

Tracy Hatch
Senior Attorney
Law and Government Affairs
Southern Region

Surte 700 101 N. Monroe Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 850-425-6360

January 12, 2004

BY HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Blanca Bayó, Director The Commission Clerk and Administrative Services Room 110, Easley Building Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 000121-TP – BellSouth Performance Measurements

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing are an original and fifteen (15) copies of the CLEC Coalition's Response to BellSouth's December 4, 2003. Memorandum Containing Proposed Remedy Amount for Metric B-10 in the above-referenced docket.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter by stamping the extra copy of this letter "filed" and returning the same to me. Thank you for your assistance with this filing.

Sincerely yours,

Tracy W. Hatch

TWH/las Enclosure

cc: Parties of Record

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation into the Establishment)	
of Operations Support System Permanent)	Docket No. 000121A-TP
Performance Measures for Incumbent)	
Local Exchange Telecommunications)	Filed: January 12, 2003
Companies (BellSouth Track))	
-)	

CLEC COALITION RESPONSE TO BELLSOUTH'S DECEMBER 4, 2003, MEMORANDUM CONTAINING PROPOSED REMEDY AMOUNT FOR METRIC B-10

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC ("AT&T"); DIECA Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company ("Covad"); MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC and MCI WORLDCOM Communications, Inc. ("MCI"); NuVox Communications, Inc. ("NuVox"); and Momentum Business Solutions. Inc. ("Momentum"), collectively referred to as the Competitive Local Exchange Carrier Coalition ("CLEC Coalition"), hereby respond to BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s ("BellSouth") memorandum dated December 4, 2003 which staff filed in this docket on December 5, 2003. That memorandum pertains to a "proposed fee amount for Percent Billing Errors Corrected in 'X' Business Days (B-10)", whereby BellSouth proposes a "Tier 1 Fee amount of \$20 and a Tier 2 Fee amount of \$30 for B-10." The CLEC Coalition has several concerns about this proposal, as well as the claims BellSouth conveys concerning their analysis of the CLEC wholesale Bill Adjustment Requests. For the reasons set forth below, the Commission should not adopt BellSouth's proposal at this time but instead should schedule a meeting to reconcile the data derived from all parties regarding BellSouth's proposal and to discuss an appropriate fee amount.

As part of the BellSouth memorandum outlining the B-10 (Percent Billing Errors Corrected in "X" Business Days) metric remedy amount proposal, BellSouth contends that the recommended Tier 1 remedy amount of \$20.00 "is approximately 3 times the value of the typical dispute (\$7...)". The CLEC Coalition disagrees with BellSouth's claims regarding the value of disputes because they do not appear to be accurate. Based upon their experience, including review of Billing Adjustment Request ("BAR") form data, the CLEC Coalition believes that a review of BellSouth's claim is warranted. BellSouth should provide the supporting data that it used to determine its valuation of a typical dispute. The differences in the dollar amounts between the CLEC data and BellSouth's conclusion (for the analysis itself and back-up data were not provided) warrants this review before moving forward with any decisions on the B-10 metric.

Another concern of the CLEC Coalition is that BellSouth states that it conducted a thorough analysis of the CLEC wholesale bill adjustment requests it has received for the three-month period from June through August 2003 to determine the appropriate fee amount to apply to a failure for this measure. Based on feedback from CLEC Billing organizations, the CLEC Coalition believes that a thorough analysis would encompass nine months at a minimum. Billing adjustments are not just a routine act. Therefore, a CLEC may not have claims each month.

To further support its proposal, BellSouth also contends that "[o]ne-third of the Billing Adjustment Requests resulted in no billing error." In considering this, it is important to understand that BellSouth may unilaterally classify a Billing Adjustment Request as not being a billing error since BellSouth assigns the denial or agreement status. The decision that a billing error exists should not be based only on how BellSouth

classifies the claim. Denial of a claim does not mean that a billing error did not exist.

The claim denials made by BellSouth are not a consensus decision which included the CLEC opinion. As a result, BellSouth's contention warrants further examination.

BellSouth also contends that "the results of the dispute analysis showed that a large number of the disputes involved a low monetary value with little effect on the CLEC." The CLECs question whether BellSouth's analysis included the complete set of data for the time period as it appears that BellSouth seems to omit denied billing disputes from its analysis. As the attached confidential matrix reflects, the majority of the denied claims are for significant dollar amounts. For BellSouth to suggest that the billing disputes are of low value is misleading.

Given these concerns, the CLEC Coalition recommends a reconciliation meeting so that BellSouth can provide clarification concerning the data used for the analysis. BellSouth should be required to provide the parties, prior to the meeting, the supporting data used in its analysis. As part of the supporting data, the CLEC Coalition requests inclusion of the following:

- Provide the ACATS/BDATS distribution of the disputes.
- The number and dollar amount of disputes that were dropped from the
 performance reporting during the three-month period. This data should be
 accessible to BellSouth given that the business rules for the B-10 metric states,
 BellSouth will report separately the adjustment requests that are disputed by
 BellSouth.

¹ A "Review Of BellSouth Billing Dispute Process" dated June 2003, prepared by R. Lynn Fisher of the Commission's Division of Competitive Markets & Enforcement concluded that if a billing dispute is denied by BellSouth and is escalated to a higher dispute level, the escalated disputes are dropped from performance measurement reporting (at p.5).

In addition to addressing BellSouth's proposed remedy amount for the B-10 metric, the CLEC Coalition has concerns related to the implementation of the B-10 metric that will be raised at the Six Month Review. It appears that the B-10 metric implementation is not compliant with the metric business rules. In the "Review of BellSouth Billing Dispute Process" dated June 2003, prepared by R. Lynn Fisher of the Commission's Division of Competitive Markets & Enforcement, there are several areas discussed about the BellSouth billing dispute process that were not clearly understood and are of great concern to the CLEC Coalition:

- 1. Until the dispute is logged into the appropriate BellSouth tracking systems (ACATS or BDATS), the clock does not begin on the 45-business day resolution time frame. As stated in the aforementioned document, "BRR staff found that a representative had received a dispute 13 days before, but had not yet entered it into the system." (p. 8) There still does not appear to be any measurement for this step of the billing dispute process.
- 2. Disputes that are escalated are dropped from BellSouth performance reporting. This includes denied and partial credits.
- 3. BDATS is not tied to the billing systems like ACATS. BDATS requires users to manually calculate late charges and interest charges and enter them into the billing system for correction.

The CLEC Coalition hopes to discuss these items in depth at the next six-month review.

For the reasons set forth herein, the CLEC Coalition respectfully requests that the Commission not accept BellSouth's proposal or the Tier 1 and Tier 2 fee amount for the

B-10 billing metric at this time. In addition, the CLEC Coalition requests that a reconciliation meeting be scheduled for all interested parties to attend to review the data used in BellSouth's analysis and discuss the proposed fee amount for Percent Billing Errors Corrected in "X" Business Days (B-10).

Respectfully submitted,

COUNSEL FOR THE CLEC COALITION

Tray Hatch /cs

AT&T Communications of the Southern

States, LLC

101 N. Monroe St., Suite 700

Tallahassee, FL 32301

Donna McNulty Cs

MCI

1203 Governors Square Blvd. Suite 201

Tallahassee, FL 32301-2960

Gene Watkins

Senior Counsel

Covad Communications, Inc.

1230 Peachtree Street, NE, 19th Floor

Gen Wathirs/LS

Atlanta, GA 30309

Russell E. Hamilton, III
Nuvox Communications, Inc.
Vice President of Legal and Regulatory
Affairs

NuVox Communications, Inc. 301 N. Main Street, Suite 5000 Greenville, SC 29601

David Benck

Vice President and General Counsel Momentum Business Solutions. Inc. 2700 Corporate Drive Suite 200

Birmingham, Alabama 35242

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U.S. mail on this 12th day of January 2004 to:

(*) Blanca S. Bayo Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 3239-0850

Ms. Nancy B. White c/o Nancy H. Sims
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 150 S. Monroe Street, Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556

Michael A. Gross Florida Cable Telecommunications Assoc. 246 E. 6th Avenue, Suite 100 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Nanette Edwards ITC Deltacom 4092 South Memorial Parkway Huntsville, AL 35802

Donna C. McNulty MCI WorldCom 325 John Knox Road, Suite 105 Tallahassee, FL 32302-4131

John D. McLaughlin, Jr. KMC Telecom, Inc. 1755 North Brown Road Lawrenceville, GA 30043

Messer Law Firm Floyd Self Norman Horton P.O. Box 1867 Tallahassee, FL 32302 Pennington Law Firm
Peter Dunbar
Karen Camechis
P.O. Box 10095
Tallahassee, FL 32302-2095

Rutledge Law Firm Kenneth Hoffman John Ellis P.O. Box 551 Tallahassee, FL 32302-0551

McWhirter Law Firm Joseph McGlothlin/Vicki Kaufman 117 S. Gadsden St. Tallahassee, FL 32301

Wayne Stavanja/Mark Buechele Supra Telecom 1311 Executive Center Drive, Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Kimberly Caswell Verizon Select Services, Inc. P.O. Box 110, FLTC0007 Tampa, FL 33601-0110

John Rubino George S. Ford Z-Tel Communications, Inc. 601 S. Harbour Island Blvd. Tampa, FL 33602-5706

Renee Terry e.spire Communications, Inc. 131 National Business Parkway, #100 Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-10001 William Weber Covad Communicatoins Company 19th Floor, Promenade II 1230 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30309-3574

WorldCom, Inc. Dulaney O'Roark, III Six Concourse Parkway, Suite 3200 Atlanta, GA 30328

Richard Melson Hopping Law firm P.O. Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314

IDS Telcom, LLC Angel Leiro/Joe Millstone 1525 N.W. 167th Street, Second Floor Miami, FL 33169-5131

Katz, Kutter Law Firm Charles Pellegrini/Patrick Wiggins 106 East College Avenue, 12th Floor Tallahassee, FL 32301

Mpower Communications Corp. David Woodsmall 175 Sully's Trail, Suite 300 Pittsford, NY 14534-4558

ALLTEL Communications, Inc. C/O Ausley Law Firm Jeffrey Wahlen PO BOX 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302

BellSouth Telecom., Inc.
Patrick W. Turner/R. Douglas Lackey
675 W. Peachtree Street, Suite 4300
Atlanta, GA 30375

Intermedia Communications, Inc. Scott Sapperstein One Intermedia Way M.C. FLT-HQ3 Tampa, FL 33647-1752

Sprint Communications Company Susan Masterton/Charles Rehwinkel PO BOX 2214 MS: FLTLHO0107 Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214

Miller Isar, Inc, Andrew O. Isar 7901 Skansie Ave., Suite 240 Gig Harbor, WA 98335-8349

Birch Telecom of the South, Inc. Tad J. Sauder Manager, ILEC Performance Data 2020 Baltimore Ave. Kansas City, MO 64108

Suzanne F. Summerlin 2536 Capital Medical Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32308-4424

Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP Jonathan E. Canis/Michael B. Hazzard 1200 19th Street, N.W., 5th Floor Washington, DC 20036

David Benck Momentum Business Solutions, Inc. 2700 Corporate Drive Suite 200 Birmingham, AL 35242

Russell E. Hamilton, III Nuvox Communications, Inc. 301 N. Main Street, Suite 5000 Greenville, SC 29601