

ICG, and NextLink/NEXTLINK revealed only minimal discrepancies in SWBT's records, and only a handful of instances in which the reconciliation affected SWBT's satisfaction of a Texas PUC performance standard.

A. SWBT's Hot Cut Data Are Reliable

DOJ's Evaluation of the January 10 Application questioned the reliability of SWBT's hot cut performance data. See Feb. 14 DOJ Eval. at 31 n.83. As already noted, SWBT maintains a standing offer to any CLEC that wishes to reconcile data. Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 13. In any event, the Texas PUC itself specifically oversaw resolution of concerns about SWBT's hot cut data. On March 28, 2000, the Texas PUC directed SWBT to provide to each Texas CLEC its raw data relating to PMs 114, 114.1, and 115, for all of their respective loop conversions. The Texas PUC additionally invited all CLECs that "believe that the performance data reported by SWBT does not reflect actual performance" to submit their own internal hot cut data for reconciliation with SWBT's data. Order No. 4, Section 271 Compliance Monitoring of Southwestern Bell Tel. Co. of Texas, Project No. 20400 (Tex. PUC Mar. 28, 2000). Four CLECs chose to participate in the Texas PUC-supervised reconciliation, which covered all data from December 1999 through February 2000.²⁶ See Texas PUC Supp. Eval. at 12.

This process of reconciling SWBT and CLEC records demonstrated what SWBT has said all along – SWBT's performance data are highly reliable.²⁷ Looking at data for AT&T, the most

²⁶ Reconciliations of March and April hot cut performance data are also in progress. See Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 17-18.

²⁷ For a general discussion of this issue and specific responses to AT&T's contrary arguments, see Dysart Reply Aff. ¶¶ 2, 16; Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 14-17; see also Dysart Aff. ¶ 70 (App. A, Part A-5, Tab 1).

vocal opponent of long distance competition in Texas, SWBT's reconciliation resulted in only minimal changes. See Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 33-35. This reflects that SWBT's Local Operations Center ("LOC") personnel carefully log all information relating to hot cut activity and work closely with CLECs to ensure that this information, which forms the basis for SWBT's raw hot cut performance data, is entered promptly, accurately, and completely. Id. ¶¶ 36-38. SWBT also provides its underlying data to CLECs in a format that, as a result of steady refinement, is now acknowledged to be clear and useable. Id. ¶ 39.

DOJ additionally expressed concern in Docket No. 00-4 that the business rules for PM 114.1 fail to capture the time it takes SWBT to notify the CLEC that the conversion has been completed. See Feb. 14 DOJ Eval. at 31-32 n.84. AT&T affiants DeYoung and Van de Water raise the same point here. See AT&T's DeYoung/Van de Water Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 53-54. At the April 12-17 Texas PUC workshops on performance measures, however, this issue was resolved when SWBT and participating CLECs agreed to revise the business rules so that the conversion interval will end after the SWBT technician has notified the CLEC that the cut-over has been completed. See Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 11-13.

In any event, the time period between order completion and CLEC notification is not substantial. The average gap between completion of the hot cut and notification to the CLEC was 6 minutes in December, 0 minutes in January, and 10 minutes in February. Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 13. Inclusion or exclusion of these short intervals from the calculation of PM 114.1 had no material affect on SWBT's satisfaction of the measure. Id.

B. SWBT Provides Nondiscriminatory Hot Cuts

In the New York Order, the Commission found that Bell Atlantic was providing nondiscriminatory hot cuts where it showed "on-time hot cut performance at rates at or above 90

percent, in combination with the evidence indicating that fewer than five percent of hot cuts resulted in service outages and that fewer than two percent of hot cut lines had reported installation troubles.” New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4114-15, ¶ 309. This conclusion related to Bell Atlantic’s coordinated hot cut process – the only process offered by Bell Atlantic and one analogous to SWBT’s coordinated hot cut (“CHC”) method. SWBT’s CHC process meets the performance standards set out for Bell Atlantic’s analogous process.

Timeliness. Based upon reconciled data for February and the currently available data for March and April 2000, PM 114.1 shows that for these most recent three months, less than 1 percent of CHC lines were not cut-over within the Texas PUC’s two-hour benchmark. See Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. Attach. B. This is far better than the 10 percent standard suggested in the New York Order.²⁸ If one makes the comparison to New York more precise and tests loop orders of 1 to 10 lines against a one-hour interval, SWBT again meets the 10 percent standard – only about 6.1 percent of CHC lines were not cut-over within an hour. See App. B, Tab 1, PM 114.1.

In Docket No. 00-4, DOJ suggested that the Texas PUC’s use of lines, rather than orders, as the basis for reporting “likely overstates SBC’s performance as compared to the Bell Atlantic performance analyzed in New York which was based on orders.” March 20, 2000 DOJ Ex Parte at 9. In fact, whether one approach is stricter than the other depends upon the extent to which

²⁸ The rule that came out of the New York proceeding is that on-time performance should be measured against “the [state] Commission’s adopted standard” (here, a standard of perfect performance under a two-hour benchmark) or, alternatively, a standard of meeting the state commission’s benchmark 90 percent of the time. New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4105-09, ¶¶ 292-298; see also SWBT Reply Br. at 39-40 (discussing Texas PUC benchmark for PM 114.1).

delays occur on multiple loops in the same order. To illustrate this, SWBT recalculated its performance under PM 114.1 for December 1999 through March 2000 to determine the percentage of orders completed within the benchmark, as opposed to the percentage of lines. This exercise showed that moving from one method of reporting to the other has no substantial, or even consistent, impact on the results. Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 47. During the Texas PUC's performance measurement workshop in April, moreover, AT&T and other CLECs urged line-based reporting for this and other hot cut measures. See ~~Id.~~id. ¶ 46.

Outages and Trouble Reports. SWBT's CHC process also meets the Bell Atlantic yardstick of no more than 5 percent outages. As explained in SWBT's April 5 filing, SWBT performed a reconciliation of monthly outages with AT&T, under Texas PUC supervision. Conway/Dysart Supp. Aff. ¶¶ 25-36 (Apr. 5 Supp. ¶¶ 25-36, Appl. Vol. C, Tab 1). The reconciled results for December 1999 through March 2000 show, for CHC conversions, SWBT-caused outage rates of 2.8 percent of lines in December; 0 percent in January; 4.5 percent of lines in February after correction for an isolated computer systems problem; and 7.0 percent in March.²⁹ Outages were approximately the same on a per-order basis in all months except February, which was far higher than any other month. April 25, 2000 Hot Cuts Ex Parte at Tab 3, Conf. Attach. 2 at 2; Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 18-19 & Attach. C. As noted, however, it has now been agreed in Texas that a per-line measurement for outages is appropriate. See Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 25-27, ¶ 46.

²⁹ Significantly, only 5.8 percent of CHC orders experienced an outage in March. Noland/Conway Supp. Reply Aff. Attach. C.

Moreover, the AT&T/SWBT outage data must be considered in conjunction with the I-7 trouble reports for all carriers (which are arguably more meaningful due to the larger base of orders); in the New York Order, the Commission made clear that these are two complementary measures of loop quality. See New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4109-11, ¶¶ 299-303. SWBT has substantially surpassed the final Bell Atlantic criterion, reported installation troubles on “fewer than two percent of hot cut lines.” ~~New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd~~Id. at 4114-15, ¶ 309. Average trouble report rates for CHC lines, within 10 days of installation, were 1.64 percent for ~~January~~December through March 2000. Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. Attach. I. AT&T bizarrely suggests that Southwestern Bell is somehow hiding poor performance by using a longer reporting interval for troubles than Bell Atlantic used in New York. See AT&T’s De Young/Van De Water Aff. ¶ 70. Of course, troubles reported within 7 days of installation (the Bell Atlantic measure) are less than troubles reported within 10 days of installation of the same lines. But to prove this, SWBT has recalculated its trouble reports to provide the “I-7” figure used in the New York Order. See New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4109, ¶ 300 & n.957. The resulting reports show an average trouble report rate of 1.45 percent over the four months. Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 23 & ~~Attach. I.~~Attach. I.

Where SWBT has demonstrated low trouble report rates of less than 2 percent, per-line outage rates well below 5 percent in 4 of 5 months, and timeliness of better than 90 percent, slightly higher per-order outage levels simply do not affect a CLECs’ ability to compete.

Frame Due Time (“FDT”) Conversions. SWBT also has assisted CLECs by developing a mechanized hot cut process that was not available to CLECs in New York. See New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4104-15, ¶¶ 291-309 (noting Bell Atlantic’s coordinated process). Use of this process is optional and requires less CLEC resources than the coordinated process. See

Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 25-26 (discussing FDT process); Conway Aff. ¶¶ 75-79 (Jan. 10 Appl. App. A. Part A-4, Tab 3) (same). SWBT provides the FDT process to CLECs free of charge, despite the fact that FDT conversions require most of the same SWBT labor as CHC conversions. Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 51-55. These cost-saving aspects of FDT makes it an attractive option to CLECs who may not wish to pay the Texas-PUC-approved charges or devote scarce manpower to CHCs. Id. These facts must be considered in any performance assessment of FDT.

Moreover, performance results for the FDT process are also good. Timeliness and trouble reports are comparable to the CHC process and within the New York Order's standards. Id. ¶ 6. Outage rates have been higher than for the CHC process, and SWBT is working with CLECs to correct this situation. Id. ¶¶ 17-30. At the same time, however, the AT&T/SWBT FDT outage results are particularly overstated for FDT because the reconciliation methodology considers any FDT cutover that takes more than half an hour to be an outage, regardless of actual service disruption. Id. ¶ 20. Attachment F to the Supplemental Reply Affidavit of Brian Noland and William Dysart adjusts for this by excluding outages that are already scored against SWBT under PM 114 (Percentage of Premature Disconnects), as well as conversions with a duration of less than 1 hour (the New York timeliness standard). Id. ¶ 21 & Attach. D.

With full knowledge of the pluses and minuses of the FDT process, CLECs chose to perform about half of their hot cuts in April using FDT, rather than the CHC process. See PMs 114-02 & 114-06 (App. B, Tab 2, PMs 114a, 114b). Indeed, SWBT's largest CLEC customers have generally increased their use of FDT during 2000. Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 52-53. This indicates that the simplicity of the FDT process, and its lower cost, have benefits to CLECs that are not captured in performance data alone. Moreover, if any CLEC determines that

the CHC process is the better choice for a particular hot cut, SWBT has adequate resources to accommodate that preference. Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 55; Conway Aff. ¶ 107 (discussing SWBT's force model).

III. CLECS HAVE PROVEN THEIR ABILITY TO INTEGRATE SWBT'S OSS AND TO ACHIEVE LOW REJECTION RATES

Continuing to press an issue fully rebutted in SWBT's April 5 filing, several CLECs claim that SWBT's OSS do not allow them to integrate pre-order and order capabilities. Sprint Supp. at 44; see also MCI WorldCom Supp. at viii, 4-8. This accusation is meritless. As shown by actual operational evidence, the experience of other CLECs, and Telcordia's independent review, CLECs have the ability to integrate, and have indeed integrated, all of SWBT's application-to-application ("app-to-app") pre-ordering interfaces – DataGate, EDI, and CORBA – with SWBT's EDI Ordering Gateway. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 17 (~~App. A, Tab 1~~). SWBT also has conclusively demonstrated that CLECs are capable of parsing address information obtained from each of SWBT's three pre-ordering interfaces. Id. Whether or not they choose to utilize the full capabilities of SWBT's electronic OSS interfaces, moreover, CLECs have shown their ability to send accurate LSRs to SWBT and to have those LSRs flow through for generations of a service order. CLECs' reject rates are consistently declining as CLEC order volumes increase, a sure sign that CLECs' local entry is not limited by SWBT's OSS. See id. ¶ 57.

A. Integration of SWBT and CLEC OSS

At least four CLECs have integrated pre-order and order functionalities with their own back-end systems. Ham Supp. Aff. ¶¶ 3-4 (Apr. 5 Supp. Appl. Vol. B, Tab 1).

- Sage and Navigator have successfully integrated DataGate with SWBT's EDI ordering gateway. They are able to take information received in the CSR from DataGate, populate

the various fields in an LSR, submit the LSR through the EDI ordering interface, and transfer the information to their own back-end systems. Id. ¶¶ 19-20 & Attachs. A, B.

- Mantiss has enabled one major nationwide CLEC to integrate pre-ordering information obtained in the Address Validation function of CORBA with SWBT's EDI ordering gateway, thus facilitating streamlined submission of LSRs. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 27 & Attach. F.
- Another major carrier has completed integration of EDI pre-ordering with EDI ordering through a third-party vendor. See id. ¶¶ 28-29 ¶ 29 & Attach. G. This CLEC is able seamlessly to create and manage multiple types of service requests and pre-order inquiries to deliver a full range of services. Id. ¶ 29.

Consistent with this real-world integration, Telcordia specifically found that "SWBT provides or references sufficient documentation and information to CLECs to enable them to use their backend CLEC systems to integrate pre-order and order." Texas PUC Supplemental OSS Readiness Report Pre-order/Order Integration Analysis at 8, Project No. 20000 (Apr. 2000) (Ham Supp. Reply Aff. Attach. J). Using this documentation, Telcordia was able to achieve integration, obtaining pre-order information returned from the CSI function of EDI pre-order and using that information in the SWBT ordering process.³⁰ Id.; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 32-33. ~~The CSI function is the same as the CSR function in DataGate, provides the same information, and uses the same business rules. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 31, n.7. Because EDI is a presentation layer on top of DataGate, Telcordia was also testing DataGate when it tested EDI pre-order~~

³⁰ Telcordia parsed the address information in the CSR query via EDI and took the necessary steps to ensure that when SWBT's order system was queried, the appropriate fields on the LSR were populated with the information returned from the pre-order response, validating integration for purposes of submitting LSRs that flow-through SWBT's systems. Id. ¶¶ 31-34. Ham Supp. Reply ¶¶ 32-35.

Telcordia recommended three changes to SWBT's documentation to facilitate integration, all of which SWBT has implemented and informed CLECs of through an Accessible Letter. See Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 36 & Attach. 1-2.

integration. The CSI function of EDI pre-order is the same as the CSR function of DataGate, provides the same information, and uses the same business rules. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 32 n.7.

Commenters try to downplay the successful integration of SWBT and CLEC OSS by focusing on a few areas where integration is not yet possible or ~~they~~CLECs have yet to complete integration of their own systems. MCI WorldCom, for example, claims that functions such as due date availability and telephone number reservation cannot be integrated when using SWBT's systems. MCI WorldCom Supp. at 7. In fact, Telcordia/GEIS has successfully integrated due date availability and telephone number reservation, among other pre-ordering functions, through Exchange Link, which automatically interfaces with SWBT's OSS to retrieve this data.³¹ Furthermore, the Commission has held that integration of some pre-order functions – which SWBT has plainly demonstrated here – “is probative evidence that carriers are capable of integrating the remaining pre-ordering functions.” New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4020, ¶ 138.

AT&T claims that it cannot integrate SWBT's DataGate pre-ordering interface with EDI, because, according to AT&T, SWBT has failed to provide parsed service address information via the Address Validation function. AT&T's Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶ 48; see also id. ¶¶ 54-78; MCI WorldCom Supp. at 8-11 (claiming there is not sufficient documentation for CLECs accurately to parse address information). This claim is meritless for numerous reasons.

³¹ See Telcordia Technologies Press Release, Telcordia Technologies Delivers Leading-Edge Telecommunications Solutions to Intermedia Communications (May 2, 2000), available at <<http://www.telcordia.com/newsroom/pressreleases/000502.html>>; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. Attach. H; see also MacFarland Aff. (Attach. E to Ham Supp. Reply Aff. Attach. G). Integration of all service types except the UNE Platform are offered, and the UNE Platform is scheduled to be tested in June 2000. The address field on the LSR is identical whether the service request is for Resale, UNE Loop or the UNE Platform. See Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 29 n.4.

First, as explained on several prior occasions, SWBT provides address information in a Concatenated Address Information (“CAI”) format for all three interfaces via the CSR, which is in full compliance with Ordering and Billing Forum (“OBF”) standards. Ham Aff. ¶ 182 (Jan. 10 Appl. App. A, Part A-4, Tab 1); Ham Reply Aff. ¶ 49 (Feb. 22 Reply App. A, Vol. A-2, Tab 1); Ham Supp. Aff. ¶ 17; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 22. SWBT uses the CAI format in its own back-end systems and thus provides CLECs access at parity with that which SWBT affords its own retail operations. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 22. In addition, SWBT provides parsed address information via the Address Validation function in EDI and CORBA.

Furthermore, as illustrated by the success of CLECs in accomplishing integration of the CSI/CSR function, described above, CLECs are fully able, using SWBT’s documentation, to achieve integration by parsing the Address Validation information in DataGate. Ham Supp. Aff. ¶ 18; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 26-29. Regardless of whether CLECs use DataGate or EDI and/or CORBA for pre-ordering, they interface (directly or indirectly) with DataGate to SWBT’s back end systems. See Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 18. The very fact that EDI and CORBA rely on DataGate to provide SWBT’s back end information, and SWBT provides parsed address information in EDI and CORBA, demonstrates that Address Validation is capable of being parsed via DataGate and subsequently integrated with ordering. Id. ¶ 19.

AT&T’s standby claim that, even if CSR address information may be parsed, address validation information cannot be, is simply wrong. AT&T’s Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 55-60. The business rules necessary to achieve parsing are the same for both CSR and address validation information, and both are equally “parseable.” Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 20, & 37 ¶¶ 20 & 38 n.11; see also Ham Supp. Aff. ¶¶ 18-20. ~~And the~~ The source of the address information (whether CSR or Address Validation) makes no difference for purposes of parsing

and integration, as the input fields on the LSR and the output fields in Datagate are the same. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 21. Street address information is returned to the CLEC in identical concatenated format, regardless of the preorder interface used by the CLEC and regardless of whether the information is returned via a CSR or an Address Validation inquiry. See id. & Attach. C-1; Ham Supp. Aff. Attach. F. Given that the processes are identical, the fact that two CLECs already have demonstrated the ability to parse address information from the CSR in Datagate conclusively demonstrates the CLECs' ability to parse address information from Address Validation in Datagate.

Moreover, as explained in the April 5 supplemental filing, SWBT has retained, at SWBT's own expense, General Electric Global Systems ("GXS") to provide assistance to CLECs on these and other integration issues.³² See Ham Supp. Aff. ¶ 15; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 30. GXS is the consulting arm of GEIS, which is a developer of Virtual Front Office ("VFO") and Exchange Link, applications that integrate SWBT's OSS. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 30. GXS is familiar with SWBT's systems and ordering rules, having developed an integrated solution for a CLEC in SWBT's region and gone through the process of implementing VFO and Exchange Link for a second CLEC. Id.

Although AT&T criticizes this free consultation, see AT&T's Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 50-78, AT&T has itself requested GXS's services, confirming the value of SWBT's offer, see offer. See Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 42. Instructions for scheduling GXS's consulting services were set out for CLECs in Accessible Letter CLECSS00-078, dated May 16, 2000;

³² SWBT is also sponsoring workshops specifically to assist CLECs with pre-order/order integration beginning June 21, 2000. Ham Supp. Aff. ¶ 16; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 38. ¶ 37.

CLECs will be contacting GXS directly to arrange consulting sessions and the GXS contact's name, number and email address is published in the accessible letter. Id.

There is no basis for AT&T's claim that SWBT's willingness to take this unprecedented step to assist CLECs somehow undercuts the other proof of integratability presented in this Application. Id. ¶¶ 41-43. This claim is plainly rebutted by SWBT's showings that its interfaces not only are designed for integration, but actually have been integrated by multiple CLECs, without the help of a SWBT-funded consultant. And in any event, AT&T's argument would suggest that any extra step to assist CLECs detracts from a BOC's showing of checklist compliance, a proposition that could not be accepted.

AT&T's related claim that SWBT has failed to provide accurate, specific interface documentation to CLECs also falls flat. AT&T's Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶ 36. Telcordia explicitly found that SWBT furnishes CLECs with readily available, clear, and comprehensive information that conforms to applicable OBF and TCIF EDI guidelines. EDI Documentation Report at ES-1; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 7-16. Other CLECs interviewed by Telcordia found the information provided by SWBT to be useful, and various CLECs have been able to use this information to establish integrated connections with SWBT's systems. See EDI Documentation Report at 11; Ham Aff. ¶ 111; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 8. ~~Moreover, to make integration even to make integration even easier,~~ SWBT has implemented all the changes Telcordia recommended to SWBT's documentation ~~easier, and initiated a documentation meeting with CLECs, the results of which are currently being implemented.~~ See Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 36 & Attach. C. ¶¶ 9-12, 36.

Finally, AT&T complains that SWBT does not provide additional ways of finding ordering rules in the SWBT Local Service Ordering Requirements ("LSOR"). AT&T's

Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶ 42. However, as SWBT has previously explained to AT&T, cross-referencing between the LSOR and other ordering rules can be accomplished by using the search function of the CLEC Handbook. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 13. In addition, SBC will provide a new mapping document on its CLEC website to provide cross-references between the LSOR and the CLEC Handbook for SWBT. *Id.* ¶ 10. Finally, numerous other changes to SWBT's documentation suggested by CLECs are being implemented. *Id.* ¶¶ 9-16; ~~Accessible Letter CLEC00-102. ¶¶ 9-16 & Attach. A (Accessible Letter CLEC00-102).~~

B. Flow-Through and Reject Rates

Several CLECs also advance their already-discredited claim that SWBT's systems reject such a high percentage of orders that CLECs are unable to compete effectively. *See, e.g.*, AT&T's Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶ 91; Sprint Supp. at 39. This claim is completely baseless. Reject rates have long been nondiscriminatory and have generally decreased over the past four months, even as volumes have risen. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 58. This is shown in the table below:

MONTH	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr
REJECT RATE	%	%	%	%
ALL CLECs / EDI	26.3	22.1	24.4	19.9
ALL CLECs / LEX	40.7	40.1	39.1	37.0
ALL CLECs / BOTH	34.3	30.5	31.4	28.1

Source: Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 59.

The average reject rate for LSRs submitted over EDI for the last twelve months was 23.0 percent and the average reject rate for LEX was 35.2 percent. The LEX rate is comparable to, and the EDI rate is decidedly lower than, than Bell Atlantic—~~New Atlantic~~—New York's 27-34 percent reject rate. *New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4044, ¶ 175; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 59.

Manual rejects in particular have shown a sharp decline. From December to April, the percentage of manual rejects decreased from 11.5 percent to ~~7.79~~9.4 percent, as volumes increased from 58,408 to 151,549 LSRs per month:

MONTH	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr
MANUAL REJECT RATE	11.5 %	11.4%	10.7%	10.0%	9.4%
LSR VOLUMES	58,408	62,712	85,488	134,999	151,549

Source: Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 60.

AT&T's allegations that reject rates have been kept artificially low by sending jeopardy notices rather than reject notices is wholly unfounded. See AT&T's Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 93, 99-106. It is true that, since January 2000, SWBT has sent a jeopardy notice rather than a reject notice for an LSR once a FOC has been sent to the CLEC; CLECs agreed to this change in the CMP. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 62-63; Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 73. However, the data show that the new jeopardy reporting mechanism has had little, if any, impact on the total number of reject and/or jeopardy notices received by CLECs. Comments of Southwestern Bell Tel. Co., Investigation Into Southwestern Bell Tel. Co.'s Entry Into the Texas InterLATA Telecommunications Market, Project Nos. 16251, et al. (Tex. PUC filed Apr. 20, 2000); Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 63; Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 74. As shown above, while total LSR volumes continue to increase, overall reject rates have decreased 6.4 percent from ~~December 1999~~January to April 2000 for orders received over EDI and 6.2 percent overall, and jeopardy notices have increased less than two percent in the same timeframe. Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 73-75 & Attach. Q. Both AT&T's reject rates and jeopardy notices have decreased in the past three months. Id. Attach. O. The Texas PUC specifically reviewed these data through March 2000 and confirmed that the process change had a minimal effect on reject

rates. Texas PUC Supp. Eval. at 9; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 62; Noland/Dysart Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 74.

In the New York proceeding, the Commission found that a wide disparity in reject rates between CLECs was evidence that high reject rates were the responsibility of CLECs themselves. New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4039-40, ¶ 167, 4045, ¶ 175; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 72. The same disparity has been shown on the record in this proceeding. See Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 72 & Attach. J; Texas PUC Supp. Eval. at 8-10. As in Bell Atlantic's case, many CLECs placing the highest volume of orders have been able to achieve reject rates well below the average. New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4045, ¶ 175 n.555; Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 72.

In fact, SWBT has undertaken every effort to help CLECs reduce their reject rates. In response to CLEC requests, for example, SWBT is modifying its systems so that, as of May 27, 2000, CLECs will no longer be required to populate the End User Service Address on the LSR for UNE Platform conversions. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 80. Instead, SWBT will automatically populate the address from the existing CSR.³³ Id. Thus, CLECs will no longer receive fatal rejects from MOG or rejects or jeopardies from LASR GUI related to an invalid address. CLECs have universally acknowledged that this change – initiated at MCI WorldCom's request – will substantially reduce reject rates. See MCI WorldCom Supp. at 16; AT&T's Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 52, 70. As MCI WorldCom stated, "implementation of the proposal will significantly reduce rejects associated with service addresses." MCI WorldCom Supp. at 16. Given this unanimity about the beneficial impact this systems change will have upon reject rates,

³³ This applies to all conversions other than xDSL-capable loops. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 23-25, 83.

the Commission can comfortably take account of this change in its assessment of the Application.

AT&T and MCI WorldCom express concern regarding the potential for differences between address information in two of SWBT's databases, CRIS and PREMIS. MCI WorldCom Supp. at 11-15; AT&T's Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶ 71. They claim that eliminating the service address requirement for UNE Platform conversions will not resolve this problem, because when the address is populated directly from the existing CSR, the address will be derived from CRIS, and may not match the address in PREMIS. To the extent address mismatches between CRIS and PREMIS do occur, they affect SWBT's retail operations equally. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 87; see also New York Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4023-24, ¶ 143 (rejecting challenges to the format in which Bell Atlantic provides loop make-up information because Bell Atlantic provides its retail operations the information in the same format). CLECs can use SORD to identify potential address mismatch errors to the same extent as SWBT; and CLECs can resolve such errors by manually creating their own orders in the same manner that SWBT manually creates orders for its retail operations. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 87. Furthermore, SWBT has in place a process to resolve address mismatch problems for CLECs. ~~Id. Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 84.~~

AT&T's complaint that SWBT has failed to reduce manual rejects by moving more edits from SORD to LASR/MOG is meritless. AT&T's Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Aff. ¶¶ 104, 106. SWBT moved at least 146 SORD edits to LASR in 1999 alone. See Ham Supp. Reply Aff. ¶ 64. In the last year, however, AT&T has never once proposed in the Change Management Process that a particular SORD edit be moved to LASR, nor has AT&T sent a CLEC Change Request to its Account Manager requesting that a specific SORD edit be moved "up-front." Id. ¶ 67.

AT&T's failure to make such requests cannot be blamed on a lack of knowledge about the edits, as SWBT provided AT&T a complete list of SORD edits. Id. ¶¶ 66-67.

IV. OPPONENTS' MISCELLANEOUS CHECKLIST ALLEGATIONS ARE ALSO UNFOUNDED

Given that the CLECs' principal arguments, discussed above, are without merit, it should not be surprising that their secondary claims are unfounded as well. This section shows, point-by-point, that Southwestern Bell has in fact met the checklist requirements.³⁴

As a preliminary matter, however, it should be stressed that the Texas 271 Agreement remains fully available to CLECs. Because section 271 relief was not granted for Texas by April 20, 2000, SWBT followed the terms of the Texas 271 Agreement by sending CLECs that had opted into it a notice of termination. At the same time, however, SWBT made clear that if this Commission grants interLATA relief in Texas before July 12, 2000, those CLECs will have the right to continue to receive the benefits of their agreements for an additional three years, until October 2003. See Auinbauh Supp. Reply Aff. ¶¶ 23-25. Whether to stay in the agreement or terminate it in October 2000 will be solely up to the CLEC.

A. Checklist Item (i): Interconnection

Southwestern Bell's previous filings demonstrated that SWBT provides Texas CLECs nondiscriminatory interconnection. DOJ, which previously voiced concerns regarding SWBT's performance in provisioning interconnection trunks, has concluded that SWBT's performance

³⁴ Commenters have not raised any consequential claims regarding checklist items (iii) poles, ducts, and conduits; (v) unbundled local transport; (vi) unbundled local switching; (ix) nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers; (xi) number portability; (xii) local dialing parity; (xiii) reciprocal compensation; or (xiv) resale.