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[4] is plainly false. AT&T's Trouble Ticket Master Log states that the duration of the outage was 21.72 hours.

[4] 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 3rd 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).[5]

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.

[5] 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 3rd 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 3rd 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.