

**AT&T PON: NYCY9900199**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Outside plant problem.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously agreed that the outage was the result of a BA provisioning error, and agreed to treat the outage as an I-code. The outage resulted from a BA outside facilities problem.

**Staff Response:**

This hot cut involved 11 lines and was provisioned on June 18. AT&T's Hot Cut Log contains a June 18 entry @ 6:54 mountain time, which states, "tested voice mail over 9 lines and fax over 2 lines called [individual's name and extension at BA] and let him know cut went well."

AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log notes that the trouble was fixed at the customer's premises. The lines had dial tone until June 21. Therefore, this trouble does not appear to have been related to the hot cut.

This order is an example of BA properly scoring an I-code for a trouble that was not related to hot cut provisioning activity.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9904203**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

BA and AT&T had agreed that this order was a miss in August due to a late notification of completion. Quote from AT&T log, "this customer's lines are up and working only issue is static on line" dated August 6, 1999 at 16:11.

A technician from Urban (an AT&T contractor) had advised AT&T of no dial tone coming from the AT&T switch, but the technician was testing the wrong pair. A post hot cut test call reached the customer, so this could not be a case of a "network terminating wire not hooked up" as claimed by AT&T.

AT&T's allegation that this trouble could not have occurred except as a result of the hot cut is false – this appears to be an underground facilities problem.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9905247**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:**

Questionable. Telephone numbers were reversed. AT&T swapped in the switch to bring customer up: not clear who was right.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

There were two lines in this order, which was scheduled for July 9, 1999. AT&T was notified on June 28 that there was no dial tone on either line. As part of that notification, the AT&T and BA representatives verified that their cable and pair information matched. BA notified AT&T on June 29 that AT&T had the wrong dial tone on the lines. The documentation indicates that AT&T's translations were built incorrectly.

On July 12, the customer reported that his lines were ringing backwards. AT&T notes indicate that AT&T corrected the lines in the AT&T switch. However, the log is not clear about whether the July 12 switch of lines was the first change AT&T made, or whether AT&T had made a switch when notified by BA on June 29.

In summary, this could have been either a BA provisioning error or an error in the AT&T Local Service Request.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9905465**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Not clear from notes which side had problems.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

The main line of a four-line order went out of service after the cut, while AT&T was working on a hunt-group for this customer. The customer elected to return to BA local service, so the source of the problem was never determined. AT&T Hot Cut Log notes are incomplete on this order, so it is difficult to reconstruct the chronology of events.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9905521**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August\*

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log\*

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA notified of problem 8/2 @ 15:35, closed 8/3@ 8:32 NTF.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This was a five-line order, due July 30, 1999. Four lines tested ok, but on August 2 the customer was having trouble faxing on the fifth line. AT&T notes indicated that AT&T test calls received a fax tone on this line before and after the hot cut. Since neither AT&T nor BA took any corrective action, yet the line was found OK on August 3, the alleged trouble cannot be attributed to BA.

\* For the August order review, BA provided a WFA log documenting that PON NYCY9905521 was completed on 8/9, and Staff therefore scored that order as met. It appears that BA had the incorrect PON on the WFA log, and therefore on its metric report. Because BA completed the order in a timely manner, Staff scored that order as met. However, that documentation was not used in this review as it clearly did not pertain to the order in question here.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9905672**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** no

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Not clear what the problem was.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error.

**Staff Response:**

Staff agrees with AT&T's analysis related to this order. The documentation indicates that the customer could not receive calls when AT&T ported the number because BA failed to perform the required frame work on one line of the order. The customer then lost dial tone during the snap-back to BA. BA's failure to perform frame work was a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9905848**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, BA WFA Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Notes indicate problem with underground facility.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff agrees with AT&T that the trouble on this order was the result of a hot cut provisioning problem. The documentation initially indicates that an outside plant problem existed. However, further review indicates that BA cut the wrong pair, and put the customer out of service while trying to correct a "cannot be called" condition through an outside plant repair.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9905921**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

There were multiple problems with these lines, including hunting, voice mail (AT&T problems), and outside plant (BA facilities problems).

AT&T did not have Harris testing capability for the lines, and it is not clear what the BA technician did to correct the outside plant problem. This is not an IDLC conversion, so the outside plant problems would not have been related to the hot cut.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906086**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA notified 7/8 @ 13:23;  
trouble 8/9 @ 12:22.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

The hot cut associated with this order was performed on July 1, 1999. AT&T opened a trouble ticket on July 2 because AT&T received ring no answer when attempting to telephone the customer. AT&T did not perform a Harris test to check the line on July 2.

The customer contacted AT&T on July 7 and reported a "ring no answer" condition and intermittent dial tone. AT&T logs indicate that only about 75% of calls were getting through.

AT&T's allegation that the lines in question were never ported, or were disconnected, is not consistent with AT&T documentation, because such conditions would not allow any calls to be completed.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906230**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Logs, AT&T Hot Cut Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA notified 7/12, and closed ticket 7/14, customer said problem was CPE.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T's documentation indicates that the trouble ticket associated with this hot cut was closed, "customer prem equipment needed reset, all lines working."

AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log states, "[customer name] called back. No problems. Problem was evidently with their system, because they reset their computer system, and when the BA tech came out last night he found no problems. Closing ticket."

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906308**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Hot Cut Log, NPAC printout, LSRC, LSR, BA WFA Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff previously determined this order was a BA provisioning error. AT&T raised two complaints about the same issue. This duplicate should be deleted.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906364**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** no

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T ring generator problem, AT&T switch problem, and bad BA underground facilities all played a role in this.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

The customer was cut over on June 28, 1999. AT&T's test calls got "ring no answer," but on June 29 the customer verified that the hot cut "went OK," and AT&T issued index number 171. Later that day, the customer reported that he could not be called.

AT&T's contractor found what he believed to be a bad underground cable, but AT&T also had a ring generator failure and the customer's line was removed from the AT&T switch. According to the documentation, a BA technician found no trouble with the BA facilities.

This order did not involve IDLC, and, therefore, any underground facilities problem would not have been a hot cut provisioning failure. The most likely cause of the customer outage was that AT&T tried to "snap-back" the customer to BA due to the AT&T ring generator failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906365**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** no

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This hot cut is changed from "Questionable" to "Not BA Provisioning error."

This was a three line order due on July 22, 1999. According to AT&T's log entry on July 22 @ 16:27, "made test calls rec'd fax tone on [telephone number] called other numbers spoke to lady she said all OK to close." AT&T provided index number 232 indicating acceptance of cut.

On July 23, customer reported no dial tone on two lines. Although AT&T's log states that BA cleared trouble tickets, there is no detail provided as to what the problem or the resolution was. AT&T's affidavit notes suggest an outside facility problem, which could not have been related to hot cut provisioning as this was not an IDLC conversion.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906375**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, LSR, LSRC, BA WFA Log, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA Provisioning error. Reviewed in 2<sup>nd</sup> reconciliation; cut ok.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

BA documented (in both the WFA Log and on the Hot Cut Checklist) a turn-up call to AT&T. AT&T claims that it never received the call, and therefore did not port the number. This customer was out of service (could not receive calls) because AT&T did not perform its required activities.

Although AT&T's log documents that AT&T personnel were aware that the hot cut would take place at noon on July 23,<sup>1</sup> the AT&T records do not show the go/no go call or the completion notification from BA, while BA documented both calls. Even if AT&T did not receive any of these calls, AT&T should have called BA for a status report.

---

<sup>1</sup> In fact, the records indicate that AT&T had provided this information to its customer on July 22.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906438**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation: June**

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 1<sup>st</sup> reconciliation; post-completion trouble, BA dispatched tech multiple times with no access before trouble finally resolved.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Contrary to AT&T's representation, there is no indication in the documentation provided to Staff that the problem was due to BA underground facilities. In fact, AT&T's log documents that the "out" trouble ticket AT&T opened with BA was closed due to no access to the customer's premises. AT&T called the line<sup>2</sup> and confirmed that it was working. There clearly was no problem associated with the hot cut.

---

<sup>2</sup> AT&T did not have Harris test capability on this line.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906483**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA notified 7/12, closed 7/21.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

This one line order was cut over on July 1, 1999. AT&T did not accept the cut on July 1 because test calls received a ring no answer. However, AT&T reached the customer's AT&T voice mail on July 2 and issued index number 312.

AT&T's trouble log indicates that BA switched a bad underground cable and pair. This order did not involve IDLC, so it could not have been a hot cut provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906599**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff agrees with AT&T. Further review of the documentation indicates a problem with outside plant due to conversion from IDLC. [Note: AT&T November 19, 1999 analysis does not appear to pertain to this order.]

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906600**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** LSR, LSRC, AT&T Trouble Ticket Taster Tog, AT&T Hot Cut Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; according to AT&T's logs, line tested ok and then didn't work later in the day.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an I-code.

**Staff Response:**

Staff's review confirms original conclusion – AT&T tested and accepted the hot cut. The logs are inconclusive as to whether there was any problem, and if so, how it was fixed. On August 11 @ 11:50, AT&T log notes customer's fax machine was off due to recent electrical problems.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906604**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation: June**

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 1<sup>st</sup> reconciliation; cust. Had retail trouble on 6/29, activated call forwarding to avoid; trouble was cleared as bad underground 6/30, cut ok 7/2.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

The trouble reported on this line was that the customer could make calls, but could not receive calls, on June 29, 1999. The cut over to AT&T was scheduled for July 2, 1999.

According to AT&T's log, the AT&T representative had the customer dial "00" to determine whether the line had been moved to AT&T prematurely. When the customer reached an AT&T operator, the AT&T representative incorrectly concluded that the line had indeed been cut prematurely. However, dialing "00" reaches the customer's pre-subscribed long-distance operator, not the local operator.

As described in Staff's original analysis, there was a retail trouble on this line that preceded the hot cut due date. The line was cut without incident on the due date.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906632**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No.

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, NPAC printout, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA notified 7/19, ticket closed 7/19.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error.

**Staff Response:**

Staff agrees with AT&T. Further review of the documentation indicates that this was a premature disconnect.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906772**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSRC, LSR, BA BA WFA log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA repaired wire per AT&T log.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T.

**Staff Response:**

As discussed in Staff's initial affidavit, a score of I-code in the data reconciliations was merely an acknowledgement that a problem existed, not a finding of fault during a hot cut. In this case the problem was a "30<sup>th</sup> Street wiring problem," according to AT&T. Although the 30<sup>th</sup> Street wiring problem affected a number of AT&T's orders, Staff has not been able to determine whose wiring was defective in the 30<sup>th</sup> Street office. Therefore, the score of "questionable" remains.

Although AT&T is correct that the problem would not have occurred absent a hot cut, a conclusion that the fault lies with BA is not supported.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906851**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA ticket closed 7/12 due to no access, trouble was cleared 7/16.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T log indicates that this customer had cross-talk problems on her line prior to the hot cut. BA performed this cut on July 9. AT&T log notes, on July 9 @ 12:37, indicate "a good cut. I tested all 6 lines with [customer's name], customer." AT&T provided index number 129.

The customer later reported trouble (a buzzing noise) on the same line that had trouble before the hot cut. The trouble was closed at a BA outside facility problem, and was not related to the hot cut.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906876**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA notified 7/19, corrected problem 7/19.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

There is not enough information in the documentation to determine whether the trouble was caused by a BA hot-cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9906997**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation: June**

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, BA WFA Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 1<sup>st</sup> reconciliation; AT&T was notified on 6/30 of 3 lines that couldn't be ported (coded terminals), told BA to proceed anyway.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T's complaint is that three lines did not get ported. However, as the original Staff analysis noted, AT&T was notified on June 30 (for a hot cut with a due date of July 13) that the telephone numbers were associated with coded terminals and could not be ported. An AT&T representative requested that BA proceed with the cut anyway, and BA did so.

AT&T's affidavit claim that only two telephone numbers were auxiliary trunks is not consistent with AT&T's own Trouble Ticket Master Log, which states "3 lines not portable," and "new order being placed for three new TCG lines out of 10<sup>th</sup> [10<sup>th</sup> Street TCG switch] per customer request to replace missing BA dial tone."

This is another example of an order with an outage that AT&T claims "could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T," but where the fault lies entirely with AT&T.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907004**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA closed ticket to CPE.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error.

**Staff Response:**

The documentation provided does not contain enough information to identify the source of the problem. BA closed the trouble ticket to CPE, but may have done some work at the customer's premises. There is no indication that this order was an IDLC conversion, so an outside facility problem is not a likely cause of one line ringing to the wrong telephone number. The problem could possibly be a local number portability issue, but does not appear to be related to hot cut provisioning.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907034**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** LSR, LSRC, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 1<sup>st</sup> reconciliation; trouble 7/1 was retail svc (static, cross talk), BA replaced drop wire 7/2, cut ok 7/9.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This customer was scheduled to cut over to AT&T on July 9, 1999. The customer reported static on his line on July 1. As noted in Staff's earlier analysis, the static was a retail trouble and was eliminated when BA replaced a drop wire on July 2. The hot cut proceeded as scheduled on July 9.

AT&T's affidavit suggests its notes are "consistent with early cut." However, a premature disconnect would have resulted in a loss of either incoming or outgoing service, not static on the line. There is nothing in AT&T's logs to indicate that even AT&T's technicians treated this as an early cut.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907062**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T reported NDT 1 on one line after cut, BA installed new drop and interface block.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

BA's outside plant had to be replaced. This was not an IDLC conversion, and, therefore, not a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907102**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA was notified 7/12 @ 12:28; trouble cleared 7/13 @ 14:59.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

This order did not involve an IDLC conversion. BA dispatched out and cleared the trouble, although it is not clear from the documentation what the problem was. The trouble was not likely to be a hot cut provisioning failure as it was cleared in the field.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907112**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, LSR, LSRC, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 1<sup>st</sup> reconciliation; cust. Reported NDT to AT&T on 7/16, but ticket was closed no trouble found, this order was cut ok 7/23.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

As stated in Staff's previous analysis, AT&T's trouble ticket, which pre-dated the hot cut, was closed with no trouble found. There is no evidence in the documentation of a premature disconnect.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907129**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA notified of problem 7/17, fixed 7/20.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

This order did not involve an IDLC conversion. The trouble was resolved after BA dispatched a technician to the field. Although it is not clear what the problem was, or how it was resolved, it was not likely to be associated with the hot cut provisioning process.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907156**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. No documentation provided by AT&T.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T provided a trouble ticket log for a duplicate ticket, but did not provide the log for the ticket with activity. The AT&T hot cut log is also incomplete. Staff is unable to determine what happened on this order.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907170**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA notified 7/13, fixed 7/14.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Upon further review of the documentation, Staff believes that the scoring of this hot cut should change from "Questionable" to "Not BA Provisioning error."

This one line order was cut on July 12, 1999. AT&T notes state, "tested lines over all carriers...good cut." AT&T provided index number 239.

The customer reported no dial tone on July 13. AT&T log indicates that BA had cross-connects wrong on the frame. If this were true, AT&T would have been unable to obtain a "test OK" result on the day of the hot cut.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907262**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 1<sup>st</sup> reconciliation; AT&T logs don't clearly demonstrate any problems with this cut.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

The score of "Met/I-Code" in Staff's July reconciliation was not correct. BA provisioned this hot cut on time, and there was no I-code, because AT&T did not open a trouble ticket with BA, which is necessary to create an I-code.

As noted in the original Staff analysis, AT&T's logs do not demonstrate a problem with this cut. Instead, AT&T provided index number 192, which would indicate that the cut was accepted by the responsible AT&T representative.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907263**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June, July

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, NPAC printout, LSR, LSRC

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Underground problem.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

The problem on this line was a humming sound and cross talk, which was attributed by AT&T to a BA underground facility problem. This order did not involve an IDLC conversion. A fault in underground facilities, which do not change with the hot cut, would not be a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907293**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, BA WFA-C, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

In this instance, the trouble reported was a "ring no answer." AT&T notes indicate that the cause was wires crossing and causing a short. However, Staff did not believe that the AT&T statement, absent other information, was sufficient to conclude that BA was at fault, or that the problem was the result of a hot cut provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907336**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, LSR, LSRC, BA WFA Log, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 2<sup>nd</sup> reconciliation; no evidence of early cut – may be retail trouble.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error.

**Staff Response:**

The customer lost dial tone on one line for a few hours on July 19, 1999. The hot cut was scheduled for July 30. The order was for three lines. As stated in Staff's original analysis, there is no evidence in the documentation of a premature disconnect.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907374**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** June

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA notified 7/26, cleared 7/27.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T's "previous Staff score" note is incorrect. Staff scored this order as a miss due to BA's failure to provision the order on the July 16 due date.

The documentation provided does not clearly define the problem. AT&T's Trouble Ticket Master Log states, "disco message on local calls was due to the fact that LRN was not in SCP. Fixed by LNP group. BA VM was corrected by BA removing translations."

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907432**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA notified 7/20 @ 11:06, closed 7/20 @ 13:11 as NTF.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

BA trouble tickets were closed with no trouble found. No further relevant information is included in the documentation.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907435**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 2<sup>nd</sup> reconciliation; late completion was due to BA escalating within AT&T after encountering AT&T voice mail.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service

**Staff Response:**

AT&T's trouble ticket log states, "trouble was opened due to one line having a trouble symptom. The line was tested and the customer was in service on that line." AT&T provided index number 160 to BA.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907504**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Lot, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Alarm system (CPE) caused problem.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service

**Staff Response:**

According to AT&T's trouble log, "[technician name] found the problem and it was due to the CUSTOMER'S ALARM LINE (emphasis in original) causing the SHORT CIRCUIT CONDITION THE ALARM LINE WAS REMOVED (emphasis in original) and the line normalized the customer will have to contact the alarm co. he deals with and restore the alarm. All lines are up and the problem is now resolved."

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907569**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation: July**

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. According to AT&T's own log, the customer experienced outage "for a short time;" log shows less than 1 day; issue was static, not out of svc.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

This order was for a three line cut, scheduled for July 20, 1999. AT&T's log indicates that after the cut "lines were working fine." AT&T provided index number 239.

Subsequent to the cut, on July 20, AT&T's trouble ticket log states, "customer experienced outage for a short time Bell sz [says] they did nothing ALS [AT&T Local Services] did nothing." There are subsequent complaints of hum on July 21 and July 23, which appear to have been cleared by a BA dispatch to repair outside plant. This problem would not have been related to the hot cut provisioning process, as this order did not involve an IDLC conversion.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907665**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; cut ok, AT&T provided index number accepting cut; 3<sup>rd</sup> line wasn't part of order, should be retail trouble.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T.

**Staff Response:**

Staff and AT&T do not disagree on the facts surrounding this order. BA cut a customer's third line, when AT&T was requesting only two lines. Since BA cut a line that still belonged to BA, the trouble would be properly recorded as a retail trouble.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907687**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No.

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, NPAC printout, LSR

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Cut ok 8/31.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

According to AT&T log, customer reported no dial tone on August 30, but it is clear that BA did not perform the hot cut until August 31, and test calls reached the customer prior to BA performing the hot cut. In addition, AT&T originally had the wrong Local Routing Number assigned to this order. When AT&T corrected the Local Routing Number, the line tested OK.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907696**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 2<sup>nd</sup> reconciliation; pre-existing problem.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

According to the BA WFA log, AT&T reported that the customer was getting cross-talk. The BA frame technician indicated that the problem existed before the throw (the technician would have tested the line prior to cut over and may have heard the cross-talk). It is not clear how the problem was resolved, but a pre-existing condition is not a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907709**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T's log shows cut and tested ok on due date; subsequent trouble with 1 line.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This was a six-line order, due on July 22, 1999. AT&T hot cut log notes on July 22 state, "good cut, tested all lines all carriers ok." AT&T provided index number 79, and noted "got customer on all lines and fax tone on one."

AT&T reported a subsequent trouble on one line (ring no answer on July 24). AT&T's notes indicate this line was still with BA, but this cannot be accurate, since AT&T successfully tested all lines on July 22.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907739**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation: July**

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 2<sup>nd</sup> reconciliation; AT&T order was 2 lines, trouble was with 3<sup>rd</sup> line – should be retail trouble.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T.

**Staff Response:**

Staff and AT&T do not disagree on the facts surrounding this order. BA cut a customer's third line, when AT&T was requesting only two lines. Since BA disconnected a line that still belonged to BA, the trouble would be properly recorded as a retail trouble.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907789**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** LSR, LSRC, BA WFA Log, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 2<sup>nd</sup> reconciliation; no evidence of early cut.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This customer was scheduled to be cut over on July 23. On July 22, the customer reported that he could not receive calls. AT&T's trouble ticket notes tht BA removed translations early. If this were the case, the customer would have lost dial tone, but not incoming service.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907856**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 2<sup>nd</sup> reconciliation; AT&T tried to supp this order after the cut was complete; cut ok 7/26.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T's notes, that AT&T sent a supplemental order on July 23 to change the due date to August 9, are misleading. AT&T submitted a supplemental order on July 23, which was rejected due to an AT&T error. The error was not corrected until after the due date. The hot cut was performed as originally scheduled, on July 26. The corrected supplement was re-submitted on July 27 @ 5:21 pm. BA sent a query back on the supplement stating, "this cut was due 7/26...you can't change the dd after the dd has past."

Although AT&T claims this order was cut without notice, BA's WFA Log and Hot Cut Checklist document both "go-ahead" and "turn-up" calls to AT&T.

The customer appears to have had a trouble on a line not involved in the cut, but neither AT&T nor BA provided any documentation of the problem.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907876**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Cut 7/26, noise called in on 7/28; cust also had hunting problem (AT&T's) that may have caused busy signals.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This eight-line order was cut on July 26, and did not involve IDLC. BA was late in completing the order (and therefore scored this as a miss in the Carrier to Carrier metric). However, when the cut was completed, AT&T tested the lines and provided index number 403.

The customer reported two troubles to AT&T on July 28 – noise on the line, and busy signals when callers tried to reach the customer. The busy signals were the result of an AT&T provisioning error with a hunt group. The noise may have been due to a BA outside plant problem (BA was dispatched out, but there was not disposition code noted when the trouble report was closed). However, since this was not an IDLC conversion, an outside plant problem would not be a hot cut provisioning error. Noise on the line is not an “out-of-service” condition. The loss of incoming service is attributable solely to the AT&T provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9907937**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; “trouble” was no AT&T voice mail.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T’s documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA’s attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T’s documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Although AT&T alleges that Staff did not review all available information, AT&T noted on the information provided to Staff that there was no AT&T trouble ticket associated with this order.

This order is an excellent example of a trouble report that “could not have occurred except as a result of BA’s attempted hot cut to AT&T,” but where the trouble was entirely the fault of AT&T.

This line was cut on August 6, 1999. AT&T tested the line prior to the cut and received voice mail, then tested the line after the cut and got ring no answer. As noted in AT&T’s log, the customer had BA voice mail prior to the cut, but AT&T neglected to provision its own voice mail for the customer after the cut.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908006**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** July

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, NPAC printout, LSR, LSRC, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Per AT&T log, BA replaced defective wire terminal cable.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

Upon further review of the documentation, Staff believes that the scoring of this hot cut should change from "Questionable" to "Not BA provisioning error."

This was a six-line order, and did not involve IDLC. According to AT&T's hot cut log, there was a trouble on one line (a fax line). AT&T's log notes that "BA replaced defective wiring" at the customer's demarcation point. As this was not an IDLC conversion, this cannot be considered a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908010**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Cut accepted ok 7/28, BA later notified of a problem; fixed within 1 hour of notice.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

As noted in Staff's initial analysis, AT&T accepted this cut on the scheduled due date – July 28, 1999, and provided index number 143. On July 29, the customer reported a trouble with voice mail, and no dial tone on one line.<sup>3</sup> AT&T opened a trouble ticket with BA on July 29 @ 16:19, and on July 29 @ 17:03 AT&T was able to complete test calls to both lines. AT&T's notes that the lines were never punched down by BA are inconsistent with the other notes that the lines went down after initial testing.

AT&T made several provisioning failures with this order, including voice mail, hunting, and the failure to activate one telephone number until the day after the hot cut.

---

<sup>3</sup> The customer subsequently lost dial tone on a second line.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908056**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Cut ok 8/16 per AT&T log; cust. Couldn't receive calls 8/19 due to LNP problem; BA notified 8/20 @ 8:00, problem fixed 8/20 @ 8:26.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This customer's line was cut properly on August 16, 1999. BA recorded a miss on this order because the order was completed late. AT&T's allegations that the loops, "did not work as initially provisioned," are false. The subsequent Local Number Portability problem was not a provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908074**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master, AT&T Hot Cut Logs

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Cut and tested ok 8/9; trouble called in to BA 8/12.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T is incorrect that this order was not reported on the August 1999 Carrier to Carrier report. BA scored this order as met, while AT&T scored it as an I-code. Therefore, Staff did not review this order in the reconciliation of *PR 4-06 - % On Time Performance – Hot Cut*.

According to the AT&T log, the customer was ported on August 9, 1999 with no problems. The customer complained about cross-talk on August 12. Both BA and Urban (an AT&T contractor) dispatched on August 17, and the problem was corrected that day.

Finally, AT&T alleges that it had been escalating this problem for "8 days," but the trouble was initially called in on August 12 and was fixed by August 17.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908140**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Lines tested ok after cut; cust. Reported NDT on 8/2, BA closed NTF.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This was a two-line order, cut on July 30, 1999. According to BA's Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T informed BA that the customer was not home to receive test calls. AT&T reached the customer on July 31 and confirmed that "all lines are fine."

On August 2, the customer reported no dial tone on one line. AT&T opened tickets for both lines, but both were closed with no trouble found. Test calls on August 3 reached the customer, who verified that the line was ok.

Since the lines tested ok after the hot cut, this would not be a hot cut provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908142**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log,  
AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T accepted cut ok 7/30,  
reported NDT on 8/2, BA closed NTF.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This was a two-line order, cut over to AT&T on July 30. AT&T tested and accepted the cut (AT&T log has index number 21, BA log has index number 31).

The customer reported no dial tone on one line on August 2 (an ATM line). This line was apparently repaired by BA on August 4 after a dispatch out. Since this was not an IDLC conversion, an outside facility problem would not be considered a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908174**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, SOP G4, BA WFA Log (it appears that there was a second BA service order ID that was not provided)

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T didn't send trouble ticket until 9/2, line tested ok 9/2.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T ported this number on August 30, 1999, but there was no apparent notice from BA that the line had been cut. In fact, the line had not been cut as evidenced by the fact that the customer had dial tone, but could not receive calls. AT&T's assertion that the disconnect order was worked in error is not supported by the documentation, since execution of the disconnect order would have caused the customer to lose dial tone.

BA did the cut over on September 2, 1999, and the customer's service was fully restored.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908220**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Not clear whose fault, cust. Had svc. on both lines.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

It is not clear from the documentation whether BA or AT&T had the pairs reversed. BA scored this order as a miss because of a late completion, not because BA had a provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908270**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Not clear what the problem was.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, but does not assign responsibility.

It is not clear from any of the documentation what the problem was. The customer ended up "snapped back" to BA, so no resolution was found for the trouble. Although AT&T criticizes Staff for not reviewing all available information concerning the customer outage, AT&T does not provide any identification of the problem.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908346**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

This order did not involve IDLC, and, therefore, the hot cut did not involve any outside facilities work. The customer was served by the same outside facilities both before and after the cut. The documentation indicates that service was restored when BA located and repaired a defective underground cable. Because there may have been another problem causing the no-dial tone condition, Staff scored this order as questionable.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908378**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA notified 8/9, trouble cleared 8/10 defective wire terminal.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

BA repaired defective wire terminal at the customer's premises. This order did not involve IDLC. Therefore, the outside plant problem was not caused by the hot cut activity. Staff scored this as questionable, but it is fairly clear that this was not a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908448**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, NPAC printout, BA BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA was notified of problem on 8/23; BA tech showed up 8/23 and was told there was no problem; dispatched again 8/24 and problem cleared.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

Staff scored this as questionable because the AT&T log is not clear as to what the problem was. According to the AT&T Hot Cut Log, the customer had dial tone, but could not receive calls. According to the AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, the customer could receive calls, but could not make outgoing calls.

This order did not involve IDLC. The trouble was corrected after a dispatch to outside plant. The documentation indicates that this was not a hot cut provisioning problem, but does not clearly indicate what the problem was. AT&T log summary states, "dispatched Bell out; customer's fax line fixed, no information given by BA network as to what the problem was."

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908492**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA defective cable and AT&T hunting error.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

The documentation indicates that there were two problems associated with these lines. AT&T had a hunting problem, and BA had a defective cable, which was repaired at the demarcation point. Because this was an IDLC conversion, Staff agrees that this should be scored as a BA hot cut provisioning error.

The AT&T log also indicates that the customer did not authorize the switch to AT&T local service. Generally, AT&T calls the customer prior to the due date to confirm the order and to ask the customer if there were any problems with the line. However, the AT&T documentation indicates that, in this case, the customer was faxed the confirmation instead.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908558**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Changed pairs.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

This problem was resolved by changing pairs on the frame. With the information provided, Staff can not determine whose facilities were at fault. Therefore, Staff scored this as questionable.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908568**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Bad underground pair.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Further review of the documentation indicates that this hot cut involved IDLC. Therefore, the defective underground pair in the outside facilities is a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908596**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, BA WFA Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Wiring problem.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code. AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

This was a two line order, cut on August 10, 1999. AT&T made test calls and got a fax tone on one line, ring no answer on the other line. There was apparently no Harris test performed. The customer reported lost dial done on August 12.

Service was restored on August 13 after a dispatch out (AT&T's notes indicate block bridal wire). Although this was not an IDLC conversion and therefore an outside plant failure would not be a hot cut provisioning failure, it appears that another problem may also have existed in this case. Because the documentation does not allow a determination as to whether another problem existed or what the problem might have been, Staff scored this as "Questionable."

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908628**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:**

Not BA provisioning error. Cut with no problem 8/11; on 8/23 no dialtone reported to BA @ 22:15, restored 8/24 @ 13:29; not clear if problem was on BA side.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This was a six line order, cut over and accepted by AT&T on August 11, 1999. AT&T hot cut log states, " lines tested good over all carriers."

On August 23, the customer called to report no dial tone on one line, and callers getting ring no answer. The line was fixed by a BA technician in the field. This issue was clearly not related to the hot cut, as the line first went down more than a week after the order was provisioned.

AT&T's statement that the customer was out of service for more than seven days<sup>4</sup> is plainly false. AT&T's Trouble Ticket Master Log states that the duration of the outage was 21.72 hours.

---

<sup>4</sup> Attachment 1 to the October 15, 1999 Meek affidavit, page 4 of 10.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908662**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA closed in ticket, NTF.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T opened a trouble ticket for this order due to ring no answer before and after the August 11 hot cut. AT&T's log is not clear as to when the customer reported a problem, but the BA trouble ticket was closed with no trouble found.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908672**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Tested fine 8/11, noise reported 8/12 – changed pairs.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This was a two-line order, cut and accepted by AT&T on August 11. AT&T log states, "made test calls and s/w [spoke with] cust,...both lines are good. AT&T provided index number 75.

This was an outside plant failure subsequent to the hot cut. While AT&T is correct that the pair that failed was assigned to the customer as part of an IDLC conversion, BA cannot be expected to foresee problems on lines that AT&T has tested and confirmed are working properly.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908721**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Tested fine 8/12; no dialtone 8/13; AT&T logs show BA said problem was with loose cross-connects at AT&T end.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T.

**Staff Response:**

This was a one-line order that was provisioned on August 12, 1999. AT&T logs state "test calls ok" on August 12 @ 9:21. AT&T provided index number 21.

The customer reported no dial tone on August 13. As noted in the original Staff analysis, AT&T logs show that BA attributed this problem to AT&T.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908725**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T order was cancelled by the customer on 8/13; the customer was out of svc on 8/27 because BA botched the snap-back; retail trouble.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This was a three-line order with a due date of August 13, 1999. AT&T never confirmed the port with the customer. Instead, AT&T logs state "left message on machine with date/time." BA cut the order and when AT&T made test calls and reached the customer, the customer did not want AT&T local service.

The customer's lines went down on August 27. It is not clear from the documentation what the problem was on August 27. It is, however, clear that on August 27 the customer was a BA retail customer. AT&T's observation that its "documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T" is somewhat ironic in this case. If AT&T had confirmed that the customer that the customer wanted AT&T local service prior to cutting the customer's lines, this outage might have been avoided.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908726**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; there was a retail trouble on this line, both companies agreed to cut the line over anyway.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T's affidavit notes, that this order was not cut over until August 28, are incorrect. This was a seven-line order scheduled for August 26. AT&T was advised that there was a problem on one of the lines on August 25. AT&T requested that BA cut the order anyway, and AT&T accepted the cut on August 26 @ 10:10 (not done at 10:50, as AT&T's affidavit states).<sup>5</sup>

Although AT&T suggests that "on 8/28 BA did not do X-connects" and that this is "all reflected in our logs supplied to staff," in fact AT&T's log activity ends on August 27, when the service was restored.

---

<sup>5</sup> AT&T's log entry of August 26 @ 14:42 states, "spoke to [name] at Bell and was told that there may be a facility problem for fax line. He wanted to know if we still want to cut over." On August 26 @ 14:46, AT&T's log entry states, "called [name] @ Bell and told him to go ahead and cut it."

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908759**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Broken wire in CO – may be retail trouble; order cancelled by AT&T.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA previously acknowledged explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T's logs indicate that BA never worked this order. The customer lost service prior to the hot cut due to a broken wire in the central office. The broken wire may have been the result of some pre-cut activity at the frame, but the facts are not clear from the documentation.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908793**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; per A&T log both lines were tested and working within the testing window.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This order, for two lines, was cut by BA and accepted by AT&T on August 12, 1999. AT&T provided index number 98. The logs document that BA and AT&T confirmed cable and pair information prior to the cut, and the information on the LSRC matches the LSR submitted by AT&T.

The customer reported that on August 13, he could not receive calls on one line. AT&T swapped the lines in its switch, and the problem was resolved. AT&T's allegation that BA punched down to incorrect pairs is not supported by the documentation.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9908894**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Tested ok 8/13; 8/16 no dialtone reported; fixed 8/20 via miracle.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This four-line order was cut and accepted by AT&T on August 13, 1999. AT&T documented numerous test calls, and provided BA index number 216.

On August 16, the customer reported no dial tone on one line. Both BA and AT&T dispatched technicians multiple times, and the line was fixed on August 20. However, two other lines went down. These lines came back up later on August 20.

Contrary to AT&T's affidavit notes, there is not clear evidence that BA replaced a tie pair on August 19. AT&T changed pairs on August 19. Whatever actually happened on these lines, the fact that AT&T tested the lines on the day of the cut over and found them working indicates that this was not a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909002**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Per AT&T log cut ok on 8/17; trouble reported 8/19 @ 23:15, closed 8/23 @ 13:53; not clear if BA was at fault.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

AT&T tested and accepted this six-line hot cut on August 17. AT&T provided index number 84.

On August 19, the customer reported that he or she could not receive calls. Although AT&T's affidavit notes that BA had failed to work their "D [disconnect]" order, such a failure by BA would not have affected AT&T's customer's ability to receive calls.

Because the lines tested ok after the cut was complete, Staff did not attribute this trouble to a BA provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909078**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; trouble was static on line, AT&T did not verify line was ok prior to cut.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This was a three line order, cut on August 26, 1999. During the test calls after the cut, the customer reported static on one line.

AT&T notes that BA's RCCC said their records did not match the LSRC, but AT&T fails to note that AT&T had sent duplicate orders for this customer, and never cancelled either order. It is not clear what impact, if any, the RCCC issue had on this trouble (it is unlikely that an order discrepancy would cause static on a line), nor is it clear what steps either company took to resolve the trouble.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909170**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Cut and tested ok 8/19; no dialtone reported by customer 8/29m BA notified 8/23, fixed outside plan problem 8/23; AT&T had hunting and voice mail problems until 8/24.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This three line order was cut on August 19, 1999, and accepted by AT&T with index number 219.

On August 20, the customer reported a loss of dial tone on one line. The trouble was resolved when BA changed pairs.

Although this appears to have been an IDLC conversion, AT&T tested and accepted the lines on the due date. Subsequent problems are not hot cut provisioning errors.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909239**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Retail trouble.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This order was never cut over to AT&T. The customer reported loss of dial tone to AT&T on August 23, 1999, but was referred to BA retail because he was still a BA retail customer.

AT&T has no information in its logs on which to base an assumption that this loss of service was due to a premature disconnect.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909246**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; not clear if problem was on BA side.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This was a five-line order, cut on August 20, 1999. After the cut, the customer reported that one line (the customer's computer line) did not make the phone flash when called. This was the fourth line on a hunt group. AT&T had provisioned the hunt group incorrectly, and corrected the problem.

AT&T's Hot Cut Log statement, that "BA had not completed work," is inconsistent with the fact that the customer had dial tone and there did not appear to be a concurrence problem. There is no indication in the BA WFA Log that BA did any additional work after the turn-up to AT&T. In fact, the WFA Log notes that AT&T was still working their end.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909284**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; not clear if problem was on BA side.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This one line order was scheduled to cut on August 20, 1999, and was pushed out to August 31 because of a no-dial tone condition.

The customer reported a loss of dial tone on one line on August 18. Since the original due date was not until August 20, it is not likely that the customer's loss of service was due to a premature disconnect.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909286**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Cut ok and tested ok 8/20; no dialtone reported 8/23, closed 8/25 to underground problem.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This nine-line order was cut by BA and accepted by AT&T on August 20, 1999. AT&T provided index number 135.

On August 23, the customer reported no dial tone on one line. Other lines subsequently went down. BA appears to have changed some pairs, but it is not clear from the documentation what the problem was. It does not seem to be related to the hot cut, as this was not an IDLC conversion.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909291**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; cut and tested ok, then AT&T reported cross-talk problem later.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

This was a three-line order, cut on August 31, 1999. AT&T Hot Cut Log notes indicate that test calls were successful over all carriers, and AT&T provided index number 35 to BA.

The customer reported hearing cross-talk later on August 31. BA was dispatched out, but the ticket was closed due to no access. The trouble cleared on September 1, without further work by AT&T or BA on lines.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909292**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; retail trouble 8/13, not early cut.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This six-line order was scheduled to cut on August 20, 1999. AT&T alleges an early cut on August 13. There is simply no support in the documentation reviewed for this allegation. In fact, AT&T did not even send the hot cut order until August 13. AT&T's log documents that they called BA on August 13 to report a trouble on one of the lines, and BA confirmed that there was a problem. AT&T's affidavit notes that "BA said cross connects in frame were completed prematurely," are not supported by the documentation AT&T provided.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909327**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T tested and accepted cut 8/24; trouble cleared 8/25 @ 16:21, not clear what problem was.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This six line order was cut on August 24, 1999. AT&T tested and accepted the cut, providing index number 348.

The customer reported no dial tone on one line on August 25. AT&T notes indicate the lines were re-run and tested ok. This problem occurred after the lines were tested and accepted by AT&T.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909344**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, BA WFA Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, LSR, LSRC

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:**

Not BA provisioning error. Problem was hum on line, may have been AT&T side; AT&T logs note that AT&T didn't escalate because it was just a hum, cust. Not out of svc.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This was a 12 line order that was cut on August 24, 1999. After the line were cut, there was a hum on one line. BA and AT&T sent multiple dispatches to correct the problem, which was ultimately resolved by assigning new facilities to the customer. AT&T notes state, "concern is unknown but it seems this customer was on a bad ALS channel."

Staff note on escalation was in response to AT&T's affidavit (Meek, October 15 Page 10 of 10) allegation that the "customer was out of service for approximately four weeks." AT&T's trouble ticket log entry on September 16 @ 13:06 states, "did not attempt to expedite this due to weather conditions back east and the fact that the line is not dead just has static/hum." Clearly there were a number of escalations during the course of the trouble shooting process.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909502**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T tested and accepted cut 8/24; underground problem, no escalation to BA mgrs.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This four-line order was cut on August 24. AT&T tested and accepted the cut with index number 130.

The customer reported intermittent dial on August 25. BA changed bad underground pairs and the trouble cleared.

As this was not an IDLC conversion, bad underground pairs would not be considered a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909521**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** No

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA Provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; trouble was with AT&T, translations, hunting, also “non-portable TNs”

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T’s documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA’s attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T’s documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This seven-line order was ported on August 26, 1999. The customer has two other lines that were part of the hunt group, which were not ported. AT&T notes on August 26 state, "lines tested good over all carriers."

There is no evidence that BA ported the other two lines – BA sent a query back to AT&T confirming that this was a partial port.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909526**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Reviewed in 3<sup>rd</sup> reconciliation; AT&T accepted cut 8/25 w/index #; trouble was with AT&T voice mail.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

AT&T's documented customer service outage could not have occurred except as a result of BA's attempted hot cut to AT&T. Staff did not review all available information concerning AT&T's documented customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This one line order was cut on August 25, 1999. AT&T tested and accepted the cut with index number 17.

On August 26, AT&T opened a trouble ticket on August 26. The ticket was closed on August 27 @ 11:44 with the notation, "WAS OPEN IN SWITCH, CLRD, OK 2 CLOSE PER [AT&T representative name] @ ATT."

AT&T successfully tested the line at cut over. The trouble ticket, opened the next day, appears to be closed by BA upon being advised by AT&T that an open condition was corrected in the AT&T switch. Clearly, the documentation does not indicate a BA hot cut provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909717**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log,

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. AT&T tested and accepted cut; customer later reported couldn't make outgoing calls; can't tell what repair was made.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

BA-NY reported no trouble found condition when it investigated outage, or did not specify nature of its acknowledged repair, yet service was restored only after AT&T opened trouble tickets with BA-NY and without change to AT&T's network.

**Staff Response:**

This three line order was cut by BA and accepted by AT&T on August 31, 1999 @ 13:37. AT&T tested the lines and provided index number 142.

Later on August 31, the customer reported that she could not call out. A trouble ticket was opened with BA. On September 1, AT&T's log notes, "stopped clock on ticket. Call customer in morning." The documentation provided does not indicate what the problem was.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909723**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA notified 8/27 @ 15:20, repaired 8/27 @ 19:35.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

The documentation provided is inconclusive as to the cause of this trouble. AT&T notes that BA repaired an open line. However, BA closed the trouble ticket to CPE.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909772**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA SOP Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket  
Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Questionable. BA showed order cancelled, AT&T shows  
this order worked, not coordinated.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service  
outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error.

**Staff Response:**

Staff agrees with AT&T that an early cut took place on August 25, 1999.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909787**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Closed via miracle 8/31.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error.

**Staff Response:**

This was a three line order cut by BA on August 30, 1999. The customer reported no dial tone later that day. BA closed the ticket with no trouble found after a dispatch out. AT&T confirmed that the line was working. The documentation is not clear as to the nature of the problem.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909793**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA trouble ticket closed for no access on 9/1, fixed bad cable 9/2.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

Staff treatment of an order as an I-code merely recognizes a problem, it does not assign responsibility.

This was a two line order cut by BA on August 31, 1999. The customer reported no dial tone on both lines after the cut. BA dispatched out on September 1, and could not obtain access. A second dispatch was made on September 2, which located and fixed an underground facilities problem. Since this order did not involve IDLC, the outside facilities problem did not result from a hot cut provisioning failure.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909801**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. Cut and tested ok 8/30, no dialtone reported 8/31; cable problem at frame.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined to treat AT&T's documented customer service outage as an "i" code.

**Staff Response:**

This seven-line order was cut by BA on August 30, 1999. AT&T's log, notes from August 30 @ 12:58, state "did test call on all lines and reached customer." AT&T provided index number 160.

On August 31, the customer reported no dial tone on one line, and BA fixed the problem at the frame. Since the problem occurred after the hot cut had been provisioned by BA and tested and accepted by AT&T, this does not appear to be a hot cut provisioning error.

**AT&T PON: NYCY9909957**

**Reviewed in Prior Reconciliation:** August

**Documents Reviewed:** BA Hot Cut Checklist, BA WFA Log, AT&T Hot Cut Log, AT&T Trouble Ticket Master Log, LSR, LSRC, NPAC printout

**Staff Notes from Exhibit 5:** Not BA provisioning error. BA changed underground 9/1.

**AT&T Criticism of Staff Analysis:**

Staff previously determined explicitly that AT&T's documented customer service outage resulted from BA's hot cut loop provisioning error. BA-NY defective outside facility problem caused the customer service outage.

**Staff Response:**

This was a two-line order cut by BA on August 31, 1999. A hollow sound and static on one line was identified by AT&T during test calls. The problems were eliminated when BA dispatched out and changed underground facilities.

Since this order did not involve IDLC, the outside facilities problems would not indicate a hot cut provisioning failure.