

Timolyn Henry

From: Daniels, Sonia C - LGCRP [soniadaniels@att.com]
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2005 1:08 PM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Lisa Harvey; ateitzman@psc.state.fl.us; rmulvany@birch.com; gwatkins@covad.com; mfeil@mail.fdn.com; Michael Gross; dst@tobinreyes.com; aleiro@idstelcom.com; NEdwards@itcdeltacom.com; Donna McNulty; jmclau@kmctelecom.com; jacanis@kelleydrye.com; mhazzard@kelleydrye.com; jmcglothlin@mac-law.com; Vicki Gordon Kaufman; rheatter@mpowercom.com; danyelle.kennedy@networktelephone.net; Inowalsky@nbglaw.com; Michael Britt; Peter Dunbar; Susan Masterton; Dulaney L. O'Roark; Mark.Ozanick@accesscomm.com; mconquest@itcdeltacom.com; MCampbell@nuvox.com; TSauder@birch.com; Nancy Sims; Nancy White; Tracy Hatch; Chris McDonald; Musselwhite,Brian J - LGCRP; Norris,Sharon E - LGCRP
Subject: RE: 000121A -- CLEC Response BellSouth's Dec. 6 2004 Filing



01-10-05 CLEC
usiness Rules.p.

> Docket No. 000121A-TP -- In re: Investigation into the Establishment
 > of Operations Support system Permanent Performance Measures for
 > Incumbent Local Exchange Telecommunications Companies (BellSouth
 > track)

> Attached please find for electronic filing the CLEC Coalition's
 > Response to BellSouth's December 6, 2004 filing in the above-referenced docket. The cover
 > letter, certificate of service and the CLEC Coalition's Response are a total of 9 pages.
 > The attached document should be considered the official version for purposes of the docket
 > file.

> As indicated in the cover letter, copies of this filing are being
 > distributed to parties via electronic (in cases where e-mail addresses are available) and
 > U.S. Mail. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

> > <<01-10-05 CLEC Business Rules.pdf>>

> **CMP** _____ Sonia Daniels
 > on behalf of Tracy Hatch
 > **COM** _____ AT&T Law & Gov't Affairs
 > 1230 Peachtree
 > **CTR** _____ 4th Floor
 > Atlanta, GA 30309
 > **ECR** _____ Phone: 404-810-8488
 > Fax: 281-664-9791
 > **GCL** _____
 > **OPC** _____
 > **MMS** _____
 > **RCA** _____
 > **SCR** _____
 > **SEC** I
 > **OTH** _____

ORIGINAL



Tracy Hatch
Senior Attorney
Law and Government Affairs
Southern Region

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

January 10, 2005

BY ELECTRONIC FILING

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. 000121A-TP

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Attached please find the CLEC Coalition's Response to BellSouth's December 6, 2004 Filing in the above-referenced docket. Pursuant to the Commission's Electronic Filing Requirements, this version should be considered the official copy for purposes of the docket file. Copies of this document will be served on all parties via electronic and U.S. Mail.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing.

Sincerely yours,

s/ Tracy W. Hatch

Tracy W. Hatch

TWH/scd
Attachment
cc: Parties of Record

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00312 JAN 10 05

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the CLEC's Reply was served by electronic and U.S. Mail this 10th day of January 2005 to the following:

(*) 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 Canzano McNulty
MCI
1203 Governors Square Blvd., Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301

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 Communications 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

IDS Telecom, 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 Whalen
PO BOX 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

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

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 98225

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

s/ Tracy W. Hatch

Tracy W. Hatch

CLEC Response to BellSouth's December 6, 2004 Filing

Measure	CLEC Agree/Disagree and Rationale
OSS Response Interval	<p>Title: See note 1. Retain as OSS-1. CLECS agree with name.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs can agree, subject to outcome of calculation issues (including % within 10 seconds).</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree with Pre-Order Calculation. CLECs disagree with M&R % within 10 seconds. It should be average just as Pre-Order calculation. Additionally, if you have common business rules, why do you need differing calculation terminology?</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs disagree with M&R % within interval. Are bullets improperly aligned?</p>
OSS Interface Availability	<p>Title: See note 1. Retain as OSS-2 `CLECs agree with name.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs disagree with BellSouth's removal of Loss of functionality outages. CLECs disagree with removal of references to scheduled maintenance.</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs disagree with BellSouth's removal of Loss of functionality outages. Leave calculation as is.</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree.</p>
UNE Bulk Migration Scheduler Availability	<p>Title: See Note 1. CLECs OK with name.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs disagree. In first sentence, why is ordering included? For description beyond first sentence use same business rules recommended by CLECs for other OSS Availability measure. (OSS-2)</p> <p>Calculation: Use same business rules recommended by</p>

CLEC Response to BellSouth's December 6, 2004 Filing

	<p>CLECs for other OSS Availability measure. (OSS-2)</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree.</p>
Held Order Interval	<p>Title: See Note 1. CLECs agree with Name.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs agree to all changes except for the omission of type of held order. This is useful information and should not represent a burden to BellSouth as it is already reporting this information.</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree to changes as they appear to be consistent with Staff disaggregation proposal.</p>
Jeopardy Notice Interval	<p>Title: See Note 1. CLECs agree with name. This is measure P2-A.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree with changes.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs agree to changes except: the deletion of description of dispatch order treatment, as this provides useful information, and use of the word "systems" unless includes fax transmissions. (If this report measures dispatch only, why do MSS reports include non-dispatch?)</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree to changes except for addition of "electronic only".</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs disagree. Non-mechanized should continue to be included as separate report because a different process is used. (BellSouth's rationale does not match calculation.)</p> <p>Why do current non-mechanized jeopardy reports indicate diagnostic instead of the 48 hour benchmark?</p>
P-2B Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	<p>This measure (except for the second calculation, which was moved to P-2A), was omitted by BellSouth and should be</p>

CLEC Response to BellSouth's December 6, 2004 Filing

	<p>einstated.</p>
% Missed Installation Appointments	<p>Title: See Note 1. CLECS agree with name</p> <p>Definition: Agree with changes except "date" needs to remain plural.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs disagree to the changes to canceled orders (see August 27, 2004 comments) CLECs will agree with the deletion of end-user misses, subject to the inclusion of the language into the business rules section provided below. CLECs agree to the remainder of the changes.</p> <p>Business Rules: The business rules should be as follows; All completed service orders are considered met, unless the missed appointment code is due to BellSouth caused reasons. Further, if a "no access" occurs any time other than the committed date and time, the order will be coded as a missed appointment for BellSouth caused reasons. (Also see CLEC August 27, 2004 comments)</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs disagree. Dispatch and non-dispatch should be reported separately.</p>
Order Completion Interval	<p>Title: See Note 1. CLECS agree to name.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs disagree with the change to business days only. Such as change is unnecessary as this is a parity measure and L coded orders are already excluded. CLECs agree to other changes.</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree with changes.</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree with changes.</p>
Average Completion Notice Interval	<p>Title: See Note 1.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree to changes.</p>

CLEC Response to BellSouth's December 6, 2004 Filing

	<p>Business Rules: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree to changes.</p>
<p>Percent Missed Repair Appointments</p>	<p>Title: See Note 1. CLECs agree to name.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs disagree to changes excluding troubles outside BellSouth's control for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a parity measure, not a benchmark, and therefore BellSouth is not penalized if it does not provide discriminatory service. 2. Permitting this exclusion allows BellSouth to discriminate in favor of its own customers when both retail and wholesale customers are affected by the same service issue. 3. Troubles caused by customer or CLEC equipment are already excluded. <p>Business Rules: CLECs disagree with the "no access language" and propose it be replaced with "If no access occurs after the commitment time, the report is flagged a 'missed appointment'. If no access occurs before the commitment time, the report is considered a "made appointment."</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree to changes.</p>
<p>Out of Service > 24 Hours</p>	<p>Title: See Note 1.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs disagree to changes excluding troubles outside BellSouth's control for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a parity measure, not a benchmark, and therefore BellSouth is not penalized if it does not provide discriminatory service. 2. Permitting this exclusion allows BellSouth to discriminate in favor of its own customers when both retail and wholesale customers are affected by the same service issue. 3. Troubles caused by customer or CLEC equipment are already excluded.

CLEC Response to BellSouth's December 6, 2004 Filing

	<p>Business Rules: CLECs agree with changes.</p> <p>Calculation: No changes</p> <p>Report Structure: No changes</p>
Invoice Accuracy	<p>Title: See Note 1.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs disagree with changes (See August 27, 2004 comments.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree to changes</p>
Percent Billing Adjustment Requests (BAR) Responded to Within 45 Business Days	<p>Title: CLECs agree to changes.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs do not understand first change and disagree with the second change. The number of adjustments disputed by BellSouth is useful information, and is currently being reported.</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree with changes in heading and item a. CLECs disagree with changes in item b. The numerator should be a sub-set of the denominator, therefore item (b) should be "Total number of BAR responses due or past due in the reporting period."</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree.</p>
Average Answer Time	<p>CLECs believe that implementing this combined measure as the sole reporting process is premature, and should not be implemented until BellSouth's processes have changed for its centers. As centers convert, they could be reported under this measure. However, those centers which have not converted should continue to be reported under the existing</p>

CLEC Response to BellSouth's December 6, 2004 Filing

	<p>measures, O-12 and M&R-6. With those conditions, following are CLEC comments on proposed measure</p> <p>Title: See Note 1. CLECs agree with name "Speed of Answer.</p> <p>Definition: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Exclusions: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Business Rules: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Calculation: CLECs agree.</p> <p>Report Structure: CLECs agree.</p>
--	--

Note 1- As addressed in previous comments, CLECS strongly prefer that the title of the measure continue to include the existing numbering scheme, e.g. P-4, rather than replace with initials or acronym as proposed by BellSouth. CLECs further recommend that if a measure is deleted, the numbers be retained but not used, e.g. P-6. Therefore any new provisioning measure would be assigned the next available number, i.e. P-14.