put out as of end of year 2000.

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Boone, do you want to respond to

7 that? Can you?

8   MS. BOONE: Not for the entire ALEC community. I

9 would like to respond to this slide, though. Will I have an

10 opportunity to do that?

11   CHAIRMAN JABER: Yeah, we've been pretty flexible,

12 but I need to make sure that the Commissioner's question is

13 addressed.

14   Commissioner Bradley, on the ALEC side,

15 Ms. Lichtenberg from WorldCom.

16   MS. LICHTENBERG: I can respond only to obviously the

17 WorldCom numbers.

18   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Right.

19   MS. LICHTENBERG: WorldCom entered the Florida market

20 in a very limited fashion because of cost issues. We're

21 serving a very small portion of the market. Through the end

22 2001 -- actually, through January 31st, 2002, we had

23 successfully installed about 2,700 residential customers here

24 in Florida. That number is an install number. It does not

25 include customers who later left and went someplace else. And

1   again, that's residential UNE-P customers only.

2   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you. Let's go ahead and let

3   the BellSouth panel finish.

4   MR. PATE: I think I was talking about the Sprint

5   submitted change requests and that we had rejected that

6   particular one for cost prohibitive. The reason cost

7   prohibitive usually comes into a point is because it's just a

8   volume consideration at this point in time based on the product

9   and the offer and the volume and particularly when you're

10   looking whether your resources are working on some of the other

11   requests.

12   Moving on to the next point there, which is one of

13   Covad's issues, the UDC/IDSL. As you can see, we did offer

14   them an alternative for that which was a product used on ISDN

15   lines. It could be ordered, but even in light of that, based

16   on there, the very bottom bullet on that presentation, their

17   change requests, this is being implemented in a two-phase

18   approach. The first phase took place February 2nd. Ms. Boone,

19   I think, acknowledged that earlier. This does give them the

20   ability to order these electronically. However, it will be

21   fallen out by design at this point in time and have to be

22   intervened by the representatives in the local carrier service

23   center for further processing, but phase two will take care of

24   that so that it will be flowing through the systems. And that

25   is right now currently targeted for May 18th of this year in

1   Release 10.5. I think that directly responds to Covad's issues

2   that they have raised here on Page 8.

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Palecki, you were

4   asking that question. Does this respond to your question? And

5   Ms. Boone has indicated she'd like to respond.

6   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Yes, that does respond to my

7   question. And I would like to hear Ms. Boone's response.

8   CHAIRMAN JABER: Go ahead, Ms. Boone.

9   MS. BOONE: I'll be very brief. If I could take them

10   from the bottom up. The UDC/IDSL loop, I'd like to mention

11   that we are happy that apparently this release of last week

12   will give us at least some functionality, but you heard

13   Mr. Pate say it's going to fallout in the LCSC. Now, what that

14   means is, they've got to retype the order there, and all of the

15   errors that are inherent in a manual process will then come

16   into play, because if there's an error in something that's been

17   retyped, then obviously it won't flow correctly.

18   I'd also like to add that -- it's interesting because

19   we have a different view, and there's a whole panel on change

20   management, Commissioners. And we consider that to be just

21   imperative particularly in a post-271 environment because

22   that's how you get everything done. Everything is referred to

23   change management. Unfortunately, that's at the end of the

24   day, but I will tell you that Network Telephone submitted a

25   request to mechanize this UDC loop in February of 2001. Covad

1 submitted it in August of 2001, and it was only through the

2 271 process through our filings around the region and through

3 the FCC's concern about the high volume of orders that we had

4 to place manually that we are seeing this process be brought

5 into place. And as BellSouth has said, the second phase that

6 is a true electronic flow-through is several months down the

7 road.

8   Then moving up the line, the ADSL with conditioning,

9 this was requested and rejected as cost prohibitive. Every

10 other ILEC -- we work with every ILEC in the country. Every

11 other ILEC allows us to place orders electronically for loops

12 with conditioning. That's just the way it is. The UCL

13 nondesigned, we actually --

14   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Ms. Boone, let me just ask you

15 a question about that. They made a decision in April of 2001,

16 BellSouth, that this conditioning was not -- was cost

17 prohibitive to go ahead with electronic interface because they

18 had so few requests for the service. Isn't that a reasonable

19 response, if they're only receiving several hundred requests a

20 year for this product that, you know, they would not want to

21 spend the dollars there?

22   MS. BOONE: I could certainly understand that, and

23 let me address -- the volume issue was the next one I was going

24 to address because that is their excuse for both the UCL

25 nondesigned and for the conditioning. And I would say

1 basically two things about volume. The first is that that is a

2 criteria that is placed on wholesale that is not placed on

3 retail, because on the day that BellSouth began to offer Fast

4 Access, which is its retail DSL product, they had fully

5 mechanized preordering and ordering. So they had zero orders,

6 and they got an electronic system. And they're saying, okay,

7 now we have a small volume, and it's not enough to justify an

8 electronic system. So we view that as inconsistent.

9   The second thing is that, you know, in April this

10 Commission, for example, hadn't ruled that load coil removal

11 was zero and that we could get bridged taps removed for $9. So

12 some of this is a process of going around state by state by

13 state and convincing commissions to set good rates so that we

14 can then come in and serve customers. And just to be clear,

15 BellSouth will not offer their retail services to people who

16 have conditioned lines. So we're willing to provide DSL to

17 people that BellSouth won't provide it to.

18   And the last part of the volume question is, there

19 was a greater volume in DSL before Rhythms went out of

20 business, before NorthPoint went out of business. Now we're

21 just a few DSL providers left here in the state of Florida, and

22 so the volume is not as high as it was, say, you know, last

23 year, but we're hoping it will be again. And we're not going

24 to add 600,000 people to our network faxing orders the

25 way BellSouth -- when BellSouth can do it electronically.

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Pate, go ahead. And I recognize

2   you were interrupted. We'll try not to do that again.

3   MR. PATE: Thank you. One point I'd like to just

4   make, and I know we have a whole session dedicated to change

5   control process, but the CLEC community is involved in the

6   prioritization of change control -- or change requests that are

7   submitted so that overall process itself helps to prioritize

8   what we work on, what we look at in terms of implementations.

9   Of course, that is also a part of that process associated with

10   orders from a regulatory authority like this Commission.

11   The issue that I would like to also point out is, we

12   had performance metrics that Mr. Varner will get into in

13   detail, so the step for moving at least from a manual

14   submission to an electronic submission where it falls out does

15   bring with it quicker response time to which we are held

16   accountable for, and there's even penalties associated with it.

17   So there's definitely one step towards that at least to get it

18   submitted electronically, and then the final step to make it

19   where we would all like to see everything is to have it then

20   flow-through once it's submitted electronically, but there are

21   rigid standards associated with that to assist in the

22   processing of these various transactions.

23   The next one that we have here just deals with some

24   other issues associated that Covad raised in their filing.

25   They raised this by reference to, I think, some previous

1 | filings, so I'd just like to make a few points here. Covad has

2 | previously raised concern over line sharing and ADSL -- xDSL

3 | ordering processes, but, you know, Covad was one of two line

4 | sharing collaborative members that participated in the original

5 | testing of this process. So I thought we worked well with them

6 | trying to work through the process and put it in place, listen

7 | to their needs and through their cooperation and assistance.

8 | BellSouth does conduct a very thorough testing end-to-end on

9 | these releases as they are put in place. There's been some

10 | reference to the fact that that does not occur. Well, that's

11 | not true. It does occur in a very extensive manner.

12 | We have professionals that work and labor day in and

13 | day out to thoroughly test the systems prior to release, and

14 | then, as you know, we have the CAVE system that allows the

15 | CLECs to test and see if there's other things that could be

16 | discovered.

17 | BellSouth has also established an internal team to

18 | ensure both manual and electronic line sharing orders were

19 | successfully processed with Covad. We had individuals from

20 | Covad's account team. Their customer support manager was on

21 | there. We had members from my interconnection staff support to

22 | take a look at the various orders that were submitted by Covad

23 | as well as within BST's own internal processes. And frankly,

24 | we found some points out for both. We found some areas of

25 | opportunity for BellSouth, and we found some areas of

1 opportunity for Covad working closely with them from their

2 orders. Then we both learned some lessons out of that for

3 improvement as a result of that process.

4 Covad's complaint that LENS would not allow

5 supplemental LSRs -- you heard that referenced, I think,

6 earlier -- for the xDSL loops. This was a temporary problem.

7 We immediately got a work-around in place. This took place

8 at -- the work-around was in place in August that allowed them

9 here in this situation to submit them electronically, but once

10 again, they fell out for manual processing until we had a

11 permanent fix. And that permanent fix was put in place so that

12 this worked properly on November 3rd of 2001.

13 The final one here, Covad's complaint that LENS

14 rejected orders due to an invalid billing account number. That

15 issue has been resolved. Covad identified the difficulty

16 associated with BellSouth's documentation, but the

17 investigation turned that some of these problems really

18 resulted from Covad's misunderstanding of that documentation;

19 therefore, resulted in their failure to follow some of the

20 instructions that we had provided both on the Web as well as

21 some additional information to them via e-mail. But the bottom

22 line to that one is that one was resolved back in September of

23 2001 as well.

24 A couple other things -- let's hold that one, Nate.

25 A couple other things I'd like to talk to you, just trying to

1 respond to some of their discussions we had here, we talked

2 about the CSR process. And I wanted to make sure that the

3 Commission understood that the CSR process, particularly in a

4 migration from one ALEC to another ALEC, that involves their

5 permission to look at this. I think that came out in the

6 discussion. And BellSouth has little control over that

7 process. But Ms. Conquest was talking about, well, it would be

8 nice if we had some standard procedures. Well, there is a

9 forum for that. That same forum she referred to, the order and

10 billing forum for Access, well, there is an ordering and

11 billing forum for the local services as well. And BellSouth

12 subscribes to the industry approach. That is just a perfect

13 example. As things evolve, we are going to encounter these,

14 and we would like to see those taken from the industry as a

15 whole in that ordering and billing forum and drive to processes

16 that would then be uniform for everyone. So we applaud, you

17 know, that approach ourselves, and we would say that that forum

18 does exist today in the ordering and billing forum.

19   I'd also like to point out that we do have a

20 CLEC-to-CLEC migration process that is posted on our Web site,

21 so we have defined a process for them to follow. The challenge

22 with this, as you can appreciate, is this requires them to work

23 together when they're competitors. And I can appreciate that

24 being an opportunity. They don't want to lose one of their

25 customers to another customer. So there's some challenges

1 associated with that. Maybe if we get back to an OBF forum

2 giving us some further insight to this, that we can deal with

3 that.

4   I'd also like to just discuss briefly, MCI made a

5 reference to their request back to an account team to evaluate

6 a sample of orders, and the account team for Ms. Lichtenberg

7 has refused to do that. I want to make sure the Commission is

8 aware that this account team that she's referencing has worked

9 very diligently with MCI, has done numerous other samplings.

10 She's even made reference to one that which they got a lot of

11 insight to that assisted them. So this account team, I'm not

12 obviously privy of the specific conversation that took place,

13 but I can assure you that this account team is diligent in its

14 efforts of working with MCI.

15   I have also had the opportunity every now and then to

16 chat with members of that account team, and I know here from

17 what I thought was taking place was the account team wanted to

18 focus on taking a look at data, and based on the data, let the

19 data tell them where to go look to try to evaluate and identify

20 opportunities for improvement. So instead of maybe taking a

21 sampling -- and I'm not sure this is what took place in this

22 conversation, but they were proposing, let's use our data, and

23 let's use -- you've heard the old 80-20 approach. If we have

24 data that shows 80 percent of the issues are coming from

25 Point A, then let's don't spend any time on those Bs, Cs, and

1 Ds for the 20 until we get A resolved. That's what that

2 account team is trying to do instead of taking a look at

3 samples, is they want to evaluate some of the submissions from

4 the local service requests from MCI and see if there's a

5 particular area where they can go look and everybody can

6 benefit from that. But I know they're working diligently with

7 MCI, and I just wanted to bring to your --

8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Excuse me. You indicated that

9 the account team preferred to look at the data as opposed to

10 doing a survey. Did I understand that correctly?

11 MR. PATE: As opposed to doing the sample that I hear

12 that Ms. Lichtenberg is discussing today. They have done many

13 samples in the past with them.

14 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, I guess my question is,

15 what data are they relying upon if it's not based upon some

16 sample? I mean, do you have data on the whole universe so that

17 a sample is not needed?

18 MR. PATE: They have data on the universe that they

19 can pull at least to identify a given area to go look, and then

20 within that area take a sample, because obviously they couldn't

21 look at the -- MCI gives us thousands upon thousands of

22 transactions. So, for example, if they were going to look at

23 the manual fallout, they would first -- if they could use their

24 data to identify the majority of the manual fallout was coming

25 as a result of a particular type of transaction, then pull

1 samples from those transactions to see if they could find out

2 what is the root cause within that type of transaction is

3 causing the manual fallout. Those are the approaches they

4 discussed with me. As opposed to trying to take a sample of

5 that whole universe of fallout, let's look to a particular type

6 because that's where the volume could at least be centered on

7 the data they have.

8   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Madam Chair?

9   CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes, go right ahead.

10   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Well, one question. What is

11 the reliability of the data if you're using sampling as

12 compared to hard numbers? I mean, you know, if you take a

13 sample -- if you do a sampling versus doing an actual account

14 and determining what the completion rate might be? I mean,

15 how are you -- what's the reliability of it?

16   MR. PATE: I don't think we're talking about

17 statistical samples here from being statistically valid. The

18 samples in the past is where MCI gave us the PONs, their

19 purchase order numbers, to go look at. I can't speak to how

20 they pulled the sample. So I don't think there's anyone that

21 can sit here in this room -- I know I'm not a statistician --

22 to say they were statistically valid, but it still was a good

23 intent effort on MCI as well as ours to get a sample that would

24 be representative.

25   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Mr. Pate, I think that MCI

1   told us that they really wanted to look at the sample of orders

2   so they could see the reason that some of these orders had

3   fallen out to manual rather than being processed

4   electronically. And I think what I hear you saying is that

5   your account team is working on that and that they are planning

6   to get back with MCI with some further information, is that

7   correct, to help MCI make that determination?

8   MR. PATE: That's my understanding. I think some

9   members -- Mr. Ainsworth maybe can speak to trying to pull some

10 other information -- other sources just to help MCI. We have

11 numerous aspects trying to help MCI. But to answer your

12 question, the account team is, yes. And if that's not the

13 case, you know, if Ms. Lichtenberg has something different,

14 I'll be glad to talk to that account team myself because I can

15 do so to make sure --

16   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Well, that's one thing I want

17 to make sure of, and I want your assurance that there will

18 continue to be communication with MCI to help them try to

19 identify why these certain orders are falling out so they could

20 fix their own problems and correct their own mistakes.

21   MR. PATE: Most definitely, Commissioner. I mean, we

22 both -- I think MCI and BellSouth has the same desire there.

23 We may be at discussion as to what the approach is, but I think

24 we have both the same intent and end result desire.

25   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you.

1   MS. LICHTENBERG: Mr. Commissioner, if I could

2   respond for MCI, and I appreciate your help here. We made a

3   very specific request. And this is the second request we've

4   made. The first request we made was in a conversation that I

5   had with our account team on August 30th, 2001. We asked that

6   they look at a sample of orders, any -- that they just go

7   around the LCSC and grab some orders that we submitted

8   electronically but that fell to manual, that they research

9   those orders and tell us why.

10   On October 3rd, 2001, approximately a month and a

11 half later, they responded to us. And we discovered that there

12 were certain flaws in the BellSouth systems that were causing

13 these orders to fall to manual. One of those is being fixed,

14 we understand, in May. We asked again specifically for exactly

15 the same work. We requested it January 10. In our meeting

16 last week, which would have been -- I believe it was the

17 February 15th meeting, we requested it one more time. The

18 response we received was this -- and I don't know what better

19 word to use but gobbledygook of getting low hanging fruit.

20   We found the review of 89 of our orders to tell us

21 absolutely specifically why they fell to manual to be a major

22 help to us. I would like exactly the same thing. And I

23 appreciate that Mr. Pate will go back and speak to our account

24 team and that I should be seeing that answer, I hope, next week

25 or the week after. So thank you for helping us with that.

1   MR. PATE: Can I just respond? I want to make one

2 point clear. I did not make any --

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: Let me go ahead and set the stage

4 here going forward. When you all sat down and thought about

5 the time periods for commenting on each of these sections, I

6 would assume, because Ms. Keating is really good and thinks

7 about all of this stuff, I would assume that that included time

8 periods for questions from Commissioners, and I'm sure that you

9 evaluated whether or not you'd have an opportunity to respond

10 to each other. So I would ask that you remember that I have

11 been flexible so far, but closer to 5:00, we will not be

12 flexible. Tomorrow is an agenda today, and that's the reality

13 of the situation. Go ahead.

14   MR. PATE: Thank you. I appreciate that. The other

15 thing I would respond was a comment made by Covad on the retail

16 ADSL. And it's my final comment. I'll pass over to

17 Mr. Ainsworth. Ms. Boone made reference to what BellSouth

18 offers from its retail standpoint and everything being

19 electronic and their conditioning and so forth. And some of

20 that's true, but that's not to totally accurate as to what she

21 said. We offer a product, the Fast Access is what it's

22 referred to, on the BellSouth retail consumer offering. The

23 product is not guaranteed, and that product itself by not

24 guaranteed means even though there is a mechanized means to

25 prequalify the customer, we have an error rate in that that we

1 have shown through experience as high as 10 percent. We have

2 talked about this before, I think, in other proceedings before

3 this Commission. And when we incurred the error installation

4 at provisioning time, we tell them, I'm sorry, we cannot

5 provision this. We cannot install it. It's not a guaranteed

6 process.

7   Then there's another offering that's offered through

8 the network service providers that BellSouth sells its ADSL

9 through that they do have -- and I've forgotten the term, but

10 it is a business type of offering that guarantees the service.

11 So it's built in in the offering itself to go out and condition

12 the lines if that cannot actually be provisioned without such.

13 So it's built into the process. It's not that the conditioning

14 is built in up front as part of the service inquiry so much as

15 it's built in as a guarantee, and the rate's based on that.

16   With that, that's all of my comments, and I'll defer

17 to Mr. Ainsworth -- or Ms. Cox, obviously, before

18 Mr. Ainsworth.

19   MS. COX: Yes. I was just going to briefly address

20 the issue about the removal of the ADSL USOC from the line

21 before converting to UNE-P. Our ADSL service is a wholesale

22 service, so our customers for that service are network service

23 providers or Internet service providers. So we will sell the

24 service to those customers. Those customers then tell us which

25 of our telephone customers to put the service on on their

1 behalf. So the USOC that goes on our customer's telephone line

2 is really what we call a nonrated USOC. It doesn't generate

3 billing to the end user customer. The billing goes to the

4 network service provider.

5 And it's true that in order to convert to UNE-P, that

6 ADSL USOC does need to come off of that line. What we suggest

7 is when the ALEC would look at the customer service record they

8 can see the USOC. The end user needs to get with the network

9 service provider. We take our instructions from our customer,

10 who in this case is the network service provider, to remove the

11 USOC.

12 The original process for this was that upon

13 submission of a UNE-P order, the ADSL USOC was removed

14 automatically. And there was some concern about that.

15 Customers were losing their Internet access service, and so it

16 was brought to the change control process, a request to modify

17 that process. The current process is the result of that

18 request, and it was designed to enable the ALECs to work up

19 front with their customers so there would be no confusion about

20 the loss of the Internet access. That went in, I believe,

21 sometime last fall.

22 My understanding is, there has been another change

23 control process request, and it will be discussed at

24 prioritization in March to modify somewhere sort of between

25 those two that would allow an ALEC to submit a UNE-P order. It

1   would come back clarified. At that point, the ALEC would know

2   what the reason was. They could go to the end user, get that

3   resolved with their Internet service provider, or they could

4   elect to resubmit the LSR, and at that point, the ADSL would be

5   removed. So it's a process that has evolved. We've done it

6   originally in the way that it seems like we hear here that

7   would be preferable; however, for whatever reason, it was not

8   preferable. We made a revision, and now we're looking at it

9   again.

10   But, Commissioner Deason, I believe you had asked how

11 does the service get on the line. We take the request from the

12 network service provider, is who we sell the service to, and

13 that's who we would send the bills to. I believe Mr. Ainsworth

14 is going to discuss it a little bit further.

15   MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. I'm going to talk about the

16 manual processing. And, first of all, I'd like to say that

17 absolutely the manual processing does work. As we're going

18 through the process, I'll try to pick up and I may have to go

19 back to my notes to finish and make sure that we have responded

20 to all the issues that I have made note of, but initially, as

21 soon as the slide comes up, we'll talk about ordering; we'll

22 talk about the PIC freeze. PIC freeze being the end user's

23 capability to initiate a notation on their account not allowing

24 service transition of their local service for interexchange

25 carrier service which is a PIC without their concurrence. That

1 certainly is something this Commission is familiar with, and it

2 certainly is for the protection of the end user.

3   Methods of removal of the PIC freeze is: The end

4 user contacts the retail business office to request to remove

5 the freeze; three-way call with BellSouth business office, end

6 user and alternative local service provider; written

7 documentation to business office for authorized agent to

8 represent the end user. Those are the methods that they can

9 remove that PIC freeze.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Keating, may I ask you a

11 question on the PIC freeze removal? Didn't we last year

12 sometime ask the Staff to conduct -- I can't remember if it was

13 a Staff workshop or that we asked you for a Commission workshop

14 on precisely this issue?

15   MS. KEATING: I'm not recalling that in particular,

16 but I can certainly check on it and make sure.

17   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. If you would, please --

18   MS. KEATING: Certainly.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: -- because something in the back of

20 my mind is -- I thought we had asked you all to work on it, and

21 I just don't know what the status of it is. I don't know if

22 you've had a Staff workshop.

23   MR. AINSWORTH: Continuing? Okay. In looking at

24 some of the analysis, we only had two PONs -- only one of two

25 PONs provided could be identified dealing with particular

1   issue. An analysis of Florida Digital Network examples, the

2   examples that I'm trying to communicate here did not -- the end

3   user did not have a record of call concerning the removal of

4   the freeze within the BellSouth business office documentation

5   that we could review in this case prior to 1/11. And the

6   rationale here or the point being made here, in the

7   documentation on the analysis, it was that that was trying to

8   be removed earlier, but we actually did not -- or were not able

9   to determine a call requesting that until that particular date.

10   And at the time, a three-way call was initiated with

11 the end user and a Florida Digital agent which occurred that

12 resulted in an order being issued to remove the local freeze.

13 And at that particular time, Florida Digital then processed an

14 order and it was completed on 2/1. So we did see that process

15 take place, just not in the time frame as was alluded to in

16 some of the data that we had, and that could be actually

17 something that Florida Digital may have presumed also and just

18 did not occur. I'm not sure of why that time frame took place.

19   Looking at ADSL that Cindy had just talked about,

20 ADSL removal delaying migrations. ALEC pre-migration

21 responsibility, and the ALEC is responsible for validating

22 against end user records and determining if ADSL exists prior

23 to migrating end user accounts. A request should be submitted

24 by the end user to the Internet service provider for the

25 removal of ADSL to allow migration activity to be completed.

1 Clarifications will be issued in the cases where ADSL has not

2 been removed prior to submission of an order.

3 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: What does that mean

4 "clarifications"?

5 MR. AINSWORTH: Clarification means that if they

6 submit an order, ADSL is still on that order. We will clarify

7 an order back for them to validate that and get that order

8 clear for the ADSL, and we're talking about in moving that over

9 to a UNE product.

10 BellSouth documentation indicates that requests were

11 processed by the retail unit on the date that was documented in

12 the data that we reviewed in the analysis, and also, one thing

13 that I am happy to report here today is that currently

14 BellSouth is trialing an enhanced process to assist ALECs to

15 reduce the delays with ADSL. And I can tell you that we are

16 working with one CLEC, and within the last two weeks we have

17 initiated an additional process, a contact process, and will be

18 evaluating that process. And once we formalize that, we will

19 roll it out to all the CLECs. This is an enhancement to try

20 and more expediently remove the ADSL USOC where we encounter

21 that on the processing of their order. So we have only been in

22 this about two weeks, and we really don't have enough

23 information right now to know that we have a final product or a

24 final process there that we think will be satisfactory to both

25 parties.

1   Manual errors. Analysis of 19 alleged service order

2   errors provided to BellSouth by AT&T indicated that nine of the

3   orders did not contain errors and one order was canceled. One

4   order was not found, and the remaining eight orders had service

5   order errors. Again, if you look at these orders, this was

6   really a period through June through December. And based on

7   the order volume for AT&T, this represents a very insignificant

8   number, a very small number, in that process.

9   Additional analysis of 500 lines performed by

10   WorldCom revealed a 2.5 percent error rate. That was, I

11   believe, their documentation on that. In other words,

12   BellSouth had a 97.5 percent accuracy rate based on WorldCom's

13   audit. BellSouth contends that a smaller portion of these

14   errors are related to actual service orders.

15   Manual errors, we have done several things to reduce

16   those -- any manual handling errors that may be encountered, so

17   we've put several quality controls in place. We have a

18   regional quality group today that samples orders and does

19   quality reviews in that process. We also have a service order

20   quality review group in each of the LCSCs which are reviewing

21   orders and feeding that process back to the service reps and to

22   their management team and also the customer support center call

23   analysis group in Jacksonville actually taking calls from the

24   CLEC and questioning clarification and other issues is running

25   analysis and also providing feedback in that process to the

1 centers and also feedback to the customer support managers and

2 the account team even indicating reasons and rationale for why

3 the CLECs would be calling the center to question a

4 clarification or service order errors.

5   Just to note, service order accuracy on the SQM for

6 November was 96.28 and December 95.79 which really provides

7 support for the fact that these controls and these quality

8 controls we've put in are having an impact and they're having a

9 positive impact.

10   Serial clarifications. LCSC clarification process is

11 to validate an order, an LSR, for all errors prior to

12 clarification. There are limiting factors in that and that is

13 the point of what type error we're dealing with. In some

14 situations that would not allow them to go beyond the process

15 to a certain point on the order based on the type error that

16 were submitted.

17   And the other thing is that the number of ALEC

18 errors. If you realize that or you understand that on

19 clarifications we're really clarifying back what is in most

20 part CLEC errors, then we are actually looking at that LSR

21 trying to resolve those processes or trying to resolve those

22 errors completely. And the service process for the service

23 representative is to go through that order completely and try

24 to identify every error it can. But again, we need the CLEC

25 support in that to make sure when they transit -- when they

1 actually initiate these LSR requests, that they're making the

2 same commitment to validate those LSRs and the quality of those

3 LSRs that come across. And also, on any resubmission of LSRs,

4 they have a responsibility also in that mode to do a quality

5 analysis check also and to validate that they have eliminated

6 any error that they can identify.

7   ALEC error process. We had one example provided

8 which was not a serial clarification. Initially, in this case,

9 just as an example, it was an auto reject up front, and then it

10 was a clarification or a manual clarification after the LSR was

11 resubmitted, so that really was not a manual serial

12 clarification. It was two submissions from the CLEC but only

13 one manual clarification. The up front fatal reject actually

14 returned that order from the initial response from the CLEC.

15   Again, BellSouth quality controls. I take you back

16 to the fact that we're looking at that in the customer support

17 center call analysis group. We're attempting to determine what

18 are the reasons for those. We're trying to feed that back, and

19 we're doing monthly and quarterly reports on there to identify

20 the cause of the calls that are coming into the center. The

21 intent here is, one, to help reduce the amount of errors we're

22 having overall on the orders, and the other one is certainly

23 from a BellSouth perspective to reduce the number of calls for

24 those type issues into our centers.

25   Invalid clarifications and rejects. An analysis for

1 the period December through early February, Network Telephone

2 presented 113 examples of alleged invalid clarifications. We

3 sampled 35 of the 113 and determined 23 were clarified

4 correctly. And I will just point out here that I think part of

5 that process was where they were showing invalid clarifications

6 involving the ADSL issue which in the process that we are in at

7 that time, those would be valid clarifications, but I just

8 wanted to mention that because I do think we have a process in

9 place that is going to reduce that issue.

10   When compared to the estimated number of

11 clarifications for December and January, the clarification

12 rejects would be correct in this case as 96.9 percent of the

13 time. And I guess the point here is, when you look at the

14 clarification rate and the numbers that are being clarified

15 back versus the amount of errors we're seeing on

16 clarifications, BellSouth certainly is in the smaller number of

17 that, very significantly smaller than the errors we're looking

18 at.

19   Invalid clarifications/rejects. Analysis: AT&T

20 cited 203 orders that were incorrectly clarified as a result of

21 a USOC problem. We agree and while that's true, a system

22 defect -- and I believe that was mentioned today by AT&T -- was

23 identified on 11/9 of 2001. And it was related to a 1FB to MFB

24 USOC class of service change, and a fix was implemented on

25 10.2.1 release on 11/17. And this resolved the major

1   clarification issue on the examples provided by AT&T.

2   Florida Digital provided three examples of alleged

3   invalid clarifications for January of 2002. Two of these

4   examples were clarified correctly -- I'm sorry, it was three

5   examples. Two of these were clarified correctly, and one was

6   clarified in error. The average clarifications for Florida

7   Digital are approximately 128 per month. Therefore, again,

8   we're clarifying properly 99 percent of the time in the

9   examples if you look at the total clarification rate.

10   Again, when you look at BellSouth quality controls,

11   customer support center call analysis again is one of the main

12   processes we're looking at here to try to improve that process,

13   identify any deficiencies that may be on BellSouth's part, and

14   implement changes to address those issues.

15   COMMISSIONER DEASON: How did you come to the

16   conclusion that 99 percent of the FDN clarifications were

17   accurate?

18   MR. AINSWORTH: I'm sorry?

19   COMMISSIONER DEASON: How did you determine that your

20   99 percent --

21   MR. AINSWORTH: We just -- I'm sorry, Commissioner.

22   We looked at the volumes that they had sent, and we looked at

23   what they said were clarified in error versus what was

24   clarified. So, you know, just logically looking at that we

25   would assume that the others were clarified correctly and not

1 clarified in error.

2   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Did you review all 128?

3   MR. AINSWORTH: I'm sorry?

4   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, I'm just -- I'm a little

5 confused. You indicated that there were three that were

6 provided, and you determined that two were clarified correctly

7 and one incorrectly, and then you conclude that 99 percent of

8 the clarifications are accurate.

9   MR. AINSWORTH: Right. All we're saying is that out

10 of the ones that we sampled, when we perform the sample, we

11 just calculated it back up to the number of clarifications that

12 were issued and came up with that number. I mean, that's just

13 a sample and a projection.

14   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: But that's just for the month

15 of January, not for every month.

16   MR. AINSWORTH: That's correct.

17   Partially mechanized FOC timeliness. Partially

18 mechanized orders are requests that are entered electronically

19 and are distributed to the LCSC for manual firm order

20 confirmation processing. Service order SQM or the service

21 quality measures have been established by the Public Service

22 Commission to assure timely processing. The present SQM for

23 Florida is ten hours for FOC processing of partially mechanized

24 orders.

25   Also, there was a comment from WorldCom that was

1 about the communication between the LCSC in the Jacksonville

2 customer support operation, and Jacksonville, as you're aware,

3 acts as a customer support center contact for Birmingham and

4 for Atlanta. The advantages I'd like to point out here are the

5 efficiencies in handling the FOC and the reject interval,

6 reduce answer time, and also allows Birmingham and Atlanta to

7 focus on processing orders in an expedient manner.

8   If you can recall with me and go back to a little

9 history, we started out with 36 hours FOC. We went to 24. Now

10 we're at 10 hours FOC. So as you reduce these type timetables

11 for processing in a manual world, you need to gain

12 efficiencies. And one of the methods to do that was

13 implementing the Jacksonville center to support those centers

14 for taking calls, customer support calls. Absolutely, as we

15 reduce that time, we need to not interrupt the work activity

16 that's going on in Atlanta and in Birmingham. And it's been a

17 very good process. We feel very strongly about it. And we

18 think the Jacksonville center is certainly doing a great job in

19 the analysis process.

20   Again, their quality enhanced process, they track and

21 they document assistance calls, provide input to the LCSCs for

22 quality improvement, and they provide CSMs and account teams

23 with ALEC issues.

24   The customer service record undate, Florida Digital

25 Network and Network Telephone complained of delays in CSR

1   updating. And I think we had talked of this earlier in other

2   collaboratives. And the CSRs should -- updates should occur

3   within a 24- to 72-hour period after the completion. This is

4   at parity with retail which has already been stated. In the

5   analysis we performed on CSRs out of 498 examples provided by

6   Network Telephone for December and January, over 50 percent

7   meet the 72-hour interval. And that was just based on what was

8   supplied according to Network Telephone's own data.

9   BellSouth's analysis on the sample of the other 50 percent

10   indicate that only 5 were outside the stated 72-hour period.

11   Again, my staff did the analysis. We'll be certainly happy to

12   sit down with Network Telephone and look at that in detail if

13   they would choose to do so. We would certainly welcome that.

14   Florida Digital alleged CSRs again with a CSR with

15   pending orders are not being processed efficiently. The end

16   user here is responsible for contacting BellSouth to cancel any

17   pending orders -- we talked about that earlier -- for BellSouth

18   service. BellSouth's analysis indicates that end users made

19   additional requests for BellSouth services after having told

20   FDN they wanted to migrate the service to Florida Digital.

21   Again, that was a comment I had made earlier to where when you

22   look at the documentation trying to resolve those issues trying

23   to get the CSR updated -- or on the CSR that we found, that

24   additional contacts are still going between the end user in

25   some cases and the retail units. The discussion we had

1 earlier, we certainly welcome the opportunity to work with the

2 CLECs in that manner to try to come to a better process

3 collectively in trying to resolve that pending order issue, and

4 we certainly will be available to do that.

5   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Ainsworth, you know when we were

6 talking earlier about the ADSL USOC -- I can't remember if it

7 was Ms. Cox or Mr. Pate -- the customer -- the BellSouth

8 customer is the ISP. So you count on the ISP to tell you to

9 put on the ADSL USOC or to cancel it.

10   MR. AINSWORTH: That's true, yes.

11   CHAIRMAN JABER: Now, analogize that with this

12 situation. You're not with the ADSL USOC. You are not

13 communicating with the end user, nor is the end user

14 communicating with you to take ADSL service off of their line.

15 With the pending service orders, you want the end user to

16 communicate with you. I fail to see the difference between the

17 ADSL USOC and this situation.

18   MR. AINSWORTH: Well, actually, in the ADSL situation

19 when the CLEC were to identify that, they still should have

20 that USOC -- or they still should have that service removed. I

21 think the process is really more than one situation that could

22 occur. One is, they do have ADSL, and they need to have it

23 removed so the service can be transferred. That would be the

24 end user notifying whoever that ISP is that they want to remove

25 that service. That's one process, and that's just the same as

1 the service order process.

2 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. But on the service order

3 process, you want the ALECs to treat it differently. We

4 discussed earlier why the ALEC couldn't just contact you and

5 represent that the customer wants the pending service order

6 removed or, you know, that the service order had been

7 completed; therefore, allow the customer to migrate into the

8 competitive provider network. Does that make sense? I'm not

9 being very articulate. Do you understand the question?

10 MS. COX: Let me take a stab at it. What we really

11 have in these two instances are, the customer is two different

12 people to BellSouth. In the ADSL USOC world, our customer is

13 really that Internet service provider. That's who we are

14 billing for the ADSL service, and so that's who would tell us

15 to remove it.

16 In the pending service order, the customer, the end

17 user is the person we would be dealing with on a particular

18 service. So I guess we're hearing from the customer in both

19 cases, it's just the customer is not the same person depending

20 on the service. I don't know if that made any sense.

21 CHAIRMAN JABER: Well, isn't the ISP your wholesale

22 customer?

23 MS. COX: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN JABER: And isn't the ALEC your wholesale

25 customer?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1   MS. COX: Yes.

2   CHAIRMAN JABER: So what's the difference?

3   MS. COX: Well, the network service provider is the

4   wholesale customer for the ADSL which is going over the high

5   frequency portion of the loop. When we're going to migrate to

6   UNE-P, the ALEC then takes the loop, and they have the whole

7   loop to do what they wish with. But we need to hear from the

8   network service provider. In other words, the ALEC doesn't

9   have the authority to speak for our network service provider

10 customer that they want that service disconnected. So the

11 current process is that we need to hear from that network

12 service provider. You know, it's been cases where we didn't

13 and that's been requested to be changed, and it's still a

14 process that's being looked at. But we hear from our customer

15 in both cases, it's just depending on the service. Our

16 customer might be an Internet service provider; our customer

17 might be what we think of as an end user.

18   CHAIRMAN JABER: What authority -- okay. I see the

19 distinction you're trying to make. You're saying that the

20 network service provider, the ISP, has received the authority

21 from that residential end user to represent the change in

22 service on Internet. How did you go through that process?

23 What authority did the ISP have to achieve, and why can't that

24 process apply for the ALECs on the pending service order side?

25   MS. COX: Well, in the case of the ADSL, the

1 customer -- the end user that would be making the decision

2 about the telephone service, their service provider is the

3 Internet service provider. They don't really have a

4 relationship with BellSouth. They are going through an

5 Internet service provider, so that's who they have their

6 relationship with. And that's who would decide -- they would

7 work out between the two of them whether or not they're going

8 to continue to get Internet access service. If they say they

9 are not, then the Internet service provider would call us and

10 say, you can go ahead and take that off the line. I no longer

11 need it to provide service to this customer. There's not the

12 same sort of circumstance in the ALEC. We have the

13 relationship with the end user for a pending service order

14 could be the case.

15   COMMISSIONER DEASON: What about a situation where

16 the customer wants to maintain that Internet service but they

17 want FDN to basically be coordinating that? How do they go

18 about accomplishing that?

19   MS. COX: It could be done a couple of ways. The

20 first, FDN could enter into a line splitting agreement with an

21 Internet service provider, and in that way, they would be able

22 to provide the voice on the low frequency portion of that loop,

23 and then they could provide -- an Internet service provider

24 could make use of the high frequency portion to make -- to

25 provide service to the end user.

1   They could make use of a resold line. In which case,

2   the ADSL USOC would stay on the line because at that point the

3   ALEC doesn't really have control of the full loop. So that

4   would be a couple of ways that -- or FDN could elect to use

5   their own Internet service provider and provide their own

6   Internet access service over that high frequency portion.

7   COMMISSIONER DEASON: But if the end use customer

8   wanted to continue service from their existing Internet service

9   provider who apparently they have a relationship with, for them

10   to continue that and to also have local service from FDN, just

11   repeat your answer. How do they do that?

12   MS. COX: One way would be if FDN is purchasing

13   resold lines, then the --

14   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let's forget the resold. I'm

15   talking about a UNE approach.

16   MS. COX: Okay. Under the UNE approach, we are

17   required to facilitate what's known as line splitting, and that

18   enables two ALECs to split the functionality of the loop. So

19   FDN could enter into a relationship with an Internet service

20   provider and provide the full package in that way. Now, it may

21   or may not enable the end user to keep their exact same

22   Internet service provider, but it would be a means for them --

23   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can that be accomplished

24   without a disruption in service to the Internet?

25   MS. COX: I don't know. I don't know.

1   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can we go back to the slide?

2 On the slide, it indicates that BellSouth's analysis shows that

3 end users made additional requests for BellSouth services after

4 apparently indicating to FDN that they wanted FDN service. Why

5 would a customer do that? If they have contacted FDN and says,

6 I want your service, and then subsequent to that they contact

7 BellSouth and say, you know, I want to order something else on

8 my telephone service, why would they do that?

9   MR. AINSWORTH: I mean, that's a great question.

10 When we saw some of that, as a matter of fact, we had the same

11 discussion of why that would be taking place. And, you know,

12 we don't know if that had already taken place or if in the

13 business aspect where you're dealing with small business or

14 business type individuals out there, they have multiple people

15 that are making those -- can you hear me okay? I mean, I'm

16 getting feedback. There may be multiple people that are

17 involved in that process, and I don't -- you know, I don't

18 really know in that situation if they're communicating

19 internally or if there's something else going on, but it would

20 be more likely to happen in a business scenario than in a

21 residential scenario, I think. But we asked the same question

22 to ourself as we looked at that data.

23   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: But wouldn't the correct

24 response from the BellSouth representative in that case be to

25 say to the customer, you're now an FDN customer, you'll have to

1 call them and ask for that change of service?

2   MR. AINSWORTH: In regard to?

3   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: If they made additional

4 requests for as we were talking earlier -- what was the name of

5 that?

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: Hunting.

7   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Hunting. If they called after

8 they have already --

9   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioner Palecki would

10 probably prefer fishing as opposed to hunting, but --

11   (Laughter.)

12   MR. AINSWORTH: I think it just -- it takes us back

13 to the same conversation we had earlier. At that point, it's a

14 pending order, which I'm assuming we can agree on here, and

15 we're trying to clear that order. So from that process, that's

16 why -- or that's the part that we're going to have to look at.

17 I mean, from our standpoint, we're looking for the end user to

18 clear that order.

19   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Let me ask someone from the

20 CLEC community. If there's a pending order to BellSouth, do

21 you have any problem whatsoever with BellSouth switching over

22 that customer and making that request for whatever change of

23 service to hunting or whatever else, call forwarding, call

24 waiting, to making that your responsibility? From thereon in,

25 they're your customer, and BellSouth does not have to deal with

1 that.

2 MS. LICHTENBERG: MCI would very much like to see

3 that, Commissioner. We believe that in this specific case if a

4 customer has started the migration process by issuing an order

5 to the CLEC, that that pending order should keep BellSouth from

6 making changes and the migration should continue and the

7 customer should get what he ordered.

8 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: So you have no problem with

9 doing whatever work is necessary to complete the requests that

10 they have previously made to BellSouth?

11 MS. LICHTENBERG: Absolutely not. When the customer

12 comes to us in a residential environment, we provide to

13 BellSouth a complete list of what we want for that customer,

14 and that would include whatever the customer decided with us.

15 So we would want that request to be completed.

16 CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Lichtenberg, as a follow-up,

17 when you have a customer that calls you that's pursuing the

18 option of your services, how do you even know what price to

19 quote them if you don't have a very good handle on what

20 services they are getting from BellSouth or another CLEC?

21 MS. LICHTENBERG: That is a very good question,

22 Madam Chairman. We talk to the customer and try to understand

23 from the customer what features they've got. Prior to having

24 the ability to use the parsed CSR and again not wanting to have

25 to have two terminals and two sets of functionality on

1 everyone's desktop, we've had to walk through that with the

2 customer. We have a script where we ask a number of questions

3 and we explain the features. The customer tells us what

4 features we want and that's -- what they want; that's what they

5 order.

6 Sometimes they forget something. You may be the

7 decision maker, but you don't know that someone else in your

8 household at one point decided to add call waiting. So you may

9 not tell me that. Later, you may call me back and say, you

10 know, I made a mistake. I also need call waiting. In that

11 case, we will go ahead and provision that as well.

12 CHAIRMAN JABER: You also don't know if they don't

13 have services that they might have alleged that they have.

14 MS. LICHTENBERG: Absolutely correct. We only know

15 what they can tell us and what we see on the CSR. And if the

16 CSR is not correct and if the customer tells us he doesn't have

17 ADSL, then all we know is that he doesn't have ADSL.

18 CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Monroe.

19 MS. CONQUEST: Could I share an IDSL experience

20 briefly, please, that we had.

21 CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes. Let Mr. Monroe go first. He

22 was actually up next.

23 MR. MONROE: In response to the question, I agree

24 with Sherry, absolutely, correct. If there is a pending order

25 to add a feature -- again, we're speaking of hunting with

1   BellSouth -- we would still take that customer over, and we

2   would give them a hunting package or agreement with us. So in

3   response to the question, absolutely, we will take that

4   customer if there are pending orders, provided it's a pending

5   order that is something that -- or a product that we actually

6   have that we can offer to the customer.

7   If it is something that we cannot offer to the

8   customer, obviously we will go back to the customer and say,

9   this is something that we cannot do. Are you still interested

10 in porting your service over to Florida Digital? If so, we'll

11 take that customer even though there is that pending order out

12 there.

13   Yes, sir.

14   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: If it's a service that you

15 don't do, would it be to your benefit to have BellSouth put

16 that service in place before they transfer the customer over to

17 you?

18   MR. MONROE: Not necessarily. If it's a service that

19 we don't provide, we would not provide it whether Bell does or

20 whether Bell does not provide it. What I mean by that is, if

21 the customer goes ahead and completes out that request with

22 BellSouth, we still won't provide that service. If it's not a

23 product that we actually have, whether Bell completes that

24 service for the customer or not, we won't have that particular

25 product. So again, say that they do add Product A, what the

1 customer was looking for, it's not something that we actually

2 service or provide, we will go back to the customer and say,

3 I'm sorry, Mr. Customer, this is not something that Florida

4 Digital can do for you even though you did complete this order

5 out with Bell.

6   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you.

7   CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Conquest.

8   MS. CONQUEST: Yes. I just want to make sure that

9 the Commission understands that in the UNE-P offering that the

10 ALECs are prohibited from assuming a customer that -- has ADSL.

11 And ITC DeltaCom had a unique experience in that we had

12 converted several customers to UNE-P and were later notified by

13 our account team that BellSouth had converted about 24 of those

14 customers after they became our customer and put ISP traffic on

15 those services. So our approach was, since we know the service

16 works, the customer had had it for several months, even though

17 you say in your regulatory documents we can't do this, why

18 can't we amend this process? We know it works. Why are we

19 penalizing these customers just for a policy statement?

20   The response to ITC DeltaCom was, it isn't that the

21 services don't work. It is our policy that you cannot have the

22 ADSL on the UNE-P services. So we were required to do -- we

23 had two approaches. We could either tell the customer they

24 could revert back to BellSouth. We could convert them back to

25 resale. And actually, all of this occurred through no fault of

1 our own. We never saw the orders. We knew nothing about it

2 until the account team notified us. So I think we should ask

3 why ADSL is prohibited for UNE-P customers. Why restrict us?

4   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: I think we have an open docket

5 on that issue right now.

6   MS. CONQUEST: Okay.

7   CHAIRMAN JABER: BellSouth panel, were you done?

8 Mr. Ainsworth.

9   MR. AINSWORTH: I'm sorry?

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Were you done with your panel --

11   MR. AINSWORTH: No, I had a couple more things.

12   CHAIRMAN JABER: Go ahead.

13   MR. AINSWORTH: Just following up on that -- I think

14 the last part of that, again, I want to take you back to the

15 controls we have in place there and the things that we're

16 looking at in those processes. And again, we're -- we've done

17 a lot of work in this area and we continue. We have all three

18 of these quality groups support that effort in trying to move

19 through that process to identify and put any kind of process

20 improvements that we need to look at or either get that

21 information back to the LCSCs for rep development in that

22 process to make sure that service order accuracy is indeed at

23 an acceptable level, that we're performing at an acceptable

24 level.

25   I'd like to talk about -- make sure that I have

1 looked -- in the process I know MCI made the comment from a

2 training aspect, and I'd just like to make a brief comment on

3 that. First of all, I adamantly disagree that we have

4 untrained reps in the LCSC. I would, however, agree that

5 they're not electronically trained to answer electronic

6 questions on processing. That belongs to our EC support group,

7 and that's where that information should be pointed to. Their

8 point is to process manual orders and to efficiently process

9 those orders, and they are not the electronic SMEs, and

10 therefore, they are not the contact for those type of

11 questions. I believe that's all I had.

12   Al, did you have a comment?

13   MR. VARNER: Yes. Back to the beginning, I guess.

14 On a couple of things concerning flow-through on a Network

15 Telephone chart I wanted to comment on. This won't take very

16 long. First, there was, I guess, a chart that put out a

17 bunch -- listed a bunch of flow-through rates for Network

18 Telephone, several months -- I think April through December is

19 what was listed -- comparing their flow-through to a line that

20 said BST. That's the performance for the CLEC aggregate. It's

21 not a BST flow-through number. We don't really have a

22 flow-through number. We have tried to come up with one

23 different times, but that's actually performance for the CLEC

24 aggregate.

25   Another thing I wanted to point out is that when

1 you're looking at those, the numbers that are compared are

2 Network Telephone versus the aggregate of all flow-through

3 which is resale and UNEs. Network Telephone, however, is

4 largely UNEs, and our flow-through rates, as well as every

5 other region's flow-through rates, tend to be lower for UNEs

6 than they are for resale. In fact, when you compare us to the

7 other regions, we're a little bit better on flow-through to

8 kind of put this measurement in perspective and put the

9 performance in perspective to where the other regions are. We

10 tend to be higher on resale and about the same as everybody

11 else on UNEs. So when you're looking at these flow-through

12 rates, that kind of gives it a little bit of a perspective.

13   The other thing I wanted to kind of point out with

14 flow-through is that in looking at flow-through, you always --

15 and evaluating its meaningfulness, I guess, you have to look at

16 it in conjunction with a couple of other measurements. What it

17 says is that if you have a fairly high flow-through rate, you

18 don't have as much manual processing. If the flow-through

19 rates are not as high, you have more manual processing. So

20 then the question becomes, how are you doing on processing

21 these orders that you're getting manually? And the way you

22 look at that, and the way the FCC has tended look at it, is you

23 look at your performance on FOC timeliness for these

24 nonmechanized orders and service order accuracy. And we're

25 doing well on both of those. We consistently meet the

1 benchmarks on FOC timeliness that says that when these orders

2 fallout and are handled in the centers, they are returned in a

3 timely fashion, they're processed in a timely fashion. And on

4 service order accuracy, we're running in 90, 95 percent range;

5 that says that not only are they performing in a timely manner,

6 they're being performed accurately.

7   Now, what that says is that, okay, even if the

8 flow-through rates are not up to a very high level, that what's

9 happening when these orders do fallout, is they're being

10 processed timely and accurately which is ultimately what you're

11 trying to achieve. What you're trying to achieve with

12 flow-through is timely and accurate processing of orders.

13 Obviously, it goes faster if they're mechanized, but the fact

14 of life is, not everything is mechanized.

15   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do you have a performance

16 standard for those orders that are done manually?

17   MR. VARNER: Yes, we do. They are the FOC timeliness

18 nonmechanized and partial mechanized standards. I think the

19 Commission right now for the KPMG test, I can't remember the

20 benchmarks for them, but they are in the SQM that KPMG is using

21 to evaluate our performance. And this Commission recently set

22 benchmarks for those in the order that's supposed to be

23 implemented with May data. And I think they're --

24   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Was it ten business hours? Is

25 that --

1   MR. VARNER: No. This is partial mec. Those are the

2   new ones. I was looking at the ones that's in existence now.

3   I think the ones in existence now is about 85 percent within --

4   I believe it's 24 hours, I believe, for the FOC timeliness, and

5   service order accuracy is a 95 percent accuracy rate.

6   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Are you meeting those?

7   MR. VARNER: We're consistently meeting the FOC

8   timeliness. The service order accuracy we're running between

9   90 to 95.

10   I think that was essentially -- oh, the last thing I

11   wanted to mention was a comment from AT&T about the June, July,

12   and August flow-through data. We disclosed that we did have

13   some problems with the initial postings of those data. It had

14   gone back, corrected, reposted. Since that time, I know of no

15   issues that anybody has raised with that data or any reason to

16   believe that it's not accurate. That's all.

17   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you. Any other panelist for

18   this panel, Mr. -- is it Ainsworth or Ellsworth?

19   MR. AINSWORTH: Ainsworth.

20   CHAIRMAN JABER: Ainsworth. All right. We are ready

21   to move to the third topic. Big number three.

22   COMMISSIONER DEASON: We were supposed to be here at

23   11:25.

24   CHAIRMAN JABER: Two and a half hours ago, two hours

25   ago. All right. Provisioning.

1   MS. BOONE: Madam Chairperson, could I -- before we

2 start on the provisioning panel, a couple of requests from this

3 side. As you know, we are required to provide PON-specific

4 information to BellSouth in advance.

5   CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes.

6   MS. BOONE: And you've seen some response here. We

7 were wondering if we could get the data that they use to do

8 this response. We could continue with the dialogue.

9   CHAIRMAN JABER: You mean after the workshop?

10   MS. BOONE: Right, just have them provide it to us,

11 whatever they used to create their analysis here on the screen.

12   CHAIRMAN JABER: BellSouth, that's a reasonable

13 request.

14   MR. AINSWORTH: Sure.

15   CHAIRMAN JABER: Because I don't want this to come

16 back to the Prehearing Officer, how about we say within

17 seven days of today, you provide that information to the ALECs?

18   MS. BOONE: Okay. We are ready to move on to the

19 provisioning panel now. I think we've touched on a lot of the

20 issues, so we are going to -- we are conscious of the time,

21 Madam Chairperson, and we are moving -- we'll move quickly

22 through them. I believe Ms. Lichtenberg will begin.

23   MS. LICHTENBERG: Yes. Let me start by saying that

24 the provisioning issues are the issues that really touch the

25 customer. That I send an order -- I find out what the customer

1   wants; that's called preorder. I send that order, and

2   sometimes it rejects, and sometimes it gets through. And when

3   it does get through, the order needs to be provisioned. And

4   what that means is that the features and the functions and the

5   long-distance CIC code and the intraLATA routing all need to be

6   provisioned, translated is another word that's used, in the

7   BellSouth switches so that the customer gets what the customer

8   asked for.

9   Mr. Ainsworth cited my data, which was a random

10 sample of service order accuracy, on 500 of our customers for

11 one month stating that after all only two and a half percent

12 got the wrong things. They got the wrong intraLATA -- the

13 wrong intraLATA carrier. They got the wrong features, or they

14 didn't get a number of features. They got the wrong interLATA

15 carrier. And in a number of cases, they weren't able to block

16 calls to things like Ms. Whatever-her-name-is psychic hot line.

17 So they were provisioned inaccurately enough to make customers

18 run up large bills that they didn't know they were going to run

19 up.

20   Provisioning accuracy is measured in -- by BellSouth

21 similarly to the way I do it, but they use fewer orders, and

22 they use all types of orders. When I look at that two and a

23 half percent, by the way, based on the number of customers I

24 have across the BellSouth footprint, that's close to 4,000 who

25 were provisioned wrong. And the only way that we know about

1 that is when the customer calls us to complain, or we or

2 BellSouth find something in a random audit. We've been

3 providing examples to BellSouth of provisioning errors since

4 our launch in May, but I'm confident that Mr. Ainsworth will

5 have answers to those in BellSouth's rebuttal panel. That will

6 be good because it's almost a year later.

7   We find that these are the most disconcerting

8 customer problems of all, and they are problems that require us

9 to make multiple calls to BellSouth. If a customer calls up

10 and says, my call waiting is not working, I issue a trouble

11 ticket because I assume that his call waiting is broken.

12 BellSouth will then tell me, no, no, we didn't provision it, so

13 now you need to call the LCSC and issue an order, and by the

14 way, it will take a couple of days to get that to work.

15 Again --

16   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Excuse me. Do you verify that

17 you're billing the customer for call waiting?

18   MS. LICHTENBERG: Yes, sir, we do. We pull our own

19 local service request in every single instance. When a

20 customer calls us, we can do that on-line internally in our

21 systems. We verify what we sent to BellSouth, and we then

22 assume -- and we would have been billing because we received a

23 service order completion, assuming that what we ordered was put

24 on the customer's account. We also --

25   COMMISSIONER DEASON: So you refer to that before you

1   actually issue a trouble ticket to BellSouth?

2   MS. LICHTENBERG: Yes, yes. All of our trouble

3   handling personnel have access into MCI's own systems which

4   will show them in an English language and a universal service

5   order code format exactly what we sent, when we sent it, and

6   when the completion was received by both telephone number and

7   purchase order number.

8   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do you receive -- if you order

9   a service, you receive indications from BellSouth that it was

10   provisioned, and then you subsequently receive a complaint from

11   the customer that it's not working, and then you determine that

12   it was never provisioned to start with, do you get a refund

13   from BellSouth for that period of time that service was not

14   operational?

15   MS. LICHTENBERG: If I go back in and look at my

16   wholesale bill and if I can take out of the hundreds of

17   thousands of customers I've got that specific customer number,

18   I can open a dispute with BellSouth to try to get that money

19   back.

20   COMMISSIONER DEASON: So you have to actually file

21   for that? It is not automatic.

22   MS. LICHTENBERG: It is not automatic. In certain

23   other operating companies such as Verizon, when the completion

24   is returned to us, the information I talked about before, the

25   billing completion, it actually shows what it is that that ILEC

1 provisioned for the customer, so it can be compared right there

2 to the order. And if there are any issues, they can be

3 resolved for every customer.

4 We have another interesting problem in terms of

5 errors in provisioning. Sometimes customers leave us, and we

6 at that point receive what is called a line loss notification

7 from BellSouth to say, this is no longer your customer. At

8 that point, we stop billing the customer, and we would expect

9 that we would no longer be billed by BellSouth and we would no

10 longer receive what we call daily usage records. That is

11 records of what the customer has dialed.

12 We have provided examples to BellSouth, a subset of

13 which were provided in this hearing, showing the receipt of

14 local calling data for customers who left us months earlier.

15 Now, this points to two things. Either the customer did not

16 leave us and the line loss was in error, but of course, we

17 stopped billing the customer, so he's getting free service, or

18 it took that long to update the customer service record, and

19 these are old records being sent to us, sometimes up to two

20 months later. Again, these are problems that need to be fixed

21 and that impact customers.

22 Another problem that we are having goes back to this

23 issue of pending service orders. We receive a reject saying,

24 you cannot migrate this customer. All records are final. Now,

25 that generally means the customer has no phone service, but

1 given the fact that he called us on the phone, we've got that

2 one taken care of. When we take that to the LCSC -- and

3 Fleming (phonetic) Island takes a while to answer the phone,

4 and a call generally takes about 25 minutes to try to get an

5 answer -- we are told in many of these cases that, no, the

6 customer hasn't left us. The CSR has not been updated. And in

7 one case last week, we were told that it normally takes at

8 least five days to update that CSR. So again, there is some

9 question of what these help desks are actually telling us. We

10 can't track down how that was handled because, of course,

11 Fleming Island does not allow CLECs to get a trouble ticket

12 number so that we could refer back to them and say, I called

13 you on Tuesday with Ticket 1234. What was the status of it?

14   These are all very troubling issues because these are

15 issues that impact customers. We want to work with BellSouth

16 on them, and we appreciate this Commission providing us a forum

17 to do that. It doesn't appear to happen that way on a daily

18 basis.

19   And let me note also before I pass the baton that

20 KPMG has seen similar problems in the excellent third-party

21 test being run by this Commission, translation errors, errors

22 in giving the customer what they want.

23   And I believe we go next to Covad.

24   MS. BOONE: Yes. I'd like to talk briefly about our

25 experience in the provisioning process with two of our three

1 types of loops. The first is the IDSL loop you've already

2 heard about. That's about 43 percent of our orders. This is a

3 loop that enables us to serve customers that are more than

4 18,000 feet from the central office, so it's not a

5 distance-sensitive technology which is good. And it also

6 enables us to provide DSL over fiber which is a big problem in

7 BellSouth because there is so much in fiber in Florida that's

8 particularly acute.

9   We've had the same sorts of problems with this loop

10 really since we got into business here in August of 1999. And

11 it kind of comes down to some basic provisioning realities, and

12 that is that when you have a loop that works over fiber, you

13 have a line card that's in the central office, and you have

14 another one that's out there in the remote terminal. And it's

15 really nothing more than the settings on these cards have to

16 match. And that's exactly the same when BellSouth provisions

17 its own IDSL service. I mean, it's the same process. It's the

18 same loop. It's the same everything. But we seem to have had

19 a lot of problems in getting those line cards situated

20 correctly.

21   As a result of the Georgia Commission's involvement

22 in the 271 process last year, a collaborative was formed with

23 BellSouth and Covad, and some new test scenarios have been put

24 in place toward the end of November, beginning of December, and

25 we have not yet seen whether that's going to yield results.

1   We're certainly hopeful, but if you look on Page 12 of our

2   presentation, that will give you a sense of sort of some of

3   the -- the magnitude of the problem. This is from BellSouth

4   reported data specific for Covad. That's part of the

5   performance measurements application platform, PMAP.

6   BellSouth missed 11 percent of installation

7   appointments in Florida on these loops in November. We have

8   3 percent troubles in 30 days, but then of those, we have

9   30 percent repeat troubles. And that's really where it comes

10   into. We've been doing a lot of research on closing out orders

11   to no trouble found, and in Georgia because the 271 process

12   BellSouth has put in place some mechanisms to automatically

13   call for a joint meet when the Bell technician would normally

14   say, oh, look, I can't find any trouble. So we're hoping for a

15   similar process here in Florida because that seems to have

16   helped a little bit in Georgia.

17   The next type of loop is line sharing. And again,

18   this is a very analogous service to what BellSouth Fast Access

19   retail service is, and that is, you've got an existing -- a

20   BellSouth voice customer. We're just using the high frequency

21   portion of the loop. We have this cool kit that we send out to

22   folks, or our ISPs send them, and they get it at home. They do

23   a couple of installations just like the BellSouth product

24   works, and the only work that's done by BellSouth is actually

25   done in the central office. So they don't have to roll a truck

1 or anything like that. So it's a lot faster. It should give

2 customers a lot more of a timely DSL installation. And we have

3 a contract that entitles us to a three-day loop interval, and

4 we're getting five days currently. And again, there's no truck

5 roll involved. It's literally doing cross-connections in the

6 central office. That's the entire work effort on the part of

7 the BellSouth.

8   In November, 36 percent of our orders had troubles on

9 them within the first 30 days, and of those, 30 percent had

10 repeat troubles. BellSouth missed 18 percent of repair

11 appointments. The average duration was 14 hours. And

12 recently, we have seen a problem with -- this goes back to the

13 preauthorization for conditioning that I mentioned in the

14 beginning, and that is, BellSouth will actually turn up line

15 shared loops to us and say, okay, we're done with that. We're

16 ready to hand it over, and it will show up. It will have a

17 load coil on the loop which means our service won't work. We

18 actually have to get them to go out there and remove that. But

19 what's interesting is that part of the BellSouth provisioning

20 process is supposed to be a test on the loop right at the very

21 end of the provisioning in the central office to look out to

22 the NID at the customer's house and see if there are any load

23 coils. And that seems to have broken down.

24   It also shows that there are quite substantial errors

25 in the loop makeup because obviously we do a loop makeup test

1 before we even provision the loop. This is sort of

2 symptomatic. Also, on stand-alone DSL loops, we have got some

3 delays. If you want to look -- it's interesting if you want to

4 compare what Covad gets in terms of an installation. You have

5 to actually add the FOC interval plus the order completion

6 interval. Most ILECs measure from when we sent in an LSR to

7 when the order is actually installed, and that measures the

8 entire experience -- the entire period of time that BellSouth

9 has the loop. But under the way the measurements are in

10 BellSouth, we have to add two of those together, and as a

11 result, the customer experience for Covad's customer is a much

12 longer installation.

13   I believe Network Telephone is next. Thank you.

14   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Thank you. I'd like to kind of go

15 back on clarifications because when I was going through

16 ordering, I hit clarifications. And if you look at Page 12 of

17 our handout, we actually had it in there. And I believe that

18 Mr. Ainsworth took a sample of the 113 orders that we sent in,

19 and he sampled 35 of them and said 26 were valid, meaning

20 9 were invalid.

21   This is what BellSouth typically does. They don't

22 give any resolve. They just come back with number, and I can

23 assure you that on the 26 that they're calling valid, our back

24 office provisioning staff went through -- I don't even know

25 what to call it -- a tremendous task to get these orders

1   worked. They spend hours and hours and hours on the phone, and

2   I mean literally hours on the phone with LCSC trying to resolve

3   invalid clarifications, and then BellSouth puts out an

4   escalation procedure. And if you knew the amount of time and

5   costly effort that was involved to reach that escalation

6   procedure, I think that address would need to be taken with

7   respect to invalid clarifications. I can tell you that I spent

8   four hours on the phone with LCSC, I believe it was Friday. It

9   was last Friday, and I escalated it all the way up to

10 Cathy Logan (phonetic), who is a manager within the LCSC, and

11 it had to do with RPONs, due dates, and calculated dates being

12 the same.

13   The due dates were the same on the confirmation

14 request that we got back from Bell. The calculated dates were

15 different. LCSC couldn't work the order. We had to fax them

16 the situation. Four hours later, Cathy Logan told me, we'll

17 correct this order and work it, but we won't be working any

18 more of these.

19   It was an invalid clarification. These are the types

20 of responses that we get daily, and it costs our back office

21 provisioners their inability to work orders for customers

22 because they're spending time on the phone with LCSC. We would

23 request that Mr. Ainsworth provide us with those -- all 113 of

24 those and give us exactly why they consider them valid, because

25 I believe the adage goes that if you can't recognize there's a

1 problem, there's no resolve. If they're not recognizing that

2 there's a problem, we're going to continue to have this back

3 office performance issue.

4 CHAIRMAN JABER: Let me ask you a question about the

5 example you've given us that you addressed yourself last

6 Friday, the invalid clarification. What ultimately -- why was

7 it kicked out?

8 MR. KOPYTCHAK: Well, you mean on the RPON, the one I

9 just addressed?

10 CHAIRMAN JABER: (Nodding head affirmatively.)

11 MR. KOPYTCHAK: We received a confirmation notice

12 from LENS saying that the due date calculation -- when you get

13 RPONs, both of the due dates have to be the same for BellSouth

14 to work the order. I physically held in my hand a copy of the

15 confirmation notice showing that the RPONs -- or the due dates

16 were the same. BellSouth's systems were showing that they were

17 not the same, and they couldn't work the order. I had to

18 physically get on the phone after a tremendous amount of time

19 of escalation and fax what I was looking at to prove to

20 BellSouth that we had no -- that the due dates were actually

21 the same.

22 CHAIRMAN JABER: I heard you say that. I'm looking

23 for the resolve as well. Let's take it a step at a time.

24 BellSouth's systems did not show consistent due dates. Why is

25 that? Who puts the information into the BellSouth system?

1   MR. KOPYTCHAK: BellSouth's system -- we request the

2   due date, and BellSouth gives us a calculated due date. The

3   due dates that we requested were the same. The calculated due

4   dates that we were seeing were the same. The calculated due

5   dates that BellSouth was seeing was different.

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Why? Do we know?

7   MR. KOPYTCHAK: No, ma'am, we don't know. And

8   BellSouth didn't know. And BellSouth took it as an action

9   item, and at the same time within the same breath told us they

10 weren't going to work the orders anymore.

11 CHAIRMAN JABER: All right. So that inconsistency

12 immediately results in a clarification rejection.

13 MR. KOPYTCHAK: Correct.

14 CHAIRMAN JABER: And it's automatically rejected to

15 you.

16 MR. KOPYTCHAK: Correct. And I had a provisioner

17 escalating this issue for four hours that couldn't work any

18 more orders, the work orders on a production-based environment.

19 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. And the escalation process

20 just means that you're talking to supervisor, supervisor,

21 supervisor.

22 MR. KOPYTCHAK: Correct. We spent four hours

23 reiterating our position to five or six people time after time

24 after time.

25 CHAIRMAN JABER: Is it that the first person or the

1 second person you talked to doesn't have the authority to just

2 address the problem immediately?

3   MR. KOPYTCHAK: That is correct, that is correct.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: So to resolve an issue, even if they

5 agree with you, does it have to get escalated?

6   MR. KOPYTCHAK: There has been numerous situations

7 where they have agreed with us and are not empowered to correct

8 the situation. And the second thing they want us to do then is

9 supp the order and send in another order at a cost of manual or

10 mechanized rates, whatever it is.

11   CHAIRMAN JABER: Give me an example of the

12 first person you talk to. Is that a service representative?

13 What is their title, the first person you talk to?

14   MR. KOPYTCHAK: The first person we talk to, usually

15 now that Fleming Island is geared up, which has been a problem,

16 is a service representative on that side. So we call and we

17 give them information, and we request to immediately speak to a

18 supervisor regarding the clarification in question.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. And the person that

20 ultimately solved your problem four hours later was a what in

21 the management scheme?

22   MR. KOPYTCHAK: I'm not exactly sure. They change

23 every day, but they're customer service representatives,

24 they're managers, they're beyond the supervisors. The go all

25 the way up into director level.

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: And with respect to your request for

2 information, Mr. Kopytchak, I've already asked BellSouth to

3 give you information related to the data in the presentations

4 that they have used within a week's time.

5   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Great. Thank you. The other area

6 I'd like to address is the CSRs that weren't updating. I

7 believe that Mr. Ainsworth responded saying that out of the 498

8 PONs that we provided, 50 percent of them updated within two

9 days. We didn't selectively choose 498 PONs. We gave you a

10 block of PONs. And most certainly within those time frames,

11 there were PONs that updated within two days. However,

12 50 percent, or approximately 250 of those PONs, updated 10, 12,

13 14 days ahead of the timeframe that BellSouth is suggesting.

14 That creates extended customer service intervals and extended

15 back office areas. And we would like that investigated as well

16 because BellSouth admitted that 50 percent of the 498 PONs

17 updated within two days.

18   And then the last area that I'm going to just kind of

19 cover, I just have a question for BellSouth with respect to the

20 ADSL USOC. I just would like the Commission to know as well

21 that some of the times when we migrate service over and there

22 is the ADSL USOC, we don't want the ADSL. We basically want

23 the voice, and we're going to install our own loop. The ADSL

24 USOC prohibits us from even leaving the loop where it is and

25 transferring the voice, because basically we need the loop up

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 anyway, so we're going to order the loop first, and then we're

2 going to migrate the voice over. And that pending service

3 order with respect to the ADSL USOC won't allow us to even

4 leave the loop.

5   Secondly, what we'd like to ask BellSouth is, is we

6 understand that BellSouth --

7   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Just a second.

8   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Yes, sir.

9   COMMISSIONER DEASON: What do you mean by leave the

10 loop and then provision your own?

11   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Well, let's say that the customer

12 actually has ADSL with Bell, and they have decided to take our

13 service.

14   COMMISSIONER DEASON: They say the customer doesn't

15 have ADSL.

16   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Well, let's say --

17   COMMISSIONER DEASON: They have an arrangement with

18 an ISP, and the ISP is the customer of BellSouth.

19   MR. KOPYTCHAK: You know, there's several situations.

20 They could have ADSL. They could not have ADSL. It could be

21 through their ISP. It could be through BellSouth. Does that

22 make sense?

23   COMMISSIONER DEASON: BellSouth says they're not in

24 that business, not on a retail business. They do not provide

25 ADSL on a retail basis. Am I mistaken?

1   MS. COX: No, that's correct. The ADSL, the

2 telecommunications service, we sell strictly to network service

3 providers. The service I believe he's referring to is our Fast

4 Access, which is an enhanced service, which is our Internet

5 service.

6   MR. KOPYTCHAK: And that goes to the question that I

7 was going to ask, so maybe we can put that question first. And

8 that question is, as Fast Access is the largest regional ISP,

9 is the USOC on Fast Access? And maybe BellSouth can answer

10 that.

11   MS. COX: The same ADSL USOC would be on all lines

12 that have our Internet -- our wholesale service, which would

13 include Fast Access.

14   MR. KOPYTCHAK: So if I'm understanding right, they

15 do have the ADSL with BellSouth, and the USOC is on the CSR.

16 It's just called Fast Access. That's the ISP.

17   MS. COX: No, not exactly. The USOC that we're

18 discussing is the wholesale USOC, and it's an interstate access

19 service, and it's purchased by network service providers,

20 Internet service providers. BellSouth's Internet service

21 provider also purchases that wholesale service which it

22 packages with Internet access and provides as Fast Access.

23   MR. KOPYTCHAK: I'm sorry, I don't understand. Fast

24 Access --

25   CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Deason, unless this is

1 information you want to hear right now, I thought I'd ask

2 Mr. Kopytchak and Ms. Cox to meet on this, discuss this after

3 the workshop. Let's move this along.

4 　　　　　COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's fine.

5 　　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: Commissioner Deason, does this answer

6 your question? Because I believe that is in the relation to

7 the fact that BellSouth provides the ADSL and the USOC is on

8 the CSR.

9 　　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Kopytchak, I just asked my

10 colleague that question, so with --

11 　　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: I'm sorry. I didn't understand.

12 　　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: No, you need to finish your

13 presentation.

14 　　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: Okay. I believe that -- actually,

15 that's all I had in this area.

16 　　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Are you sure?

17 　　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: Yes, it is. Thank you.

18 　　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Good. And I would hope that you

19 take advantage of Ms. Cox after this workshop and discuss your

20 concerns further.

21 　　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: I will. Thank you.

22 　　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Any other ALEC participants?

23 　　　　　MR. MURDOCH: Hello. My name is Brian Murdoch with

24 KMC Telecom. Let me just first off say good afternoon. This

25 is KMC's first appearance on this panel. And forgive me if I

1 raise a couple of problems that you may have considered to be

2 part of the preorder or ordering, but when I look at

3 provisioning and the way KMC provisions local services in the

4 state of Florida, some of these we attribute to the actual

5 provisioning process and how it hampers our doing business with

6 BellSouth.

7   Let me first off state that KMC Telecom is a

8 facility-based provider, not only in Florida but in the

9 other -- in eight of the other nine state territory of

10 BellSouth. We operate in three of the BellSouth cities here in

11 Florida: Daytona Beach, Melbourne, and Pensacola.

12   First order of issue for us in the provisioning

13 agenda here are where KMC has recently been getting incomplete

14 FOCs, or firm order confirmations, from BellSouth. Incomplete

15 in a sense that the order has been accepted by BellSouth but

16 yet doesn't contain all of the necessary or pertinent

17 information from KMC Telecom to begin the provisioning process.

18   For example, our LNP, or local number portability,

19 orders with BellSouth have been missing the BellSouth ordering

20 number associated with our PON number. My friends in the ALEC

21 or CLEC community would agree that not having the Bell ordering

22 number to reference when requesting status or looking for

23 assistance from BellSouth impedes the ability to coordinate the

24 installation and the due date. And at this point in time,

25 there has been no BellSouth ownership, and the issue has been

1 in front of KMC, and I haven't heard it yet today but at least

2 in front of KMC for the last four months.

3   The work-around proposed and underway within KMC is

4 that that just means an additional telephone call to the local

5 carrier service center, or the LCSC, which obviously drives

6 operating costs for KMC higher.

7   KMC also experiences the same service delivery

8 jeopardies with regards to the DSL impacts that we have heard

9 earlier today, so I'll work with Kyle and Ms. Cox to understand

10 how BellSouth will work with the CLEC community in that regard.

11   We also have many cases where we have our orders

12 rejected in error. And in -- for instance, we have mechanized

13 disconnect orders that are rejected for invalid circuit

14 identification. This is where we have identified a particular

15 circuit ID to be disconnected, and BellSouth has told us, it's

16 an invalid circuit; your order is rejected; it's not going

17 anywhere -- anywhere fast at that point, anyway. But we

18 validate -- the CLEC has the opportunity to validate the

19 circuit IDs in a BellSouth back office system called COSMOS.

20 And that's part of the process when you're disconnecting a

21 service, is to -- obviously you don't want to disconnect the

22 wrong circuit, so you validate which circuits you're looking to

23 disconnect. And the work-arounds, and that again entails

24 calling the local service center and additional phones calls,

25 you can eventually get the LCSC to yield and acquiesce that,

1 oh, the CLEC, you do have the appropriate circuit ID. We have

2 rejected your order in error, but that causes delays for our

3 provisioning purposes.

4 We also have PIC change on a mechanized basis orders

5 being rejected. The latest incident here in the state of

6 Florida, and forgive me, I don't recall the IXC code that was

7 involved, but what it amounted to was the orders were rejected

8 based on BellSouth back office tables not being updated with a

9 current IXC provider. So additional phone calls into the LCSC

10 and a couple of days later we're able to get the PIC changes

11 made on customers, where as a matter of BellSouth's business,

12 it could take as long as four hours. So in the light of our

13 customer, we appear to be not as efficient as the incumbent.

14 And of course, the perception is hard to overcome.

15 The next opportunity for KMC and BellSouth are to

16 address the BellSouth-caused missed installation appointments.

17 This is where on average BellSouth causes or misses 26 percent

18 of our DS-1s that we've attempted to install in a given month

19 on average. The BellSouth standard or the BellSouth mark or

20 benchmark on that, they have missed less than 3 percent on

21 average. So there is a disparity in regards to that number.

22 What we found is that the pending facility scenario

23 has hampered KMC's ability to deliver service in the stated due

24 date that we have made. And the due date, again, is based on

25 the FOC date that BellSouth responds to us within 24 hours.

1   However, BellSouth does not necessarily do a facility check in
2   the time of receiving that LSR from KMC and delivering the FOC
3   back to KMC.

4   I have heard from my friends on the ALEC panel here
5   that there are advantages to obviously having an FOC returned
6   as quickly as possible so that you can set the customer
7   expectation for the due date, but I believe in the flip side of
8   the coin is that you also want an accurate due date to let the
9   customer in on. And when there's not a facility check in
10 place, it's -- we've been left to basically a 50-50 -- or,
11 really, 26 percent of the time, we're coming up on the short
12 end of the stick.

13 The proposed work-around for KMC would be to have
14 BellSouth delay delivering an FOC back to KMC upon a facility
15 check. We've heard that -- from our BellSouth account teams
16 that that's not necessarily -- that's not something that's
17 feasible for them to do. As they try to standardize those
18 types of processes and based on the state commissions mandates
19 that they return the FOC within a stated amount of time, they
20 would be in noncompliance with the state mandate.

21 The last point I'd like to make is the -- upon the
22 conversion from an ILEC -- or from the BellSouth service to the
23 KMC service offering, we have experienced a number of premature
24 disconnects. This addresses -- or this really goes to point
25 out the fact that there is still two orders or a dual step

1 process where there is a new order or a disconnect order in

2 place when a CLEC ports customers. There has been proposed a

3 "C" order, or a change order, I guess, that takes into account

4 the new connect and the disconnect. That process I've heard

5 and I've seen is forthcoming for the year of 2002. But just so

6 this panel and this Commission understands, it continues to be

7 an issue for KMC Telecom in the state of Florida because

8 customers lose dial tone and they are not too satisfied with

9 that. If there are any questions.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Next speaker.

11   MS. BERGER: Good afternoon. My name is

12 Denise Berger with AT&T, and I'll focus my comments on two

13 different areas. The first area I'd like to focus in on is the

14 area of UNE-P provisioning. As this Commission is well aware,

15 a UNE-P order really should be transparent to the end user

16 customer, but our experience, and you've heard some of the

17 other ALECs talk about this as well, is that that is not always

18 the case.

19   KMC just told you about the unrelated N&D orders,

20 which is a new connect and a disconnect order. The ALECs issue

21 one order to BellSouth to transition the customer service from

22 BellSouth to AT&T. BellSouth implements two orders. If those

23 orders are not related or if somehow the disconnect order gets

24 worked prior to the new connect order, the customer loses

25 service. Now, BellSouth is proposing a new Single "C" order to

1 be implemented in April of this year, but we're not certain

2 that that is going to fix the problem. They had implemented an

3 interim fix a couple of months ago to relate the D&N orders,

4 and we're still seeing problems with customers going out of

5 service.

6   MCI also talked to you, as well as several other of

7 the ALECs, about the BellSouth retyping orders and making

8 errors on those orders as they're retyped. And I won't get

9 into that in detail again, but Mr. Ainsworth had talked to you

10 about the BellSouth quality checks that they had put in place

11 to try and prevent that from happening. But what I'd like the

12 Commission to be aware of is that those quality checks only

13 compare the service order back -- that the quality checks only

14 look at the service order that was typed by BellSouth. It

15 doesn't look at the LSR or the order that was submitted by the

16 ALEC. So if there are errors that are introduced on those

17 orders, then those will not be caught in those quality checks.

18   COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm -- if they don't compare

19 the two, what are they checking?

20   MS. BERGER: They're checking the order that they

21 typed to what came out of the end of their pipeline, not what

22 the ALEC sent to them. So if there were some order problems

23 introduced by the BellSouth rep retyping that electronic order,

24 then it wouldn't be caught in that quality check.

25   COMMISSIONER DEASON: I understand that. And I guess

1 what are they checking? If they're not checking for the
2 accuracy of the end with what came in from you, what are they
3 checking then?
4 　　　　MS. BERGER: That's our question.
5 　　　　COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.
6 　　　　COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Madam Chair?
7 　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes, Commissioner.
8 　　　　COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: One question maybe on a
9 positive note. What is working within the system that we can
10 build upon?
11 　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner, I'm sorry, I didn't
12 hear your question.
13 　　　　COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: I said, what is working within
14 the system of connecting the ALECs with BellSouth's UNE system
15 that we can build upon?
16 　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Sort of looking at the best
17 practices, what is working within the system that we can build
18 upon here?
19 　　　　COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Yes.
20 　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Well, that's, like, a subject for a
21 whole other workshop, Commissioner, but let's have an answer to
22 that. Let's start with Ms. Berger since she's speaking now,
23 and then we'll go to BellSouth.
24 　　　　And then, Commissioner Bradley, the other thing I'll
25 do is make sure that Lisa Harvey comes to see you and -- when

1   you get back into the office, we'll have her walk through the

2   OSS testing procedures.

3   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Thank you.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: Go ahead, Ms. Berger.

5   MS. BERGER: That's a very difficult question to

6   answer because when a UNE-P order does work well, it's a

7   beautiful thing, you know. It truly is. It is transparent to

8   the end user. He does not -- there's not a blip in his

9   service. He transitions from BellSouth to AT&T, and it is a

10   very positive experience for that customer. That is what works

11   well.

12   However, when that does not work well, then you have

13   a -- the flip side of that coin. You have a customer who

14   expected one thing, which was a transparent transition of

15   service, and got something completely different, you know, got

16   service disruption, got business impact, was taken out of

17   service, didn't get what he ordered, didn't get billed the

18   right thing. I mean, the list goes on and on. So it's a

19   difficult question to get your hands around. When it works,

20   it's a beautiful thing. When it doesn't, it's very ugly.

21   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. BellSouth, I am going to give

22   you an opportunity to respond to the Commissioner's question.

23   How about we do it when your panel is up?

24   Okay, Commissioner?

25   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Yes, that's fine. Thank you.

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: Go ahead, Ms. Berger.

2   MS. BERGER: The last point that I'd like to make on

3   the UNE-P orders is that, as we said, the service transition

4   should be transparent. However, what we are finding out is

5   that sometimes BellSouth changes the facilities that the

6   customer is on. How we find out about this is when we

7   determine within that first 72 hours that the customer's

8   transition that there is a problem, we go back to BellSouth to

9   try and work it and get feedback back from the LCSC or the

10 CWINS center that the problem stemmed from the fact that the

11 customer's facilities were changed. So I'm taking the

12 BellSouth representative at his or her word that that's indeed

13 what has happened, which I don't believe in a UNE-P environment

14 should be what's happening.

15   The next area that I'd like to focus in on is UNE-L,

16 which is the UNE loop, where AT&T is providing the switching,

17 and we are leasing the loop from BellSouth. KMC talked to you

18 a little bit about facilities checks, and that is -- the

19 first point on the handout that you've got is that the jeopardy

20 notice management process by BellSouth is causing problems for

21 our customers.

22   For example, there are many occasions that we get a

23 jeopardy notice from BellSouth on the day that the cut is

24 scheduled to take place. What this does is, not only does it

25 disrupt the customer's plans, but it disrupts AT&T's plans as

1 well. What exacerbates this situation and makes it an even

2 worse situation is that although AT&T is sending an order over

3 to BellSouth with our appropriate contact information -- for

4 example, BellSouth, here's my order. If you have questions,

5 here is the service rep's name, telephone number, and fax

6 number for you to get back to AT&T.

7   What exacerbates this situation of the jeopardy

8 notices coming in on the day of the scheduled cut is that many

9 times the jeopardy notice is either faxed back to the wrong fax

10 number, an old one that hasn't been in service for a couple of

11 years, or the AT&T service rep picks up his or her voice mail

12 and gets a lot of fax tones on their voice mail because

13 obviously BellSouth is trying to fax the jeopardy notice, and

14 this is an assumption on our part just because of what we do

15 know, but that they're trying to fax that jeopardy notice back

16 to the service representative's voice number.

17   COMMISSIONER DEASON: Have you contacted BellSouth

18 and gave them the correct telephone number?

19   MS. BERGER: Yes, sir. And like I said, it's on --

20 the correct telephone number and the correct fax number are on

21 the service order that's sent across from AT&T to BellSouth.

22   The final UNE-L issue that I'd like to call your

23 attention to is the issue of the circuit ID. And I won't go

24 into the same detail that KMC went into, but I would like to

25 talk just a little bit about LFACS since Mr. Ainsworth had

1   brought that up earlier. AT&T had negotiated with BellSouth

2   for quite some time to get real-time electronic access to their

3   LFACS database.

4   Now, the reason that we wanted that was a couple of

5   things, because BellSouth will tell you that they offer a

6   Web-based report called COSMOS that gives AT&T the information

7   that it's looking for. It does give some information about

8   circuit facilities. It gives us the circuit ID. It gives us

9   the CLLI, the cable and the pair, and it tells us whether or

10   not the BellSouth database shows that facility as either free

11   or busy.

12   What it doesn't, however, give us is the information

13   that if we have a database discrepancy -- for example, AT&T's

14   database shows that the pair is free, and we're trying to use

15   it for Customer A, but the BellSouth database on COSMOS shows

16   that it's busy, what COSMOS doesn't allow us to do is to

17   determine what customer does BellSouth show that facility

18   assigned to which would allow us to go back and figure out

19   where we've got a database discrepancy. If we can't figure

20   that out, then we've got a lot of facilities out there in

21   collocation cages that aren't serving any customers, and we are

22   overbuilding the network. So that is the reason why we are

23   looking for and negotiated with BellSouth and gained their

24   agreement to give us the real-time electronic access to LFACS.

25   CHAIRMAN JABER: Do you know how often COSMOS is

1 updated?

2 MS. BERGER: According to BellSouth, it's updated

3 two to three times a week.

4 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay.

5 MS. BERGER: That concludes my remarks.

6 CHAIRMAN JABER: If it's updated two, three times a

7 week, you're not disputing that showing the port busy might be

8 accurate, you're trying to figure out which customer base is

9 served on that to determine where you can network -- or where

10 you can aggregate your own customers.

11 MS. BERGER: What we're trying to do is to not have

12 to go down the path of the wholesale data reconciliation with

13 BellSouth. You know, when we have done some data

14 reconciliation in the past, you are absolutely correct,

15 Chairman, there have been discrepancies on both sides. And

16 what LFACS does is allow AT&T to determine where we have a

17 discrepancy and only address that one pair and not the whole

18 database.

19 CHAIRMAN JABER: Do you know how complicated -- do

20 you have a feeling in your own company's mind of how difficult

21 it would be to provide information on the customers that are on

22 that particular port?

23 MS. BERGER: It's our belief that it is in this

24 particular database, so it's just a matter of giving AT&T

25 access to that database, which to Mr. Ainsworth's earlier

1   point, BellSouth has said that they are updating -- or change

2   control has given us a May the 18th date. So I'm hopeful that

3   the May the 18th date is going to come, and we're going to get

4   the access that we're looking for. But since I've not seen

5   details as yet, I'm not certain that it's going to give us

6   exactly what it is that we have negotiated for.

7   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you. Any other speakers on

8   the ALEC panel?

9   Mr. Monroe and then Ms. --

10   MR. MONROE: Thank you. Real briefly. The area of

11   provisioning that I would like to focus on is the overall time

12   frame that it takes to provision one of our customers in

13   comparence (phonetic) to a retail customer from Bell calling up

14   and wanting to add -- just add a line or change their services.

15   The area in which we tend to experience the majority of the

16   problems goes back to the actual provisioning of the order that

17   we send through to BellSouth.

18   Mr. Ainsworth, I think it was, put up a slide that

19   showed of the three examples that Florida Digital specifically

20   sent over, two of them they felt were clarified or rejected

21   correctly, and there is just one that they felt was not

22   rejected properly, I should say. And I'm not still certain

23   about the type of voodoo mathematics he used to figure that

24   that was 99 percent, but 2 out of 3 to me is 66 percent. But

25   if you take that and look at the 66 percent of what they admit

1   to being clarified in error, if you project that out over the

2   number of LSRs that we send, and then look at the third that is

3   not actually clarified in error, when you are sending over 100

4   LSRs a day, I mean, that's a significant amount of LSRs that

5   are clarified in error, and then that is what is actually

6   contributing to the length of time that we are actually taking

7   to process our customers' orders.

8   We can typically take an order after it's been sold

9   in the field to the customer, present it into our database. We

10   can actually send that over to bill electronically and

11   typically have an FOC back if it's a good, clean order without

12   it being clarified within 15 to 20 minutes or so. So to say

13   that the long, drawn out provisioning process or the four- to

14   five-day intervals that we are getting on provisioning our

15   orders is a process of our ALEC OSS is not exactly certain or

16   not exactly a true point.

17   I think that the majority again of the areas that we

18   tend to fall down in or have problems in are when the

19   customers' LSRs that we send over are clarified in error, when

20   they fallout out of their system as manual orders. If we can

21   work towards cleaning the system or providing a system where we

22   can provision more orders electronically or where they will not

23   manually fallout of their system, then I think that BellSouth

24   will go a long way towards providing reciprocity that I think

25   that the Commission has called for.

1   MS. BOONE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. That

2 concludes the provisioning panel.

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: Actually, I thought Ms. Conquest

4 wanted --

5   MS. CONQUEST: I was going to make your day. I'm

6 going to give my time back. I think my cohorts did an

7 excellent job covering our issues, and I can just say ditto and

8 thank you. And let's move forward.

9   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you. BellSouth panel, and

10 please address Commissioner Bradley's question.

11   MR. VARNER: Mr. Ainsworth will do that. But I

12 wanted to suggest one thing that I think everybody might be in

13 agreement with. In going to the provisioning panel that the

14 CLECs had, there were several things that were, like, specific

15 data items. Covad brought up several that actually we hadn't

16 seen before, but we had pulled some of the data. What I was

17 going to suggest, instead of going through here and going

18 through a laundry list of responses to these, which would mean

19 I'd take things like 3.08 percent of troubles within 30 days

20 and explain what that was all about, that we include the

21 responses to these specific data issues in the filing that's

22 going to accompany Mr. Ainsworth's backup for his slides as

23 opposed to us sitting here and just going through all of that

24 detail today.

25   CHAIRMAN JABER: You know what I'd rather have

1   actually are not responses but solutions.

2   MR. VARNER: That's fine.

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: And we will talk about whatever

4   written filings the Commissioners want at the end of the

5   workshop, but I have to tell you, I'm more interested in

6   knowing when certain things will be addressed as opposed to

7   hearing responses. So remind me at the end of the workshop --

8   MR. VARNER: That will be included. What I was

9   talking about were instances wherein they're presenting numbers

10   and the numbers really are not telling you what you they're

11   laid out to tell you. Or if they are, what we're doing about

12   it to make them work, if we need to fix.

13   CHAIRMAN JABER: Right. Commissioners, what's your

14   pleasure? Do you have any objection to Mr. Varner just

15   including some of that information in that data that will be

16   provided to the ALECs?

17   COMMISSIONER DEASON: I think Mr. Varner's suggestion

18   will speed this process, and I'm for speeding the process.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: Let's do it.

20   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: I'm all in favor of it as

21   well, and I'm especially interested in seeing solutions from

22   both sides and not just finger-pointing.

23   CHAIRMAN JABER: Exactly.

24   MR. VARNER: All right.

25   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you, Mr. Varner.

1   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Madam Chair, also, may I say

2 something? I think it would be more concrete for me if we

3 could deal with hard numbers rather than statistical sampling.

4 That makes it rather difficult for me to get a grip on what

5 reality is.

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay.

7   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: I don't know if that's

8 possible.

9   CHAIRMAN JABER: Yeah. Mr. Varner has offered to

10 provide some of the numbers through the backup data that

11 Mr. Ainsworth will provide to the parties and to the Commission

12 in a week, so we'll look at what that is.

13   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Fine. Thank you.

14   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay.

15   MR. VARNER: Mr. Ainsworth.

16   CHAIRMAN JABER: Go ahead, Mr. Ainsworth.

17   MR. AINSWORTH: I'll try to address Mr. Bradley's

18 question. I'll be real brief. You know, just three things I

19 noted really quick, and one of them, I agree with AT&T and

20 Ms. Berger. It is a beautiful thing, and it's so beautiful it

21 works 99 percent of the time when it's going efficient and

22 effective. So I want to make sure that we realize that when we

23 look at the data on UNE-P that we are processing that in a

24 quality manner, and we are meeting that objective over 99

25 percent of the time when we're doing that without any

1 interruption to service. So that's one thing.

2 And the other thing that we haven't really addressed

3 today that we had worked diligently on was the hot-cut process.

4 I haven't heard any discussion on that today. But again, the

5 hot-cut process being as it is a timing issue and it is a major

6 manual process, in my mind, that we can point to and say it is

7 very, very effective and one of the best processes, I think,

8 for that type of process for that much manual effort to meet

9 time-specific times that I'm aware of.

10 And then I'll just -- in the maintenance arena when

11 you look, and Mr. Varner can talk about the maintenance results

12 and those type things, when you look at duration time and

13 clearing time in the CWINS operation, I would point to that

14 also to say that they do a very, very good job in processing

15 those things and getting them cleared in a timely manner. So I

16 just point to those three just to make those points.

17 CHAIRMAN JABER: You want to just go ahead and start

18 your panel discussion?

19 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. I'm going to back into this a

20 little bit. I'd like to go ahead and reply to some of the

21 comments, and then I'll go right into the presentation if you

22 don't mind.

23 CHAIRMAN JABER: Sure.

24 MR. AINSWORTH: I was listening to Network Telephone

25 invalid clarification. I want to make sure we're clear because

1   I thought I had done that in the earlier presentation, and that

2   was that on the invalid clarification of data, I had welcomed

3   and offered also to work with them in our SME to go through

4   those and address those. I think ADSL is going to be the

5   category where they considered that invalid; we clarified as

6   valid. And I think that's going to be the biggest issue there,

7   but we certainly want to work with them in that avenue to look

8   at those situations, and we look forward to doing that.

9   Also, on the calculation of the due date issue they

10 brought up, that did come to our attention also. That issue is

11 being looked at, and currently we are trying to understand how

12 that process occurred. And I know that Network Telephone did

13 get that into the process, but I also want them to know that

14 that escalation did come internal all the way up to my staff,

15 and we are viewing that today. As they had indicated, it

16 appears on that data that they submitted it with matching

17 dates, and it was a calculation miscalculation causing the

18 clarification to go back, but we don't understand all that

19 process that happened. But it is being looked at and is being

20 researched, and we will address that particular issue.

21   CHAIRMAN JABER: What about the general concern,

22 though, that perhaps the first person and the second person

23 that take the call is not empowered to make those just basic

24 business decisions? You know, the ALECs are your wholesale

25 customers, and at some point, you have to empower your

1   employees on the other side of the phone to say, you know what?

2   This isn't worth it. I'm going to take care of your problems

3   so that we have a better working relationship going forward.

4   MR. AINSWORTH: Well, I have actually made some notes

5   to the effect listening to that conversation because, you know,

6   we really have a belief that they should be empowered to do

7   those things. We also have a belief that if it's not being

8   handled properly, they can use the internal processes and the

9   escalation procedures, and they will work also. So I have a

10 note. I'll discuss that internally to try to look at it from

11 the other side to make sure that we get all the facts around

12 that area.

13   Okay. Also, I wanted to comment about Ms. Berger,

14 the LFACS scenario that she had laid out. I wanted to make

15 sure that, as I presented earlier, that database is out there.

16 The database is actually updated daily now, not three times a

17 week. So they do get a daily feed from that process. And I

18 also want to make it clear that in that process, that that is

19 the CLEC cable pair. They are responsible for that CFA

20 assignment, not BellSouth. We have to keep that on record as a

21 process so that we don't send work down to the field that can't

22 be worked to the central office. But the actual assignment of

23 that facility should be inventoried and kept by the CLEC. So

24 they should also have records on that that would indicate what

25 information is there and what the assignment is and what the

1 parties are involved in that. So I might just mention that at

2 that point, too, just to clear that point up.

3   Now, to go into the presentation. PF facilities came

4 up as an issue that was noted, and I wanted to just represent

5 that PF is a condition that occurs when BellSouth does not have

6 a facility to provide service to an end user. They are sent

7 out as jeopardy notices. They would be on a PF report, and

8 they would be identified on a PF report. PF identification

9 comes really in two ways, and I want to be sure that we're real

10 clear because this causes conversations from time to time. And

11 one is that on the order processing, it is processed through

12 our systems. If that order does not have an assignable

13 facility, then it will go PF when it goes into the LFACS

14 database. That will be sent out to the engineering group to

15 take a look at. They will have to try to determine what

16 availability they have for a facility or to clear a facility

17 issue or a problem to serve that particular customer.

18   And the second one that I believe we had a little

19 conversation today on was that due date based on assignment

20 facility being defective and there's no additional facility

21 that is available. Now, what that means is that we have an

22 assigned facility. We're going out on the order on the due

23 date. We get out to the order, and for some reason, the

24 facility is defective and there is no other facility available.

25 And that accounts for the process where on the due date you

1 could reach a PF condition that was not determinable prior to

2 that technician reaching and testing that facility to turn up

3 that service. So those are the two type PF conditions that are

4 there.

5   What we do behind that to try and minimize that

6 effort is, we have a PF group in the CWINS for designed

7 services. And the CWINS operation will be processing --

8 looking at those PFs and pushing those PFs to try to make the

9 due date. And the whole intent of this group is that once that

10 PF condition is identified, they will run the reports, and

11 their target is to work with the SACs, work with the network

12 engineering groups to get those cleared so that we can make

13 that due date, and that's their primary goal. The LCSC has a

14 group than monitors the PF process on the nondesigned services.

15   UNE-P migration service outages. We were talking

16 about in the provisioning process, AT&T had provided 19

17 examples of UNE-P outages from June to December. Taken into

18 account of that and facing -- or with AT&T numbers, and they're

19 averaging even in Florida greater than a thousand orders per

20 month, that this would equate to actually significantly less

21 than 1 percent of the UNE orders being processed having any

22 type of issue associated with them. So, again, when you're

23 looking at the analysis and you're looking at the outage, we've

24 taken several steps. I know in June, as you look back -- and

25 we are doing analysis daily on this. Since we started this in

1 May, we actually put in several edits. I think that was

2 mentioned by AT&T. We put those edits in to reduce that. And

3 since we have put those edits in back in the June time frame,

4 it has decreased, and it has decreased significantly.

5   And we continue to analyze UNE-P today. We analyze

6 UNE-P on a daily basis, and we're looking for any feedback or

7 we're looking for any issues that we can determine to even

8 reduce that number even further.

9   Looking at MCI's comments. Loss of dial tone on

10 UNE-P was an issue and provided 11 examples. We reviewed those

11 maintenance reports and determined that, again, less than

12 1 percent can be attributed to UNE-P. And the reason I keep

13 continuing to say that is, that's what we have said, and that's

14 what our analysis has continued to say. Our analysis from July

15 the 18th through December 31st indicates that for a migration

16 service affecting concurrence (sic) that only .56 percent of

17 the UNE-P migrations. Said another way, that indicates that

18 BellSouth does not encounter a service affecting problem in

19 99.44 percent of those migrations.

20   Pre-completion service issues are directed to the

21 CWINS center. CWINS has the responsibility to coordinate

22 resolution of all reported problems. Two things I noticed

23 there -- and I was listening to MCI as they were giving their

24 presentation. We put in an additional process in the CWINS

25 group. One is, if that order is complete, that is a

1 maintenance issue. And if that comes to the UNE-P center, they

2 will process that as a maintenance trouble ticket. If that

3 comes in during the provisioning process even prior to the

4 completion of that order, the CWINS has direction and a process

5 in place to work with the LCSC to resolve whatever issue that's

6 encountered by the CLEC. So, again, CWINS is a point contact

7 for that. We added that process a little over a year ago, but

8 we have even enforced that process and improved that process

9 throughout 2001.

10   Again, I mentioned on the quality control process

11 we're doing daily analysis on the UNE-P maintenance reports.

12 You know, as has been discussed here, that we have a plan for a

13 Single "C" order. We have a product team working on that

14 process today. And all of the efforts that we have right now

15 as far as the SMEs are looking to that Single "C" process to

16 get that implemented in a timely manner.

17   CHAIRMAN JABER: And there is an interim process in

18 place, though, that the ALECs have identified has some

19 problems.

20   MR. AINSWORTH: The interim process they're talking

21 about or that's identified is the N&D. And because of that

22 conversation, that's why we do the analysis we do on UNE-P, to

23 make sure we can identify any outlying issue out there if an

24 error is made. We do have edits in the process, but in cases

25 those edits can be circumvented -- and you could have an error

1　there, and when we encounter those, we try to get that feedback

2　directly to the LCSC and to eliminate those situations. So we

3　continue to analyze that process to see what we can do to

4　improve that even as an interim as we're moving through the

5　process to Single "C," and we will continue to do that.

6　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Well, the final -- if I recall the

7　comments correctly, there's some final conversion program that

8　should take place in April 2002. That's just a couple of

9　months from now on the reconnect/disconnect; right?

10　　　　MR. AINSWORTH: Actually, the -- April 6th and 7th,

11　and I'd have to go back and look at the dates. I think

12　Ron Pate said that the Single "C" would be implemented and that

13　will go in the testing stages and be available the last part of

14　March. I believe it actually goes in production in the April

15　time frame. And that's the Single "C" order process that will

16　be implemented at that particular time.

17　　　　What that does is that will take the place of the "N"

18　and the "D" order that we're relating today in that process.

19　So the interim process is that we continue to monitor that N&D

20　process to make sure it's being handled efficiently.

21　　　　COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Madam Chair?

22　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Yeah, Commissioner. Hang on one

23　second.

24　　　　COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Okay.

25　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: The Single "C" process that will

1 take effect end of March, 1st of April, whatever, less than two

2 months from now, that will replace the interim R&D process?

3   MR. AINSWORTH: D&N, that's correct.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: That will replace it. So have you

5 taken into account the flaws in the interim process and fixed

6 it for purposes of what you're going to launch end of March,

7 1st of April?

8   MR. AINSWORTH: Yes. The product team that's

9 developing that product now is aware of all the analysis we

10 have, and they are looking at that product. So --

11   CHAIRMAN JABER: That's not what I asked you. Not

12 that they have looked at, not that they have analyzed it. Have

13 you fixed the flaws in your final product that you intend to

14 launch end of March, 1st of April? Have you made sure that the

15 flaws in the interim procedure have been addressed for purposes

16 of launching the final product?

17   MR. AINSWORTH: We have addressed all of the interim

18 processes that we have knowledge of. I mean, we have addressed

19 that, and we continue to address that. We have fed that

20 information into the product team that's developing the Single

21 "C." So if they incorporate that in the process of initiating

22 that Single "C" and implementing that Single "C," then, yes,

23 they would have incorporated what we have learned in the

24 processes that we have learned and responded to to make that

25 interim process work properly.

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: You're not sure, are you?

2   MR. AINSWORTH: Pardon?

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: You're not sure that they have, are

4 you?

5   MR. AINSWORTH: Well, I'm trying to make sure because

6 a Single "C" is an underdevelopment process. Okay. So, I

7 mean, you're actually having to develop and put the USOCs and

8 put the ordering process together to develop that. So if they

9 are looking at the process of RRSO as an issue, RRSO will not

10 be an issue for relating that order in the Single "C" because

11 you won't need an RRSO. So if you're looking at those type of

12 situations, yes, they're going through it.

13   The other processes we have identified where we would

14 run into an LFACS issue or a COSMOS issue, they're aware of

15 those issues. So those that we're having to monitor and take

16 manual action on, they will be taking -- they are taking the

17 action through that product team to develop that, but that's an

18 in-progress process. And ultimately, yes, they will be

19 incorporated into that, so when they roll that product out,

20 those situations will be resolved.

21   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Commissioner Bradley, you had

22 a question?

23   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Well, I think he just answered

24 my question. My question was in line with what you just asked.

25 I was curious as to what the process might look like, and I

1 think he just pretty much described it --

2 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner.

3 COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: -- the testing process. Thank

4 you.

5 MR. AINSWORTH: From the CLEC standpoint, the LSR

6 coming in will be the same. I mean, they will still supplement

7 it. The difference would be, it will be generated as a Single

8 "C," not an "N" and a "D" order process.

9 Does that answer your question?

10 CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes.

11 Anything else on the BellSouth panel?

12 MR. PATE: Yes, Commissioner. I have just a couple

13 of brief comments. Not to belabor the Single "C," it's the

14 very first item. We right now have this targeted for

15 March 23rd date. The April date has been communicated, and we

16 have been able to carve out a couple of weeks thus far. So

17 we're hoping we'll be able to maintain that, and that's what we

18 currently have on our schedule. So that process should be in

19 at that point in time and, of course, be available for CAVE

20 testing prior to then.

21 Line loss notification, I'd like to give you a few

22 comments on this. The issue was raised with respect to MCI's

23 filing. First off, I'd like to make sure that everyone

24 realizes the line loss notification that we provide to the CLEC

25 community as a whole is a Web report. The issue that we have

1 been working with with MCI is not based on that Web site

2 report. It's based on a report that was designed specifically

3 for them back in 1998 over what's referred to as a network data

4 mover. It's just a direct connect type data feed that we have

5 specifically with MCI.

6 When we designed that using MCI's requirements, they

7 did request that certain disconnect reasons specifically

8 switched in error, a nice name for slamming, not be included on

9 that report. And as a result of some recent working with them

10 and trying to identify why some of their line loss

11 notifications were not being realized by their systems, that's

12 the main contributor that has been identified. And as of --

13 you'll see there at the very bottom of February 2nd, with that

14 release, these switched in errors are now included at MCI's

15 request on their network data mover feed for line loss

16 notifications.

17 So that -- I think this issue is now resolved going

18 forward with MCI. We've worked diligently with them in many

19 ways trying to get reconciliation with their line loss

20 notifications. So with that release, that issue should not be

21 one going forward that we'll have to deal with.

22 A couple of just other quick points with response to

23 some of the discussions that we have had here in this section

24 from the ALECs. I would like to just point out that,

25 first off, a statement. BellSouth, of course, I know you can

1 appreciate, we are focussed on providing quality service. And

2 we are focussed on that. We are not perfect. We make

3 mistakes, particularly when there is the human intervention

4 associated with it processing the order. But there is a tool

5 out there where the ALECs can proactively look at their orders,

6 and I just wanted to bring that to everyone's attention. And

7 that's referred to as CSOTS. It stands for the CLEC service

8 order tracking system.

9 In that tool, they actually see the service order

10 that's being processed. So if they wanted to look at it for

11 themselves based on a sampling basis or whatever to validate

12 that their orders, particularly those that they're requiring

13 manual intervention, are being processed properly. There is a

14 tool that exists out there for them to use on a proactive

15 basis. Those are all my comments. Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Mr. Pate, KMC brought up an

17 issue about not having a BellSouth number to reference when

18 they make inquiries to BellSouth, and basically they stated

19 that impeded their progress on these inquiries. It sounded

20 like it would be a relatively easy problem to fix. Could you

21 discuss this during our break with Mr. Murdoch from KMC to see

22 if perhaps some solution could be reached on that issue?

23 MR. PATE: Sure. I'll be glad to.

24 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you.

25 MS. FOSHEE: (Inaudible.)

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Foshee, come up to the

2   microphone.

3   MS. FOSHEE: Thank you. There were two items that we

4   were going to look at during the break. If this is the

5   appropriate time for our folks to respond, we have those.

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: Sure.

7   MS. FOSHEE: The first was a question about some

8   information that AT&T had talked about that we were supposed to

9   provide them on Friday, and Mr. Pate can answer that. And then

10   the second issue was about the facilities reservation number,

11   and I believe Mr. Ainsworth can address that real briefly.

12   CHAIRMAN JABER: Sure. Go ahead, Mr. Pate.

13   MR. PATE: Certainly. This was the issue raised by

14   Mr. Bradbury, and he said that they had requested some

15   information a couple weeks back that was supposed to be

16   provided this past Friday, and we had missed that date. The

17   specific information that they requested, my understanding is,

18   they were looking for some information for a TAG,

19   API (phonetic) specification. That is all related to the

20   parsed CSR. And the commitment, once again, was February 15th.

21   Well, checking with my colleagues back in Atlanta and

22   Birmingham, we checked and we did provide a posted revised

23   specifications on the Web site, and we also notified

24   Ms. Seigler, my understanding, via e-mail that that posting had

25   taken place.

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. So your response is that you

2 did contact AT&T directly on Friday, and you also posted the

3 response for everyone's benefit on the Web site.

4   MR. PATE: That's correct. And I had not had a

5 chance to tell Mr. Bradbury that directly, but that is what my

6 folks have advised me.

7   CHAIRMAN JABER: All right. And with respect to the

8 second question, Mr. Ainsworth.

9   MR. AINSWORTH: Yes. I believe this was Network

10 Telephone. I believe they were talking about a FRN issue in a

11 contact they had had, and they had not -- or we had reneged on

12 a commitment, I believe was the term. And actually in talking

13 with the individual, they indicated that the only -- the

14 commitment that was made was to present this issue to the

15 product team for consideration, which that has been done. And

16 they also are to continue submitting those service orders at

17 least in this period of time with an SI with an LSR until the

18 product team can have an opportunity to look at that and

19 respond. And they are -- in fact, have an ERT letter in

20 progress now replying to that in writing to Network Telephone.

21   CHAIRMAN JABER: And what would their response say?

22   MR. AINSWORTH: The response said that it has been

23 given to the product team to determine, can they comply with

24 that request.

25   CHAIRMAN JABER: Oh, the response will not say

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 whether the can or cannot comply.

2   MR. AINSWORTH: No.

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: It's just that they're working on

4 it.

5   MR. AINSWORTH: That's correct.

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: When did the original request come

7 to you all?

8   MR. AINSWORTH: I don't have that information.

9   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. All right. Anything from

10 BellSouth on provisioning?

11   All right. Ms. Keating, I suppose that we are ready

12 to move on to maintenance and repair.

13   MS. SEIGLER: I'm sorry, Ms. Chairman. I'm sorry.

14 I'm Bernadette Seigler, and I was expecting that e-mail back on

15 Friday, and I did not get it as of yesterday morning.

16   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Ms. Seigler.

17   MS. SEIGLER: So I did not receive that information.

18   CHAIRMAN JABER: Let's come back to all of those

19 responses at the very end, but we're going to move this along.

20 He said, she said, there is nothing we can do about that right

21 now.

22   MS. BOONE: Madam Chairperson, I actually -- we have

23 a suggestion. We have been discussing with BellSouth

24 reordering and taking the change management panel next and then

25 the data integrity panel with the hopes that we can cover some

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 billing and maintenance stuff in those and therefore skipping

2 two panels essentially. And the CLECs are okay with that, and

3 BellSouth is fine, I think.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: Skipping to --

5   MS. BOONE: Skipping to change management next and

6 then data integrity, and then if there were going to be time,

7 which there's not, that would leave billing and maintenance and

8 repair. We think change of management will incorporate kind of

9 a lot.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: That's fine. We're flexible here.

11 I'll take up change management.

12   Staff, do you have any problems?

13   MS. KEATING: Sounds fine to us.

14   CHAIRMAN JABER: Go ahead and start the change

15 management panel. And Ms. Seigler, during the next break or if

16 you have an opportunity now to sit down with Mr. Ainsworth and

17 find out who it was e-mailed you the response, that would be

18 good.

19   MS. FOSHEE: Madam Chair, one last thing while we're

20 getting situated. We will, while this presentation is going

21 on, be handing out paper copies of the preordering, ordering,

22 and provisioning sections so that everyone will have those. So

23 if you don't get one, please come see us, and we'll make sure

24 you do.

25   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you.

1   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Could you give us an

2 indication of when you will be taking a break?

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: How about right now?

4   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: That would be great.

5   (Brief recess.)

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: Now, we took such a sufficient

7 break, they tell me we don't need a billing panel; is that

8 correct? Not all at once. Okay.

9   Ms. Keating, change management. I see Mr. Moses up

10 there.

11   MS. KEATING: I was wondering if this might be the

12 right time. Mr. Moses can address the issue of the PIC freeze

13 rule.

14   CHAIRMAN JABER: Sure.

15   MR. MOSES: Chairman Jaber, you had asked the

16 question of the status of a Staff workshop involving the PC

17 freeze. What happened, a little less than a year ago, MCI had

18 petitioned the Commission for the electronic lifting of a PC

19 freeze. A workshop was held, and it was ultimately withdrawn,

20 and then it was brought to agenda and closure of the docket.

21   And we do have a draft rule that is pending that is

22 just going to clarify that the PC freeze is at the option of

23 the customer and not the option of the companies, but that will

24 be brought for you pretty soon. We're going to have a workshop

25 on that on May 2nd.

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: May 2nd?

2   MR. MOSES: Yes.

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Thank you.

4   MR. MOSES: You're welcome.

5   CHAIRMAN JABER: Change management, ALEC panel.

6   MR. BRADBURY: Yes, ma'am. Jay Bradbury with AT&T.

7 I've heard a lot of discussion today about deficiencies in

8 BellSouth's operation support systems. A principal tool for

9 the ability to correct those would be an efficient and well

10 functioning change management process. Unfortunately, the

11 process that the ALECs face today with BellSouth is flawed in

12 three major ways.

13   First, it has no time frames by which BellSouth must

14 implement feature changes. Second, the real process is

15 actually hidden from the ALECs. This is already pretty

16 well-known to you and your Staff through Exception 88 here by

17 KPMG, so we won't spend much time talking about that. And

18 thirdly, the process delivers defective software. You've heard

19 a number of examples of that today, so we won't do anything

20 except probably list them again for your reference.

21   What has this process brought us to? It's brought us

22 to a point in time where we have a considerable backlog of both

23 feature and defect change requests. My BellSouth friends who

24 try to reconcile my numbers under the feature change requests,

25 I did not include in backlog any new status items that were

1 clearly opened because of CLEC inactivity. That includes a

2 couple of AT&T change requests like TAFI, ECTA and some others

3 that are open to the ALECs to respond to BellSouth. So that

4 may come up a little bit short because I didn't want to

5 overstate a backlog here.

6   My database was the end of January, the change

7 control log at that point in time. Since that time, there have

8 been some five or six new feature change requests produced. We

9 can look at the release schedules and see that there are only

10 24 feature changes scheduled to be implemented this year. And

11 so I can do a forward-looking forecast at the end of the year

12 and say that the defect -- pardon me -- the feature change

13 request backlog at the end of this year will still be

14 63 feature change requests. And it will take until 2005 under

15 the present process to clear that backlog if there are no

16 additional feature change requests.

17   The defect change request status at the end of

18 January, there were 61. There were quite a few scheduled. My

19 instant forecast is that there are now -- there is now a

20 backlog of 39 defect change requests in place.

21   There's been a disparity over the years in the

22 percentage of change requests that were implemented depending

23 on whether the ALECs initiated them or BellSouth initiated

24 them. Now, there's some data in the next paragraph that

25 reflects to you that one out of five of the ALECs have been

1 implemented over time. One out of three of the CLECs -- excuse

2 me -- of BellSouth over time. The time for the ALECs is a

3 three-year period. The time for BellSouth is a two-year

4 period. And there's a considerable difference in the average

5 time to implement between the two of 104 days. And again, this

6 is all data from BellSouth's ex parte filings at the FCC.

7 Implemented faulty software. I think we've talked

8 about almost all of these examples today: Loop port queries;

9 the due date calculator; customer service record response

10 timeliness improvement which lost the -- actually lost three

11 different fields; the latest one that was restored was the

12 pending service order field; migration by TN and name and the

13 parsed CSR data.

14 This defective software comes into place because

15 BellSouth fails to develop and implement timely coding

16 specifications. It fails to perform an adequate internal

17 testing and the external testing environment, the CAVE

18 environment, available to the CLECs or ALECs has been limited

19 in scope, functionality, and availability.

20 All of the resources and efforts that are required to

21 correct faulty software, of course, take away resources and

22 efforts that could be used to implement new changes that

23 appear. Again, the real process has been hidden. I'll just

24 refer you to Exception 88 to the fact that there is a process

25 that goes on that the ALECs do not have any role in, have

1 visibility to.

2   Recently, at a request of the Georgia staff, the

3 ALECs have submitted a proposal, what we call the redline CCP

4 document, to the Georgia Commission. That was presented to

5 them on January the 31st. I made copies of that available to

6 the Staff then, so I haven't brought any today. I hope they

7 still have them.

8   Four major things in that that we wanted, and I think

9 we'll talk about a little bit today, is there needs to be a

10 very clear definition of what a CLEC impacting defect -- excuse

11 me -- change is. BellSouth has a very narrow view of that.

12 The ALECs, and maybe they'll surprise you, have a much broader

13 view. There needs to be prioritization of all what we call

14 Type 4 BellSouth and Type 5 ALEC initiated change requests

15 jointly that is binding upon BellSouth. There needs to be time

16 commitments for the implementation of those Type 4 and 5, and

17 we propose a 60-week interval. There is no interval today.

18 And the ALECs need to have visibility into the BellSouth

19 process after that prioritization.

20   Again, we made those recommendations in a redline to

21 the Georgia Commission about two weeks ago. BellSouth was to

22 respond on Friday. I'm quite certain they did, I just haven't

23 seen the response myself. Mr. Davis tells me that they did

24 indeed do that. I imagine that it will probably reflect a good

25 bit of stuff that I read over the weekend in their federal

1 filing where in the time intervals when they filed at the FCC

2 last October until now, they have either initiated or promised

3 to initiate some 23 initiatives in this area.

4   I'll say three things about those. All 23 of them

5 are really just in time for their federal filing. Two, all of

6 them could have been made at any time in the past, and three,

7 virtually all of them have been requests that CLECs have made

8 over time for the last two or three years.

9   With that, I'll turn it to my cohorts.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Who wants to go next? Tag your it.

11   MS. CONQUEST: Tag, I'm it. I thought I was last.

12 Okay. Basically, we support AT&T's position. It is a concern

13 of ours that changes are very slow to be forthcoming. Often

14 they are not addressed. They're sent back for clarifications,

15 and they sit for a while pending and sometimes get lost in the

16 paper shuffle. The biggest concern, I think, we've had

17 recently, and we have made a little bit of progress toward, is

18 a sizing issue. It's impossible for us to come to the table

19 and do a prioritization on a change request when we don't

20 understand what the effort with regard to the coding resources

21 that's being required. And we've tried to explain that in some

22 of the documentation, I'm sure you've read, that they bring the

23 top category or the top tier to the table. Sometimes it's a

24 small CLEC. It's that smaller tier that you really need to do

25 things in your business, and those things tend to get lost and

1 sit on the table for months and months and months.

2   So we are advocating that there be a process that

3 makes us partners in the packaging. We need to have a voice.

4 I don't feel comfortable in BellSouth being my voice because

5 they don't walk in my shoes, and they don't understand my

6 business needs. And while I applaud them for taking that to

7 their prioritization table, there are at least three internal

8 customers that are there competing with me for those same

9 resources, and that's a concern. And I feel like that we need

10 to have a co-position in there, and we should be able to help

11 in that prioritization and packaging effort.

12   I also think that BellSouth needs to help us get more

13 of these defects handled in a more expeditious manner. Whether

14 in the future they institute a more stringent testing prior to

15 deploying their releases or whatever it takes, we have more

16 beta testing with them, but I think we have to do a better job.

17 This process is snowballing, and over a period of time it's

18 going to become extremely unmanageable.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: Go ahead.

20   MS. DAVIS: Hello, I'm Colette Davis with Covad

21 Communications. The points that I wanted to make based on our

22 commercial experience with change management is that currently

23 we have 14 change requests that are in the process that affect

24 our ordering. We order through LENS, EDI, TAG preorder and the

25 manual gateway. So these 14 change requests that are in the

1 process, out of those 14, 10 of those are defects. And a

2 defect means that the programming has been done based on the

3 requirements and there's a problem with the actual quality of

4 the programming. Therefore, out of these 14 that are change

5 requests that are impacting Covad, I still have 10 that are

6 defects that are impeding my ability to place mechanized

7 orders. Most of these require work-arounds, require

8 supplemental orders that have to be sent manually. So to

9 capture what has previously been said, there needs to be some

10 type of time frame that's established so that defects are

11 corrected and corrected within a reasonable amount of time.

12 The oldest defect that I have is back to August, and that is,

13 unfortunately, one of the ones that causes us the most

14 work-around time.

15   Now, the other item that I wanted to bring up has to

16 do with, again, the timeliness of new products and

17 enhancements. The time frame in order to get a new product

18 implemented or mechanized, manual to mechanized, it tends to go

19 from six months to eight months, even maybe a year. And for

20 Covad to implement a new product, that requires us to move out

21 of a mechanized ordering environment back to manual. So there

22 is a sense of urgency for the smaller CLECs to be able to get

23 that mechanization out on a product launch. So, again, some

24 stricter time frames and delivering mechanized ordering when a

25 product is launched is critical. All the other CLECs -- ILECs

1   do it, and BellSouth should be able to do it as well.

2   And at this point, Kyle, I'll turn it over to you,

3   Network Telephone.

4   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Great. Thank you. Network Telephone

5   would support AT&T's, Covad's, and ITC's position with respect

6   to sizing and prioritization and also specifically Covad's

7   position with respect to the time frame. I just would like to

8   touch and not belabor the fact that BellSouth brought to this

9   Commission today Change Request 557 with respect to the

10   mechanization of UDCs and the fact that they initiated that in

11   November of 2001.

12   I think from a standpoint when they bring facts like

13   that to the table, it shows that, number one, it's timely, and

14   number two, it's BellSouth addressing our issues. When, in

15   fact, Network Telephone requested that service -- and I'm not

16   sure of the date, but I believe it was all the way back as far

17   as February 2001. We recognize that at that time UDCs were

18   becoming a large portion of our broadband services as a result

19   of some of the other inefficiencies of their ADSL, so we needed

20   it mechanized immediately. It took over 11 months, and it's

21   still not fully mechanized. So I just want to stress, as

22   Colette did, the timeliness involved in some of the issues that

23   are needed.

24   MS. LICHTENBERG: I think I'm the cleanup hitter

25   here. The issue of change management, as Mr. Bradbury stated

1   when we started, is that changes to the OSS systems, changes to

2   the processes by which we have to do business can actually put

3   us out of business. And so the key things in a change

4   management process are understanding jointly what is going to

5   be done, when it is going to be done, how it is going to be

6   done, and what the downstream implications are.

7   CLECs have asked that we be able to define what CLEC

8   impacting means. BellSouth doesn't use my systems to make --

9   to send orders to themselves. BellSouth takes my EDI LSR after

10   it goes through their gateway, and their systems break it down,

11   send it off through additional legacy systems, and I don't know

12   what happens to it. Yet, BellSouth tells me that, in what

13   generally sounds like a fairly paternalistic tone, it's okay,

14   you don't have to change that local service request. You just

15   keep sending it. The changes will be transparent to you.

16   As we learned in the migrate by telephone number

17   debacle, that was not the case. And each time that CLECs were

18   provided with documentation and told it was a minor change,

19   orders were rejected that should not have been rejected. We

20   are simply asking that BellSouth work with us to look at

21   changes so that they impact both sets of businesses and we work

22   together. BellSouth will tell you that to prioritize all

23   change requests together, both BellSouth-initiated and

24   ALEC-initiated, is going to hurt BellSouth. Far from it.

25   If we see a change that BellSouth is going to make

1   that will make the systems better, we'll put it at the top of

2   the list because it is to our benefit that we understand the

3   way the systems work and that we make sure they do work. So

4   that prioritization process, the work that your Staff has done

5   with the KPMG test to discover that once we think we've reached

6   an agreement on prioritization, that there is a backroom

7   process, a star chamber, that changes that process is

8   absolutely critical. And I know that the Staff and KPMG

9   continue to look at this, and it is one of the things that the

10 ALECs have asked for.

11   We think that sizing is important, but unless we talk

12 to the actual people that actually know the systems, not the

13 BellSouth change control IT guru, but the people that actually

14 program LEO and LSOG and the other systems, only if we work

15 together can we say, wait a minute. Are you sure that by doing

16 "X," you're not going to cause defect "Y"? And as this team

17 has said over and over, the number of defects is exceedingly

18 high. And it's BellSouth that decides if those defects are

19 important and if those defects need to get fixed.

20   You asked a question, Madam Chairman, I believe, of

21 Mr. Pate about what happens if you put in a change request, who

22 says yes or no. BellSouth says yes or no. When BellSouth

23 comes back and says, too expensive, they don't come back and

24 say, it's very expensive to change this system, but what is it

25 you're really trying to do, and is there a better way, a less

1 expensive way to do it? If we prioritize changes together,

2 that will no longer be an excuse.

3 We also have our changes echoed back to us which give

4 us more information. Well, we try to describe our change

5 requests, but if we don't have the right resources to work with

6 us, it's very difficult for BellSouth to understand what they

7 are. Yet BellSouth only now has decided that they will bring a

8 single IT person to the table.

9 We have an escalation process. Absolutely,

10 definitely. It escalates around in circles inside BellSouth,

11 and if we really need something done, we have to go to a

12 Commission and take your time to ask you to make that change.

13 That's parsed CSR; that's migrate by telephone number and name;

14 that's line splitting; that is the correction of a number of

15 these defects; it's the Single "C" order process that we have

16 asked for over and over but couldn't get until we found a

17 Commission who could work with us and order it. We really --

18 CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Lichtenberg, on the shared

19 prioritization, BellSouth has to prioritize among your changes,

20 but they also have to prioritize among all of the ALEC changes.

21 So do you have a suggestion for us on how that could be done?

22 MS. LICHTENBERG: The ALECs work jointly to come up

23 with a single prioritized list of ALEC changes. And we as

24 ALECs, it's incumbent upon us to work with each other and to

25 make sure that we understand how those changes impact us. What

1 we're asking for is that the BellSouth changes -- that the

2 changes they want to make to their systems that take up

3 additional capacity, that they share those with us as well and

4 that we prioritize together. Clearly everyone wants these

5 systems to work, and only by working jointly can we make them

6 work.

7   I think that the ALEC redline proposal that

8 Mr. Bradbury mentioned is a step in the right direction. This

9 is a process that works in other states. It doesn't work in

10 BellSouth.

11   CHAIRMAN JABER: Any other comments from the ALEC

12 panel?

13   Okay. BellSouth panel.

14   MR. PATE: Yes, Commissioner. I'll be the primary

15 spokesperson to address the issues on change management.

16 First, I'd like to talk from the presentation that we prepared

17 just to discuss some of the things in change management. We

18 are very committed to the change management process. I think

19 that's proven by the amount of work and the resources that we

20 devote to working with the ALEC community as a whole. But

21 there's some particular things I'd like to bring to your

22 attention that we're doing to even make this process better,

23 and we're doing this because we've listened to the ALEC

24 community.

25   I'd like to point out very first that it was

1   referenced in someone's comment earlier, but Mr. Dennis Davis

2   is here today.   Mr. Davis is the OAVP, the operational

3   assistant vice president for BellSouth, that has responsibility

4   for the change management process as well as release

5   management.   And he's here because he heard of this proceeding,

6   and he wanted to come hear what the ALECs were saying even

7   though he deals with them day in and day out as part of the

8   process.   He wanted to be present here to also better

9   understand and hear even more.   That's some of the

10 commitment -- or at least a show of the commitment made to this

11 process.

12   Let me talk about -- with respect to what we have

13 laid out here.   The first item I have is, make the process more

14 user-friendly.   BellSouth is trying to do that and provide more

15 support to the ALECs.   Let me give you some illustrations of

16 what I'm referring to here.

17   BellSouth has begun distributing to the change

18 control process members a single document that outlines all

19 document changes associated with each release.   Now, this will

20 allow them to consult a single source to learn about the

21 business rules and other related documents that have changed.

22 That's a drastic improvement from what has been there before.

23   We've also agreed at the ALECs' request to separate

24 the release schedule based on system versus nonsystem impacting

25 type changes, and we're updating the Web site to reflect that.

1   In the fall of 2001, we began providing members of the CCP a

2   daily activity report which shows the update activity on each

3   individual change request. In March of 2002, we'll begin

4   distributing a quarterly tracking report that's in an Excel

5   format that allow them to pull it down to Excel and do whatever

6   they wish (phonetic) to better understand their particular

7   request.

8   We've also changed the manner in which we actually

9   conduct the prioritization meetings. What I mean by the

10   prioritization meeting, this is the meeting that's held where

11   we come together and actually use a voting methodology to

12   prioritize a change request. The meeting in the past had to be

13   held in person, and the information associated with that

14   meeting was typically distributed at the meeting. Well, now

15   we've expanded to get the information out in advance and

16   actually will conduct those meetings via a conference bridge to

17   assist those that have difficulty in traveling to the meeting.

18   CHAIRMAN JABER: Who attends the meeting?

19   MR. PATE: The meeting is attended by the ALECs

20   participating in change control. This is a major meeting.

21   They have a monthly meeting as it is. The prioritization does

22   not necessarily occur monthly, though. It's typically on a

23   quarterly schedule. So that's the meeting that we're referring

24   to here.

25   I introduced Mr. Davis that was here, but we also

1 have some other members that we now have attending these

2 monthly meetings. There's been some reference made to this.

3 We have members of the account team, a gentleman that

4 represents the account teams that the ALECs interface with that

5 attends the meetings. So he can hear and be a part of this

6 discussion. As reference, we have a member from our IT

7 department that comes to these meetings that can help speak to

8 the issues and take them back. We also have members of our

9 staff and the change review board. These are people that

10 represent the project managers of the various interfaces and

11 such that attend these meetings. So the bottom line is, we're

12 trying to bring the people, the appropriate resources to the

13 meetings themselves so that the meeting becomes a more

14 meaningful dialogue in exchange of information.

15   The next item I have up there is to modify the

16 process and response to the needs of the CLEC community. In

17 the summer of 2001, we implemented a process to distribute the

18 BellSouth business rules for local ordering earlier. We

19 have -- it was a 5 day in advance, for example, for nonsystem

20 changes and 30 days for systems. Well, there are intervals

21 associated with this now that where -- the way it's currently

22 worded for a major release, that will be provided eight weeks

23 in advance; for minor release, five weeks. For those that are

24 nonsystem impacting changes will get 30 days notification.

25   Also, in December of 2001, a coding matrix associated

1 with each release was developed so that it would be a more

2 simplified version of all the user requirements to try to aid

3 in the ALECs interpreting the coding requirements -- the coding

4 needs they would have. I don't have the exact date, but

5 sometime also in late 2001 we began distributing a complete

6 schedule of the release implementation for the year. So they

7 could see what the releases are scheduled, and based at that

8 point in time based on the information, they'll know what's

9 going to be in those releases when they see that schedule.

10   Adding CCP performance measures is another item I've

11 noted. We had added three new performance measures to even

12 continue to monitor a commitment to this. The CLECs will

13 receive timing notification of all BST software defects, so the

14 time periods associated with those defects, a measure has been

15 put in place for that.

16   We also have a measure for the percent of the change

17 requests submitted by the ALECs that are accepted within 10

18 business days. And a third measure that was added was a

19 percent of change requests rejected by BellSouth based on the

20 reasons specified in the change control process.

21   We've also made a commitment to implement the top

22 priority change requests for this year. We've said that of

23 those change requests, we will definitely state now we'll get

24 15 of those in, and 7 of those, I believe, have already been

25 scheduled. And the others will be scheduled and put in place

1 during the second half of the year, the third and fourth

2 quarters.

3 The implementation and availability of the CAVE

4 testing system has been expanded also. When that system was

5 initially rolled out, the intent was for a period before and

6 after releases for that to be available for the ALECs to test

7 the functionality associated with that release. Essentially,

8 if you look at the schedule now, we've expanded that beyond

9 that initial approach to essentially make it more available so

10 they can get in there and test the functionality and work with

11 the various issues that are going to be impacting their changes

12 for that particular request.

13 A comment you've heard throughout that appears to be

14 a major issue, a theme, that we've heard and we have been

15 working diligently with the community deals with the capacity.

16 How does BellSouth allocate the capacity and the releases so

17 that the ALECs' change requests will be worked? This -- you

18 know, I'll admit to tell you right now, this is a challenge,

19 because as you try to take a look at the releases and take a

20 look at all the changes that we have before us, it is a major

21 balancing act to take all the resources necessary to implement

22 each and make sure that you can really fulfill those requests.

23 This, of course, had some initial roots back here through the

24 third-party testing exception that was raised on this issue.

25 And you're probably familiar with a proposal that was made that

1 we would allocate 40 percent of the released capacity to the

2 ALECs' change requests as well as any ALEC-driven mandates. A

3 mandate could be, for example, the parsed CSR that we have

4 already discussed today. And then 60 percent of that remaining

5 capacity then would be allocated to BellSouth's what we refer

6 to as a public switched network mandate. By that, I'm talking

7 about NPA overlays, for example, or number pooling. And then

8 we would have within that 60 percent what we need to do to deal

9 with the defects and regular maintenance of our systems and

10 then the remaining part of that to deal with the

11 BellSouth-initiated change requests.

12   So we were saying by the time we take a look at all

13 of our maintenance needs, getting all the defects that's been

14 corrected that's been discovered and then do what we have

15 requirements from a public switched network, we need 60 percent

16 of that capacity, but we'll give you the 40 other percent. And

17 we even developed a tool to help them, a sizing model, so they

18 could see what that 40 percent would require in terms of each

19 individual change request. The ALECs as a whole have said that

20 they find that unacceptable. Some of the words I read is they

21 said it was nothing more than maintaining the status quo. And

22 we're puzzled by that comment, frankly. We were definitely

23 trying to do something that would help in this prioritization

24 process as we listen to their needs specifically, their

25 requests.

1   As a result of that, we have taken a look at a

2   different proposal. I have the handout that was passed to

3   everyone at the break that's labeled, "CCP Release Capacity

4   Planning Proposal 2/12/02." This was actually a copy of what

5   was presented to the ALEC community on February 12th. And in

6   fairness to them at that point in time, you know, some of this

7   was new, and they had not digested all of this. I'm sure

8   they've had an opportunity to further digest since then because

9   this was just, as you can see, very recently. But if you flip

10 to first page, you can see that we heard what they said, and we

11 came back with a different approach.

12   First is, we made it clear that we'd have three to

13 four releases annually plus any maintenance releases. Then --

14 there's six different types of changes. We have listed here in

15 the second item a Type 2, 3, and 6 features would be scheduled

16 prior to 4 and 5. Let me put that in terms outside the process

17 so you can understand what it's saying. The 2, 3, and 6 deal

18 with releases associated with industry changes, orders from the

19 regulatory authorities and defects.

20   The 3 -- excuse me. The 4s and the 5s deal with the

21 CLEC-initiated changes in BellSouth. The major difference in

22 that a lot of time is you can talk about a 4 and 5 as an

23 enhancement. It's not something that's impeding the ability to

24 submit orders, but it would help and make it nicer because of

25 their individual needs if we did these things, but they are

1 enhancements. Well, the 2, 3s, and 6s obviously need to be

2 done. There could be some mandates associated, in particular

3 the defects which are categorized as 6. So it makes sense, and

4 I think they're in agreement with this as well, that particular

5 piece of it. Those take precedence.

6   The third item is, we provide release capacity

7 measurement feature prioritization matrix. We have an example

8 of that matrix on the very next page. This gets to really

9 taking a look at each of the change requests you're submitting

10 and would give you some information back on that change

11 request. Also, goes with this is the second bullet which we'll

12 get in more detail in a second, capacity associated with that

13 change request. But here, as you look and refer to it, this is

14 where we're trying to identify the change request. We'll

15 capture the description, and you can see, particularly if you

16 look down the left-hand side, we're trying to identify all the

17 systems impacted with that. And that helps us identify, if you

18 go all the way over to the right-hand side, any type of

19 integrated testing that's going to be needed because it could

20 impact multiple systems.

21   But right in the middle of that, you will see the

22 level of work effort. This gets to a major point that we're

23 trying to develop here to assist the prioritization process,

24 and this is at the request of the ALEC community; that is, give

25 them some way to understand the sizing, the work effort that

1 has been said associated with a particular change request so

2 they can use that to evaluate the prioritization, because

3 sometimes at the face value you're looking at change requests

4 it may look simple, but it may be a major effort from a coding

5 change to the system. And what we've done is, we've developed

6 the model to help them evaluate. We provide that information

7 back to them. It uses a resource model that we put in hours of

8 resources, and you can see the way it's listed -- the way this

9 will come out. One unit equals 100 release cycle hours. What

10 we're talking about there, that's the overall programming

11 effort all the way from analysis -- right up front the

12 analysis, then the design, then the coding, then the testing.

13 How much does that take so that you deliver a product for that

14 release, that software release? So we will --

15   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Pate.

16   MR. PATE: I'm sorry, yes.

17   CHAIRMAN JABER: Do you acknowledge that your change

18 requests will not always take priority over the ALEC changes?

19   MR. PATE: Yes. You're referring to the Type 4s and

20 5s? Correct, they prioritize that is what we're saying here.

21 So they would prioritize it.

22   Now, do I understand your question correctly?

23   CHAIRMAN JABER: Well, I'm just trying to evaluate

24 whether this satisfies the ALEC concerns, and at first blush,

25 doesn't -- it looks to me that you're talking past each other,

1 but perhaps that's my lack of understanding. So you're free to

2 correct me if I'm wrong, but I hear them say, we want to be

3 part of the team that evaluates the properties, because they

4 acknowledge that BellSouth will have changes and the ALEC has

5 changes. They want to look at the criteria that is used for

6 the ALEC changes and they also want to look at the criteria

7 that BellSouth uses. So this doesn't make them part of the

8 team real-time, does it?

9   MR. PATE: Yes, we believe it does.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Explain that to me.

11   MR. PATE: This makes them part of the team real-time

12 from the up front prioritization of all those requests that are

13 impacting to those systems. What I'm hearing the ALECs say,

14 and I think it's what you're referring to, is then for what we

15 need to do internal for our systems. They're not a part of

16 that process, and we're still proposing that they should not be

17 a part of that process. Those are the things that BellSouth

18 needs to do for managing those systems internal, but what we're

19 trying to say in this, but we'll only take so much release

20 capacity to do that.

21   CHAIRMAN JABER: Right. But isn't it correct that

22 they want to be part of that internal process because they're

23 worried that the changes you make to address their concerns

24 actually create defects in other areas?

25   MR. PATE: That may be part of their concern. I'm

1   not sure that I've heard it from that perspective, the way you

2   phrased it.

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: That's what I heard.

4   MR. PATE: Well, I heard more from a standpoint that

5   they wanted to be in that to ensure their changes was getting

6   the capacity that it deserved and that our changes was not

7   taken away from theirs.

8   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Hang on to that thought

9   because I want to make sure I understand.

10   Ms. Lichtenberg, like a two second answer.

11   MS. LICHTENBERG: You are absolutely correct,

12   Madam Chairman.

13   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Well, so what I heard was

14   accurate, so now you need to respond to that.

15   MR. PATE: Well, our position is that the processes

16   we're proposing here would take care of that, and through the

17   capacity management of itself, that should not be an issue.

18   The systems that they're talking about and the systems that

19   they're trying to expand the overall scope of change control

20   are systems, as we have said in trying to deal with the

21   definition, are not impacting to their interfaces up front.

22   They're not ALEC affected because one of the issues they raised

23   here earlier in their points of discussion, that there is

24   currently discussion over that definition of what is ALEC

25   affecting. We're saying when we do an internal change for our

1 system -- the system we talked about here today, for example,

2 is a loop facility assignment control system. That's internal

3 to BellSouth. Our obligation is to make that change and make

4 sure it does not have any adverse impact on processing their

5 orders. When we make that change to that system, just

6 recognize that those are the downstream provisioning systems

7 that are the same for BellSouth's retail as it is for the

8 wholesale customers that we serve the ALEC community. So from

9 that viewpoint, those changes are impacting everyone the same.

10   For them to say that they should be involved with

11 that change, our position is, no, you do not need to be

12 involved, but we have an obligation to make those changes

13 properly so it does not impede what you're doing.

14   CHAIRMAN JABER: I understand your position, but I

15 also understand that in five minutes I caught that you were

16 talking past each other, and it strikes me as there's plenty of

17 room here for more dialogue.

18   MR. PATE: I agree.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: And I don't know if you were

20 personally involved in assessing what the ALEC request is, but

21 what they're saying is that to legitimately understand the way

22 you put priorities on changes, they want to be part of a team.

23 And you may give some thought to putting a group together that

24 meets as often as it needs to to evaluate what the criteria are

25 and what the priorities should be.

1   MR. PATE: Yes, ma'am.

2   CHAIRMAN JABER: And maybe that's an independent

3   group that's represented by, you know, ALECs and BellSouth, and

4   frankly, maybe you bring another ILEC in. An independent group

5   that takes a look at these issues might be worth pursuing.

6   MR. PATE: And I think you hit on a key point. I

7   mean, this is evolving. We are continuing with discussions.

8   That's why Mr. Davis is here. He is the one that is involved

9   with these discussions day in and day out. It is not I, but I

10 do have frequent discussions with him as well as attend

11 meetings on these discussions with Mr. Davis and other

12 executives at BellSouth trying to have a full appreciation for

13 what's being proposed.

14   This proposal that we have today on the table we

15 think deals with those issues, however, recognize the one that

16 they still are concerned about, and that is, being a member of

17 that internal process. And that's one that we still have not

18 come to any type of agreement on. What we are looking at that

19 I can tell the Commission today, though, with respect to the

20 definition of what is ALEC affecting, we have in our hands and

21 we're evaluating and I think we're almost to the point of

22 proposing it, we'll use exactly what Verizon has currently in

23 their process for that definition. And that's one apparently

24 that's worked there. Ms. Lichtenberg has made several nice

25 comments about Verizon, and obviously, the FCC has accepted

1 their overall process since they are in the long-distance

2 business.

3   But we feel this tool that we are proposing would

4 give them what they need for capacity management assessment at

5 prioritization, and then as you can see in this page we're

6 talking about from a capacity standpoint that, first, the

7 estimated capacity assigned goes to -- from the Type 2 through

8 6 features provided. Capacity that would be remaining after

9 you look at those Type 2, 3s, and 6s, you would then allocate

10 the remaining capacity to 4 and 5s. And we're proposing today,

11 since there seems to be a concern about making sure they get

12 their share even of that, that we'll ensure there's a 50-50

13 split of a BellSouth 4 versus the CLEC's 5 that's initiated.

14   We'll also -- one of the things they have stressed is

15 they want to get some type of commitment to get these

16 implemented. They've made reference to the backlog, and it

17 appears it will take through -- I think Mr. Bradbury said

18 2005 to clear it out. So they've requested a 60-week interval.

19 We had no problem with the 60-week interval concept, but it's

20 got to be based on available capacity because there's only so

21 much capacity to do the changes. So to say 60 week can be a

22 target, but let's look at the capacity. We're going to give

23 you all the information on that, each individual request, to

24 help you understand what that takes up in capacity. Now, help

25 us with all that to manage it, so we can truly put in those

1 that are the most important to you.

2   As I said at the beginning, this ink is still pretty

3 wet on this proposal, and I think this represents just the

4 ongoing effort that we have through Mr. Davis's team to work

5 with the ALEC community. Change control process is going to be

6 the major process that drives our working relationship as we

7 continue to go forward for many years. We're committed to it.

8 We want to find a way that's mutually acceptable to everyone so

9 that everybody's interest can be served. And I speak on behalf

10 of BellSouth that we wish this process to be an effective

11 process. There's nothing hidden from the standpoint of what

12 we're trying to do with the capacity management and giving them

13 the information they need on each of the individual change

14 requests to make it happen. Thank you.

15   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you, Mr. Pate. Any other

16 comments from the BellSouth panel?

17   MR. SCOLLARD: Yes, very quickly. There was one

18 issue that MCI raised and that is including the billing

19 invoices and usage records as part of change control.

20 BellSouth's position is that generally what we provide are

21 buckets of records that are already controlled by the

22 guidelines at OBF, and that's the appropriate place for those.

23 What we have offered, though, is on the changes to service

24 orders and those kinds of processes, if there is a billing

25 system change that would be required to put those in, that we

1 would look at those. However, since our retail customers are

2 using the exact same system as we're using for the CLECs, it

3 probably will take some additional time to make sure we don't

4 adversely effect those customers when we put them in.

5   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Madam Chair?

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes.

7   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: At some time in the near

8 future, I would be interested in hearing what Verizon's

9 proposal is.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Pate, are you familiar enough

11 with the Verizon proposal to articulate that for us in a

12 summary fashion?

13   MR. PATE: I have seen it, but I haven't internalized

14 it.

15   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Okay.

16   MR. PATE: We can make that available to you, the

17 language that we're --

18   COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Well, I don't want to put you

19 at an unfair disadvantage by asking you to explain something

20 that you don't know the details of, but I'd just be interested

21 in knowing what it is.

22   CHAIRMAN JABER: What about the ALECs? Anyone that

23 is actually participating in the Verizon method?

24   MS. LICHTENBERG: I'm doing this off the top of my

25 head, and I'll try to be rapid. Verizon doesn't refer to ALECs

1 as "them." They refer to us as part of the team. We work

2 together to prioritize everything. There is no

3 reprioritization. Billing system changes are included in

4 change management. Changes to the internal systems -- Verizon

5 learned after the New York meltdown that it was critical to

6 talk about internal changes and let CLECs know when they were

7 going to take place. The result -- the problem where CLECs

8 were missing huge numbers of notifiers after a Verizon internal

9 change taught them that.

10 We had originally brought the Verizon change

11 management proposal to BellSouth as the original starting point

12 for change management. We continued to try to work with

13 BellSouth to do that. I have not seen BellSouth's new

14 definition of CLEC impacting. There was one at the change

15 management meeting on the 12th. It was not one that allowed us

16 to see into the systems, and it was not one that responded to

17 your question about, shouldn't everything be prioritized

18 together?

19 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Ms. Lichtenberg, you just

20 represented that you brought the Verizon change management

21 model to BellSouth.

22 MS. LICHTENBERG: Yes. Tyra Colbert (phonetic), who

23 I think her new last name is Hush (phonetic), who is our

24 representative with MCI, when change management started, we

25 wanted to start with the Verizon process because it was

1 working. That was some years ago.

2 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. And Mr. Pate just said that

3 they'd be happy to implement the Verizon change proposal if

4 that's what the ALECs want.

5 MR. PATE: That was specifically referring to the

6 definition we're talking about for ALEC affecting. That

7 appears to be a major issue at this point in time. I don't

8 want to represent that we're willing to adopt everything within

9 Verizon's change control process. I'm not even familiar what

10 everything is in that context, specifically --

11 CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Pate, you can go back and look

12 at the Verizon model and review for us what part of that model

13 you would be willing to implement on your own.

14 MS. LICHTENBERG: If I could add a couple of things

15 about the Verizon process that my colleagues have reminded me.

16 There is no backlog in Verizon. Testing is done very well, and

17 when defects are found, they're announced and corrected

18 sometimes in days. There are issues, as there always are with

19 software development, but the CLECs would be more than happy to

20 have the Verizon process in BellSouth.

21 CHAIRMAN JABER: And that's a Verizon process that

22 Verizon is using in Florida today.

23 MS. LICHTENBERG: I can't speak to Florida. It was

24 developed by the old Bell Atlantic region, and we're not doing

25 business in the Verizon footprint here. I think there were

1   some changes that were agreed to because of the GTE merger and

2   the merger conditions. We would be in favor of the current

3   process that works in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts,

4   New Jersey, and I believe it is very similar to what is in

5   Verizon Florida.

6   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Ms. Lichtenberg, when you say

7   that the Verizon process allows the CLECs to see into the ILEC

8   systems, what do you mean? Does this mean that you actually

9   have IT people who have every detail of the software itself and

10 can help design the software?

11   MS. LICHTENBERG: Yes, that is correct. In Verizon

12 change management is a process that is run by the information

13 technology organization. And so when a Verizon change is

14 suggested, the actual people who write the business rules, do

15 the coding are there. And so rather than -- Verizon is

16 slightly different than BellSouth. They don't outsource their

17 IT. So we find it much more important to have IT people

18 talking to IT people so that they understand fully what the

19 systems are capable of.

20   One of the things that that does is, it allows you to

21 say, here's a release, and we've got this much of it filled up,

22 but we see farther down on your change management list three

23 changes that we could actually drop in because we have a little

24 more room, and we can talk about it and we can do it.

25   One of the other things that the Verizon process

1 allows us to do is to determine as a team -- and we do view it

2 as a team, we talk to the actual IT people all the time -- to

3 determine as a team if, for instance, we want to skip an

4 industry-mandated release. We agreed in Verizon to skip

5 LSOG 3 and move on to LSOG 4, for example, because jointly we

6 decided that would be a better process.

7   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Pate, were you done with the

8 BellSouth panel?

9   MR. PATE: Yes, I was. Thank you.

10   MR. BRADBURY: Madam Chair, may I have a minute or

11 two? There's three points I'd like to talk about. It will

12 help clear up Mr. Pate --

13   CHAIRMAN JABER: Actually, we're going to move on.

14   MR. BRADBURY: Okay.

15   CHAIRMAN JABER: And are we moving on to data

16 integrity/performance measures, Ms. Boone? Is that what you

17 all decided?

18   MS. BOONE: Yes, very briefly.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Who wants to start that?

20   MS. BOONE: AT&T will be kicking off this panel.

21   MR. TIMMONS: Good afternoon. My name is K. C.

22 Timmons. I work as a performance measures manager for AT&T, so

23 what I do on a daily basis is to monitor and analyze the

24 performance data that is reported by BellSouth. In the last

25 two years that I've been doing this, my analysis has uncovered

1 numerous data integrity issues, and, you know, I've witnesses a

2 consistency of instability with the BellSouth performance data.

3 So if I can refer you to the handout very quickly.

The first thing I want to talk about are gaps or

5 insufficiencies in the BellSouth raw data. These gaps prevent

6 the ALECs from being able to verify the accuracy of the

7 performance reports within BellSouth. First -- and I'll run

8 through this briefly. Stop me if you have any questions.

There are some types of customer orders, although

10 present in BellSouth's legacy systems, that they are not

11 providing to the ALECs or to the Commission within their raw

12 data. Some examples of that: Orders classified as projects,

13 confirmations of canceled orders, or also directory of listing

14 orders for some performance measures.

Projects in particular are critical to identify

16 customer experience and to be able to monitor that. What we

17 have with projects, orders with -- if a customer places an

18 order with 15 lines or greater, then BellSouth will classify

19 that as a project. And what happens is, BellSouth, like I

20 said, they have that data within their legacy systems. They do

21 not provide that to the ALECs. So with our bigger customers

22 who have orders of 15 lines or greater, we're not able to

23 monitor that performance at all. So -- and BellSouth will tell

24 you that they provide raw data that allows the ALECs to

25 reproduce their reports in PMAP, but quite frankly, that's not

1   enough, and that's not what the Commission has ordered.

2   The Commission has ordered that BellSouth provide raw

3   data in order for ALECs to be able to validate the performance

4   reports. And with the current state of the raw data and the

5   gaps that are there, we're not able to do that. We cannot

6   validate the performance measures and reproduce some of the raw

7   data that they have and that they're missing.

8   Next, on Page 2 of the handout, I would just like to

9   briefly mention that there are some performance reports. And

10   we're kind of shifting gears here from raw data to the actual

11   performance measures reports that summarize the measures.

12   There are some of those measures that through AT&T analysis and

13   through BellSouth analysis, there are reports that are not

14   giving correct data. Some of these -- data for acknowledgment

15   message timeliness and completeness. What AT&T did here is, we

16   have compared multiple reports that should give comparable

17   data. BellSouth came back and addressed our concerns and said,

18   hey, here's the reasons that these reports should not match.

19   And when we went back and reevaluated the data, we agree that

20   the reports should not necessarily match each other; however,

21   the real data that was there was not reflective of the reasons

22   BellSouth was giving us.

23   Also, jeopardy notice interval is another issue where

24   BellSouth in a January 25th filing in Florida admitted that

25   they are still going through program coding changes for this

1 measure. And lastly, the average completion notice interval

2 report is another example where the performance data by

3 BellSouth is not accurate. There are exclusions to that report

4 that BellSouth has admitted, so of which are completion notices

5 for orders that are completed in a different month from when

6 the notice is sent are being excluded. A big one for AT&T is

7 the stand-alone local number portability numbers. We have

8 thousands of orders in Florida that fall under that category,

9 and BellSouth is currently excluding those orders from this

10 performance measure.

11   And lastly, going back the project issue, the LSRs

12 classified as projects. It's another big -- like I said, our

13 biggest customers. Their completion notices for their orders

14 are not showing up in the data. So essentially, because

15 BellSouth has these admission of reports that are giving

16 incorrect results and also because of the gaps that are in the

17 raw data and the incomplete raw data, the ALECs really have no

18 assurance that the data we're looking at within PMAP is

19 correct. So with that, I'll hand it back over to Covad.

20   CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Boone.

21   MS. BOONE: Network Telephone.

22   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Thank you. With respect to picking

23 up just where AT&T kind of left off -- Ron, if you would.

24 Thank you, Ron. I think Mr. Varner had stated earlier that

25 they were aware of some June, July, and August repost with

1 respect to the flow-through, and I'd just kind of like to draw

2 your attention to the December repost. If you notice the

3 December repost, or the initial December which is the top, our

4 concern was with the TAG column that I've highlighted in

5 purple, if you would.

6   You'll notice that there's no TAG orders for Network

7 Telephone, and what you're seeing there is, the blue for the

8 top and the bottom are all Network Telephone, and then the

9 yellow is Network Telephone's, and then the subsets underneath

10 are BellSouth's. So you'll see the December '01 and then the

11 December repost. So there was actually a December repost. You

12 will see that all of our figures changed, if you look at the

13 first yellow line and the second yellow line; however, none of

14 BellSouth's numbers changed. And I'm not sure -- maybe

15 Mr. Bradbury can help me because I think that he said that, in

16 fact, there was another posting where BellSouth's aggregates

17 did change, but my concern was with the TAG orders.

18   Network Telephone doesn't implement TAG, and on the

19 repost we now have 72 orders -- 73 orders issued in TAG, and

20 it's very confusing. And I guess my point here is that I don't

21 understand how the data can be tracked correctly if this is the

22 situation.

23   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Kopytchak, so your point is

24 where we see a 72, that should be zero?

25   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Yes, ma'am. Seventy-three, actually.

1   On the repost on the bottom, it's actually 73. There was 72

2   for OCN8772 (phonetic), and then one order for 2911, but we

3   don't implement TAG at all.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. And your point is that flaw

5   is indicative of the data not being accurate throughout.

6   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Well, we don't understand why the

7   repost was the way it was, and we don't understand how -- and

8   we've also had some TAG orders in the past as well that we've

9   questioned and not been able to get an answer to.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Mr. Pate or Mr. Varner,

11 actually, anyone, before we leave this point, can you explain

12 that discrepancy?

13   MR. VARNER: No, we can't. We're just seeing this

14 for the first time right now. We can go back and look at it.

15 We've seen these type things happen before. And invariably

16 when we've gone back and looked at it, we've found out that it

17 was legitimate, that orders did, in fact, come in through TAG.

18 One thing that happens --

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: That the order did come in through

20 TAG?

21   MR. VARNER: Yeah.

22   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Kopytchak asserts that they

23 don't even use TAG.

24   MR. VARNER: Like I said, we'll just have to go back

25 and see what happened to it and why this is occurring. We have

1 seen them happen before. We've had folks make those claims and

2 then come back and find out that, yes, in fact, they did come

3 in that way for whatever reason. But just sitting here looking

4 at it, I can't tell you why.

5 The one thing that I can point out, though, is he's

6 talking about a repost. The difference up there, I believe, is

7 preliminary versus final data. There was no reposting of

8 December. We posted preliminary data like we always do, and

9 then we post final data. But I can go back, look at that,

10 include it in the response with all of the other, you know,

11 CLEC-specific things that we'll put in in a week.

12 CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes. Thank you.

13 MR. BRADBURY: Can I ask Mr. Varner to explain then

14 why the numbers filed with the Georgia Commission on

15 January 31st for the CLEC aggregate were different than the

16 numbers on either of these? That's -- if you can find that

17 data --

18 CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Bradbury, are you referring to

19 this chart?

20 MR. BRADBURY: Yes, ma'am.

21 CHAIRMAN JABER: So that we can follow what your

22 question is --

23 MR. BRADBURY: As Mr. Kopytchak said, there are

24 actually -- the CLEC aggregates, if you look at them there, you

25 don't see any change in the data. BellSouth filed this --

1 purportedly this very same data with the Georgia Commission on
2 January the 31st. The CLEC aggregate numbers in that posting
3 were different from this. Specifically, there was a
4 difference -- there was a shift between LENS and TAG that was
5 there.

6   MR. VARNER: That's right. There was no difference
7 in the total; there was a shift between LENS and TAG between --
8   MR. BRADBURY: That's correct. Apparently across a
9 number of CLECs.
10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Mr. Varner has indicated that
11 he'll respond to your questions and ours in next week's filing.
12   MR. BRADBURY: Thank you.
13   MS. BOONE: Covad just has a few brief comments. On
14 Page 14 of our filing, you will see -- the first thing we
15 highlighted is that KPMG has about 10 exceptions open on data
16 and metrics. And as KPMG has been struggling with trying to
17 reconnect the metrics so has Covad and other CLECs. And one of
18 the biggest differences we found between the BellSouth data and
19 the Covad data was the affected volume, and the reason for that
20 on a lot of these metrics is because of these exclusions. And
21 what an exclusion does is it kicks an order out of the average.
22 And where that can come into play, for example, is on the order
23 completion interval. How long on average did it take BellSouth
24 to get the ADSL loops out to Covad? And what we noticed was a
25 high volume of L coded orders.

1   Now, according to the business rules, an L coded

2 order is an order in which you've asked for either longer or

3 shorter than the standard interval. Now, as a policy matter,

4 we don't do that, but sometimes later in the process if our

5 customer needs to change the day, we will change. So some of

6 them are going to be validly coded L. But we looked in July

7 and they're about 23 percent of our orders.

8   And so we actually conducted a manual review, and we

9 filed it here in the third-party test docket and also with the

10 FCC. And basically what we concluded was that we pulled the

11 original LSR and we pulled the Covad work logs that showed when

12 we got back the FOC, how long we had actually asked for, the

13 LSR, you know, has the desired due date on it, so you can

14 literally get out a calendar and count 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to make

15 sure that we asked for the standard interval. And we found of

16 a small sample that we did -- I can't remember how many it

17 was -- it was like 15 in which BellSouth had erroneously

18 excluded, and the result of this was a downward bias on the

19 interval. And we are currently conducting that same analysis

20 on November data. We have not completed it yet. But

21 33 percent of our orders were excluded out of the order

22 completion interval in November.

23   We've recently raised this with KPMG and asked them

24 if they had encountered any L coded orders, and the response

25 back was that it was not part of the scope of the test because

1 they're not actually looking at their own orders and how

2 they're coded. That's not part of the metrics test, but it is

3 something that we think is of concern. And I think as long as

4 this Commission is going to be, you know, relying on

5 maintenance of service based on what's reported, we need to

6 have accuracy and understanding around what is being reported

7 here. Thank you. I think that's it.

8   Mary, sorry.

9   MS. CONQUEST: I think I'm last this time. Briefly

10 speaking, we again believe the data is flawed. There's missing

11 data. We brought that before two other commissions. We found

12 trouble tickets in our systems that were not reflected in the

13 TAFI system and the raw data that BellSouth had. They have not

14 disputed that.

15   We currently are working spreadsheets. We are

16 attempting to resolve this together as a team, and I will say

17 that that part is working well with us. We have spreadsheets

18 and we're working through the flow-through analysis at this

19 time. We have a number of orders that currently do not appear

20 to be part of the raw data that BellSouth provides. And so

21 we're attempting to get an understanding of why it has been

22 impossible over these months for us to reconcile our data and

23 working toward a common goal of accomplishing that. But at

24 this point in time, it is our opinion that the data is

25 inaccurate.

1   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you, Ms. Conquest.

2   BellSouth panel.

3   MR. VARNER: All right. How would you like for me to

4 proceed through this? It's after 5:00. I can --

5   CHAIRMAN JABER: Quickly.

6   MR. VARNER: -- do this in five minutes or five

7 hours, so you tell me how far you want to go with it.

8   MS. BOONE: Five minutes. I vote for five minutes.

9   MR. VARNER: I'm sure you would, but I was talking to

10 them.

11   CHAIRMAN JABER: The five hours would not acceptable,

12 but something sufficient would be --

13   MR. VARNER: What I could do is just respond

14 specifically to these. We've got responses to much of this in

15 a handout that's being made right now. So what I think I will

16 do is sort of go at a general level. There's some -- a couple

17 of specific things that I wanted to point to in there and maybe

18 do it that way, which will probably get us through it fairly

19 quickly.

20   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay.

21   MR. VARNER: Okay.

22   CHAIRMAN JABER: Now, what have the parties decided

23 on maintenance and repair and billing? Update us on that. Do

24 we have a billing panel? I thought that during the break you

25 all were trying to work some issues out such that we didn't

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 need a billing panel.

2   MS. BOONE: I think we need a maintenance and repair.

3   MS. FOSHEE: Madam Chair, from BellSouth's

4 perspective, we have slides prepared on the billing, and we'd

5 be happy just -- I think they have been handed out. We'd be

6 happy just to file those as our response to comments that have

7 been filed in the record by the ALECs. But we can -- it's at

8 your pleasure whether we actually have Mr. Scollard present

9 those.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. ALECs, I'm trying to

11 determine how much longer we need to go. So tell me, do we

12 need a billing panel, and do we need a maintenance and repair

13 panel?

14   MR. KLEIN: Madam Chair, from KMC Telecom's

15 perspective, we did speak to BellSouth off the record before

16 and just have a brief statement we do need to put on the record

17 with regard to billing. Aside from that, we don't feel there's

18 a need for a panel.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Great.

20   MR. KLEIN: I don't know. There were two other ALECs

21 listed on the agenda as having billing issues, though.

22   MS. LICHTENBERG: MCI WorldCom has noted its billing

23 issues in our filing. We are still having them, and we are

24 trying to work through them, but I don't think we need to take

25 the time of this Commission at this moment. We'd like to

1 reserve the ability to make statements later.

2 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Then after Mr. Varner, we'll

3 go to maintenance and repair.

4 MR. VARNER: All right. First, I just wanted to

5 go -- I think I'll just work my way through here and tell you

6 what's in here, and there are a few points that I wanted to

7 stop on. First, the first few pages, Pages 2 through

8 7 identify several of the key metrics and talk about what our

9 performance has been on those. And what you can see in going

10 through it, that we're performing very well on them. The

11 preordering are on Page 2, ordering is on Page 3, and the

12 numbers there indicate the number of months that we met either

13 the benchmark or retail analog that was applicable to that

14 particular measurement. Page 4 are some ordering measurements.

15 You see some wherein there were zeros, but if you look over on

16 the left side, you'll see what the actual performance was. The

17 benchmark here is 97 percent in one hour. We hit 94.7, 94.5,

18 94.5.

19 Next would be some more -- some provisioning

20 measurements, installation, PT-30, and then some maintenance

21 measurements and some billing measurements, which brings me up

22 to sort of the place where I kind of wanted to go through them

23 in a little bit more detail. We have a set of comprehensive

24 metrics to evaluate BellSouth's performance. I don't think

25 anybody disputes that. The Commission has an extensive set of

1   measurements that they instructed KPMG to use. It consists of

2   some 75 measures, 2,300 submetrics. That's what they're

3   evaluating in the third-party test. So I think the size and

4   the scope of the measurements is pretty impressive. They were

5   developed through a collaboration with ALECs, and we've had

6   guidelines of several commissions to deal with those.

7   Now, the earlier slides on selected key measurements

8   for ordering, provisioning, and maintenance illustrate that

9   we're providing high quality service. And I should point out

10   that on the data integrity issue, that you've heard several, I

11   guess, references to the level of performance that BellSouth

12   has been having and the data that's being used to support the

13   view that we're not giving them good performance. That data is

14   coming from this system. It is the same data that they're

15   saying is flawed is the data that's being used to indicate that

16   we're not doing well. So I believe that there is a greater

17   degree of reliance and a greater degree of accuracy on this

18   data, and I'll just submit that for your consideration as you

19   work your way through it. And I can go through here, and as we

20   go through it, I think you'll be able to see in a little more

21   detail why I say that.

22   The next one is Slide 10 which is really the penalty

23   plan. The Florida Commission has ordered a penalty plan to go

24   in place, and it will begin with May data implemented in June,

25   if I remember correctly.

1   Next one is a few points on why we believe the data

2 is reliable and accessible. We provide monthly results to the

3 Commission. We provide the results available to the Commission

4 and ALECs at the secured Internet sites. This allows the ALECs

5 to go through and analyze this. As you heard Mr. Timmons say,

6 that's his job to go through and analyze this data. AT&T and

7 others have been doing this for at least two years, going

8 through and analyzing this data and letting us know. That way

9 you're assured that any issues that arise with this data, quite

10 frankly, we get told about them. What we found out, though,

11 quite frankly, is that in most cases what we're told are not

12 really issues with the data but misunderstandings about it, and

13 I'll get to some of those in a few minutes. We have the data

14 verified through internal quality controls and also, of course,

15 you know the KPMG test is working on this.

16   The next one, KPMG is auditing every measure. You

17 talked about the 10 exceptions. KPMG is auditing each of these

18 2,300 submetrics. When they open exceptions, it can be for one

19 or multiple submetrics. We have provisions for recurring

20 annual audits. The data is stable and reliable. We haven't

21 had to repost anything in four months. In 2001 our initial

22 postings were 98 percent accurate for the data.

23   And with regard to the written comments, AT&T was the

24 only ALEC to raise any data integrity issues. That's why when

25 I went through to identify what to respond to I was only

1   prepared to respond to theirs because they were the only ones

2   that raised them. And none of the issues that they raised have

3   a significant impact on the performance results. The issues

4   that they raised, which are all of the ones that was on the

5   handout that Mr. Timmons gave you, fall into these following

6   categories. Either AT&T was incorrect; they were old problems;

7   some of them fixed as early as July of last year; issues that

8   were limited to a single month. We had something that happened

9   in one month; it got fixed in the same month and recurred.

10   There were issues with raw data. There are issues wherein

11   there is something in raw data or not in raw data. It doesn't

12   have any impact on the resulting reporting. And there are some

13   wherein, yes, there are some problems in some of the data, but

14   all of the impacts are less than one-half of 1 percent in terms

15   of what it does to the accuracy of the performance that's

16   reported.

17   The remaining charts after this actually go to each

18   of the issues that Mr. Timmons brought up on the handout that

19   he gave and give us -- and sort of tell you what it is that

20   results from our analysis of those. Let's see. Oh, for

21   example, the first one talks about projects. Projects are

22   properly excluded. They're not used in some of the

23   measurements. The commissions recognize that, and they've made

24   those exclusions even as recently as the order that they just

25   issued. But AT&T's concern is that, well, I don't see an order

1 that's not used to calculate the measurement in the raw data

2 for that measurement. Well, it doesn't help you to see that.

3 It's not used in the calculation. The Commission has said it

4 shouldn't be used in the calculation, so there's no need for it

5 to be in the raw data. If you're concerned about whether or

6 not that -- you know, an order that you sent in as a project

7 has been captured or not or in the raw -- is in -- the

8 measurement result is very simple. The only orders -- if

9 orders are not in raw data, they are not used to calculate the

10 measurement. So if you go in, you look in raw data, that order

11 is not in the raw data, it wasn't used to calculate the

12 measurement. It's very simple.

13   I'm going to skip several of these and go to one I

14 think -- Number 19 is where I want to go to because it requires

15 a little more explanation. The rest are pretty self-evident.

16 You can just read through them and see what they say. This one

17 is a little more complicated. And this was an issue wherein

18 AT&T said they could not replicate FOC and reject intervals for

19 PMAP data for LSRs that are submitted in one month but FOC'd or

20 rejected in a different month. It comes in towards the end of

21 the month and the FOC or the reject doesn't get returned until

22 the next month.

23   In fact, AT&T does have the data to enable them do

24 this. What they say is that, well, if it comes in and is

25 responded to in the same month, they get two lines of data and

1 raw data. That's right. Those are the two lines that I've

2 shown. One says received; one says FOC. The first column is

3 for LSRs that are received either fully mech or partial mech,

4 and it tells you when the LSR came in. The second column is

5 for LSRs that are sent in nonmechanized. It tells you when

6 they came in. The important point is that for those two

7 columns, both lines are the same. It's the same dates, the

8 same time on both lines.

9 The next column tells you on the top line it's going

10 to be either the same as the first or second column, depending

11 on whether we got the orders as a fully mech or as a

12 nonmechanized order. The second line of that third column is

13 when the FOC was sent back out or reject as the case may be.

14 If you go down to the next sort of group, you will see where

15 AT&T was having a problem. If they looked at it, if the LSR

16 came in in October and the FOC went out in November, in October

17 they saw one line, that first line. But that one line told

18 them when the LSR came in, and that's all there was because it

19 wasn't responded to in October, it was responded to in

20 November.

21 The next -- when they looked at the raw data for

22 November, they saw one line. It showed them in the

23 first column or the second column, depending on whether they're

24 a fully mech or a nonmech, when the LSR came in, and it showed

25 them in a third column when the FOC went out. That's the

1 information you need to calculate the interval. It's there.

2 It's just that when it splits the month like that, you don't

3 get both records in the same month, but you can calculate the

4 interval based on the information that you have. So the reason

5 I wanted to go through that one is it was a little bit more

6 complicated.

7 ACNI, or average completion notice interval, is one

8 that gets a lot of attention. One of the things there is that

9 on Chart 20 it says, completion notices for orders completed in

10 one month, but the notice provided in a different month are

11 excluded. There was a difference in interpretation of what the

12 SQM required. We agreed to do what AT&T says. The SQM has

13 always said it's never been clear about what you do about

14 things that straddle a month whether they're in or out of the

15 measurements. It always says that you're reporting data for

16 that month. We've interpreted that means that both ends of the

17 activity had to occur in a month. If it's an FOC, you had to

18 get it in a month and FOC it in a month; reject the same thing;

19 completion same thing. One interpretation is as valid as

20 another. If AT&T prefers this one, we'll use this one, and

21 we're going to go ahead and implement it.

22 This issue on the next one about orders submitted

23 directly in the SOCs not receiving completion notices, that's

24 really not correct. These are administrative orders. We use

25 this terminology in a response back to AT&T. What -- these are

1 administrative orders that are issued by BellSouth usually as a

2 correction to an order that's already been completed, and

3 they're properly excluded from the data for the SQM. The SQM

4 says, you exclude these administrative orders, and that's what

5 we did.

6   On the next one, it talks about the null intervals.

7 This is one that we raised back, I think, as early as June. It

8 has a minor impact on the data. It affects less than one --

9 well, it's like one hundredth of 1 percent of the records are

10 affected by this.

11   Completion notices for stand-alone LNP orders are

12 excluded. You just look at the MSS, there's volume there. I

13 don't know what the concern is, that there's specific orders we

14 can go and look at whether they should be in -- oh, there were

15 some that AT&T sent us that were trigger orders. And trigger

16 orders do not carry an OCN. Without an OCN there is no way to

17 classify them as an AT&T order. A trigger order is something

18 on LNP that you put on that let's the LNP operate

19 automatically. If there's no OCN on it, there's no way to

20 identify it as an AT&T order. It's not that it's excluded,

21 it's just that you can't identify it appropriately for the

22 carrier.

23   The average jeopardy notice interval, Number 26, that

24 is a measurement that we acknowledge is incorrect. It's been

25 incorrect since about June. We are working to fix it, so

1   there's really nothing new there. We ask people not to rely on

2   it because we know it's incorrect.

3   We don't exclude directory listing orders except

4   where, in fact, the SQM does not have a place to put them. We

5   have gone back in I think starting in November and started

6   utilizing the other nondesigned category as a placeholder, but

7   when you don't have a disaggregation to put them, we've got no

8   place to put them.

9   The last slide is, I guess, sort of like the

10 first group which deals with change management measures, and it

11 gives you the results. The last couple I wanted to address is

12 one that Ms. Boone raised concerning an issue regarding the

13 timeliness on some of those orders. I remember that issue.

14 What we went back and ultimately found out was that there was a

15 misunderstanding about how to calculate the appropriate

16 intervals on those. We went back and we updated the

17 information on the Web site. That's the ordering guide, if I

18 remember correctly, that said how to do that to resolve that

19 particular problem.

20   And then on the one about the trouble tickets, I also

21 recall that one. What we found out is that when they sent us

22 those supposed trouble tickets, they were never able to

23 identify for us the telephone numbers associated with them so

24 we could research the issue, and that's where that issue ended

25 up.

1   MS. CONQUEST: I have those here if you'd like to

2   have them.

3   MR. VARNER: Yes. We've asked for them before.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Conquest, why don't you make

5   sure Mr. Varner has those after the workshop?

6   Mr. Varner.

7   MR. VARNER: Okay. I think that's it.

8   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Any other comments from

9   BellSouth on data integrity before we move on?

10   Okay. That brings us to maintenance and repair.

11   ALEC panel.

12   MS. NORRIS: Madam Chair, you're going to discuss at

13   the end the opportunity to file written comments; is that true?

14   CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes.

15   MS. NORRIS: Thank you.

16   CHAIRMAN JABER: Who wants to start the ALEC panel?

17   KMC.

18   MR. MURDOCH: Okay. Thank you. Brian Murdoch with

19   KMC Telecom kicking off the maintenance and repair agenda panel

20   here. KMC experiences in the field a number of service

21   delivery and maintenance issues that are reported back through

22   our operations headquarters in Atlanta. And just to rebut, I

23   guess, I mention of the fact that KMC or all of the other CLECs

24   rely on the BellSouth self-reported data in one instance and,

25   however, reflect some concerns over the integrity of the data

1 in other cases.

2 KMC feels that the reports from our field with

3 regards to service outages reflect the need for KMC and

4 BellSouth to work or to partner more together, and the actual

5 maintenance data itself reflects the ongoing challenges and

6 opportunities therein.

7 The circuit failure on DS-1s in the KMC territory,

8 number of -- one out of every four circuits that are installed

9 on average for a month fail. And when you look at the

10 BellSouth retail offering on the same service type, it's

11 basically less than 1 percent. And that kind of disparity

12 obviously creates a negative impression on the consumer that

13 you've just won with your promises of increased customer

14 service and lower prices, not that there's that much margin.

15 But the new circuit failure rate for DS-1 circuits

16 for KMC also are out of parity with regards to the BellSouth

17 retail offering, and the similar scenario we experience -- more

18 than 8 percent of our DS-1s fail within the first 30 days after

19 they're installed. So we feel that they've been installed

20 incorrectly. And then on the back end, when BellSouth comes

21 out to repair the circuit, they're repairing it incorrectly.

22 So we cannot get a quality product from the incumbent in most

23 instances, and our resolution is to change our business plan

24 and to order up DS-0 level circuits as backup, because our

25 customers demand that they have a facility in place that is

1 reliable. And from the performance measurements themselves,

2 you can see that DS-0 level services are the best of the worst,

3 I guess, with regards to maintenance performance measurements.

4 The poor quality installation and the poor quality

5 repair basically amounts to a point where Florida, it looks

6 like, will be issuing remedy payments or remedy credits to

7 CLECs operating in the State. I would advise that the payments

8 themselves are merely a cost of doing business for the

9 incumbent as we've seen in Georgia and Louisiana and in other

10 ILEC territories actually as well. It doesn't seem to effect

11 change, if you will, as we've been feeling the effects of

12 BellSouth's inability to provide a quality product for four,

13 five years now.

14 CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you, Mr. Murdoch.

15 Mr. Monroe.

16 MR. MONROE: Thank you, Madam Chairperson. No dial

17 tone situations are by far the biggest maintenance and repair

18 issue that we as a Florida CLEC experience. The majority of

19 those no dial tone situations, we actually have the ability to

20 go in through our legacy systems that we have and do a

21 preliminary testing to determine whether or not the actual

22 issue was on our side of the fence, so to speak, or whether

23 it's on the Bell side of the fence where the actual repair

24 issue lies.

25 In doing that testing, for the majority of the no

1 dial tone situations that we come across, we identify that it

2 is a Bell repair issue. Then what happens, we typically will

3 open the ticket with Bell. At that time what happens, Bell

4 will actually do their research and close the ticket out to no

5 trouble found in the majority of these that we actually send

6 over to them. In addition to that, closing a ticket out to no

7 trouble found, it actually brings that circuit back up.

8   Now, back on the 25th of January at the OSS meeting

9 that we had with BellSouth up in Atlanta, that was one of the

10 issues that we brought to the table and asked, is it just ALECs

11 or CLECs that are experiencing this type of issue, or does this

12 type of thing happen to BellSouth customers as well? One of

13 the responses that was given to us is, yes, it does happen to

14 BellSouth customers as well. And what we're actually speaking

15 of is jumpers being pulled in the field for specific customers

16 which causes the customer to go down. The technician will go

17 back out there and realize that they have actually pulled the

18 customer down once the ticket has been opened up, and then

19 they'll go ahead and put those jumpers back in place so that

20 the customer comes back up. But then again, they're being

21 closed out to no trouble found.

22   We asked why that continues to happen, and not just,

23 again, not just CLEC customers, but again BellSouth says it

24 happens with their customers as well. A response in asking why

25 that tends to happen, BellSouth stated that it was basically

1 due to records in the field, and looking at some of the central

2 offices, it is very difficult to determine which jumpers belong

3 to which customer.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you, Mr. Monroe.

5   Mr. Kopytchak.

6   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Thank you. I'm going to try to put

7 some more data up on your screen for you. We're having some of

8 the same problems as Florida Digital Network with respect to

9 what we believe is BellSouth closing out some tickets. This is

10 our December data that Network Telephone's operations reports.

11 And one of the vital areas you can see here is that out of the

12 total outages of 245, 141 of them were BellSouth resolutions;

13 28 of them were Network Telephone. But the average trouble

14 response time is where the area gets critical. BellSouth, I

15 believe, for their DS-0s are reporting about six-hour

16 resolution times, and we're having trouble replicating that

17 data for two reasons and I think both of them combined.

18   One of them is, is that BellSouth will close out the

19 trouble ticket and force us to reopen the trouble ticket, and

20 we believe that they're doing that within their six-hour

21 window, but there's no resolution, and we're having to reopen

22 it. And then another reason, which is one of the reasons it is

23 bringing this -- our data collection average up, is that we're

24 not receiving closeout calls from CWINS, and apparently we're

25 supposed to receive that on every ticket. So we don't

1   necessarily know when the resolution has been corrected. And

2   if I could switch to one more screen here.

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: You said you're not receiving

4   closeout calls from --

5   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Calls, yes, ma'am.

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: -- CLECs?

7   MR. KOPYTCHAK: From CWINS, from the CWINS center.

8   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you.

9   MR. KOPYTCHAK: And then on the last screen here,

10 just to kind of point out, these are the hours that we're

11 keeping and the resolution tickets on the very bottom

12 maintaining about 11 hours for Network Telephone and 31 hours

13 for BellSouth. And again, I think that's a combination of both

14 areas, but that's not what BellSouth is reporting within their

15 measurement systems of six-hour resolution times.

16   And that's all we have, and we'll turn it over to

17 AT&T. Thank you.

18   MS. BERGER: Thank you. AT&T experiences the same

19 thing that has been outlined by my three colleagues, so the

20 last issue that I would focus on deals with UNE-P maintenance

21 issues. One thing that we're finding is that BellSouth's

22 maintenance technicians are closing out repair tickets without

23 calling AT&T and establishing that connection to ensure that

24 the customer truly is back in service, and then what this

25 causes is a delay in getting those problems resolved.

1   Secondly, although on our maintenance repair report

2 we specify a customer's business hours and that there is -- you

3 know, whether the demarcation point is inside the customer's

4 premise, BellSouth technicians try to go to the customer's

5 premise outside of business hours to clear that maintenance

6 ticket and without making any arrangements to have access to

7 the appropriate equipment, so then they'll close out the

8 trouble ticket saying that there was no access provided. So

9 those are two additional issues that AT&T is experiencing in

10 addition to the things that my colleagues have outlined.

11   CHAIRMAN JABER: Any other comments from the ALEC

12 panel?

13   Okay. BellSouth panel.

14   MR. AINSWORTH: This is the last one?

15   CHAIRMAN JABER: I think so.

16   MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. I'm going to first go through

17 this, and then I'll talk about the slide presentation if you'd

18 like. First of all, KMC's comments on the trouble report rates

19 and failures. Let me just clarify because we have had some

20 discussions around this area. Particularly, they were talking

21 in the DS-1 arena, and I want to try to identify for you CWINS.

22 The CWINS center actually takes the trouble reports for all UNE

23 maintenance and for resale. CWINS, however, is not the contact

24 bureau that calls back the CLEC on every trouble ticket.

25   If you can envision with me for just a second, you

1 have design services which are special service like that have

2 engineering, and those have a MCO, maintenance control office,

3 and that, in effect, is CWINS. And for those troubles, they

4 are making the contact back to the CLEC to close out those

5 tickets. As a matter of fact, that's part of their process.

6 They document that. They get the name in the log of that

7 contact.

8   For the nondesigned services -- and nondesigned would

9 be like POTS type services, UNE-P type services, those are

10 closed out by the network field technicians or the network

11 technicians that receive that trouble report. They actually

12 are received by the CWINS as a maintenance issues, but the

13 closeout and the final status of that is in the network

14 organization, the same as it is in retail today. So I just

15 wanted to try to clarify that up front.

16   CHAIRMAN JABER: What does that mean? For the

17 nondesigned services, those are closed out by the field

18 technicians, does that mean that no one calls the CLECs --

19   MR. AINSWORTH: No. They should get a call, yes, but

20 it's not the CWINS that would be making that closeout on those

21 particular issues. And I guess my point there is, if that is

22 an issue, I feel very confident that CWINS, because we have

23 that documentation in the log to back that up, is making those

24 contacts. If it's designed services, we certainly want to know

25 that. From a network perspective, we want to know that also.

1 We'll take that to the areas where if that's a problem, we can

2 get that addressed and certainly have that validated.

3 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. So as it relates to Network

4 Telephone, would they be receiving designed services?

5 MR. AINSWORTH: I believe -- Kyle can probably

6 answer. They have both, I believe, Kyle? I believe they have

7 both designed and nondesigned.

8 MR. KOPYTCHAK: Yes, Madam Chairman, we have both

9 designed and nondesigned.

10 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. So you receive some calls

11 from CWINS. And as it relates to the nondesigned services, who

12 would be making that call?

13 MR. AINSWORTH: Whoever the technician that was

14 dispatched or referred that trouble condition to resolve it and

15 had the final closeout status for that would be making that

16 closeout. If it were a dispatch, it would be the I&M

17 technician that actually was dispatched.

18 With that, I'll go back to the T-1 issue, and I'll

19 address the repeat type scenarios. We had some conversations

20 with this before. What I'm mainly interested in and what we

21 have been trying to really get at is, one, when you provision

22 T-1s, you go through a turnup process, and that process also

23 allows the CLEC to have the ability to do joint testing with

24 you. And from that process, we feel like that that really

25 solidifies an end-to-end process. So if the CLEC validates

1 that, that should give some assurance not only on the BellSouth

2 end but also on the CLEC end that that circuit is up and

3 working properly. So that's handled on the turnup process. We

4 should give them an opportunity to make those tests with us to

5 certify that circuit. I mention that because when they're

6 talking about failures after install, they being part of that

7 process have that opportunity to look at that and validate it.

8 It validates really their part of the network and the BellSouth

9 part of the network. It's a very good process.

10   The second thing is, in looking at situations where

11 you get into repeat type situations, you will see on the slide

12 in just a moment that we've opened up in -- the CWINS center

13 has always had what we call a chronic group. We have enhanced

14 that chronic group. As a matter of fact, we've invited several

15 CLECs, including KMC, to visit that center and discuss the

16 technical aspects of chronic. And one of the important

17 situations there is that is an opportunity for these type

18 scenarios to be addressed. They go into more extensive detail

19 testing. They have some very strict processes in there to go

20 through looking for arbitrary type situations or situations

21 that fall in the no trouble found category. So there is a

22 vehicle there, and we are -- have attempted to bring that to

23 the CLECs to have them the opportunity to work with us and for

24 us to work with them to resolve those kind of issues and

25 hopefully reduce any kind of issues we're running into where we

1 get into repeat type troubles or troubles after 30 days. So I

2 think we've got things in place that should address that if

3 they're utilized.

4   The second point, Florida Digital mentioned no dial

5 tones where they're closed to no trouble found. That's really

6 kind of tough to answer here. I guess the situation that I did

7 notice in what they had filed where they had given some of that

8 information to the CWINS center -- and they've been trying to

9 address some of those issues or looking at some of those

10 issues. But I'm very interested in that from the standpoint

11 that if they are actually testing that trouble, and that's what

12 we're having dialogue now with CWINS on the opportunities that

13 they've given them, they actually test a trouble.

14   When it comes across and we actually enter the

15 dispatch and go out to test that trouble, if there's not a

16 trouble condition there to resolve, then the situation would be

17 that you would have a no trouble found condition. If there is

18 a trouble condition there to resolve, then we certainly would

19 resolve that. So there are situations when that could occur.

20 That's no different than what happens in the retail world

21 today.

22   And again, if we run into those kind of situations

23 where it's becoming a repetitive situation or a repetitive type

24 situation for a customer out there, I again emphasize the fact

25 that we need to get that to chronic and have that looked at so

1 that we can eliminate any additional reports coming in, and we

2 can do the analysis on that.

3   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. FDN has represented that it

4 is a continuing problem.

5   MR. AINSWORTH: Pardon?

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: FDN has represented that it's a

7 continuing problem, so you'll have a team of people look at

8 that expeditiously?

9   MR. AINSWORTH: Yes, we will.

10   CHAIRMAN JABER: And be able to report back to us

11 your findings within the time frame that I'm going to establish

12 for post-workshop comments?

13   MR. AINSWORTH: Depending on that time frame, yes, we

14 will.

15   CHAIRMAN JABER: It will be a reasonable time frame.

16   MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. Network Telephone addressed

17 premature closures, and again, as I have indicated, if these

18 are design loops, I can't even envision that that would be an

19 issue, and I would certainly like to see those type situations

20 in the design world because we can go back and track that down

21 to the technician that made that closure. In the network

22 entity where they're closing out these trouble tickets --

23 again, I think I addressed that earlier -- we need to know

24 where that's happening so we can address that in whatever area

25 it's happening. And I will say in the nondesign world, one

1 attempt is made to make that customer contact call. If they

2 don't reach that customer, they will close that trouble report.

3 That's consistent with retail, and that is the process in the

4 design world. So in the MCO special service world, you have a

5 little bit different situation from an MCO standpoint as you do

6 in the nondesign world, but that is consistent, but we still

7 need that information.

8   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: You said if one effort is

9 made, if it's a busy signal, that's the end of it then.

10   MR. AINSWORTH: Normally in the I&M world for

11 nondesign, they will make that attempt, and then they will

12 close the ticket. And normally that ticket will feed back that

13 information -- that closed information if it's in the

14 nondesigned world through the TAFI system. If they're using

15 TAFI, they will get that closeout information, and they'll have

16 that.

17   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Is there any way in the

18 nondesign world that the message could be sent other than

19 through a regular phone call such as an e-mail or something

20 that would be there even if there's not someone answering the

21 phone in the office or if the signals are busy, something

22 that -- it sounds to me as if the CLECs are telling us that

23 this can really cause some major problems if they don't get

24 these calls when these tickets are closed out.

25   MR. AINSWORTH: Yes, that's true. And there's two

1 opportunities out there. As far as e-mail, no, that's not a

2 capability they have, but you have TAFI sitting out there

3 that's available to CLECs today. And a lot of the CLECs here

4 today use TAFI. They will get those closures back through

5 TAFI. You have other CLECs here today that have an electronic

6 gateway, ECTA process, that they get electronic notification

7 through. So if the CLEC chooses to utilize those avenues, then

8 they will get those notifications electronically.

9   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you.

10   MR. AINSWORTH: Looking at AT&T, again, I think I

11 have addressed the premature closeouts and after-hours business

12 contacts. If they're so noted, that should be represented also

13 before that contact is made. If those hours are put in on

14 there, we should be applying the business hours to those

15 contacts and to those dispatches. And if anything is going to

16 occur after that, we should be notifying those CLECs that

17 that's going to take place to be able to gain access to that

18 end user, whether it be a business or a residential customer.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: When you close out tickets, whether

20 it be that the field technician calls or the CWINS program

21 makes the call, do you document the method of contact and

22 whether there was a busy signal or a no answer?

23   MR. AINSWORTH: Well, let me talk about the design

24 first. In the design, we won't close it until we make a

25 contact, so that's the maintenance control office for the

1 design type services. So we have to make that contact to

2 close, or we have to have a vehicle to leave a message, a

3 proper message based on that CLEC to notify them if that

4 trouble is being closed. In the nondesign world, they will put

5 information in on that ticket in their system to document what

6 transpired on that closeout, yes.

7 　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Kopytchak, have you been keeping

8 track or documenting the instances where you believe there's

9 been premature closure of the tickets?

10 　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: Ma'am, I would have to go back to

11 operations and go into maintenance and repair and request more

12 information. I don't have that with me right now.

13 　　　　CHAIRMAN JABER: Just -- it seems to me that if you

14 do or if it's information that's easy to compile, you may want

15 to share that with BellSouth.

16 　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: Yes, ma'am.

17 　　　　COMMISSIONER PALECKI: And, Mr. Kopytchak, if you

18 have a proposed solution, I think you've heard what

19 Mr. Ainsworth has said, if you have any sort of proposal, we

20 would like to hear that in your response that you'll be filing.

21 　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: Okay.

22 　　　　COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Because this does not seem

23 like it should be that difficult to solve this problem.

24 　　　　MR. KOPYTCHAK: Our operations has reported to me

25 that they're calls from CWINS about 25 percent of the time.

1 That's all I can tell you right now.

2   MR. AINSWORTH: And again, I'll be glad to see that.

3 Like I said, on the design services, not a problem. We can

4 pull that and give the contact to who it was closed to. So

5 I'll be glad to work with Kyle on that.

6   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Is there any kind of follow up

7 or quality control that BellSouth could do behind your service

8 people -- and I'm talking nondesign -- to bring home to them

9 the importance of making these contacts? And, you know,

10 sometimes for quality control, it means that you have to come

11 down on your employees out in the field. I mean, could you

12 make this a priority?

13   MR. AINSWORTH: I can address it from a CWINS

14 process. I can tell you that, yes, we have quality controls

15 in. I can tell you that we evaluate those maintenance tickets

16 in every aspect or in every fashion, and we do feed that back,

17 and we do take action where that's required. I don't do the

18 analysis on the network I&M technicians. They do have

19 processes in place, but I don't personally have control of that

20 particularly function.

21   I'll move on to the -- I think I've covered the

22 first two bullet items there. I'll talk about loop testing

23 requirement 73-600. This is a document that in some of the

24 feedback that we've got to the Commission about testing and

25 about whether or not a circuit would meet the parameters in the

1   CLECs' minds, and I just wanted to point out that that is our

2   document. For every service that we provide, there are

3   requirements out there that we maintain for that service, and

4   those are our test guidelines and that's provided and the CLEC

5   has that available to them. And that's requirements we meet

6   when we go out to do the testing, whether it be turn up for

7   provisioning testing or also for maintenance testing to assure

8   that these services meet the requirements that's laid out for

9   that particular product.

10   Provisioning orders, I commented on that earlier

11   today, and I'll just make another comment on that. We enhanced

12   the CWINS operation to really eliminate confusion. And we took

13   ownership of the situation where if the CLEC encountered what

14   they consider an outage based on the fact their service order

15   activity in effect, they can call the CWINS center, and the

16   CWINS center will interface with the LCSC to work that process.

17   And that is something we have enhanced in CWINS, and we have

18   initiated to assist the CLECs if any issues like that arise.

19   That seems to be a good process. It eliminates a lot of times

20   the CLECs having to deal with the retail operations, or in the

21   event they have a lack of success in that process, to contact

22   CWINS to give them a control point that will manage that for

23   them. That really concludes everything I have on maintenance.

24   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay, Mr. Ainsworth. Any other

25   commenters from the BellSouth panel?

1   MR. VARNER: Just a couple. One is that on the

2 specific data issues, we'll just include that in the filing, if

3 that's fine with the Commission.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: (Nodding head affirmatively.)

5   MR. VARNER: Another is, there was a chart that

6 Network Telephone used, we'll need a copy of it, and I'm going

7 to need them to decipher it for me, talking about maintenance

8 average duration, I believe. I didn't understand it, and if

9 we're going to know what it means, I'm going to have to get a

10 copy of it and get them to explain it to me. Likewise, a copy

11 of the flow-through chart. None of these were in the filing,

12 so if we're going to deal with them, we've got to have a copy

13 of them to deal with. You may just address that.

14   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Kopytchak, why don't you just

15 provide copies of those two charts?

16   Were there more than two, Mr. Varner?

17   MR. VARNER: I think there were only two, the

18 flow-through one and the one on maintenance average duration.

19   CHAIRMAN JABER: Are they included --

20   MS. FOSHEE: Yes, ma'am. While Mr. Varner was up

21 here talking, I got a copy --

22   MR. VARNER: Oh, okay.

23   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. But Mr. Varner --

24   MR. VARNER: So we're all right.

25   CHAIRMAN JABER: -- if you need an explanation of

1 those charts, I would leave it up to the two of you to just sit

2 down and talk about it.

3 MR. VARNER: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Kopytchak, please make yourself

5 available to walk Mr. Varner through the charts and make sure

6 he understands the data that you've put in and where the chart

7 came from the source.

8 MR. KOPYTCHAK: More than happy to.

9 MR. VARNER: That's it.

10 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Is there a billing panel or

11 isn't there?

12 All right. Staff, I've sort of left you out of this

13 entire process, so if you have questions, this would be a good

14 time. And then I'm going to switch to the Commissioners here.

15 MS. KEATING: I don't think we have any questions

16 this evening, Madam Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Commissioners, if you have

18 any questions before we start talking about the post-workshop

19 comments.

20 Okay. What I thought we would do, Commissioners, is

21 explore the idea of allowing all of the parties to comment in,

22 let's say, four weeks' time, in a month's time, on the

23 questions that the Commissioners have asked, the questions that

24 were raised by all the parties. And I would encourage us to go

25 through our notes and sort of give some direction to the

1 parties on what we thought would be easy in terms of finding a

2 solution.

3 Commissioner Palecki, I think that all of the

4 Commissioners today sort of picked places where there seem to

5 be a common sense approach to some of the issues raised. And

6 we could encourage the parties to read the transcript from this

7 workshop. But I know I took notes on some of those issues, and

8 just quickly, I would encourage the parties to address the

9 following issues: On the -- Mr. Bradbury's concern, BellSouth,

10 on BellSouth coming back -- actually, it was Kopytchak. On the

11 concern that BellSouth came back and said that the EDI system

12 was unsuccessful, that the test was unsuccessful -- this is

13 early back this morning -- I'd like for you to address that.

14 The allegations that BellSouth's computer systems are

15 not updated, that the customer records are not updated, that

16 seemed to be a theme the whole day, and I would suggest that

17 you approach all of these as not responding to the allegations

18 but how do we solve the issue.

19 On the -- I think it was Ms. Boone said that the

20 nondesigned copper loop is available now, better pricing, but

21 if ALECs take advantage of that loop, they cannot order it

22 electronically. I'd like BellSouth to consider making that --

23 having that be provided electronically, that the ALECs can

24 order that copper loop nondesigned electronically.

25 Let's see. WorldCom, Ms. Lichtenberg, wants to be

1 able to randomly select 100 orders. BellSouth has refused to

2 do that. I know, Mr. Pate, I heard your explanation. Frankly,

3 it didn't sound sufficient. So again, in approaching the

4 response to that, I'd like for you to address how ALECs can

5 select 100 orders randomly, and collectively perhaps you could

6 share the information that comes from that.

7   Staff, there was a reference to a customer complaint,

8 Complaint Number 4228IT -- no, 42281T, I think. I need you all

9 to tell us the status of the complaint and when -- you know,

10 will it come to agenda.

11   There was some discussion -- BellSouth, you said that

12 currently BellSouth is trialing an enhanced process to assist

13 ALECs to reduce delays with the ADSL process. You've only been

14 doing it for two weeks. You're working with one ALEC on the

15 process. I want to know when that trial will be complete and

16 whether ALECs can volunteer to participate in that trial,

17 recognizing the risks, of course, of failure. But I don't want

18 to have in your post-workshop filings that you're working on it

19 and that you're pursuing it. I want to know when it will be

20 complete.

21   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Madam Chairperson, I'm sorry, was

22 that the ADSL USOC issue?

23   CHAIRMAN JABER: That was -- I think so. Yes,

24 removal of ADSL USOC.

25   And I believe, Mr. Ainsworth, I've got your name next

1   to that.

2   MR. AINSWORTH: That's exactly right. I have that.

3   MR. KOPYTCHAK: Thank you.

4   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. On the escalation process,

5   BellSouth, I want you to think about and respond to how your

6   first employee can be empowered to address a situation, that

7   the escalation process should be a nip-in-the-bud process, and

8   sort of establishing the drop dead time period for ending the

9   complaint process. You know, even if it's getting back to the

10 ALECs and saying, we just can't address your concern, it

11 shouldn't last four people four hours. So address your

12 escalation process.

13   On the prioritization process, I want the parties to

14 address the Verizon model and how the Verizon model can be used

15 here for BellSouth. And this is an area where definitely there

16 were some agreement, so please feel free on all of these areas,

17 especially this one, to reach agreement and not feel like you

18 have to comment at all in your post-workshop filings.

19   This is not an open invitation for to you keep these

20 problems going just so you respond to the post-workshop

21 comments. This is to facilitate the dialogue that you all

22 should be having in the next month.

23   And then, Mr. Kopytchak, as I indicated to you a

24 little bit earlier, if you have documentation on the premature

25 closing of tickets, share that with BellSouth.

1   Commissioners, those are the items I had on my list.

2   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Madam Chairman, I think you

3   have covered most of my concerns as well. I had one other

4   concern, and that is that we've heard dozens and dozens of

5   issues today, and I expect that when we receive these filings,

6   we'll be hearing about very many of them. And I know in the

7   change control process there's a requirement that the CLECs

8   prioritize their concern, and I wonder if we could have some

9   prioritization in these posthearing -- or post-workshop filings

10   so that we know what's really important to the individual

11   companies.

12   CHAIRMAN JABER: From each company?

13   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Yes.

14   CHAIRMAN JABER: Right. Yes. Commissioner, what

15   you're asking for are the criteria that you believe each

16   company should use and prioritizing the change.

17   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: I would almost prefer seeing

18   one through infinity as to however many issues they might

19   address. One being the most important that needs to be

20   addressed now that really has a, you know, high priority and

21   whatever the last number happens to be; something with an

22   actual number that can help us decide what really needs to be

23   addressed and needs to be addressed now.

24   CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioners, any other questions,

25   direction?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1   COMMISSIONER DEASON: No, Madam Chairman. Other than
2 that, I'm sure the parties will review the transcript, and if
3 there are matters which we've overlooked, they certainly can
4 respond, and we'd expect them to do so.

5   CHAIRMAN JABER: Right. And I would just encourage
6 you all to please stay focused on the discussions that we've
7 had today so that we achieve the very best solution to all
8 these issues.

9   Staff, what's four weeks from today?

10   MS. KEATING: March 18th.

11   CHAIRMAN JABER: Post-workshop comments are due
12 March 18th. Thank you for your participation today.
13 Commissioners, thank you. I'm sorry it's a long day.

14   COMMISSIONER PALECKI: I just wanted to thank the
15 parties, both BellSouth and the CLEC community. I think
16 there's been a spirit of reasonableness in the room today and a
17 search for solutions, and I hope this continues.

18   MR. KLEIN: Before we conclude, if I could possibly
19 suggest one other issue.

20   CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Come up to the microphone.

21   MR. KLEIN: Andy Klein.

22   CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Klein.

23   MR. KLEIN: Yes. There was one other issue that got
24 a fair amount of discussion early today and that was why a
25 subsequent order should not take precedence over a prior

1 pending order. I think that might also include instances where

2 there's a DSL on the line and why a subsequent order should not

3 take precedence over where that is already allocated in a

4 multiline customer's grouping, and I'd like to propose that

5 that be included in the filings four weeks from now.

6   CHAIRMAN JABER: Let's do this, Mr. Klein. I'm sure

7 there are things that the Commissioners didn't necessarily

8 identify here, but if they were discussed today and the spirit

9 moves you to respond or to offer up some suggestions, feel

10 free.

11   MR. KLEIN: Okay. Thank you.

12   CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you. This concludes the

13 workshop.

14   (Workshop concluded at 6:02 p.m.)

15   - - - - -

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF FLORIDA   )

2   :   CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

3 COUNTY OF LEON   )

4

5   I, TRICIA DeMARTE, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby
   certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and
   place herein stated.

6

7   IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically
   reported the said proceedings; that the same has been
   transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this

8 transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said
   proceedings.

9

       I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,
10 attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative
   or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel

11 connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in
   the action.

12

       DATED THIS 25th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2002.

13

14

15 _____
                 TRICIA DeMARTE
        FPSC Official Commission Reporter

16   (850) 413-6736

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION