

**SBC and CLEC xDSL Collaborative  
January 19, 2000**

**Synopsis of Issues by Category**

**Power Spectral Density (PSD) / Spectrum Management**

CLEC Comment	SBC Response	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PSD mask system should not be required for loop qualification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PSD mask system is not required for loop qualification and will remain optional.</li> </ul>	Resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question the requirement to provide the PSD mask for the technology they plan to deploy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBC will continue to require that PSDs (or equivalent) be specified on each xDSL capable loop order as supported by the FCC.</li> </ul>	Open
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request the ability to order a loop "as is," and that SBC not reject a CLEC request simply because the loop does not meet the physical requirements of the PSD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBC's FMO will allow CLECs to order "as is" loops.</li> </ul>	Resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBC should not impose spectrum management procedures established only by SBC. (Spectrum management procedures not authorized by the industry.) SBC's spectrum management policy should adhere to FCC guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBC will not unilaterally impose spectrum management policies not approved by the industry.</li> </ul>	Resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBC should adopt the xDSL loop offerings ordered in the Texas Rhythms/Covad arbitration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBC is evaluating the adoption of xDSL loop offerings similar to those that will be available in Texas.</li> </ul>	Open
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SFS (Selective Feeder Separation) system of binder group management should be dismantled.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SFS system of binder group management will be dismantled.</li> </ul>	Resolved

**SBC and CLEC xDSL Collaborative  
January 19, 2000**

**Synopsis of Issues by Category**

**Digital Loop Carrier (DLC) Data**

<b>CLEC Comment</b>	<b>SBC Response</b>	<b>Status</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Ordering where DLC is involved is not discussed in POR.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Current ordering procedures for DSL capable loops are applicable regardless of the serving technology. These procedures are detailed in the CLEC web sites.</li></ul>	Resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Request access to information about DLC portion of loop, e.g., data rate.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The POR complies with the merger conditions. As required by the UNE Remand, SBC will provide access to information contained in SBC's records pertaining to the existence, type, and location of DLC.</li></ul>	Resolved

**SBC and CLEC xDSL Collaborative  
January 19, 2000**

**Synopsis of Issues by Category**

**Loop Make-Up (LMU) Data**

<b>CLEC Comment</b>	<b>SBC Response</b>	<b>Status</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request sample loop qualification response with attributes defined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The field definitions for the EDI and Datagate enhancements will be provided according to region-specific CMPs. Sample responses may be obtained as part of the CLEC test plan processes in each region.</li> </ul>	Resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request availability of all data on all requests.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All data is not available in mechanized systems. A manual loop qualification may be requested.</li> </ul>	Resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request all information not available in a mechanized database be migrated to an OSS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FCC UNE remand and line sharing orders do not require population of databases where mechanized data does not exist.</li> </ul>	Open
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request identification of where actual data is and is not available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The matrix provided in the POR indicated the availability of actual data in mechanized databases.</li> </ul>	Resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that where loop make-up information provided is based on design data, it be identified as such</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>POR already indicates that this designation will be provided on loop make-up response where applicable.</li> </ul>	Resolved

**SBC and CLEC xDSL Collaborative  
January 19, 2000**

**Synopsis of Issues by Category**

**271**

<b>CLEC Comment</b>	<b>SBC Response</b>	<b>Status</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Requests POR reflect commitments made during Texas 271 proceeding.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Although the provisions of the Texas 271 proceedings apply only to Texas, the Plan of Record is consistent with all of the provisions relating to DSL.</li></ul>	Resolved

**SBC and CLEC xDSL Collaborative  
January 19, 2000**

**Synopsis of Issues by Category**

**FOCs/Rejects**

<b>CLEC Comment</b>	<b>SBC Response</b>	<b>Status</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Request that the POR provide intervals for FOCs and Rejects.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>This issue is outside of the scope of the POR. The FOC/Reject intervals are addressed in contracts and/or performance measures.</li></ul>	Open

**SBC and CLEC xDSL Collaborative  
January 19, 2000**

**Synopsis of Issues by Category**

**Implementation Dates (Timeframes)**

<b>CLEC Comment</b>	<b>SBC Response</b>	<b>Status</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Questioned if POR deployment schedule could be improved for EDI ordering changes</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is all new development work and represents a reasonable timeframe in which to accomplish this work.</li></ul>	Open



1 PUBLIC UTILITY Commission OF TEXAS

2 DOCKET NO. 20226

3

4 )  
5 PETITION OF ACCELERATED )  
6 CONNECTIONS, INC., D/B/A ACI )  
7 CORP. FOR ARBITRATION TO ESTABLISH )  
8 AN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH )  
9 SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY )  
10 \_\_\_\_\_ )

11 DOCKET NO. 20272

12 PETITION OF DIECA COMMUNICATIONS, )  
13 INC., D/B/A, COVAD COMMUNICATIONS )  
14 COMPANY FOR ARBITRATION OF )  
15 INTERCONNECTION RATES, TERMS, )  
16 CONDITIONS AND RELATED ARRANGEMENTS )  
17 WITH SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE )  
18 COMPANY )  
19 \_\_\_\_\_ )

20

21

22 Volume I  
23 Pages 1 to 320

24

25 DEPOSITION OF VICTORIA BIRD

Austin, Texas

May 6, 1999

26

27

28

29

30 George A. Haas, CSR 5939

1 about that phone line from LFACS?  
2 A. If it's Southwestern Bell.  
3 Q. That's right, Southwestern Bell. I  
4 apologize. I forgot about GTE.  
5 A. Yes, we inventory everything for the  
6 loop.  
7 Q. If you were working in Dallas and had  
8 access to LFACS, and they asked you about a loop in  
9 Houston, could you use the computer in Dallas to  
10 provide that information to them?  
11 A. I would only have access to where I  
12 am, so no. You can't call up a Houston number in  
13 the Dallas computer.  
14 Q. So then the information is segregated  
15 to the various different LACs, loop assignment  
16 centers?  
17 A. Loop assignment center or MLAC.  
18 Say that again.  
19 Q. I'm asking, the data about any  
20 particular area is all kept separately at the  
21 different MLACs; there is no central storing?  
22 A. There is a central storing, but there  
23 are five or six machines, and depending on what LAC  
24 you are at, you can only access information on that  
25 machine.

1 Q. Is there any place in Texas that you  
2 can access all the machines from one location?

3 A. I can do that.

4 Q. Are you the only person who can do  
5 that?

6 A. The general headquarters staff people.  
7 We all can do that, I mean in my group.

8 Q. At general headquarters, you can  
9 access any one of the machines?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. How many machines did you say there  
12 were?

13 A. Five or six.

14 Q. Where are the other MLACs located?

15 A. One in Arkansas.

16 Q. Just in Texas.

17 A. Oh. San Antonio, Houston, Austin, and  
18 Dallas.

19 Q. And by going to each one of these  
20 places or accessing it through the general  
21 headquarters, I can find out information about any  
22 loop in SWBT territory in Texas?

23 A. Ask me that again.

24 Q. By either going to -- I think it's the  
25 same question I asked before. I just want to make

1 sure.

2 I can use LFACS to find out  
3 information about any loop anywhere in SWBT  
4 territory in Texas?

5 A. You can?

6 Q. Not I can personally, but someone who  
7 has access to LFACS can.

8 A. I can access anything in Southwestern  
9 Bell, but the MLAC cannot.

10 Q. They can only access their particular  
11 area?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. But it's possible for someone at  
14 general headquarters, for someone to get  
15 information on any loop in Texas that is in SWBT  
16 territory?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. Ms. Bird, have you at various times  
19 worked in each one of these five different groups  
20 in the LAC?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Which ones have you not worked in?

23 A. I have not worked in the engineering  
24 work order group, the held order group or the RMA  
25 group.

1           A.    It's a report that a user can request  
2    from LFACS.

3           Q.    What information does a PDL/PROC  
4    report contain?

5           A.    It depends on which PDL/PROC you are  
6    pulling.

7           Q.    Why don't you tell me what a PDL/PROC  
8    is?

9           A.    Just a report that a user can request  
10   from LFACS.

11          Q.    Then go back to when you said it  
12   depends on what PDL/PROC you are pulling.  What  
13   types of PDL/PROC can I pull?

14          A.    There is a whole book of them.

15          Q.    Can you tell me generally, I'm not  
16   going to get into all the specific details right  
17   now, but generally the type of information that I  
18   can get by requesting a PDL/PROC report?

19          A.    Pretty much any information in LFACS  
20   that you need.

21          Q.    What is a PDL/PROC report used for?

22                Let me put it a different way.  Why  
23   would I choose to get, for example, a PDL/PROC  
24   report as opposed to an ACR?

25          A.    For example, when you are looking for

1     disturbers or when you are trying to provision  
2     ADSL, if you pull an ACR, first of all, you have to  
3     type it in, pull it, print it and then you have to  
4     look at it. And if you want to look at anything  
5     specifically, you have to go in and look at each  
6     and every cable pair. With the PDL/PROC, it's  
7     designed to look at disburber type services for  
8     ADSL. It will go in and count those services,  
9     print them out and total the number of disburbers  
10    for you without you having to go through all that.

11                    It just brings up the pertinent  
12    information that you are really looking for.

13                    Q.    It sound like you can -- let me  
14    analogize here.

15                    Is a PDL/PROC something like a search  
16    engine on the web? You can program it to pull up  
17    whatever information it is you want?

18                    A.    I really can't tell you exactly how  
19    they do it. The people in IT do it, but yeah, we  
20    tell them what we want and they program a PROC for  
21    us to get the information.

22                    Q.    If, just for example, SWBT were going  
23    to deploy -- well, in this case, SWBT wants to  
24    deploy ADSL. And SWET decides it needs to know  
25    about the disburber makeup in a cable. So then

1 somebody says, okay, please, someone says to IT,  
2 please design a PROC so that we can generate a  
3 report that will give us all the disburber  
4 information.

5 Is that how it works?

6 A. Basically.

7 Q. Can you or can the IT department  
8 generate a PROC to pull together any information  
9 that is contained in LFACS?

10 A. You would have to ask them that,  
11 but --

12 Q. To the best of your knowledge?

13 A. I would think they could.

14 Q. Have you ever asked them to try to  
15 pull together a report and it not -- and them not  
16 be able to do it?

17 A. I have haven't asked them to do that.  
18 That's not part of my responsibility.

19 Q. Whose responsibility is that?

20 A. The different LACs could ask them to  
21 do that if they wanted a particular report.

22 In the ADSL, PDL/PROC disburber case,  
23 the person in my job before me called and had that  
24 done. So in some cases I would do that, but I  
25 haven't had to do that.





1           A.    Yes.

2           Q.    12-18-98 members?

3           A.    Okay.

4           Q.    Anything in the loop qual section --

5           there are two loop qualification sections on these

6           notes.  One on Page No. 1 and one on Page No. 2.

7           A.    I see them.

8           Q.    If the first loop qualification sub

9           section, anything in there about WebQual, ZipQual

10          or CPSOS?

11          A.    Not in the first section.

12          Q.    How about the second section -- I see

13          your name, Mr. Phillips?

14          A.    Must be.

15          Q.    Do you see, George Phillips reported

16          we would use a D3 like approach in lieu of the

17          ZipQual system?

18          A.    Yes.

19          Q.    The next bullet saying, George is

20          asked to provide more detail to the core team on

21          the D3 like approach?

22          A.    Yes.

23          Q.    And then, new mechanized system will

24          be called complex service order system, CPSOS, and

25          is targeted for deployment in SWBT in 3-99?

1 A. Yes, I see those.

2 Q. On the January 7 meeting notes of the  
3 UNE loop qual is there any reference or discussions  
4 about WebQual, ZipQual or CPSOS?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Let me ask, before I go on from here.  
7 Is CPSOS the system that eventually the core team  
8 decided upon to use in lieu of WebQual or ZipQual,  
9 or are we are talking about two separate things  
10 here?

11 A. Ask your question again. I think I  
12 can give you a very good answer.

13 Q. Is CPSOS the system that eventually  
14 the core team decided to use in lieu of WebQual or  
15 ZipQual, or are we talking about two separate  
16 parallel system tracks here?

17 A. CPSOS was designed as the service --  
18 is being positioned as the service negotiation  
19 system for Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and  
20 the Southwestern Bell loop qualification system is  
21 the five state loop qualification process that is  
22 the parallel to WebQual in California.

23 Q. Let me understand your answer.

24 Is CPSOS the system that is being  
25 proposed to use in the five state region that is

1 analogous to WebQual?

2 A. No.

3 Q. I don't understand your answer.

4 What is the service negotiation  
5 system?

6 A. The system that our centers use to  
7 handle requests from the retail and potentially the  
8 wholesale side of the house, requests for services,  
9 products and services, service negotiation.

10 Q. Well, is it -- let me use the terms  
11 your witnesses used in the hearings in their  
12 testimony?

13 A. That's fine.

14 Q. Your company has put forward a  
15 proposal that there be a loop prequalification  
16 process --

17 Keep the word red, yellow, green on  
18 the side of your head.

19 A. I understand.

20 Q. -- and loop qualification process,  
21 both of which would precede the actual loop  
22 ordering process.

23 Does that sound right to you?

24 A. That's true. That sounds correct.

25 Q. A three step kind of process to get to

1 order?

2 A. Right.

3 Q. Which of those three; that is loop  
4 prequalification, loop qualification and loop  
5 ordering does WebQual help support?

6 A. Ask that question again and I'll  
7 answer it.

8 Q. Which of those three, the three being  
9 loop prequalification, loop qualification, and loop  
10 ordering, does WebQual help support?

11 A. In California WebQual supports loop  
12 qualification.

13 Q. What about ZipQual, which of those  
14 three does it report?

15 A. In California it was used for the  
16 prequalification.

17 Q. And which of those three does CPSOS  
18 help support?

19 A. What were the three again?

20 Q. Loop prequalification, loop  
21 qualification, and looped ordering.

22 A. CPSOS Release 1, as it stand today in  
23 the Midwest, primarily supports the  
24 prequalification function.

25 Q. Okay.

1           A.    It is being planned and designed to  
2           evolve out of that role into the service  
3           negotiation function in future releases.

4           Q.    When you say service negotiations?

5           A.    Loop ordering.

6           Q.    It will pick up loop ordering. Will  
7           it also pick up the loop qualification function in  
8           the middle?

9           A.    No, no.

10          Q.    So it's going to pick up, as it's  
11          being designed for the future, it will pick up loop  
12          prequalification and loop ordering?

13          A.    As it exists today, it performs the  
14          loop prequalification function in the Midwest.

15          Q.    Okay.

16          A.    In the future, its role will evolve  
17          from that to the negotiation tool, and the loop  
18          qualification function will evolve into a separate  
19          entity called loop qualification.

20          Q.    It's kind of going to be the book end  
21          around loop qualification; prequalification and  
22          ordering, once it evolves, CPSOS that is?

23          A.    You'll have to rephrase that question.

24          Q.    Well, of the three functions I'm  
25          discussing with you here, loop prequalification,

1 loop qualification and loop ordering, it picks up  
2 No. 1 and No. 3, and loop qualification is a  
3 different system?

4 A. Today CPSOS is prequalification in the  
5 Midwest.

6 Q. I understand that.

7 A. And tomorrow it will become service  
8 negotiation loop ordering focus, and there will be  
9 a separate loop qualification function.

10 Q. Is there any plan to bring that  
11 separate loop qualification function at some point  
12 in the future into the CPSOS so you unify all those  
13 three into one?

14 A. They will work together.

15 Q. So the plan is to leave the loop  
16 qualification as a separate system although that  
17 would work together with CPSOS?

18 A. Tightly coupled.

19 Q. You have to say yes, then you can  
20 explain if the answer is yes.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. I'm not going to walk through the rest  
23 the meeting notes at this time on that topic.

24 Let's talk about.

25 (Pause in the proceedings.)

1 MR. LEAHY: Back on the record.

2 MR. BOWEN: Back on the record.

3 Q. Let me see if I have the two tracks,  
4 the California track and the SWBT track in my head  
5 correctly. I want to talk about loop prequal, loop  
6 qual and loop ordering.

7 In California, ZipQual supports  
8 prequalification, right?

9 A. I can't say right because I'm not sure  
10 where that system fits in California today.

11 Q. But at one point at least it did  
12 support?

13 A. At one point I believe it did.

14 Q. Then in California WebQual supports  
15 loop qualification?

16 A. That's true.

17 Q. And what systems supports ordering, is  
18 it EASE/SORD?

19 A. DSL-MS.

20 Q. What does that stands for?

21 A. I don't know.

22 Q. In SWBT in the Midwest, as you call it  
23 or the five state region, you are about to or  
24 already using CPSOS to support the prequal  
25 function?

1           A.    That's true.

2           Q.    For loop qual right now it's a manual

3 process?

4           A.    Right.

5           Q.    And you plan to have CPSOS support the

6 ordering function at some point in the future?

7           A.    Right.

8           Q.    What is the project in service date

9 for that additional functionality, ordering

10 functionality of CPSOS?

11           A.    Probably third quarter 1999 for the

12 next release, but I'm not at this point aware of

13 all functions that will or will not be in the

14 system.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

