

**BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Application by SBC Communications Inc., )  
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, ) CC Docket No. 00-65  
And Southwestern Bell Communications )  
Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long )  
Distance for Provision of In-Region )  
InterLATA Services in Texas )

**JOINT SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY AFFIDAVIT OF  
BRIAN D. NOLAND AND WILLIAM R. DYSART**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PARAGRAPH (S)</b>
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND	2
PURPOSE OF AFFIDAVIT	5
UNE LOOP CONVERSIONS	6
ORDER PROCESSING	56
UNE P CONVERSIONS/THREE ORDER PROCESS	77
LIDB UPDATES	87
DIGITAL SUBSCRIBER LINE (DSL)	93
HDSL	105
CALCULATION DATA (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT A
REPORTED/RECONCILED RESULTS SUMMARY FOR 114.1 (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT B
REPORTED/RECONCILED RESULTS SUMMARY FOR 114.1 FEBRUARY-APRIL DATA	ATTACHMENT B
PERCENT OF LINES WITH OUTAGES BASED ON PPIG DATA (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT C
AGREED-UPON MARCH PPIG DATA (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT C
PPIG DATA ADJUSTED TO EXCLUDE PM 114/LESS THAN 60 MINUTES (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT D
PM 114 RECONCILED/REPORTED RESULTS SUMMARY (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT E

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PARAGRAPH (S)</b>
<u>PM 114 RECONCILED/REPORTED RESULTS SUMMARY</u> <u>FEBRUARY-APRIL</u>	<u>ATTACHMENT E</u>
JANUARY 2000 RECONCILED FDT OUTAGES (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT F
SWBT REPLY TO NEXTLINK	ATTACHMENT G
SWBT REPLY TO AT&T – PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS	ATTACHMENT H
TROUBLE REPORTS, I-7 AND I-10 DATA	ATTACHMENT I
REVISED BUSINESS RULES	ATTACHMENT J
AT&T RECONCILIATION, PM 114/114.1, CHC/FDT DECEMBER- MARCH, LINE vs ORDER COMPARISON (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT K
SERVICE ORDER COMPLETION (SOC) CHART	ATTACHMENT L
MCI WORLDCOM DETAILS ON TIMELY FOC/SOC (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT M
SWBT COMMENTS (CURRENT JEOPARDY MECHANISM) TPUC PROJECT NO. 16251, 20400 AND 22165 (PART 2 CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT N
AT&T SPECIFIC JEOPARDY/REJECT – APRIL DATA (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT O
NEXTLINK – POST FOC JEOPARDIES (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT P
TOTAL SWBT/CLEC JEOPARDIES NOVEMBER – APRIL	ATTACHMENT Q
NETWORK INTELLIGENCE SUMMARY – TROUBLE REPORTS (1) (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT R
NETWORK INTELLIGENCE SUMMARY – TROUBLE REPORT ANALYSIS (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT R
NETWORK INTELLIGENCE SUMMARY – TROUBLE REPORTS (2) (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT S
ADDITIONAL NETWORK INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT S
COVAD – PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT 55.1 – EXCLUSIONS (CONFIDENTIAL)	ATTACHMENT T

Brian D. Noland and William R. Dysart, being of lawful age and duly sworn upon my oath, do hereby depose and state as follows:

1. My name is Brian D. Noland. I am adopting the affidavit(s) previously filed by Candy R. Conway in CC Docket No. 00-4, representing SWBTs Interconnection Services organization, including the Local Service Center (LSC) and Local Operations Center (LOC).
2. I am currently Director-Local Wholesale Operations. In this capacity, I am responsible for regulatory issues concerning Southwestern Bell Telephone's (SWBT's) LSC and LOC teams.
3. I am a graduate of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Engineering. I began working for SWBT in August 1980 in El Dorado, Arkansas, as an Installation Supervisor. I transferred to Fayetteville, Arkansas in August 1981 and held several positions within the Installation and Repair Department through 1987. In January 1988, I moved to Little Rock, Arkansas and held the position of Manager – Special Services Design. I was promoted to Area Manager – External Affairs in December 1988 and held this position until June 1989 at which time I was transferred to Jonesboro, Arkansas as Area Manager – Residence Service Center (RSC). In May 1993 I accepted the assignment of Area Manager – Installation and Repair in Jonesboro, a position I held until September 1997 when I transferred to Fort Worth, Texas as Area Manager – LSC. I held this position until January 1999, when I accepted another assignment within the Local Wholesale Operations as Area Manager – Local Number Portability Center (LNPC). I held this job until I was promoted to my current position.

4. ~~My name is~~ My name is William R. Dysart. I am the same William R. Dysart who filed direct testimony and supplemental in this proceeding. I am employed as Director – Performance Measures for SWBT.

#### **PURPOSE OF AFFIDAVIT**

5. The purpose of this affidavit is to address issues raised by third party intervenors in this proceeding concerning the operation, methods, procedures and performance of SWBT's LSC and LOC. Among other things, this affidavit addresses SWBT's performance in provisioning hot cuts, processing orders for pre-combined network elements, and provisioning unbundled loops for wholesale customers' advanced services.

#### **UNE LOOP CONVERSIONS**

6. SWBT has provided the FCC with unequivocal evidence demonstrating SWBT's satisfaction of the requirements of the Act with regard to the provisioning of unbundled loops through the Coordinated Hot Cut (CHC) process. Specifically, the Joint Supplemental Joint Affidavit of Candy Conway and William R. Dysart (the Conway/Dysart Supplemental Affidavit),<sup>1</sup> filed April 5, 2000, demonstrated that SWBT's CHC loop provisioning performance meets or exceeds the standards found acceptable by the FCC in its Bell Atlantic New York Order:<sup>1</sup> at least 90% on time performance for orders of less than 10 lines; no more than 5% outages on conversion; and no more than 2% troubles reported within 7 days of installation. Moreover, looking beyond the specific Bell Atlantic New York findings, SWBT performs hot cuts in a manner that allows CLECs in Texas a meaningful opportunity to compete.
7. SWBT's compliance with these standards is further demonstrated by the following facts, which respond directly to the complaints raised by the CLECs in their reply comments.

---

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum Opinion and Order, Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York, 15 FCC Rcd 3953

On Time Performance (PM 114.1)

8. To address concerns related to the reliability of SWBT's reported data, SWBT and interested CLECs, at the direction of the TPUC, reconciled their raw data for hot cut PMs 114.1 (hot cut duration/on time performance) and 114 (early disconnects) for the months of December, January and February. Reconciling CLECs included AT&T, MCI WorldCom and NEXTLINK for PM 114, and AT&T and MCI WorldCom for PM 114.1 on LNP with loop.
9. At Tab 2 of its ex parte filed April 25, 2000 (Reported/Reconciled Results Summary for PM 114.1), SWBT provided a recalculation of its CHC performance under PM 114.1 using reconciled data where available. SWBT's performance – after reconciliation with interested CLECs – continued to meet the FCC requirements for CHC with an average of 89.92% completions within one hour (96.24% within the TPUC's two-hour benchmark) on orders of 1-10 lines over the three months.
10. As part of the reconciliation process, the TPUC also directed the reconciliation of data for the Frame Due Time (FDT) process for PMs 114 and 114.1. SWBT's recalculated PM 114.1 results for FDT using reconciled data also meets the FCC's standards, with an average of 93.5% completions within one hour (and 95.62% within two hours) on orders of 1-10 lines for the months of December, January and February.
11. In response to concerns expressed by DOJ and by CLECs that SWBT's current performance does not capture the "gap" between completion of the CHC and notification to the CLEC, SWBT has undertaken to calculate the average lapsed time based on the AT&T/SWBT reconciled data for PM 114.1.
12. In reconciling data for PM 114.1, it is SWBT's understanding that AT&T provided raw

---

(1999):3953, 4114-15, ¶ 309 (1999) ("Bell Atlantic New York Order").

data on all cutovers for which AT&T identified a discrepancy between its log notes and SWBT's raw data, including any discrepancies on conversion end times. In most cases, a discrepancy on the end time for the CHC conversion represented the difference between the time recorded by AT&T (i.e., the time AT&T received a call from the SWBT technician notifying AT&T that the cutover was complete), and the time recorded by SWBT (i.e., the time the cutover was completed in the central office). It is SWBT's understanding that, where no discrepancy was identified by AT&T, the conversion end times reported by SWBT and AT&T were roughly identical.

13. Accordingly, to calculate the "average gap" between the time SWBT completed the work in the Central Office and the time SWBT notified AT&T of the cut, SWBT has divided the sum of the "gaps" identified during the course of the PM 114.1 reconciliation process by the total number of AT&T CHC orders for December, January and February. This calculation yields an "average gap" of 6 minutes in December, 0 minutes in January, and 10 minutes in February. The average gap for all the AT&T CHC orders was 7 minutes. The data used to make this calculation is provided as Attachment A to this affidavit. As discussed later in this affidavit, as part of the TPUC six-month performance measurement review process SWBT and the CLECs have agreed that in the future the conversion end time will be measured at the time the SWBT technician notifies the CLEC of completion. However, the results provided above demonstrate that the delay is not significant on an average basis.
14. SWBT's results on PM 114.1 for both CHC and FDT improved in March and April. Attachment B to this affidavit updates the Reported/Reconciled Results Summary for PM 114.1 (originally provided as Tab 2 to SWBT's April 25 Ex Parte) with March and April

data which have not been reconciled. For March, SWBT's combined CHC/FDT on-time performance for cuts of 1-10 lines within one hour was ~~93.94.05~~ 94.16%; for April the total was ~~95.43~~ 95.36%. Both FDT (~~94.95~~ 95.108%) and CHC (~~93.40~~ 93.86%) are well within the FCC's 90% standard and the TPUC's benchmark for the three month February – April time period.

15. On May 5, 2000 the TPUC issued Order No. 9 requiring reconciliation of March and April performance measure data for PMs 114, 114.1 and 115 between SWBT and interested CLECS. Pursuant to the order, CLECs and SWBT were to complete the reconciliation of March LNP with Loop data for both CHC and FDT orders on or before May 19. The reconciliation of March stand-alone LNP data is to be completed on or before May 26. April data is to be completed on or before June 9.
16. As of May 19, two CLECs (NEXTLINK and Allegiance) have requested to reconcile March LNP with loop data. Reconciliations with NEXTLINK on PM 114 are complete; SWBT will file affidavits outlining the results of those reconciliations on May 19. A joint matrix on the NEXTLINK reconciliation will be filed by May 26, reporting reconciliation results on the \*\*\* \_\_\_\_\_ \*\*\* for PM 114 on which discrepancies were found to exist. Due to an unintentional delay on SWBT's part in responding to Allegiance's request to reconcile, the reconciliation will not be completed by May 19, 2000. Immediate attention is being given to this reconciliation and results will be reported as soon as they are complete.<sup>2</sup>

#### Outages (PM 114 & PPIG Reconciliation)

17. PM 114 measures the percentage of premature disconnects on CHC and FDT orders. Tab 1 of SWBT's April 25 Ex Parte (PM 114 Reported/Reconciled Results Summary) provided a

<sup>2</sup> Teligent, CoServ and Austin Bestline have all requested to reconcile stand-alone LNP for March.

recalculation of SWBT's performance results to include both reconciled and reported data.

SWBT's results on PM 114 for the December through February time frame for CHC averaged 4.45% premature disconnects, and 2.27% premature disconnects for FDT, both within the FCC's 5% standard for hot cut outages.

18. In order to further assess the quality of SWBT's performance with regard to outages occurring upon installation, the TPUC followed a procedure similar to the one undertaken by the New York Commission and supervised a comprehensive, collaborative reconciliation of AT&T's outage data for the months of December, January and February. The initial results of that reconciliation were reported in the ~~Conway/Dysart~~ Joint Supplemental Affidavit ¶ 27 of Candy Conway and William Dysart (Conway/Dysart Supp. Aff. ¶ 27); the final results are contained in the Joint Affidavit of Mark Van De Water and Robert Royer filed with the TPUC on April 21, 2000, and attached to SWBT's April 25 Ex Parte.<sup>3</sup> A summary of the agreed-upon PPIG results for March is Attachment C to this affidavit.
19. As noted by AT&T (De Young/Van De Water Supp. Decl. ¶ 38-39) the fully reconciled PPIG results for December through February show greater outages than the initial results reported in the ~~Conway/Dysart affidavit~~ Supp. Aff. However, AT&T fails to mention that these PPIG outage results include premature disconnects already reported in PM 114, resulting in those disconnects being "double counted."
20. Also, for PPIG reconciliation purposes only, SWBT agreed to AT&T's request that any FDT conversion with a duration of more than 30 minutes would be considered an "outage," regardless of whether any actual outage occurred.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, this agreement has resulted

<sup>3</sup> On Friday, May 19, 2000, SWBT and AT&T discussed reopening their agreed-upon TPUC data reconciliation results to ensure that the data is correct. The parties will set a date to go over the data, and will apprise both the TPUC and the FCC of any changes in results.

<sup>4</sup> Notably, the ~~Bell Atlantic New York Order~~ provides no support for AT&T's suggestion that the FCC should

in an unintentional (at least on SWBT's part) skewing of the PPIG results. For the purposes of the current version of PM 114.1, SWBT has two hours to complete cuts of up to 24 lines. Service disruptions of some duration are inherent in the hot cut process and CLECs are instructed that they are responsible for advising their customers that service outages may occur during the provisioning period. See Accessible Letter CLEC99-092 dated July 15, 1999, filed with this Commission in Appendix G, Tab 621 of SWBT's January 10 Application. As such, for performance measurement purposes the PPIG data unfairly penalizes SWBT by considering any FDT cut that takes more than 30 minutes to provision as an "outage." In most instances, SWBT does not believe any such outage occurred. In any event, however, SWBT should not be penalized for outages occurring within the TPUC-approved time frame allowed for completion of the cut.

21. ~~When adjusted to exclude premature disconnects reported in PM 114, and to exclude any conversions with a duration of less than one hour (in recognition of the standard approved by the FCC for BANY on conversions of less than 10 lines), the AT&T/SWBT reconciled PPIG outage data for CHC falls well within the BANY standard for three of the last four months: 0.71% in December; 0% in January; 3.37% in February and 7.01% in March, for an average four month result of 3.33%. See Attachment D to this affidavit (Percent of Lines with Outages Based on PPIG Data).~~
22. When adjusted to exclude premature disconnects reported in PM 114 and to exclude any FDT conversions with a duration of less than one hour (in recognition of the standard approved by the FCC for BANY on conversions of less than 10 lines), the reconciled PPIG data for FDT

---

~~consider the benchmark interval for FDT as just a half hour. SWBT has offered FDT voluntarily as an alternative to the CHC process. As noted by the TPUC, a stricter standard would inappropriately discourage innovation by SWBT and other BOCs across the country. See Evaluation of the Texas Public Utility Commission, CC Docket No. 00-65, at 14 (Apr. 26, 2000).~~

shows a higher percentage of outages than for CHC~~The adjusted PPIG results show a higher percentage for FDT outages: 12.95% in December; 19.35% in January; 8.7% for February; and 0% in March. The options available to a CLEC that is concerned about these outage rates are discussed later in our affidavit.~~

23. FDT and CHC results were both impacted by a SOAC/MARCH programming error in February that resulted in an excessive number of early disconnects. This programming error was discussed in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Conway/Dysart Supp. Affidavit ¶¶ 10-11~~Supplemental Affidavit~~. Although tests were run prior to implementation of the SOAC update, the particular scenario that led to the early disconnects was not part of the testing routine. In order to ensure that this problem does not occur in the future, SWBT has enhanced its pre-update testing to apply this additional scenario to its routine procedures. SWBT takes full responsibility for the SOAC problem, and is being held accountable. Performance measures impacted by this software problem have not been restated, nor have any SWBT performance penalties been negated.
24. Following correction of the SOAC error, SWBT's results on PM 114 for both CHC and FDT improved significantly in March and April. Attachment E to this affidavit updates Tab 1 of SWBT's April 25 Ex Parte with March and April data. CHC results improved from 13.44% in February to 0.75% in March, and 0.93% in April. Similarly, FDT improved from 4.49% in February to 1.42% in March, and 2.27% in April. SWBT's average performance on both FDT and CHC for the three month period, February — April time period through April, is 3.60%, well within the FCC's 5% standard for outages on conversion.
25. As discussed in prior affidavits (Conway Affidavit, Aff. ¶¶ 85-89) FDT is a relatively new ordering option for provisioning UNE loops on a non-coordinated basis. The option was

implemented with the May 1, 1999 release; ordering options were clarified with a July 15, 1999 Accessible Letter and CLEC testing took place in August of that year. Since that time SWBT has worked both internally and with the CLECs to improve its service offering.

26. FDT was not an option available to CLECs in the BANY region, nor is it an alternative the FCC has found necessary in order to provide CLECs with a “meaningful opportunity to compete.” As SWBT’s significantly improved FDT results for March and April demonstrate, SWBT has devoted considerable effort to improving its FDT performance. While SWBT does not believe it should be penalized for voluntarily making an additional ordering option available to CLECs – as would be the case if both CHC and FDT were held to the New York criteria – SWBT is committed to continued development and improvement of its FDT offering. SWBT’s performance to date has demonstrated that FDT is a viable option for those CLECs who choose not to use the CHC process.<sup>5</sup>
27. AT&T complains that the explanation provided by SWBT for its January PPIG results on FDT (namely cuts outside the window, including IDLC, and LSC error) are inadequate to explain the results (De Young/Van De Water Supp. Decl. ¶ 45).<sup>6</sup> In fact, as noted by AT&T, the PPIG results reported in the Conway/Dysart affidavit Supplemental Affidavit were preliminary, and considerable reconciliation activity took place after the affidavit was filed. Accordingly, at the time SWBT reported those initial results, it did not have the full benefit of a complete PPIG reconciliation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Notably, the Bell Atlantic New York Order provides no support for AT&T’s suggestion that the FCC should consider the benchmark interval for FDT as just a half hour. SWBT has offered FDT voluntarily as an alternative to the CHC process. As noted by the TPUC, a stricter standard would inappropriately discourage innovation by SWBT and other BOCs across the country. See Evaluation of the Texas Public Utility Commission, CC Docket No. 00-65, at 14 (Apr. 26, 2000). Commission at 14 (CC Docket No. 00-65 filed Apr. 26, 2000).

<sup>6</sup> The explanations provided in paragraph 29 of the Conway/Dysart affidavit at ¶ 29 Supplemental Affidavit clearly relate to January FDT results. It appears that the De Young/Van De Water affidavit Affidavit has misinterpreted SWBT’s explanation as applying to all three months, December through February.

28. Attachment F to this affidavit is a chart providing January reconciled PPIG data for SWBT-caused FDT outages. This chart provides the agreed-upon cause assigned during the course of the PPIG for each such outage, as this information was filed with the TPUC in the Joint Affidavit of Mark Van De Water and Robert Royer (~~Tab 3,~~ (SWBT's April 25 Ex Parte, Attachment 3). As this chart demonstrates, out of 20 orders for which the outage was attributable to SWBT, 4 related to cuts outside the window and 6 related to LSC error.
29. SWBT does not dispute the IDLC numbers provided in paragraph 42 of the De Young/Van De Water Affidavit ~~¶ 42, Supplemental Declaration~~. However, since SWBT identified the process breakdown in handling IDLC requests and undertook the corrective action of sending "flashes" to the LSC and LOC service representatives (Conway/Dysart Supp. Aff. ¶ 30), IDLC issues have continued to diminish. There are no known IDLC identified problems in the February or March 2000 PPIG data.
30. Although AT&T complains of SWBT January FDT performance explanations, the fact is that CHC performance is within the FCC's criteria for outages, and FDT performance is improving.

#### Data Integrity

31. Much has been made over supposed problems with "data integrity" and the reporting of SWBT's results on its hot cut performance measurements.<sup>7</sup> However, despite the hue and cry, the CLECs have failed to present any evidence demonstrating that SWBT's results are unreliable, or that SWBT has failed to accurately report its performance on these measurements.
32. To date, AT&T and SWBT have reconciled PMs 114, 115 and 58 for August and

---

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., AT&T DeYoung/Van de Water: Allegiance Page 1, ¶8-9, ALTS Krabill ¶9, ALTS Koch/Smith ¶14, RCN Telecom Pages 9-10, Sprint Pages DeYoung/Van de Water Supp. Decl.; Allegiance Supp. at 1, ALTS' Krabill

September and PMs 114 and 114.1 for December through February. As discussed below, while differences were noted during the reconciliation process, there were no material changes to SWBT's reported results on these measures.

33. Although AT&T complains that SWBT's results on PM 114 "significantly understated its poor performance" (DeYoung/Van de Water Supp. Aff. ¶ 29), the fact of the matter is that the difference between the reconciled and reported results on PM 114 was minimal. Based on reported results, SWBT missed the benchmark for PM 114 for February as a result of the SOAC/MARCH programming error discussed earlier. SWBT's February reconciliation with AT&T resulted in minimal changes to SWBT's reporting of premature disconnects, as follows:

- CHC (Dallas) from \*\*\* \*\*\* to \*\*\* \*\*\*<sup>8</sup>
- CHC (Houston) no change
- FDT (Dallas) from \*\*\* \*\*\* to \*\*\* \*\*\*<sup>9</sup>
- FDT (Houston) no change

34. There was no change to SWBT's reported results for PM 114.1 for December and January based on its reconciliation with AT&T. For February, SWBT's reported results showed that it had met the TPUC benchmark of 100% conversions completed with 120 minutes. Upon reconciliation, SWBT agreed that it had missed the benchmark for FDT on a total of \*\*\* \*\*\*\*\* \*\*\* lines, representing 4% of the total \*\*\* \*\*\* lines provisioned via FDT in February. While this reduced SWBT's performance on AT&T's cuts to 96%, SWBT's "All CLEC" reconciled/reported results for February on this measure (99.2% for

---

Supp. Aff. ¶ 9, ALTS Koch/Smith Supp. Aff. ¶ 14, RCN Telecom Supp. at 9-10, Sprint Supp. at 26-28.

<sup>8</sup> \*\*\* \*\*\* of the \*\*\* \*\*\*\*\* \*\*\* of the \*\*\* \*\*\* premature cuts were the result of the SOAC software programming problem.

<sup>9</sup> \*\*\* \*\*\* of the \*\*\* \*\*\*\*\* \*\*\* of the \*\*\* \*\*\* premature cuts were the result of the SOAC software programming problem.

CHC and 95.63% for CHC and FDT combined)<sup>10</sup> are well within the FCC's approved standard of 90% completions within one hour on orders of <10 lines. SWBT agrees with AT&T's statement that perfection, or "zero percent defects" is always a desired standard (De Young/Van De Water ¶ 10-11; Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 10-11). However, while perfection will never be attainable in a process involving human activity and input, SWBT believes its results – both reported and reconciled – are more than sufficient to provide CLECs a meaningful opportunity to compete.

35. Similarly, SWBT's PM 58 (SWBT Caused Missed Due Dates) reconciliation with AT&T, which involves mechanized data collection, had minimal changes. SWBT and AT&T reconciled both 8dB and 5dB loop results. For the Dallas market area (DFW), there were no changes between the original and reconciled 8dB loop (combined field work/no field work) results for PM 58 for August and a one percent change for September (on a base of ~~\*\*\* \*\* orders, \*\*\* \*\* orders, \*\*\* \*\* orders~~ were found to be SWBT caused missed due dates). For the Houston market area, there were no changes from the original to the reconciled results. The DFW 5dB loop results were reported on a circuit basis as follows: original results for August and September 0.0% (base of ~~\*\*\* \*\* circuits~~) and 0% (base ~~\*\*\* \*\* circuits~~), respectively, and reconciled results were 0.8% (base of ~~\*\*\* \*\* circuits~~) and 13.6% (base ~~\*\*\* \*\* circuits~~), respectively. The reconciled change represented ~~\*\*\* \*\* order(s) with \*\*\* \*\* circuits in August and \*\*\* \*\* order(s) with \*\*\* \*\* circuits in September~~. Houston 5dB loop results did not change between the original and reconciled results. The reconciled results for the mechanized PM 58 were

<sup>10</sup> See ~~SBC's~~ SBC's April 25 ex parte, attachment ~~Attachment~~ Attachment 2.

inconsequential.

36. Based on its data reconciliation on PM 114, NEXTLINK has expressed concerns both in its supplemental filing (Krabill Affidavit, Supp. Aff. ¶ 8) and before the TPUC that SWBT's data failed to capture a number of NEXTLINK outages. SWBT's reply to NEXTLINK's specific concerns, as filed with the TPUC, appears as Attachment G to this affidavit. As set out in that response, when a ~~Premature Disconnect~~ "Premature Disconnect" occurs, the CLEC is instructed to call the LOC provisioning unit. The LOC has two outage desks set up. ~~One~~ one for LNP with loop and the other for LNP only. The personnel that work these outage desks will reinstate the end user's service and record the activities associated with the outage. If the outage is determined to be a "Premature Disconnect," the outage desk logs the information required to report it. Rather than reporting all such outages to the LOC, however, NEXTLINK notified the LSC line unit that handles orders for NEXTLINK. The LSC line worked the issue for ~~NEXTLINK~~ NEXTLINK, but since acceptance of these types of trouble reports was outside its regular duties, the LSC did not report the outages back to the LOC outage desk. For this reason, these outages were not included in the raw data for PM 114. This process was explained to NEXTLINK during the reconciliation meeting, and NEXTLINK was asked to call the provisioning unit in the future, to avoid a possible recurrence of this situation. Also, the LOC Manager responsible for Premature Disconnects has met with the LSC management team and developed a process for ensuring that outages called to the LSC line unit are referred to the LOC for handling and reporting purposes.
37. SWBT has taken every precaution to ensure that SWBT data is accurate and complete. The SWBT LOC technicians track and document hot cut activity into the OSSLOG screen in

- WFA. Each event is documented as it occurs with each step of the provisioning process to ensure that SWBT data is timely and accurate. The technician then inputs the same information for completion of the service order into the comment/remark field of the DOCOMP screen of WFA. This completion information is used for performance measurement reporting purposes.
38. A quality manager and a training manager were assigned to the LOC CHC/FDT work group as of April 1. These managers are assisting the LOC line managers and technicians with their ongoing work quality and training requirements. In that capacity, a quality review was conducted for all orders completed through April 15, in which a comparison was performed on the WFA OSSLOG notes and the comment/remark field of the close-out information related to the service order completion. For the remainder of the month, a random sample methodology was used to continue this review. Discrepancies between the OSSLOG notes and comment/remark field were reviewed with the responsible employee. In addition, any employee who is consistently identified as a source of errors is subject to disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal.
39. NEXTLINK has requested that SWBT provide an explanation of its performance measurement raw data, indicating that the column headings and formatting are difficult to understand. ALTS/CLEC Coalition's Krabill Supp. Aff. ¶¶ 11-13. At the April 12 TPUC work session, NEXTLINK acknowledged the data currently being provided has understandable columns and headings that are appropriate going forward. The inescapable truth is that raw data can be difficult to decipher and understand. SWBT has undertaken an effort to clear up those difficulties as much as possible, as evidenced by NEXTLINK's comments (April 12, 2000 Workshop Transcript (Tr. at 15) at 15, attached to the Texas PUC

Supp. Eval.) and by AT&T's comments that the past six months of data production have seen improvement in presentation, and the presentation is now ~~are~~ at a point it can be stabilized (April 12, 2000 Tr. at 16). In order to further assist the CLECs in utilizing SWBT's raw data, SWBT has scheduled a workshop to be held during the week of June 26 to assist CLECs in reading and understanding raw data reports.

40. On April 15, 2000, AT&T filed (in TPUC Docket 16251) a UNE-L [loop] Coordinated Cutover Action Item List identifying 15 areas of the "hot cut" process that they believed would improve with changes. On May 11, 2000, SWBT filed its response to AT&T's process improvement suggestions. As set out in that response (Attachment H to this affidavit), SWBT has responded to AT&T's suggestions by undertaking various enhancements to SWBT's data collection and reporting mechanisms, as well as initiating process improvements and additional training for LSC and LOC personnel.

Trouble Reports (PM 59, I-10 and I-7 Breakdowns)

~~42-41.~~ Finally, SWBT's performance in providing "trouble free" hot cut lines upon installation is comparable to the FCC approved standard of no more than 2% trouble reports within 7 days of installation. As discussed in paragraph 9 of the Conway Reply Affidavit~~9~~ and paragraphs 19 through 20 of the Conway/Dysart Supplemental Affidavit~~19-20~~, SWBT's performance on troubles after installation is measured by PM 59: Percent Installation Reports (Trouble Reports) Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation. Although I-30 information is tracked according to loop type (8db; 5db; and BRI), the information is not mechanically broken down into FDT and CHC. In order to provide the FCC with a more manageable comparison to Bell Atlantic, which measures its trouble reports on a 7 day basis, SWBT undertook a manual breakdown of its I-30 report into trouble reports received on CHC and FDT conversions within

10 days of installation. SWBT's March results (attached to its April 25 ex parte) of 1.45% on CHC and 1.84% on FDT clearly meet the FCC's standards. While the three-month combined results for January –through March on FDT (2.45%) slightly exceed the 2% threshold, the average is distorted by February's results of 3.28% which – again – are attributable to the now-corrected SOAC/MARCH programming error.

42. In its comments, AT&T questions why SWBT chose to break its I-30 report down to a 10 day report, rather than a 7 day report – stating that the only “apparent” reason for creating such an “idiosyncratic” measure is to “create a new excuse for its non-compliant performance.” AT&T's De Young/Van De Water Supp. Decl. ¶ 70. In fact, SWBT initially chose an I-10 breakdown, because it is not an “idiosyncratic” measure for SWBT – rather, it is a measure that applies in other performance categories, such as PM 35. SWBT's purpose in providing the I-10 data was simply to demonstrate, using a measure consistent with SWBT's general trouble reporting, a comparable analogy to the FCC's analysis of Bell Atlantic-New York's (BA-NY's) performance.
43. In response to AT&T's concerns, however, SWBT has broken its I-30 results into an I-7 report. Attachment I to this affidavit sets out the I-7 and I-10 results for CHC and FDT for the December through March time frame. Contrary to AT&T's contention, SWBT's I-7 (averaging 1.9% trouble reports within seven days over the four month period) are within the FCC's approved 2% standard. By breaking this report down into CHC and FDT troubles reported with ten days of installation, SWBT captured more troubles than would have been captured within seven days of installation. Yet, even with these additional three days included, the level of service provided by SWBT to the CLECs, in terms of troubles reported ~~after, installation~~ after installation, is consistent with the level of performance

found sufficient by the FCC in the New York proceeding.

44. The evidence provided by SWBT on its hot cut provisioning performance demonstrates that SWBT provides CLECs with non-discriminatory access to unbundled local loops in a manner that complies with the requirements of the Act and the standards approved by the FCC. As part of the six-month performance measurement review now on-going with the TPUC, SWBT and the CLECs are working to further refine the hot cut measurement process.

#### Hot Cut Performance Measurement Review Status

45. At the April 12, 2000 TPUC work session, SWBT presented a set of initial proposals for PMs 114, 114.1 and 115. During the course of the work sessions held from April 12 – 17, these proposals were revised, based on CLEC input. By the end of the work session on April 17, SWBT and the CLECs had reached agreement on all aspects of these measures, with the exception of the benchmarks. Transcripts for the April 12, April 14 and April 17 workshops, Project Nos. 20400 & 22165, are attached to the Texas PUC

Evaluation). Supplemental Evaluation. Significant features of the negotiated measures, which are reflected in Attachment J to this affidavit, include the following:

- As revised, PMs 114 and 114.1 will measure premature disconnects for CHC/FDT LNP with Loop only. Premature disconnects for stand-alone LNP will be reported under PM 96 and percent out of service for stand-alone LNP will be reported under PM 101.
- Consistent with the recommendations of CLECs and the DOJ in the FCC's section 271 proceeding, the business rules for PM 114.1 were revised to provide that the conversion ends after the SWBT technician has notified the CLEC that the cut-over has been completed. See, e.g., Evaluation of the United States Department of Justice, CC Docket No. 00-4, at 31 n.84 (Feb. Justice at 31, n.84 (CC Docket No. 00-04 filed Feb. 14, 2000); Apr. 12, 2000 Tr. at 54 (Ms. De Young) ("[I] think that would close that gap to our satisfaction.").
- New PM 115 measures the percent of CHC/FDT circuits for which the CLEC submits

a provisioning trouble report (“PTR”) on the day of the conversion, or by noon on the next business day. This measure provides the “outages on conversion” measurement that AT&T and other CLECs have indicated is important to them. See, e.g., Apr. 12, 2000 Tr. at 97 (Ms. De Young). By relying upon trouble reports, this change also will render it unnecessary to perform the sort of manual, potentially subjective outage assessments that have been performed under the auspices of the PPIG. See id. at 38-39 (Mr. Cooper, SWBT); see also id. at 92 (Ms. De Young) (“[I]t would be beneficial to CLECs and to SWBT to mechanize the tracking of these provisioning troubles.”).

- PM 115 was established as a Tier 1 and Tier 2 “High” measurement at the CLECs’ request. Apr. 12, 2000 Tr. at 170-71 (Ms. De Young).
- New PM 115.1 adds an additional dimension to hot cut reporting, by tracking the average duration of a provisioning trouble from the receipt of the PTR to the time it is cleared. Again, this approach will avoid the manual review of hot cut records and ensuing guesswork that has characterized the PPIG reconciliations.

46. At the April 17 work session, AT&T and SWBT agreed to measure PMs 114, 114.1 and 115 on the basis of lines, rather than on the basis of CHC or FDT orders. Apr. 17, 2000 Tr. at 211-212. However, the parties were unable to agree on the appropriate benchmark to be applied to these measurements. That issue is presently pending before the TPUC.

#### Lines vs. Orders

47. There simply is no basis for AT&T’s complaint that reporting SWBT’s performance based on lines rather than orders “likely overstates” SWBT’s performance as compared to BANY. See De Young/Van De Water Supp. Decl. ¶ 52. In fact, based on SWBT’s reconciliation with AT&T, Attachment K provides recalculated CHC and FDT conversion results for PMs 114 and 114.1 from December through March. This recalculation shows that changing from line-based reporting to order-based reporting does not have any substantial or consistent impact on the percentage results. Consider the results for PM 114.1 for the months of December 1999 through March 2000, as set out in Attachment K. Of the eight reported results (CHC and FDT for the four months), two showed no change when line-based results were recalculated on an order basis. For three results, SWBT’s percentage

performance improved; and for the remaining three results, SWBT's percentage performance was less good. ~~Averaging all eight results,~~ SWBT's overall timeliness was ~~945.56%~~ for AT&T's orders using the line method and ~~9695.19%~~ using the order method – the results were essentially unchanged. This analysis demonstrates that the line-based reporting in Texas has no substantial impact on the reported results.

#### CHC/FDT Pricing and Availability

48. Section 3.2.2 of the CLEC Handbook, entitled "Policy on Coordinated Cuts for LNP" advises the CLECs of the "threshold" for application of charges for CHC conversions. This same information was provided to the CLECs via Accessible Letter CLEC 98-074 dated September 11, 1998 (see ~~Appendix G, App. G;~~ Tab 214 of SWBT's January 10 Application). CHC charges apply when a CLEC requests coordination on a conversion of 19 or fewer lines or whenever a CHC is requested outside normal business hours.
49. The CHC charges contained in the T2A (Attachment 6, Appendix – Schedule of Prices at 12) are as follows:
- \$21.44 Basic Rate (normal business hours) per 1/4 hour and each additional 1/4 hour increment.
  - \$28.01 Overtime Rate (Monday-Saturday, outside normal business hours) per 1/4 hour and each additional ¼ hour increment.
  - \$34.59 Premium Rate (Sunday and Holidays) Per 1/4 hour and each additional 1/4 hour increment.
50. These rates were arbitrated by the TPUC as part of the AT&T "Mega Arbitration" proceeding, and are based on the work required to complete a CHC. As discussed above CHC hot cuts are completed within one hour in the vast majority of cases.

51. On July 15, 1999 SWBT notified the CLECs of the availability of the FDT ordering process via Accessible Letter CLEC 99-092 (see Appendix G, Tab 621), App. G; Tab 621 of SWBT's Jan. 10, 2000 Application). Although there is no charge for FDT hot cuts, which reflects SWBT's policy of making this process an attractive optional offering for CLECs, there is, in fact, substantial labor associated with an FDT conversion. Two technicians typically are involved in CHC and FDT conversions. The table below shows the work activity required both types of conversions.

**CHC and FDT Work Activity Comparison**

	<b>Central Office Jumper Work</b>	<b>Line/Loop Continuity Testing before Conversion</b>	<b>Line/Loop Continuity Testing after Conversion</b>	<b>LOC Technician On-Line Coordination</b>	<b>Standby Assistance after Service Order Completion if Requested by the CLEC</b>
<b>CHC</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>FDT</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>

52. As this chart demonstrates, CHC and FDT are provisioned on an identical basis, with the exception of the following:

- on a CHC, LOC technician will wait for a call from the CLEC to begin the cut; on FDT the technician begins the cut at the time specified on the FDT order; and
- upon the completion of the CHC the LOC technician will notify the CLEC; no notification is provided on an FDT cut.

53. The fact that SWBT is refraining from charging the TPUC-approved labor charges for FDT conversions is one reason why many CLECs may elect to use FDT as a cost-saving alternative to coordinated cuts. Another reason is that the CLEC itself saves personnel resources because coordination with SWBT is not required. In fact, many CLECs do find

FDT an attractive offering. As set out in the table below, with the exception of AT&T, volumes for SWBT's largest users of FDT have generally increased over the last four months.

\*\*\*CONFIDENTIAL TABLE\*\*\*

<b>FDT LNP W/LOOP in TEXAS</b>					

\*\*\*\*\*

54. Although SWBT has in the past encouraged the use of FDT for those orders of 19 or less UNE loops where non-coordinated cuts might suit the CLEC's business plans, use of FDT has never been required. SWBT has always been clear that CLECs may freely opt to have all of their orders for less than 19 loops provisioned via FDT, or via the coordinated process.
55. Recognizing this freedom of choice of the CLECs, SWBT has staffed to a level that allows it to process hot cuts in a timely fashion, regardless of which process CLECs may choose. The Affidavit of Candy Conway ¶ 107(Conway Aff. ¶ 107) describes the force model used to manage anticipated LOC force requirements. The manual work time studies referenced in that paragraph include studies on coordinated hot cut UNE loop provisioning. Volumes are determined based on total UNE loops, regardless of provisioning mechanism. No adjustment has been made to these studies to take advantage of any efficiencies that may have been achieved through UNE loop provisioning via the non-coordinated FDT process. Accordingly, SWBT has staffed on the very conservative assumption that all hot cuts will

be the somewhat more labor-intensive CHCs.

### **ORDER PROCESSING**

56. Despite overwhelming evidence of SWBT's nondiscriminatory performance, certain CLECs (including AT&T, MCI WorldCom, Sprint, ALTS, NEXTLINK and Rhythms) continue to claim that SWBT's manual processes are insufficient to ensure their orders are provisioned in compliance with the performance requirements of the Act. In fact, the performance of the LSC on the areas of particular concern to the CLECs has met and continues to meet the requirements of the Act. SWBT's reply to specific CLEC complaints with regard to order processing follows below.

#### **Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) Return (PM 5)**

57. ALTS/CLEC Coalition (Koch/Smith Supp. Aff. ¶ 11), AT&T (Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 114-116) and Sprint (Supp. at 42-43) all complain that SWBT has failed to meet specific disaggregated FOC benchmarks.
58. While SWBT recognizes the value in disaggregating performance measures, unfortunately focusing on disaggregated results can be misleading when attempting to assess overall performance. SWBT currently has 38 levels of disaggregation for FOC under PM 5. With this many levels of disaggregation for one measurement, it is not surprising or unexpected that there may be certain disaggregations that are out of parity from time to time. However, to assess the CLECs opportunity to compete it is important to put the individual performance for each level of disaggregation by assessing overall performance. For the last 4 months, SWBT has been in parity when looking at FOC from an aggregate perspective. The following table provides a summary of aggregate FOC performance:

%FOCs Met (PM 5)

January 2000	98.71%
February 2000	97.59%
March 2000	96.64%
April 2000	96.31%

59. As can be seen from the table above, SWBT is clearly providing CLECs FOCs in a timely manner.
60. AT&T complains that SWBT failed to meet benchmark requirements for PMs 5-04, 5-06 and 5-16 and states that these measurements were outside of the benchmark for the month of February. Chambers/De Young Supp. Decl. ¶ 114. However, the FOCs missed for these disaggregated measures for all CLECs totaled 248. This number represents 0.55% of the 44,733 FOCs returned on EDI and LEX orders and only 0.27% of 93,279 total orders reported under PM 5. AT&T also fails to point out that for PM 5-04, February was the only month since November that SWBT was out of parity. In fact for March and April SWBT returned 98.1% and 97.6% of the FOCs covered by PM 5-04, "Percent FOCs Returned Within 5 Hours, UNE Loop (1-50) for LEX", within 5 hours respectively. As for PMs 5-06 and 5-16, they represented only 273 FOCs in February or 0.3% of the total FOCs reported in PM 5. Clearly these two measurements do not reflect activities with a major impact on the CLECs ability to compete.

Service Order Completion (SOC)

61. AT&T (Chambers/DeYoung Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 117-118) and MCI WorldCom (McMillon/Sivori/Lichtenberg Supp Decl. ¶¶ 92-95); suggest that SWBT provides “deficient performance” regarding PM 7.1, Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion.
62. Attachment L to this affidavit illustrates SWBT’s Service Order Completion (SOC) performance for the last 12 months. SWBT’s TPUC benchmark for this measurement is 97% completions returned within one day of work completion. As the data indicate, SWBT has met this benchmark for orders submitted via EDI for 9 of the last 12 months with all 9 of those months exceeding the 97% benchmark. Completions returned via LEX have been consistently improving over the last 6 months, even with increasing volumes. In fact, on requests submitted via LEX, data reveal a service order completion performance rate of 95.5% in March and 96.8% in April.
63. MCI WorldCom suggests that its launch of residential service in Texas has been impacted by problems encountered with FOC and SOC return (McMillon/Sivori/Lichtenberg Supp. Decl. ¶ 92-98). MCI WorldCom completely fails to support its claims with any of the detail necessary for SWBT to investigate what may or may not have occurred with regard to the orders in question. However, SWBT did investigate a similar complaint made by MCI WorldCom in an April 26, 2000 letter to the TPUC. SWBT’s April 26, 2000 ex parte.
64. Attachment M to this affidavit provides details on the 53 orders for which MCI WorldCom complained it did not receive a timely FOC. This Attachment shows that:
- 31 LSRs were rejected to MCI with fatal errors, and cancelled by MCI – No FOC due

- 6 LSRs were returned to MCI as rejects – No FOC due
- 1 LSR fatal error returned – No FOC due
- 6 FOCs were correctly provided
- 9 FOCs were returned late

65. While SBC strives to return all FOCs in a timely manner, in this case just 9 of \*\*\* FOCs were delayed.

66. While MCI WorldCom also complained to the TPUC that 42 SOC notices were not received in a timely manner, MCI WorldCom provided detail on only 27 of the orders. With respect to those 27, as set out in Attachment M to this affidavit, SWBT's investigation revealed the following:

- 2 SOCs sent on time
- 10 Jeopardy Notifications sent after FOC – No SOC due
- 15 SOCs sent late

67. SWBT strives to provide timely SOCs on every applicable order. In this case, SOCs were delayed in 15 of \*\*\* orders, or \*\*\*

#### Manual Rejects

68. AT&T and MCI WorldCom cite SWBT's performance in returning manual rejects via LASR GUI as reported in PM 10.1 and 11.1. Chambers/De Young Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 99-106; MCI WorldCom's McMillion/Sivori Decl. ¶¶ 161-162.

69. Performance Measurement 10.1, Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours, measures the percentage of LSRs that are sent electronically

by the CLEC, and are then rejected manually by the LSC and returned to the CLEC via LASR GUI. SWBT's performance on PM 10.1 for the last four months has been below TPUC-approved benchmark of 97% rejects returned within 5 hours of receipt of the LSR: January 82.4%, February 78.9%, March 77.9% and April 81.6%. However, the actual amount of time it takes SWBT to return a manual reject to the CLEC, as measured by PM 11.1, Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects Received via LEX or EDI, has improved dramatically over the same time period — moving from 28.5 hours in January to 7.5 hours in February, 6.4 hours in March and 4.9 hours in April. The dichotomy in the results on these two measures — in which SWBT's mean time to return rejects is almost at the 5 hour mark, while its actual percentage performance in returning rejects with the 5 hour time frame fails to meet the PM 10.1 benchmark — is explained below.

70. The benchmark set by the TPUC for this measure provides SWBT with a five-hour window for the return of all manual rejects, regardless of the complexity of the order. This standard is significantly higher than the standard of 95% within 24 hours for all manual reject returns approved by the FCC for Bell Atlantic, and is also much higher than the TPUC's own benchmark of 5 hours for FOC return on simple business and residential orders, and 24 hours for complex orders (See PM 5).
71. As detailed in prior affidavits, SWBT has devoted considerable time and attention to improving its results on PM 10.1 — the positive effect of those efforts can be seen in the vast improvement in SWBT's average time to return those rejects as reported in PM 11.1. However, SWBT has come to the conclusion that the TPUC benchmark of 5 hours is not reachable on any consistent basis, given the large number of complex orders being processed. Further, the Bell Atlantic New York Order indicates that a standard this high for

manual reject returns is not necessary in order to provide CLECs with a meaningful opportunity to compete. Accordingly, as part of the ongoing 6-month Performance Measurement review, SWBT has requested that the TPUC revise the benchmark for PM 10.1 by setting a more reasonable performance standard in line with the standard approved for Bell Atlantic.

72. The results on PM 11.1 demonstrate that SWBT is providing the CLECs with rapid turn around on manual rejects returned via LASR GUI, averaging ~~5.24.9~~ hours in April for all orders, including complex. Thus the service currently provided by SWBT on PM 10.1 surpasses the ~~90%~~95% within 24 hours deemed sufficient for Bell Atlantic New York.

#### Jeopardies

73. AT&T complains here (~~AT&T's~~ Chambers/De Young Supp. Decl. ¶ 93) and to the TPUC that SWBT's recategorization of certain rejects as jeopardy notices in January of this year (at the specific request of the CLECs) has led to an artificial reduction in the number of rejects reflected in PM 9, and a corresponding dramatic increase in the number of jeopardy notices received by the CLECs. Last fall, an internal gap was identified in the process of handling orders that have "errored out" from CLEC entry after the FOC has been returned. Initially, the process was to reject those orders. As agreed to in Texas Docket 21000 and with the CLECs in the Change Management Process, on January 15, 2000 SWBT began providing jeopardy notification – rather than reject notices – on such LSRs.
74. As set out in Attachment N to this affidavit (Comments of Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. filed April 19, 2000 in TPUC Project Nos. 16251, 20400 and 22165) the current jeopardy reporting mechanism has had little, if any, impact on the total number of rejects and/or jeopardy notices received by the CLECs as a whole, or by AT&T in particular. Based on

its review of this issue the TPUC concluded that the effect of this process change on the overall reject rate is minimal and does not detract from SWBT's overall performance.

*Evaluation of the Public Utility Commission of Texas, April 26, 2000, Texas PUC Supp.*

Eval. at 9. Attachment O to this affidavit updates the AT&T specific reject/jeopardy information with April data. Notably, AT&T's reject rate in April declined significantly, with no corresponding increase in jeopardies.

75. AT&T's equally unfounded complaints that SWBT should circumvent the established change management process to implement additional up front edits in LASR and MOG to reduce the number of jeopardies received by the CLECs is addressed in the Supplemental Reply Affidavit of Elizabeth Ham filed in this proceeding.
76. NEXTLINK also complains that it is receiving a high rate of jeopardy notices, many of which are post-FOC jeopardies due to SWBT's lack of facilities. Attachment P to this affidavit is a chart showing the total number of LSRs sent and the total number of rejects and jeopardies received by NEXTLINK for the February – April time frame. The number and percentage of facilities jeopardies are shown separately. Attachment Q updates the total jeopardy figures attributable to CLEC and SWBT causes (originally attached as Exhibit D to SWBT's TPUC jeopardy filing). The vast majority of SWBT caused jeopardies relate to a lack of facilities. For NEXTLINK, as with other CLECs, if SWBT is unable to assign facilities, the jeopardy condition will result in a missed due date, and will be reflected in the appropriate performance measurement. The rate of jeopardy notices received by NEXTLINK thus reflects the outcome of nondiscriminatory provisioning of its particular orders, not any failure of the ordering or provisioning processes.

### **UNE P CONVERSIONS/THREE ORDER PROCESS**

77. SWBT has presented overwhelming evidence that its three-order, UNE-P conversion process satisfies all applicable requirements of the Act for UNE provisioning. Complaints by CLECs that this process has caused their end users to experience a systematic loss or impairment of service have repeatedly been shown to be unfounded. For example, as discussed in the Affidavit of Candy Conway filed January 10, 2000 ¶¶ 58-59, (Conway Aff. ¶¶ 58-59), AT&T submitted 539 trouble tickets from the August-September time frame for SWBT to perform root cause analysis. Upon investigation, it was determined that the three-order process was responsible for trouble on only 8 of the tickets submitted, representing only 1.5 percent of the total tickets evaluated and 0.02 percent of the total orders submitted by AT&T during the subject time frame. A similar analysis contained in SWBT's March 24, 2000 Ex Parte demonstrated that only 0.7% 0.7 percent of AT&T's UNE-P conversions in December 1999 and 0.8% 0.8 percent in January resulted in loss of dial tone. See also Ham Aff. ¶¶ 196-202; Ham Reply Aff. ¶¶ 67-74; Ham Supp. Aff. ¶ 31.
78. Despite showings such as this, CLECs continue to make unfounded allegations concerning the three-order process. In its reply comments, CompTel alleges that "SWBT's 3-step process for converting UNE combinations is unlawful and causes significant customer disruptions." CompTel Reply at 2. Not surprisingly, CompTel fails to provide any support for its allegations. MCI WorldCom also makes similar unfounded complaints. MCI's McMillon/Sivori/Lichtenberg Reply Decl. ¶¶ 56-61.
79. Attached to the ~~CompTel~~ CompTel's March 31, 2000 ~~Ex Parte (Ex Parte Letter from Steven A. Augustino, on behalf of CompTel, to Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary, FCC (March 31, 2000).~~ ex parte,<sup>11</sup> Network Intelligence provided information on 43 out of \*\*\* (or

<sup>11</sup> Ex Parte Letter from Steven A. Augustino, on behalf of CompTel, to Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary, FCC (Mar.

16.2%) of the orders it submitted in the October through December 1999 time frame, claiming that these orders suffered an impairment or loss of service attributable to SWBT's three-order process. Upon investigation, SWBT discovered the following:

80. No trouble reports were ever submitted by Network Intelligence on 30 of the 43 orders.

81. Attachment R is a detailed summary of the source of the trouble found on each of the 13 orders on which Network Intelligence submitted a trouble report. None of these troubles relate to the three-order process:

- On Order Nos. 11, 12 & 13, trouble was associated with the end-users' Customer Provided Equipment (CPE) or Inside Wiring.
- On Order Nos. 6, 7, & 8, no trouble was found.
- On Order Nos. 3, 5 & 10, hunting was not properly provisioned due to a line translations problem that was corrected in December.
- On Order Nos. 1, 2, 4 & 9, trouble was associated with central office equipment or cable facilities.

82. Notably, on only two of these orders (Nos. 2 & 9) (or 0.75% of the total orders submitted) was service to the end user disrupted. Further, SWBT was only responsible for trouble on 7 of the 13 submitted reports.

83. Upon investigation of the thirty orders referenced in Network Intelligence's ex parte for which no trouble report was submitted, SWBT was able to locate information clarifying the source of the problem on 17 of the orders as detailed in Attachment S to this affidavit. In the majority of cases, trouble was traced to the submission of incomplete or incorrect orders by Network Intelligence (including failure to request features such as Call Notes, call

---

31, 2000).

forwarding, etc.) None of the 43 orders had problems that were address-related. In no case was the problem experienced by Network Intelligence related to the three-order process.

84. On Tuesday May 9, 2000, SWBT, the Texas PUC staff, and Network Intelligence representatives met to discuss a number of issues, including those raised by Network Intelligence in its ex parte letter. At that meeting SWBT and Network Intelligence agreed to reconcile this data, as well as additional data provided by Network Intelligence relating to the January – April time frame. Given this agreement, we were surprised by Network Intelligence’s May 12, 2000 ex parte (~~Ex Parte Letter from Steven A. Augustino, on behalf of CompTel, to Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary, FCC (May 11, 2000)~~),<sup>12</sup> in which Network Intelligence submitted to the FCC the very same unreconciled data it had agreed to reconcile with SWBT under the supervision of the TPUC.
85. As SWBT noted at the TPUC meeting, the information provided by Network Intelligence in its May 12 ex parte is not sufficient to enable SWBT to undertake a root cause analysis. As agreed at the TPUC meeting, SWBT will meet with Network Intelligence on May 19, 2000 to begin exchanging and reconciling data.
86. The three-order process has been exhaustively examined by the TPUC, by SWBT and by the CLECs. Despite concentrated effort, no systemic factor has been found that would indicate that SWBT’s three-order process is a hindrance to CLECs or a cause of any significant problems for their end users.

### **LIDB UPDATES**

87. MCI WorldCom complains that SWBT’s LIDB update processes are inadequate,

---

<sup>12</sup> Ex Parte Letter from Steven A. Augustino, on behalf of CompTel, to Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary, FCC (May 11, 2000).

complaining particularly of incorrect PIC updates on nineteen customer orders.

McMillion/Sivori/Lichtenberg Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 66-73.

88. MCI WorldCom first brought these orders to the attention of the LSC via a weekly conference call on April 21. Upon investigation, SWBT discovered that 3 service representatives dedicated specifically to processing orders for MCI WorldCom were responsible for these problems. These service representatives upon their own initiative and contrary to LSC processes failed to type the Toll File Guide portion (referred to as the “N” order) of the CLEC’s request in a timely manner. As a result, the portions of the LIDB record which are updated based on the Toll File Guide order also were not updated in a timely manner.
89. To address this issue, all service representatives handling MCI WorldCom orders were immediately covered verbally on the correct typing process. A flash message addressing this same process has also been distributed throughout the LSC for the purpose of reinforcing correct order typing procedures, specifically including the proper process for typing the Toll file Guide order. The 19 orders MCI WorldCom specified in its letter of April 24 to the TPUC have been processed and MCI WorldCom has not identified any additional orders with similar problems.
90. While the majority of PIC-related concerns raised by MCI WorldCom resulted from delays in typing and processing the Toll File Guide as described above, there also were some LSC representative typing errors that contributed to the problem. These typing errors resulted in some of the Toll File Guide orders going into error status, further delaying the PIC update. In order to prevent this situation from recurring, the LSC has enhanced the processes used by the Error Resolution Team (ERT) to assure close monitoring of the error reports and

analysis of the order completion and posting, thus ensuring timely LIDB updates.

91. As discussed in the Supplemental Reply Affidavit of Jan Rogers, the PIC designation in LIDB currently is not utilized to provide any service, and has no impact on implementation of the end-users PIC selection, which is maintained in the dial tone switch (not in the LIDB database) and is not processed off of the Toll File Guide order.
92. SWBT takes the LIDB errors cited by MCI WorldCom seriously and, as set out above, has reinforced its policies on proper order processing with all service representatives. Further, formal discussions have been conducted and documented with the employees in question. While SWBT acknowledges the serious nature of this infraction, the LIDB problems identified represent only 0.52% of the \*\*\* \*\*\*\*\* \*\*\* submitted by MCI WorldCom in April. Given the remedial actions described above, SWBT does not foresee a recurrence of this problem.

### **DIGITAL SUBSCRIBER LINE (DSL)**

#### **Manual Processes**

93. NorthPoint submitted a reply to SWBT's April 5 supplemental filing, with the purported purpose of highlighting concerns related to manual handling of its orders. NorthPoint (Lewandowski Supp. Aff. ¶ 5) states that the "first point of manual intervention and frequent breakdown in the system is that the LSC service representatives must manually review the order for possible errors."<sup>13</sup>
94. When an LSR is received by the LSC via LEX/EDI, the LSR is assigned to a service

---

<sup>13</sup> As previously stated in paragraph 56 of the Conway Affidavit ¶ 56 and the Ham Affidavit ¶¶ 80 and 85, and paragraphs 80 and 85 of the Ham Affidavit, SORD is generally available to CLECs. If the CLEC is uncomfortable with LSC service representatives typing their orders the CLEC may use this system for order input (after prerequisite training), which ensures parity with SWBT as this is the same system utilized by retail service representatives. By utilizing the SORD system NorthPoint service representatives have the ability to correct their

representative who first checks for correct information in all required fields per the guidelines found in SWBT's Local Service Ordering Requirements (LSOR). It is the job of the LSC to screen the LSR in its entirety and, if incomplete or incorrect information is provided by the CLEC, reject the LSR noting all incorrect fields. In the event an LSR is rejected in error, the order is processed as soon as the LSC is notified by the CLEC of the error. The LSC does not require that the CLEC supplement the LSR.

95. NorthPoint also complains of manual typing errors by LSC service representatives, and of the requirements for submission of supplemental LSRs. Lewandowski Supp. Aff. ¶ 6. In the event that an LSC service representative causes an input error, the LSC corrects the order, redistributes and pursues an "expedite" for the installation of that order. (This is the process used for the small number of mis-typed MCI WorldCom orders discussed above, for example.) However, if an LSR is rejected due to CLEC order entry error, a supplemental order is required. When the supplemental LSR is received it is standard operating procedure for every unit within the LSC, including the DSL Unit, to re-start the FOC clock. As previously stated if an LSR is rejected in error or if the LSC causes an error when typing the order into the SORD system, the LSC corrects the LSR without a supplemental LSR from the CLEC. The LSC would then follow the expedite process to ensure a more timely installation for the CLEC.
96. NorthPoint states that its has "on numerous occasions received the wrong loop qualification or no loop qualification at all." Lewandowski Supp. Aff. ¶ 7. SWBT Engineers provide loop qualification information to the CLEC, based on the existing Plant Records. However, there are instances where Pair Gain only or no facilities are found at the time of installation.

---

own errors.

This situation also occurs with orders for retail customers. In an effort to minimize the possibility of problems occurring on the due date for SWBT's wholesale customers, the LOC implemented a procedure to send a field technician to the location on the CTR1 date, 24 to 48 hours prior to the due date of the order. This new procedure will be discussed in more detail later in this affidavit.

97. Lewandowski's claims concerning NorthPoint's ~~"attempts"~~ "attempts" to work with SWBT are particularly misleading. First, SWBT is pleased that NorthPoint formed a close working relationship with a particular manager in the DSL Unit. However, SWBT does not agree that the retirement of that manager has left a ~~"gaping hole"~~ "gaping hole" in its processes. In fact, SWBT immediately replaced the area manager referenced by NorthPoint. The DSL Unit is functioning as before, and orders continue to move through the LSC in an efficient manner. Indeed, in an effort to ensure that manual handling of all DSL orders are processed efficiently, SWBT has supplemented the DSL Unit with an additional area manager. This additional area manager will focus exclusively on DSL customer care matters and adds another level of attention to this growing market segment.
98. SWBT's account management team and LSC representatives have worked diligently to ensure that NorthPoint's needs and concerns are being met on a timely and efficient basis. Through a series of meetings, beginning February 10, SWBT and NorthPoint developed a joint matrix and worked through the issues specifically raised by NorthPoint. Only three of the issues on this matrix remained as open issues when NorthPoint decided on March 2, 2000 that the previously scheduled weekly conference calls were no longer necessary. Subsequently, on April 19, a meeting was held at the officer level between NorthPoint and SWBT account team members. At that meeting it was agreed that the parties would track

and analyze data collected the week of May 15, for the purpose of addressing any process breakdowns that may occur.

99. SWBT has never refused a request to reconcile data with NorthPoint. SWBT's LSC has reconciled and investigated NorthPoint PON data each time that NorthPoint made such a request. In addition, until recently, when NorthPoint withdrew from weekly conference calls, SWBT was performing data reconciliations with this CLEC on a regular basis.

SWBT continues to be willing to reconcile data with NorthPoint on a regular basis.

100. SWBT's LSC and support teams remain in contact with NorthPoint personnel to ensure that its orders are processed as requested, and that NorthPoint personnel are apprised of any new process, method or system change that would impact its operations. As recently as May 1, SWBT representatives contacted Ms. Lewandowski to discuss the April 29 Loop Qualification release, review the operational impact ~~to~~ on manual processes and to discuss any concerns that she might have with these changes.

#### 101. Provisioning

101. As noted above, the LOC has implemented a new method to address the issue of locating possible trouble situations prior to the due date for the wholesale customer. The intent of the installation forces in Texas is to trip the order and attempt to deliver the service on the Center One Date (CTR1). This method was implemented in an effort to identify and overcome any facilities issues prior to the due date. "No access" situations that are encountered on the CTR1 date are noted on the service order log for SWBT information purposes only. The SWBT technician will be dispatched to work the order on the due date where access has been coordinated with the end user by the CLEC. SWBT does not expect the CLECs to arrange access with end users for CTR1 installations. If NorthPoint receives

a request for a due date change on an order that has a status of "~~no access~~" "no access" prior to the due date, they should escalate this request to the appropriate manager in the LOC.

This new process responds to NorthPoint's due date ~~concerns, see~~ concerns (see Lewandowski ¶ 19, Supp. Aff. ¶ 19), and has allowed SWBT to improve its missed due date performance for data CLECs substantially.

102. Covad indicates in ~~their affidavit, Page 20 (A.),~~ their comments, that SWBT's PM 55.1, Average Installation Interval, should be disregarded, because they claim it does not capture all of the DSL loops provided to CLECs in Texas. Covad Supp. at 20.
103. However, as Confidential Attachment T reflects, the Covad requests are rightfully excluded from PM 55.1, per the TPUC Business Rules regarding DSL. This exclusion involves any DSL requests submitted with a desired due date greater than the offered interval (7 days). Covad's excluded orders, for the most part, will fall into this category, with a due date greater than the offered interval. March data for Covad reflects that 28.8% of total orders submitted and 85.2% of all excluded orders represent requests with due dates greater than the offered interval. The TPUC Business Rules identify four exclusions:
- Excludes orders that are not N, T or C.
  - Excludes customer requested due dates greater than the offered interval.
  - Excludes customer caused misses.
  - Excludes Weekends and Holidays.
104. For additional detail regarding DSL issues, see the ~~Carol Chapman Affidavit.~~ The Ham Supplemental Reply Affidavit of Carol Chapman. The Ham Supplemental Reply Affidavit provides detail on OSS issues and support for this product.

## HDSL

105. SWBT's standard provisioning procedure for DS1 services on HDSL technologies is compliant with FCC Rule ~~51.309 (ICG, Rowling)~~51.309. Affidavit ¶ 6 of Gwen Rowling ¶ 6 (attached to the supplemental comments of the ALTS/CLEC Coalition). Issues with equipment settings related to the framing option for HDSL technologies have been recognized and identified in SWBT's provisioning process. SWBT became aware that an unframed repeater option setting was required to avoid disruptions in certain applications of customer data.
106. Recent versions of HDSL equipment supplied by vendors utilized by SWBT are not involved in this issue. This is due to the lack of a selectable framing option setting with the recent version. SWBT's standard provisioning guidelines for the earlier released versions of certain HDSL equipment with a selectable framing option setting are that the facility should be provisioned as unframed.
107. Included in the paragraph below is the text that was taken from an internal memo distributed by SWBT Method & Procedures organization on May 02, 2000. This memo was sent to the responsible work groups within the SBC twelve-state region to address concerns expressed by ICG Communications before the TPUC on May 01, 2000. ICG Communications had expressed a need to verify that this procedure is being followed by SWBT.
- "A problem has arisen from PairGain HDSL units being optioned for AUTO rather than Unframed. This situation could occur, possibly, due to contradictory factory defaults on the HLUs. This should be a rare occurrence since Adtran (SWBT equipment vendor) is the primary supplier of HDSL units and they are transparent to framing, having no framing options on any Adtran HDSL units. Please remind your technicians that the Central Office technician must check options when working on PairGain HDSL units, and assure that the framing option **UNFR** is selected."
108. SWBT is confident that procedures are in place to avoid or rectify these specific HDSL

equipment option conflicts with ICG and other CLEC's product offerings.