

**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: NYC9907263**

**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.