

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED-FPSC

01 JAN 16 PM 4:39

**MCWHIRTER REEVES**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

TAMPA OFFICE:  
400 NORTH TAMPA STREET, SUITE 2450  
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33602  
P. O. BOX 3350 TAMPA, FL 33601-3350  
(813) 224-0866 (813) 221-1854 FAX

PLEASE REPLY TO:  
  
TALLAHASSEE

TALLAHASSEE OFFICE:  
17 SOUTH GADSDEN  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301  
(850) 222-2525  
(850) 222-5606 FAX

RECORDS AND  
REPORTING

January 16, 2001

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Blanca S. Bayo, Director  
Division of Records and Reporting  
Betty Easley Conference Center  
4075 Esplanade Way  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870

Re: Docket No.: 000121-TP

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Pursuant to the Revised Notice of Meeting issued on January 11, 2001 in this docket, I am providing the original and 15 copies of the Issue List that Z-Tel Communications, Inc. will be prepared to discuss during the issue identification meeting scheduled for January 19, 2001.

Yours truly,



Joseph A. McGlothlin

APP      JAM/kmr  
CAF      cc: George Ford  
CMP      Tim Vaccaro  
COM   5   Parties of record  
CTR       
ECR      Enclosure  
LEG   1    
OPC       
PAI       
RGO       
SEC   1    
SER       
OTH     

MCWHIRTER, REEVES, MCGLOTHLIN, DAVIDSON, DECKER, KAUFMAN, ARNOLD & STEEN, P.A.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

988-22 JAN 16 01

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Before the Florida Public Service Commission

Docket No. 000121

Z-Tel Communications, Inc.'s Issue List

STATISTICAL ISSUES

Issue 1. Is it appropriate to employ a statistical methodology that establishes a quality standard for service provided to CLECs that is necessarily less than the quality provided by the local exchange carrier to itself or its subsidiaries?

Issue 2. Is a significance level of 0.0000000000000016 reasonable for a means difference test?

Issue 3. What is the appropriate value for the parameter delta ( $\delta$ )?

Issue 4. Should the parameter delta ( $\delta$ ) vary by sample size?

Issue 5. Should the significance level of the statistical test be any smaller than is required to reduce the expected number of Type I failures to a number less than one?

Issue 6. Should the statistical or non-statistical procedures be simple enough to be understood by all participants in the performance plan including all CLECs, BellSouth, and the Florida Commission?

REMEDY PLAN ISSUES

Issue 7. When should the remedy plan go into effect?

Issue 8. What should be the relationship between remedy payments and the severity and/or duration of non-compliance?

Issue 9. Should remedies be paid as a direct payment or a bill credit?

Issue 10. In what form shall CLECs access raw performance data (e.g., to audit the statistical results)?

Issue 11. Should some portion of a CLEC's orders, within a given measure, be excluded from "receiving" remedy payments?

Issue 12. Should the remedies for a means difference of 100% be identical to that for a means difference of 500%?

Issue 13. Should an absolute or procedural cap be used? If so, how should the size of the cap be set?

Issue 14. Should there be a minimum remedy payment for "missed" measures with small CLEC sample sizes?

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00622 JAN 16 8

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING