ORIGINAL

ATTACHMENT B

REDACTED

AT&T FLORIDA
FPSC DOCKET NO: 000121A-TP
REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION
Page 1 of 1
7/25/07

REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION OF AT&T FLORIDA'S
LSR CLARIFICATION ISSUES MATRIX
FILED JULY 25, 2007
FLORIDA DOCKET NO. 000121A-TP

TWO REDACTED COPIES FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

CMP _____
COM _____
CTR _____
ECR _____
GCL _____
OPC _____
RCA _____
SCR _____
SGA _____
SEC _____
OTH _____

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
1	***A***	▇577079AT1	NA	VER 00	12/26/2006	12:14 PM	NA	NA	NA	VER 00- Not FOCD or Clarified because SUP from CLEC sent in before VER 00 could be worked.	The CLEC sent in a supplement before AT&T Florida could take any action on this initial version.
1	***A***	▇577079AT1	1. Date Sent Field Incorrect Issued sup to correct	VER 01	12/26/2006	1:37PM	12/26/2006	3:44 PM	CLR	VER 01-Clarified because the CLEC's entry for Date Sent Field was incorrect.	When the LSR was clarified for the invalid entry in the Date Sent field, the Service Rep. did not note the incorrect entries in the Billing Account Number (BAN) field and that the Customer Terminal Location (ACTL) and Connecting Facility Assignment (CFA) did not match Serving Wire Center (SWC).
1	***A***	▇577079AT1	2. BAN Field SUP Sent on LSR Incorrect Issued sup to correct	VER 02	12/27/2006	9:10 AM	12/27/2006	9:58 AM	CLR	VER 02 - Clarified because left the Billing Account Number (BAN) field blank. In addition, populated the field requiring the type of supplement as SUP 4 on this version - 4 is not a valid character on the LSR page for this type of order.	In addition to leaving the BAN field blank, CLEC changed the SUP field to a prohibited character. Thus, required a clarification to correct the invalid character in the SUP type field. The Service Rep did not note the incorrect entry for CFA.
1	***A***	▇577079AT1	3. ACTL does not match Svc Address SWC CFA - Invalid or incorrect CFA: Not UNE CFA	VER 03	12/27/2006	3:21 PM	12/28/2006	8:38 AM	CLR	VER 03 - The LSR had to be clarified because the Access Customer Terminal Location (ACTL) on the LSR did not match Serving Wire Center (SWC), and the Connecting Facility Assignment (CFA) was invalid - not UNE CFA.	The Connecting Facility Assignment (CFA) identifies the provider carrier system and channel to be used for a specific customer order. Therefore, the Access Customer Terminal Location (ACTL) and Serving Wire Center (SWC) must match the CFA.

[1] Abbreviations are used in this column for actions taken by AT&T in response to LSRs submitted by the CLEC as follows: CAN – Request cancelled; CLR – Clarification; FOC – Firm Order Confirmation; FTL_REJ – Fatal Reject or simply Reject; REFOC – the reissue of a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC).

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
1	***A***	577079AT1	4. NC, NCI, and SECNCI Codes – Can not change codes on Sups issued sup to Cancel Completion Date: Order Cancelled	VER 04	12/29/2006	1:07 PM	12/29/2006	1:58 PM	CLR	VER 04 - CLEC sent SUP 3 and changed the Network Channel (NC) and Network Channel Interface (NCI) codes, which is a prohibited change on a SUP, therefore the PON had to be clarified again.	This version of the LSR had two fields changed: the Network Channel (NC) and Network Channel Interface (NCI) designations, which is a prohibited action for a SUP. Therefore, the LSR had to be clarified. This requires that the CLEC issue a new PON.
1	***A***	577079AT1		VER 05	1/4/2007	10:07 AM	1/4/2007	1:46 PM	CAN	VER 05 - SUP 1 to cancel. PON Cancelled.	The CLEC cancelled the PON.
2	***A***	574387T1	BellSouth Order:	VER 00	12/20/2006	11:53 AM 11:56 AM 12:08 PM	12/20/2006 12/20/2006 12/20/2006	11:55 PM 11:58 PM 12:11 PM	FTL_REJ FTL_REJ FTL_REJ	Version 00- Received 12/20/06 11:53 and 11:56 and 12:08 Valid UpFront Rejected: 1st FTL_REJ Reason - "The ACT is missing or invalid"; 2nd FTL_REJ Reason - "The ACT is missing or invalid"; 3rd FTL REJ Reason - "The ACT is missing or invalid". The 'ACT' is the activity type, such as N - Add/New Install, D – Disconnect, etc.	In this initial version of the LSR, the CLEC made errors that resulted in several Fatal Rejects. A Fatal Reject occurs when the system encounters an error serious enough to prevent the LSR from being processed further. In such cases there is no opportunity for the Service Rep to review the request for additional errors. The CLEC is required to reissue the LSR.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
2	***A***	████574387T1		VER 01	12/20/2006 12/21/2006 12/21/2006	11:57AM 12:52 PM 12:53 PM	12/20/2006 12/21/2006 12/21/2006	12:00 PM 12:53 PM 1:40 PM	FTL_REJ FTL_REJ FOC	VER 01- Received 12/20 11:57 and 12:52 Valid Up front rejected. 1st FTL_REJ Reason - "The ACT is missing or invalid"; 2nd FTL_REJ Reason - "This version and PON has already been received." VER 01-FOC'd at 1:40 PM	In this version of the LSR the CLEC's request initially contained errors that resulted in Fatal Rejects, which automatically stopped the processing of the LSR. The CLEC reissued this version of the LSR and received a FOC. However, the Service Rep should not have returned a FOC, but should have clarified because the Service Center (SC) field was incorrect.
2	***A***	████574387T1	1. 0040 – Service Center – Invalid or Incorrect Issued Sup to correct	VER 02	12/21/2006	1:40 PM	12/22/2006	9:42 AM	CLR	VER 02 -Clarified for Service Center (SC) invalid/ incorrect	The issues generated from Version 02 through Version 06 resulted from the CLEC making changes to the LSR that
2	***A***	████574387T1	2. CFA – Invalid or Incorrect Issued Sup to correct	VER 03	12/22/2006	10:43 AM	12/26/2006	9:29 AM	CLR	VER 03-CLEC corrected SC field-BUT should have cancelled PON as the SC field cannot be changed on a SUP. LCSC clarification for CFA was valid clarification.	are prohibited on a SUP or changing fields that are allowed to be changed on a SUP but making incorrect entries. Moreover, the CLEC should have been required to cancel the request and submit a new PON for at least two reasons. First, the SC field was changed on version 03, which is
2	***A***	████574387T1	3. Date Sent Field – Incorrect Issued Sup to correct	VER 04	1/3/2007	9:12 AM	1/3/2007	11:36 AM	CLR	VER 04 - CLEC typed invalid new date time sent causing LSR to be clarified.	prohibited on a SUP. Second, making changes to the NC and NCI codes on a SUP, which was done on version 06, is also prohibited. In addition, the Date
2	***A***	████574387T1	4. Date Sent Field – Incorrect Issued Sup to correct	VER 05	1/3/2007	12:26 PM	1/3/2007	2:36 PM	CLR	VER 05-Clarified NCI codes incorrect and Date Time Sent still invalid.	Time Sent field was incorrect on every version of the LSR except versions 03 and 06. On Version 05, the LSR was clarified for NCI codes incorrect, which
2	***A***	████574387T1		VER 06	1/4/2007	9:12 AM	1/4/2007	12:57 PM	CLR	VER 06 - CLEC changed NC and NCI codes which is prohibited on a SUP.	is another way of indicating that the CFA is incorrect. The CFA entry was clarified on version 03, but the CFA and NCI were inter-related. The clarification was to alert the CLEC that either the NCI or the CFA was incorrect.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
2	***A***	▮574387T1	Completion Date: 01/18/2007 Customer Desired Due Date: 01/05/2007	VER 07	1/4/2007	1:46 PM	1/4/2007	5:41 PM	FOC	VER 07- FOC'd and completed.	The CLEC received a FOC even though there were still errors on the LSR. The standard interval for this type of order was applied.
3	***A***	▮586548AT1	BellSouth Order: ▮ 1. Service Address- Invalid or Incomplete/or not RSAG Valid Issued sup to correct	VER 00	12/26/2006	3:07 PM	12/26/2006	4:31 PM	CLR	VER 00 - Clarified for service address	While the service address was the trigger reason for the clarification, the Service Rep could have clarified the request for a number of additional reasons: i.e., Service Center (SC) field; Billing Account Number (BAN) field; Location Number (LOCNUM), which is the location for the service requested; Response Type Request (RTR) field; Location Designation 1 (LD1) and Location Value 1 (LV1). However, these are entries that appear on the End User Information page. When an LSR is clarified for service address the CLEC should review all associated data before resubmitting the LSR because there are many other items that are dependent upon the service address.
3	***A***	▮586548AT1	2. Supp sent on LSR incorrect Issued sup to Correct	VER 01	12/27/2006	9:33 AM	12/27/2006	10:10 AM	CLR	VER 01-CLEC typed wrong SUP type in the SUP field - SUP 4 is not a valid option - PON had to be clarified.	Although there were several errors on the initial LSR that could have been clarified, this version of the LSR would still have been clarified because the SUP Type submitted by the CLEC was incorrect. The CLEC is required to indicate why they are supplementing the order. Valid entries are 1, 2 or 3 for this type of order. The CLEC entered 4, which required a clarification. However, the Service Rep. did not note the additional invalid or incorrect field entries identified in the response above.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
3	***A***	586548AT1	3. FOC received	VER 02	12/27/2006	3:18 PM	12/28/2006 1/04/2007	9:22 AM 10:55 AM	FOC REFOC	VER 02 - FOC'd	This version of the LSR was given a FOC, but the Service Rep should have clarified because of incorrect entries on the LSR, such as a blank BAN field. On 01/04/2007, the CLEC called the LCSC and indicated that the order was for 2 loops instead of 1. The FOC was then reissued.
3	***A***	586548AT1	4. BAN FIELD – REQUIRED Issued Sup to correct	VER 03	1/8/2007	9:11 AM	1/8/2007	1:46 PM	CLR	VER 03 - BAN Field required.	The CLEC is required to make an entry in the Billing Account Number or BAN field in order for the LSR to be processed. Service Rep did not note that LOCNUM, RTR, LD1 and LV1 fields were also incorrect.
3	***A***	586548AT1	5. LD1, LV1 field (Received after FOC) Issued sup to correct	VER 04	1/8/2007	2:21 PM	1/9/2007	10:10 AM	CLR	VER 04 - LD1 and LV1 field invalid	The Location Designator 1 (LD1) and the Location Value 1 (LV1) were incorrect. This is really a further clarification of the initial clarification that the service address was incorrect. Specifically, the entries that the CLEC made for LD1 and LV1 should have been entered in Location Designator 3 (LD3) and Location Value 3 (LV3).
3	***A***	586548AT1	6. NCI CODE – Invalid or incorrect – NCI: 04qb9.11 RTR - Invalid LOCNUM - LOC NUM Invalid or Incorrect - LOCNUM: 001 Issued sup to cancel Completion Date: Order Cancelled	VER 05	1/10/2007	9:07 AM	1/10/2007 1/12/07 1/24/07	4:15 PM 3:14 PM 3:21 PM	CLR CLR CLR	VER 05 -1st clarification for 'Access to EELs conversion has not been approved', was invalid. Subsequent clarifications for NCI code, LOCNUM, RTR and SC fields being invalid were sent.	This version of the LSR is the point at which the CLEC sought and received escalation with the LCSC office. AT&T Florida gave the CLEC, in detail, all the above clarifications and advised that the PON would have to be cancelled and a new request issued.
3	***A***	586548AT1		VER 06	1/25/2007	12:04 PM	1/25/2007	5:09 PM	CAN		This PON was cancelled.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
4	***A***	████579026T1	BellSouth Order: ████ & ████	VER 00	12/20/2006	3:13 PM	12/20/2006	3:14 PM	FTL_REJ	VER 00- Valid Upfront Reject PON will not be screened for other clarifications if it is rejected. FTL_REJ reason: "The TOS is missing or invalid."	In this initial version of the LSR, the CLEC made errors that resulted in a Fatal Reject. A Fatal Reject occurs when the system encounters an error serious enough to prevent the LSR from being processed further. In such cases there is no opportunity for the Service Rep to review the request for additional errors. The CLEC is required to reissue the LSR.
4	***A***	████579026T1	1. Field – Invalid/Incorrect – Field: NCON Not Valid Y Field – Invalid/Incorrect – Field: LD1 NOT VLD W/SUIT Issued sup to correct	VER 01	12/21/2006	10:09 AM	12/21/2006	3:09 PM	CLR	VER 01-Clarified for New Construction (NCON) and Location Designator 1 (LD1) which were valid clarifications.	Clarified for invalid/incorrect entry in the New Construction (NCON) field and the Location Designator 1 (LD1) field. The NCON field is used to indicate that the service address is a new construction or a new location within an existing service address. The LD1 field is used to provide additional specific information related to the address. The Service Rep did not note the invalid or incorrect entries in the LOCNUM, RTR, LQTY, and Date Time sent fields.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
4	***A***	579026T1	2. FOC received 3. LOCNUM – Required (Received after FOC) LOCNUM – Must match on all pages – locnum: 1 LQTY – Invalid/Incorrect Issued Sup to correct	VER 02	12/26/2006	3:20 PM	12/26/2006 12/27/2006 1/3/2007	5:21PM 9:16 AM 11:04 AM	FOC CLR CLR	VER 02- Was originally FOC'd and then went into error status and was clarified-The original notice of ACNA/ CCNA clarification was invalid-But through phone call with the CLEC, LCSC advised of the clarifications for LOCNUM and LQTY and resent those to CLEC.	This version of the LSR was originally given a FOC, but went into error status. Consequently, the LSR was clarified. The clarification sent to the CLEC was for entries in the Access Customer Name Abbreviation (ACNA)/ Customer Carrier Name Abbreviation (CCNA) field. This clarification was invalid and the LCSC Service Rep discussed this error with a CLEC Service Rep on 01/03/2007, but advised that the Location Number (LOCNUM) and Loop Quantity (LQTY) fields were invalid. The same CLEC Service Rep called back and agreed that the clarification for LOCNUM and LQTY was valid and that she would send a SUP. Then on 01/09/07, the same CLEC Rep called stating that she never received the LOCNUM clarification.
4	***A***	579026T1	4. FOC received Completion Date: Order cancelled and sent SA due to multiple Cancellations by BellSouth Customer Desired Due Date: 12/28/2006	VER 03	1/3/2007	10:05 AM	1/3/2007	12:24 PM	FOC	VER 03 FOC'd. VER 03 should not have been FOC'd either the Response Type Request (RTR) field, LOCNUM field are still invalid	This version of the LSR was given a FOC, but the Service Rep should have clarified the LSR because the request still contained errors in the RTR, Date/Time Sent and LOCNUM fields. The order was subsequently cancelled. It appears that one of the major problems with this order was that requests for DS1 and above must terminate in collocation space. The CFA provided by this PON did not terminate in collocation space.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
5	***A***	■62429T1	BellSouth Order: ■■■	VER 00	2/7/2007	2:46 PM	2/7/2007 2/8/2007	2:49 PM 12:30 PM	FTL_REJ FOC	VER 00-Valid Up Front Rejects. FTL_REJ Reason - "This version and PON have already been received." VER 00 FOC'd	This version of the LSR initially received a Fatal Reject, causing the system to cease processing before a review of the request could be made by the Service Rep. The CLEC reissued the LSR and a FOC was provided.
5	***A***	■62429T1	1. MA Status on 02/14/2007 Due to Customer Not Ready (FOC DATE) Resubmitted 02/21/2007	VER 01	2/15/2007	9:26 AM	2/16/2007	10:10 AM	FOC	VER 01 FOC'd	Although the CLEC had already been provided a FOC based on version 00 of the LSR, the CLEC issued a SUP to change the due date because of Missed Appointment due to the CLEC's customer not being ready and also to change the CLEC Fax number. This version of the LSR was then given a new FOC.
5	***A***	■62429T1	2. FOC'D for 02/28/2007 Clarified for TOS & NCI Codes 02/26/2007 (Version 2)	VER 02	2/21/2007	8:57 AM	2/21/2007 2/22/2007 2/26/2007	4:10 PM 12:34 PM 12:00 PM	FOC REFOC CLR	VER 02 FOC'd then order hit error status and was clarified due to TOS and NCI codes not valid order cannot be completed.	This was another supplement from the CLEC to change the due date and a FOC was provided. The FOC was reissued because the initial FOC was sent to the old CLEC Fax number. However, the PON subsequently went into error status because the Network Channel Interface (NCI) and the Type of Service Code (TOS) was invalid. Thus, the PON was clarified.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response¹ Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
5	***A***	862429T1	3. Order clarified again 36 hours before [due] date Completion Information: Order needed to be cancelled and ordered as Access to get earlier completion date due to delays in getting clarifications resolved Access order issued was PON # 862429SA04	VER 03	2/27/2007	7:56 AM	2/27/2007	12:09 PM	CAN	VER 03 SUP 1 cancelled PON.	The CLEC cancelled the PON. However, there was nothing that AT&T Florida could have done that would have resulted in fewer SUPs since the LSR was only clarified 1 time. The problem with this order resulted from the CLEC's invalid order type. Specifically, the PON was issued with a TOS of 19 and a SPEC code of NTCD1. This combination is not valid. A TOS code of 19 is for EELs and the SPEC code of NTCD1 is a UNE DS1 Loop riding Access. The type of loop the CLEC requested was invalid.
6	***A***	862429SA04	BellSouth Order: 1. Order issued to replace above UNE order, PON 862429T1 / CYFLDMM5 & expedite requested	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	PON is not a request handled by the LCSC. According to the CLEC's notes, this request was submitted as a new PON to ACCESS. The LCSC does not handle orders for Special Access service.
6	***A***	862429SA04	2. NCI Incorrect for CFA – SUPP to correct only use 04QB6.33 when T3Z Rides a T3TIE CFA. S/B 04DS6.44 04DS6.44 was provided on the manual UNE order but sup issued to change NCI as requested	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
6	***A***	862429SA04	3. REFNUM VCNUM FID Error message UREF LREF 0001 FNT1 Fiber Network Type Required – Supp to Correct Sent sup to add "A" in the FNT field	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
6	***A***	███862429SA04	4. Clarified back that FNT is a BellSouth populated field Account team provided FNI and FNT field information to ███ to prevent another Clarification and delay the order, and sup issued with this information	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
6	***A***	███862429SA04	5. REFNUM 0001 – DDD Cannot be same as Date Received – Supp to Correct Sup issued to change the DD Completion Date: 3/2/07 Customer Desired Due Date: 2/28/07	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
7	***A***	███775844	BellSouth Order: ███ 1. Service Address – Invalid or Incomplete/ or not RSAG Valid Field – Field Required – Field Name: sass Sup issued to correct address	VER 00	5/14/2007	2:15 PM	5/15/2007	7:22 AM	CLR	VER 00- Clarified for address being invalid.	The Service Address field entry on this initial version of the LSR was invalid requiring a clarification.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
7	***A***	▮775844	2. SPEC CODE – Incorrect/Invalid ▮ called LCSC and spoke to Robin, who explained that since there was no mileage, a SPEC code was not required. This is the 1st UNE DS3 circuit that has made it thru SI to LCSC. ▮ took the SPEC info off of the BellSouth website, but apparently it is only needed for circuits with mileage Sup issued to correct the SPEC code	VER 01	5/15/2007	8:54 AM	5/15/2007	12:28 PM	CLR	VER 01 Clarified for SPEC code invalid	On the prior version of the LSR, VER 00, the Service and Product Enhancement Code (SPEC) field was blank, but on this version, VER 01, the CLEC populated the SPEC field, which identifies a specific product or service offering. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep. clarified with the CLEC that the SPEC code is not required for the type of loop being ordered.

Item No.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	Version	Receipt Date	Receipt Time	Response Date	Response Time	Response[1] Type	Explanation	AT&T Florida Comments
7	***A***	▓▓775844	3. Clarification received stating that a SPEC CODE is required. ▓▓▓ called LCSC and spoke to Amarilis. She verified what Robin had told ▓▓▓ and checked and there is no mileage. She then sent this order through for processing. 4. Clarified again due to a missing SI document. Apparently, when CRSG forwards the completed SI with the LSR and LCSC, it comes in as an image. If we have to sup the order, we need to recreated the order manually in LENS, and send it via LENS. When we do that, it comes in as a fax, so the image is not attached. Adding to the confusion is that the image does not come in under the PON number. No Supp required. LCSC manager located the documents and forwarded them to the appropriate parties. Completion Date: 6/20/07 Customer Desired Due Date: 5/11/07	VER 02	5/15/2007	3:48 PM	5/16/2007 5/17/2007 5/17/2007	10:17AM 9:21 AM 1:00 PM	CLR CLR FOC	VER 02 Clarified for SPEC code invalid- LCSC rep spoke with the CLEC again and explained that PON was clarified in error and referred for 2nd screening.-2nd screener did not see the Letter of Authorization (LOA) with VER 02 and clarified in error	On this version of the LSR, the AT&T Service Rep. clarified the LSR indicating that a SPEC code was required. CLEC called the LCSC and LCSC Service Rep. advised that the clarification was in error and that the LSR would be second screened and processed. When the request reached the second screener the Letter of Authorization (LOA) was not viewable. This is because the LOA is on Version 00 of the LSR and due to a system loading error Version 00 was not viewable. This resulted in a clarification in error for LOA. Therefore, the request was escalated to systems personnel to retrieve version 00. The Service Rep then went on to process the request on 05/17/07 at 9:23am, pulled and worked that PON just 2 hours later not affecting customers due date. Standard Interval was applied. Note: This is a Georgia transaction.

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
8	***B***	31V01S01	Clarified for invalid address. 4:38PM 04/19/07-tnix-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error. Spoke with Angelique of the LCSC who advised clarification was invalid. Referred to screening. FOC pending.	This PON fell out for manual handling. The Service Rep was unable to validate the Local Service Office (LSO) in RSAG and clarified the LSR. The LSO identifies the NPA / NXX of the local or alternate serving central office (CO) of the customer location or primary location of the end user. Specifically, the LSO 561 498 central office address was not validating in RSAG. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep explained the problem in validating the CO and that the clarification was in error. The Service Rep was able to push the order through to completion by contacting RSAG to work a manual validation of the CO address.	4/18/2007 @ 15:16	4/18/2007 @ 17:42	4/20/2007 @ 14:55	4/24/2007	4/25/2007
9	***B***	41V01S01	Clarified for invalid TN 04:50PM 04/19/07-tnix-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Spoke with Keisha of the LCSC who advised clarification was invalid. Referred to 2nd screening. FOC pending.	This PON fell out for manual handling. The Service Rep was unable to validate the Central Office address in RSAG and clarified the LSR for invalid or missing Telephone Number (TN)/ Existing Account Telephone Number (EATN). After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep sent the request to the production group to be worked. The LCSC processed the PON and issued a FOC.	4/18/2007 @ 14:01	4/18/2007 @ 15:45	4/20/2007 @ 15:42	4/24/2007	4/25/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
10	***B***	75V00S00	Clarified for RESID not valid in LFACS: Number of loops on LFACS Reservation not equal to or exceeded by number of loops on LSR 04:52PM 04/19/07-IRUBIN-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Called LCSC spoke to Laura, this clarification is invalid and the order will be pulled and rescreened to be worked.	The PON was auto clarified in error by the system based on the entry for the Facilities Reservation Number (RESID). This error has been identified as a system issue requiring a feature change per Change Request # CR2451. The Service Rep spoke to the CLEC and advised that the clarification appeared to be in error and that the PON would be screened and provided to production to be worked. The CLEC was then given a FOC and the due date on the FOC was the same due date requested by the CLEC. Later, the PON went into Missed Appointment (MA) status, due to CLEC end user reasons, and the CLEC never responded so the PON was cancelled.	4/19/2007 @ 11:06	4/19/2007 @ 16:52	4/20/2007 @ 13:53	4/27/2007	4/27/2007
11	***B***	34V00S00	Clarified for Invalid ACNA-1000 0001--ACNA -Invalid or Incorrect ACNA: 01:02PM 04/25/07-solson2-UNJEP-LSRCLAR-Called LCSC and spoke to Tabitha regarding clarification. She advised that this is an invalid clarification and has sent it to second screening.	This PON fell out for manual handling. The Service Rep clarified in error for Access Customer Name Abbreviation (ACNA): invalid or incorrect. The ACNA identifies the COMMON LANGUAGE code of the customer to which the bill is to be rendered. After the CLEC called the LCSC, the Service Rep advised the CLEC that the clarification was in error. The PON was then processed and the CLEC received a FOC on the same day that the PON was clarified in error.	4/25/2007 @ 09:45	4/25/2007 @ 11:04	4/25/2007 @ 14:59	5/3/2007	5/3/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
12	***B***	37RC1	Clarified for 3407-ECCKT-Invalid/missing ECCKT: 3 ECCKTS on this acct-Need ECCKTS 03:02PM 04/20/07-tnix-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Spoke to Patty of the LCSC who advised clarification was invalid. Referred to 2nd screening. FOC pending.	This PON was submitted manually and the Service Rep clarified for 'ECCKTS invalid or missing'. Exchange Circuit (ECCKTS) specifies a provider's circuit identification. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised the CLEC that the clarification was in error, and that the PON would be second screened and processed. The PON was processed and the CLEC was given the requested due date on the FOC provided.	4/19/2007 @ 14:58	4/19/2007 @ 16:08	4/23/2007 @ 09:56	4/23/2007	4/23/2007
13	***B***	48T00S00	Clarified for busy tie pair-we were only sup'ing the LSR for a new due date. 09:21AM 04/13/07-jchiarolanza-UNJEP-LSRCLAR Called Bellsouth LCSC to dispute CLAR, this order was Sup'd VER 01 and this clarification. Should not be valid. Spoke with Evan, she stated invalid and should have FOC. Tie assigned this order not installed. Since this was sup for dd.	This PON flowed-through and received a FOC on the initial version, but the order went into MA status for end user not ready and a jeopardy was issued. The CLEC then issued Version 01 for a new due date assignment. The Service Rep clarified for Connecting Facility Assignment (CFA) already working. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised that the clarification was in error, removed the clarification, updated due date and sent a FOC providing the due date requested by the CLEC. Note: This is a Georgia transaction.	4/12/2007 @ 15:52	4/12/2007 @ 17:34	4/13/2007 @ 08:20	4/20/2007	4/20/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
14	***B***	23V00S00	Clarified for RESID not valid in LFACS: Number of loops on LFACS Reservation not equal to or exceeded by number of loops on LSR 03:55PM 04/30/07-Sfigueroa-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Clarified in error per Ms. White at LCSC, will have order pulled and worked.	The PON was auto clarified in error by the system for Facilities Reservation Number (RESID). This error has been identified as a system issue requiring a feature change per Change Request # CR2451. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised the CLEC that the clarification was in error and sent the PON for second screening and to production to be worked. The PON received a FOC on the same day as the clarification in error and the CLEC received the requested due date for the order.	4/30/2007 @ 13:06	4/30/2007 @ 15:55	4/30/2007 @ 16:54	5/8/2007	5/8/2007
15	***B***	80V01S01	Clarified for invalid ACTL 04:41PM 04/30-nfigueroa-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Called LCSC and spoke to Rosalind. Clarification was invalid. They will work it and send FOC.	This PON fell out for manual handling. The Service Rep clarified in error for 'ACTL invalid or not found'. The Access Customer Terminal Location (ACTL) identifies the CLLI code of the customer facility terminal location or designated collocation area. After receiving a call from the CLEC, a Service Rep advised that the clarification was in error and agreed to send the PON for second screening and to be worked. The PON received a FOC the next morning after the invalid clarification providing the requested due date. The Order resulted in a Missed Appointment because the service technician went to the address provided by the CLEC but the address that the CLEC provided was incorrect. The CLEC subsequently sent a supplement to the LSR (VER 01) to cancel the order.	4/30/2007 @ 09:24	4/30/2007 @ 12:38	5/1/2007 @ 09:37	5/4/2007	5/4/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
16	***B***	▬14V00S00	Clarified for 1000 0801-EUMI-Should be populated (This field for Moves only) 09:44AM 05/01/07-nfigueroa-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Called LCSC spoke to Ms. White. Clarification in error and will send FOC.	This PON could not be located in AT&T Florida's systems records.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
17	***B***	████52T01S01	Clarified for CFA Not Found, please verify 10:11AM 04/10/07-jchiarolanza-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in error Called Bellsouth LCSC to dispute Clar. And spoke with Angelique, she stated that the Tie shows apare-This is invalid clarification.	The PON was auto clarified by the system on the initial version of this LSR (VER 00) for CFA already working. This clarification was valid because the CLEC provided a CFA that was already being used on another PON – (████████). The CLEC then issued a supplement (VER 01) with a new CFA that was auto clarified by the system for 'CFA not found'. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised that the clarification was in error and sent the PON for second screening and to be worked. The PON was processed and a FOC sent to the CLEC on the same day as the clarification providing the requested due date. However, after the Service Technician went out to the end user location, the customer refused service because the CLEC already had another PON in for this customer (i.e., PON: ████████) and the customer didn't want two (2) orders. Consequently, the order had to be placed in jeopardy status. The CLEC then sent in a supplement (VER 02) to cancel this PON.	4/10/2007 @ 10:01	4/10/2007 @ 10:11	4/10/2007 @ 11:29	4/17/2007	4/17/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
18	***B***	▮▮▮82T00S00	Clarified for CFA not Found, please verify 09:43AM 04/10/07-jchiarolanza-PSC-CLARERR-Clarified in error Called BellSouth LCSC to dispute clarification and spoke with Tiffany, she stated that this is an invalid clarification-she was able to pull the tie. She is sending the LSR over to production for a second screen.	The PON was auto clarified by the system for 'CFA not found'. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised that the clarification was in error and that the PON would be second screened and worked. This PON was processed and the CLEC was provided a FOC on the same day as the clarification in error with the requested due date.	4/10/2007 @ 09:31	4/10/2007 @ 09:43	4/10/2007 @ 13:22	4/17/2007	4/17/2007
19	***B***	▮▮▮01T00S00	Clarified for CFA Not Found, please verify 05:05PM 04/06/07-jchiarolanza-UNJEP-LSRCLAR- Called BellSouth LCSC to dispute clarification and spoke with Angelique, she stated she was able to pull the tie and it shows spare. This is invalid clarification she is sending to production for second screening.	The PON was auto clarified by the system for 'CFA not found, Please verify CFA.' After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised that the clarification was in error. The PON was sent to the production group to be second screened and worked. The CLEC received a FOC and was provided the requested due data.	4/06/2007 @ 12:45	4/06/2007 @ 17:05	4/09/2007 @ 08:37	4/16/2007	4/16/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
20	***B***	27T00S00	Clarified for CFA not Found, please verify 10:28AM 04/26/07-kmahoney-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Clarification received from BellSouth;CFA not found, please verify CFA called CWINS and spoke to Kim who stated that this is an invalid clarification and will resubmit to production for a second screening.	The PON was auto clarified by the system for 'CFA not found please verify CFA.' After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised that the PON was clarified in error and that the PON would be second screened and worked. The CLEC received a FOC on the same day that the LSR was clarified in error with the CLEC requested due date.	4/26/2007 @ 07:45	4/26/2007 @ 10:28	4/26/2007 @ 11:39	5/4/2007	5/4/2007
21	***B***	99T00S00	Clarified for- Install one EEL DS1 with no MUX-Code Message G6428 the NCI Code referenced on the LSR must match the NCI code associated with the original implementation 09:11AM 03/16/07-rperez2-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Invalid Clarification: Spoke with Evelyn at LCSC. She stated that this is an invalid clarification. The order will be sent back to production.	The PON was auto clarified by the system for 'NCI code referenced on the LSR must match the NCI code associated with the original implementation of the Multiplexing arrangement.' After a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised that the LSR was clarified in error and that the PON would be second screened and worked. The CLEC received a FOC on the same day as the clarification in error.	3/16/2007 @ 08:59	3/16/2007 @ 09:11	3/16/2007 @ 11:23	3/28/2007	3/30/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
22	***B***	▇▇72V01S01	Clarified for G7380 UNE-ACTL Invalid 12:17PM 04/13/07-tnix-PSC-CLARERROR- Clarified in Error Spoke to Laura of the LCSC who advised clarification was invalid. Referred to 2nd will send for 2nd screening, awaiting FOC.	All the clarifications for this LSR, Versions 00 – 04, were auto clarified by the system for 'ACTL not on AN ACTL' and were valid clarifications. The ACTL or Access Customer Terminal Location identifies the CLLI code of the customer facility terminal location or designated collocation area. The AN or Account Number identifies the main account number assigned by the NSP. The LCSC Service Reps discussed with several CLEC reps that the ACTL that they provided was not on the BAN (▇▇▇▇▇). When this error occurs, the LCSC Service Rep cannot tell the CLEC whether the ACTL is incorrect or the BAN is incorrect. The Service Rep can only advise that the ACTL the CLEC provided is not a valid ACTL on the BAN. The CLEC would then need to check its ACTL and/or BAN to determine which is the correct one to use. The CLEC ultimately realized that it should have typed the BAN as (▇▇▇▇▇). The CLEC corrected this error on Version 06 (skipped Version 05) and the LSR flowed-through providing the CLEC a FOC.	4/11/2007 @ 12:04	4/13/2007 @ 12:17	4/18/2007 @ 08:31	4/20/2007	4/25/2007
23	***B***	▇▇59V00S00	Clarified for Pending Service Order exists 08:56AM 05/04/07-csykes-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Per Lynn w/LCSC, states she did not see any pending order either, recent or otherwise will send for 2nd screening, awaiting FOC.	This PON fell out for manual handling. The Service Rep clarified for 'Pending Service Order Exists'. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep indicated a pending service order did not appear and that the PON would be sent to production, second screened and worked. The CLEC received a FOC the next day after the clarification in error with the requested due date. However, the CLEC sent in a supplement (VER 01) and cancelled the PON and order.	5/3/2007 @ 15:30	5/3/2007 @ 16:10	5/4/2007 @ 11:48	5/25/2007	5/25/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
24	***B***	34V01S01	Clarified for Code Message G9686 RESDID not valid in LFACS 02:15PM 03/22/07- dthompson-PSC- CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Called LCSC, spoke with Alaine. She stated that's an invalid clarification. She will refer to production group.	The PON was auto clarified in error by the system for RESID. This error has been identified as a system issue requiring a feature change per Change Request # CR2451. The LCSC received a call from the CLEC regarding this clarification. The LCSC Service Rep advised that the clarification was in error and that the PON would be forwarded to production for second screening and to be worked. The CLEC received a FOC on the same day as the clarification in error and the CLEC requested due date was provided on the FOC.

Note: This is a Georgia transaction. | 3/22/2007 @ 12:19 | 3/22/2007 @ 14:15 | 3/22/2007 @ 15:03 | 3/30/2007 | 3/29/2007 |
| 25 | ***B*** | 15V00S00 | Clarified for Code Message G9686 RESDID not valid in LFACS: Number of Loops on LFACS reservation not equal to or exceeded by number of loops on LSR. 01:37PM 03/14/07- cchampman-PSC- CLARERROR- Clarified in error Called LCSC spoke with Ms. White who send to 2nd screening. Clarified in error. | The PON was auto clarified in error by the system for RESID. This error has been identified as a system issue requiring a feature change per Change Request # CR2451. The LCSC received a call from the CLEC and the Service Rep advised that the clarification was in error. The PON was sent to production, second screened and worked. The FOC was returned to the CLEC on the same day as the clarification in error and provided the CLEC's requested due date. However, the order resulted in a Missed Appointment due to No Access. The CLEC then sent in Version 01 of the LSR to assign a new due date on 3/22/07 and received a FOC the same day, providing the requested due date. | 3/14/2007 @ 11:00 | 3/14/2007 @ 11:01 | 3/14/2007 @ 12:00 | 3/22/2007 | 3/22/2007 |

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
26	***B***	▮▮▮15V00S00	Clarified for MISC account Not Valid 05:19PM 03/20/07-Sfigueroa-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Per Norma at LCSC this clarification was not valid as there wasn't anything wrong with that MACCT.	This PON fell out for manual handling. The Service Rep clarified for 'Miscellaneous (MISC) account Not Valid'. The LCSC Service Rep spoke with the CLEC and advised that the clarification was in error. The LSR was second screened, referred to production and worked. The CLEC was provided a FOC with the requested due date. PON completed.	3/20/2007 @ 12:56	3/20/2007 @ 14:57	3/21/2007 @ 12:12	3/27/2007	3/27/2007
27	***B***	▮▮▮47T00S00	Clarified for Code Message 1000 1209-Address-Room Field Incorrect 12:10PM 04/03/07-jchiarolanza-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Called BellSouth LCSC in regards to this clarification and spoke with Evalyn, she stated that the address does validate she is sending to production for a second screening.	This PON fell out for manual handling and the Service Rep clarified for the Address. After receiving a call from the CLEC, the Service Rep advised the CLEC that the clarification was in error. The PON was sent to production to be second screened and worked. The CLEC was provided a FOC on the same day as the clarification in error with the requested due date. PON completed. Note: This is a Georgia transaction.	4/02/2007 @ 15:15	4/03/07 @ 09:41	4/03/2007 @ 12:28	4/10/2007	4/10/2007

ITEM NO.	CLEC	PON	CLEC REMARKS	AT&T COMMENTS	DATE LSR RECEIVED	DATE/TIME CLARIFIED	DATE FOC RETURNED	CLEC REQUESTED DUE DATE	DUE DATE PROVIDED TO CLEC
28	***B***	31V01S01	Clarified for Code Message 1000 1201 Street Name-Incorrect/Or not RSAG Valid. 04:38PM 04/19/07-tnix-PSC-CLARERROR-Clarified in Error Spoke with Angelique of the LCSC who advised clarification was invalid. Referred to screening. FOC pending.	This is the same PON identified as Item No. 8.	See Item 8	See Item 8	See Item 8	See Item 8	See Item 8

Item	CLEC	PON	Message	AT&T Florida Comments
29	***C***	▮82	Error String: L9485 : CONVERSION DISALLOWED. ADSL IS PRESENT ON ACCOUNT. Response Type: NF Response Date: 5/17/2007 11:58 Technology Type: ADSL2+	This is not a clarification error. The response is an informational message to advise the CLEC that the Account has DSL on the line. If they still want to move forward with the conversion, they simply resend the PON. Resending the PON will cause the DSL to be removed and the conversion will proceed as scheduled.
30	***C***	▮71	Error String: L9485 : CONVERSION DISALLOWED. ADSL IS PRESENT ON ACCOUNT. Response Type: NF Response Date: 5/17/2007 7:54 Technology Type: ADSL2+	This is not a clarification error. The response is an informational message to advise the CLEC that the Account has DSL on the line. If they still want to move forward with the conversion, they simply resend the PON. Resending the PON will cause the DSL to be removed and the conversion will proceed as scheduled.
31	***C***	▮71	Error String: L9485 : CONVERSION DISALLOWED. ADSL IS PRESENT ON ACCOUNT. Response Type: NF Response Date: 5/2/2007 9:19 Technology Type: ADSL2+	This is not a clarification error. The response is an informational message to advise the CLEC that the Account has DSL on the line. If they still want to move forward with the conversion, they simply resend the PON. Resending the PON will cause the DSL to be removed and the conversion will proceed as scheduled.
32	***C***	▮55	Error String: L9485 : CONVERSION DISALLOWED. ADSL IS PRESENT ON ACCOUNT. Response Type: NF Response Date: 5/16/2007 13:44 Technology Type: ADSL2+	This is not a clarification error. The response is an informational message to advise the CLEC that the Account has DSL on the line. If they still want to move forward with the conversion, they simply resend the PON. Resending the PON will cause the DSL to be removed and the conversion will proceed as scheduled.
33	***C***	▮14	Error String: L9485 : CONVERSION DISALLOWED. ADSL IS PRESENT ON ACCOUNT. Response Type: NF Response Date: 5/16/2007 14:08 Technology Type: ADSL2+	This is not a clarification error. The response is an informational message to advise the CLEC that the Account has DSL on the line. If they still want to move forward with the conversion, they simply resend the PON. Resending the PON will cause the DSL to be removed and the conversion will proceed as scheduled.
34	***C***	▮99	Error String: L9485 : CONVERSION DISALLOWED. ADSL IS PRESENT ON ACCOUNT. Response Type: NF Response Date: 5/17/2007 13:03 Technology Type: ADSL2+	This is not a clarification error. The response is an informational message to advise the CLEC that the Account has DSL on the line. If they still want to move forward with the conversion, they simply resend the PON. Resending the PON will cause the DSL to be removed and the conversion will proceed as scheduled.
35	***C***	▮16	Error String: L9485 : CONVERSION DISALLOWED. ADSL IS PRESENT ON ACCOUNT. Response Type: NF Response Date: 5/11/2007 13:33 Technology Type: ADSL2+	This is not a clarification error. The response is an informational message to advise the CLEC that the Account has DSL on the line. If they still want to move forward with the conversion, they simply resend the PON. Resending the PON will cause the DSL to be removed and the conversion will proceed as scheduled.