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 2nd 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,[1] 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.

[1] 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 1st 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[2] and confirmed that it was working. There clearly was no problem associated with the hot cut.

[2] 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 3rd 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 1st 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 "30th Street wiring problem," according to AT&T. Although the 30th Street wiring problem affected a number of AT&T's orders, Staff has not been able to determine whose wiring was defective in the 30th 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 1st 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 10th [10th 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 1st 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 1st 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 1st 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.