



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's amended response to Exception 23, regarding Metrics, with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it cannot replicate five of BellSouth's reported Service Quality Measurements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will continue re-testing activities based on this amended response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG completed re-testing activities for Exception 24, regarding Pre-Ordering. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BellSouth's TAG API does not deliver timely responses to pre-order transactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current results indicate that the majority of responses are being returned within proposed timeframes. KPMG expects a n update from BLS on the late responses in the near future.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG continues to perform interviews and evaluate documentation as part of re-testing for Exception 25, regarding Capacity Management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's systems capacity management process does not include established ongoing procedures for forecasting business volumes and transactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will complete evaluation of documentation received to-date.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is preparing to conduct a re-test for Exception 26, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not deliver timely Completion Notices (CNs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions will be based on the results received during the re-test.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's second amended response to Exception 27, regarding Billing, with the GPSC on 5/19/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS provided incorrect DUF records to KPMG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will continue to clarify unresolved issues with BLS.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's second amended response to Exception 28, regarding Billing, with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS failed to deliver 46% of expected DUF records to KPMG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of re-testing activities, KPMG will complete analysis of its UNE DUF re-test.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG continues to clarify the standards cited in Exception 29, regarding Billing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS did not deliver timely DUF records to KPMG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will evaluate this exception based on the analogs and benchmarks adopted by the GPSC on 6/6/00.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG submitted a closure statement for Exception 30, regarding Change Management, to the GPSC for review and comment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's change management process does not include a comprehensive mechanism for tracking change information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting comments from the GPSC on this closure statement.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's amended response to Exception 31, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, with the GPSC on 5/19/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's electronic ordering systems do not adequately support CLEC requests for Directory Listings associated with UNE loop customers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to amend this exception in the near future to reflect recently uncovered problems encountered while submitting two separate PONs.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address Exception 32, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, KPMG expects BLS to propose a feature enhancement at the next CLEC Change Control meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS delivered FOCs on transactions after issuing Clarifications (CLRs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will monitor the results of BLS's proposal.



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's amended response to Exception 33, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, with the GPSC on 5/30/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's <i>LEO Guide, Volume 1, Version N</i> does not define data element requirements and valid entries for loop service requests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will complete its evaluation of the updated version of BLS's <i>LEO Guide</i>.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is currently evaluating updates to ODUF/ADUF documentation as part of re-testing activities for Exception 34, regarding Billing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's ODUF/ADUF documentation is deficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further activities will be based on the results of this documentation evaluation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG continues to clarify issues with BLS and to evaluate potential re-testing activities for Exception 35, regarding Billing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS issued multiple bills containing erroneous information to the KPMG CLEC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will proceed with re-testing activities, as appropriate.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to receive BLS's amended response to Exception 36, regarding Maintenance and Repair, in the near future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that, during TAFI testing, it encountered multiple inconsistencies while accessing information in BLS's Service Order Communications System (SOCS). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's amended response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to perform re-testing activities for Exception 37, regarding Maintenance and Repair, during the week of 6/12/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that during testing of the "supervisor" functions, KPMG was presented with an unfiltered list of all in-session TAFI users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon the outcome of these re-testing activities.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects BLS to submit an amended response to Exception 38, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, in the near future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not consistently provide CLECs with a service Due Date matching their Desired Due Date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's amended response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects BLS to address the issue identified in Exception 39, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, through the Change Control process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's electronic ordering systems do not provide the functionality required for submitting partial migrations to UNE loops. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will monitor the Change Control process.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is drafting a closure statement for Exception 40, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, internally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's TAG interface does not process service requests for coordinated hot-cuts on non-designed loops as described in the <i>Local Exchange Ordering Implementation Guide, Volume 1, Version 7N (LEO Guide)</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon completion, KPMG will submit the closure report to the GPSC for review and comment.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is soliciting CLEC input on the issue raised in Exception 41, regarding Flow-Through. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not provide Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs) with comprehensive flow-through documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will analyze the results of CLEC input in order to determine further actions.



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting updated SQM reports in order to proceed with re-testing activities for Exception 42, regarding Metrics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS published incomplete KPMG test CLEC Service Quality Measurement (SQM) reports for the months of November 1999, December 1999, and January 2000 for the billing metric Mean Time to Deliver Invoices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will attempt to replicate the SQMs provided in the updated reports.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting updated SQM reports from BLS in order to proceed with re-testing activities for Exception 43, regarding Metrics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS has not provided KPMG with the raw data necessary to calculate values for the Service Quality Measurements ("SQM"), Mean Time to Deliver Invoices (Billing), for the KPMG Test CLEC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will attempt to replicate the SQMs provided in the updated reports.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is currently planning re-testing activities for Exception 44, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that KPMG was unable to change the telephone number (TN) of a resale auxiliary line in certain instances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions will be based on the outcome of these re-testing activities.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG has received updated documentation and SQM reports for Exception 45, regarding Metrics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it cannot replicate four of BLS's reported Service Quality Measurements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to draft a closure report in the near future.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects BLS to provide two updated SQM reports and a revised <i>Raw Data Users' Manual</i> for Exception 46, regarding Metrics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it cannot replicate seven of BLS's reported Service Quality Measurements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon receipt, KPMG will evaluate the updated documentation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's amended response to Exception 47, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, with the GPSC on 6/02/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS delivered inconsistent and inaccurate responses to Local Service Requests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions will be based on its analysis of BLS's amended response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG received an amended response to Exception 48, regarding Flow-Through, from BLS. KPMG is reviewing a closure statement for Exception 48, regarding Flow-Through, internally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that minor errors in categorizing LSRs for BLS's Flow Through Reports indicate the potential for future, material reporting errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will file BLS's amended response with the GPSC shortly. KPMG will forward this closure statement to the GPSC for review and comment shortly.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting an amended response to Exception 49, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, from BLS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS did not provide an accurate and timely update to CLECs when implementing a Universal Service Order Code (USOC) change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon the receipt of BLS's amended response to this exception.



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed a closure statement for Exception 50, regarding Maintenance and Repair, with the GPSC on 6/02/00. BLS updated the MTR information provided in the <i>CLEC TAFI User Guide (EP-Issue 3, May 2000)</i> to reflect the current system operation. KPMG believes that BellSouth has adequately addressed the issues raised in Exception 50. This exception is closed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that in four instances, KPMG was unable to create a link between the "parent" telephone number (TN) and the "child" TN during TAFI multiple trouble report (MTR) testing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG completed re-test activities for Exception 51, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. KPMG is currently drafting a closure report for this exception. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's electronic ordering systems (EDI and TAG) do not support the partial migration of a customer's Billing Telephone Number (BTN) on UNE Loop-Port Combination service requests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will forward this closure statement to the GPSC for review and comment shortly.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's amended response to Exception 52, regarding Metrics, with the GPSC on 5/25/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it cannot replicate twelve of BLS's reported Service Quality Measurements (SQMs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects BLS to submit a second amended response to this exception in the near future.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to begin drafting a closure statement for Exception 53, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, in the near future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's <i>LEO Guide, Volume 1, Versions J-N</i> contains numerous revision-related errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon completion, KPMG will forward the closure statement to the GPSC for review and comment.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address Exception 54, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, KPMG expects BLS to propose a change control request and implement a feature change based on the change control prioritization schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's electronic ordering systems do not support UNE-to-UNE migration service requests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will monitor the progress of this change request and potential feature implementation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's updates to documentation before performing re-testing activities for Exception 55, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's pre-ordering and ordering documentation contain numerous errors and omissions in structure and format. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once BLS has provided updated documentation, KPMG will complete its evaluation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects BLS to provide an amended response to Exception 56, regarding Metrics, in the near future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS published incomplete PMAP Raw Data for December 1999 for the Service Quality Measurement (SQM) Maintenance Average Duration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's amended response.



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to begin drafting a closure statement for Exception 57, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, in the near future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS guidelines for submitting xDSL pre-order Service Inquiry (SIs) for Loop Make-Up (LMU) information do not exist. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon completion, KPMG will forward the closure statement to the GPSC for review and comment.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is currently performing re-testing activities for Exception 58, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's UNE Center does not consistently adhere to the methods and procedures for provisioning Unbundled Network Elements (UNEs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions will be based on the outcome of these re-testing activities.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is currently drafting a closure statement for Exception 59, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's documentation does not define rules for submission of batched orders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon completion, KPMG will forward the closure statement to the GPSC for review and comment.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's amended response to Exception 60, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not deliver timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs) via Electronic Data Interchange (EDI). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon BLS's implementation of a system fix, KPMG expects to re-test a limited number of EDI transactions to determine the impact of BLS changes.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's amended response to Exception 61, regarding Metrics, with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that for certain Service Quality Measurements ("SQMs"), BLS does not report values at all levels of disaggregation specified in the Service Quality Measurements Georgia Performance Report 10/22/99 (SQM Reports). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is evaluating potential re-testing activities based on BLS's response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to receive BLS's amended response to Exception 62, regarding Metrics, in the near future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it cannot replicate four of BLS's Service Quality Measurements (SQMs) in the February 2000 report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's amended response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 63, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it discovered numerous inconsistencies between BLS's <i>TAG API Guide, Version 2.2.0.5</i> and <i>Pre-Order Business Rules</i> documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 64, regarding Metrics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it cannot replicate BLS's reported values for the "Provisioning - Service Order Accuracy" Service Quality Measurement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 65, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's Calculate Due Date (CDD) pre-order query does not support all order requisition (REQ) and activity (ACT) types. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 66, regarding Pre-Ordering. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BellSouth does not provide complete pre-order responses via the TAG interface. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 67, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not deliver timely Missed Appointment (MA) notices via the EDI and TAG interfaces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 68, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not provide complete Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) and Completion Notice (CN) responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 69, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not deliver timely Jeopardy Notifications via the EDI and TAG interfaces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 70, regarding Metrics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not have an adequate change management process for the generation of Service Quality Measurement (SQM) data from its legacy/source systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to Exception 71, regarding Ordering and Provisioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that the service establishment intervals returned on Calculate Due Date (CDD) pre-order responses are not consistent with intervals defined in the BLS <i>Product and Services Interval Guide</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed BLS's initial response to Exception 72, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, with the GPSC on 5/19/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not have a clear process for delivering Jeopardy and Missed Appointment notifications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions will be based on its evaluation of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 73, regarding Billing, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 5/19/00. KPMG is awaiting BLS's initial response to this exception. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's CRIS/CABS billing documentation is deficient in the breadth and depth of topical coverage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 74, regarding Metrics, and BLS's initial response with the GPSC on 5/19/00. KPMG filed BLS's amended response to this exception with the GPSC on 6/02/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not report certain Georgia Service Quality Measurements at the levels of disaggregation specified in the Service Quality Measurements Georgia Performance Reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions will be based on its evaluation of BLS's amended response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 75, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, and BLS's initial response with the GPSC on 5/19/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's Local Exchange Ordering Guide, Volume 1, Version 7N (LEO Guide) omits definitions for certain BLS ordering responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is currently evaluating re-testing activities based on BLS's response.



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 76, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it encountered numerous BLS provisioning errors for UNE orders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 77, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not deliver timely fully mechanized Clarification (CLR) responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 78, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not deliver timely Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) responses to flow through local service requests (LSRs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG is currently evaluating re-testing activities based on BLS's response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 79, regarding Metrics, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not adequately retain certain source data used in the calculation of several Service Quality Measurement (SQM) reports that are not generated wholly or primarily by the Performance Measurement and Analysis Platform (PMAP). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 80, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 5/26/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS guidelines for submitting an order Service Inquiry (SI) and Loop Service Requests (LSR) do not provide complete, consistent information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 81, regarding Maintenance & Repair, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 6/02/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that the ECTA Gateway did not accurately notify KPMG when invalid information was entered into a trouble ticket. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 82, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 6/0200. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS Central Office (CO) technicians and Unbundled Network Element Center (UNEC) coordinators do not adhere to BLS's methods and procedures for provisioning coordinated hot-cuts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 83, regarding Metrics, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 6/0200. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that exclusions listed in the "Exclusions" section of the SQM Georgia Performance Reports are not correctly applied when creating raw data or calculating SQMs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 84, regarding Metrics, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 6/02/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that the information in the SQM Georgia Performance Reports is inconsistent with the computational instructions provided by BellSouth for five SQMs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 85, regarding Maintenance & Repair, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 6/02/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated the BellSouth ECTA Gateway did not automatically request a "Front-End Closeout" on a POTS line that produced negative MLT results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG filed Exception 86, regarding Metrics, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC on 6/02/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it cannot replicate six of BLS's reported Service Quality Measurements (SQMs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to file Exception 87, regarding Billing, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC shortly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS incorrectly billed KPMG for usage charges for messages processed in the Augusta central office. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to file Exception 88, regarding Metrics, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC shortly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that computational instructions provided by BLS for 13 PMAP SQMs are inconsistent with the information provided in the SQM Georgia Performance Reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to file Exception 89, regarding Metrics, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC shortly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS's raw data used in the calculation of the BLS SQM reports are not accurately derived from or supported by their early-stage data (Instance 1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to file Exception 90, regarding Metrics, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC shortly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS does not have a clearly defined change management process for the <i>PMAP Raw Data User Manual</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG expects to file Exception 91, regarding Metrics, and BLS's statement of investigation with the GPSC shortly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that raw data used in the calculation of BLS SQM reports are not accurately derived from or supported by their early-stage data (Instance 2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG's further actions are contingent upon receipt of BLS's initial response.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG received BLS's response to a Draft Exception, regarding Ordering and Provisioning, on 5/09/00. KPMG expects to issue an amended draft exception to BLS shortly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that BLS has delivered Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) in response to Local Service Requests (LSRs) that should have received error messages. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will await BLS's response before taking further action.



**BellSouth-GA OSS Testing Evaluation
Interim Status Report
June 9, 2000**

Ref ¹	Item	Status	Issues	Next Step/Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG submitted a draft exception, regarding Metrics, to BLS on 5/30/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it cannot replicate three of BLS's reported SQMs in the March 2000 performance measurement reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will await BLS's response before taking further action.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG submitted a draft exception, regarding Metrics, to BLS on 6/02/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG indicated that it encountered ten Service Quality Measurements ("SQMs") for which there are inconsistencies among the statements of the definition, calculation and business rules sections in the <i>Service Quality Measurements Georgia Performance Reports (SQM Reports)</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will await BLS's response before taking further action.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG submitted a draft exception, regarding Billing, to BLS on 6/02/00. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BellSouth failed to deliver 20% of expected resale DUF records to KPMG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPMG will await BLS's response before taking further action.

¹ Referencing Methodology: An item referenced as I-n indicates that the item was first discussed in the July 22, 1999 status report. An item referenced as II-n indicates that the item was first referenced in the September 10, 1999 status report. An item referenced as III-n indicates that the item was first referenced in the October 21, 1999 report. An item referenced as IV-n indicates that the item was first referenced in the November 19, 1999 report. An item referenced as V-n indicates that the item was first referenced in the December 17, 1999 report. An item referenced as VI-n indicates that this item was first referenced in the January 28, 2000 report. An item referenced as VII-n indicates that this item was first referenced in the March 3, 2000 report. An item referenced as VIII-n indicates that this item was first referenced in the April 6, 2000 report. An item referenced as IX-n indicates that this item was first referenced in the May 12, 2000 report. An item referenced as X-n indicates that this item is new for this report.

² According to the exception process agreed to by KPMG, BellSouth and the Georgia Public Service Commission, when KPMG discovers a potential component defect (e.g., a deficiency in a procedure, system or document) written substantiation is submitted to BellSouth detailing KPMG's findings. BellSouth provides a written response to this finding. KPMG's written substantiation is considered a "Draft Exception" until the potential defect has been confirmed. If KPMG's assessment of the potential error is determined to be inaccurate, KPMG will withdraw the Draft Exception. If the issue is substantiated, the Draft Exception and BellSouth response will be submitted to and published by the Commission, and the parties will agree on resolution steps. A complete exception listing, including all exceptions, responses, amended responses and closure reports, may be found on the Georgia Public Service Commission's website at www.gpsc.com.

Update for the FCC Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

W. N. Stacy

BellSouth

June 20, 2000

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

- Purpose of today's discussion
 - up date the Commission on the progress of the Georgia test
 - Provide facts to refute certain MCI allegations from their 4-5-200 exparte

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

- Evolution of the Test
 - The three components of the test are being executed as a single test plan by KPMG
 - Testing includes
 - Resale, UNEs, LNP, and xDSL
 - Test domains include
 - Pre-Ordering, Ordering, Billing, Maintenance and Repair, Change Management, and Performance Measurement Reporting (Attachment 1)

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

Status (as of June 9 - See attachment 2 - Interim KPMG status report)

- Pre-Order and Order Testing
 - Pre-Ordering - 95% complete (xDSL Service Inquiries and Loop Makeup in process)
 - Ordering - 85% complete (xDSL and revised UNE-P in process)
- Volume Testing
 - RSIMMS vs production validation - in progress
 - Normal volume test (YE2001 volumes) - in progress
 - Peak (RSIMMS) and normal (production will follow
- Metrics
 - Test CLEC metric replication (Nov99 - Apr00) - substantially complete
 - CLEC aggregate metric replication - substantially complete
 - Test CLEC raw data comparison - substantially complete
 - Some exceptions remain open in definitions, data collection and storage, change management, and raw data processing

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

Status (as of June 9 - See attachment 2 - Interim KPMG status report)

- Maintenance and Repair
 - TAFI (M&R 12) 95% complete
 - ECTA (M&R 13) 85% complete
 - xDSL loops (waiting on provisioning completion)

- Billing
 - UNE DUF retest analysis in process
 - Resale DUF test completed and exception is being processed
 - Other billing exceptions are in process

- Performance Measures and Standards
 - GA PSC approved a set of measures and corresponding standards on 6-6-2000

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

- General comments on MCI ex parte (4-5-00)
 - MCI withdrew from participation in the Georgia testing in 1999
 - Although they have been represented at the ongoing Georgia workshops dealing with xDSL and line sharing, they have not placed orders for nor participated in any of the trials involving these services
 - The Georgia Commission is addressing permanent Metrics and standards in a hearing scheduled for July 5-7, 2000

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

rebuttal of specific MCI concerns

<p>Missing Measures and Insufficient Disaggregation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Loop Qualification 	<p>Being tested by KPMG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Specific metrics and standards proposed by BLS for 7-5 hearing – Both current (manual) and mechanized (July) metrics are specified
<p>Raw Data accuracy</p>	<p>Being evaluated by KPMG</p>
<p>Query response times and percent timeouts</p>	<p>Tested by KPMG as part of functional (PRE-1) and Volume (PRE-4,5) Standards set by Georgia PSC</p>
<p>Additional measures, including E911 unlock)</p>	<p>To be established (if needed) by PSC hearing July 5-7</p>

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

rebuttal of specific MCI concerns

Trunk Augmentation

Appropriately covered by existing metrics (TGSR-to-ASR timeliness is not an appropriate metric, Trunks additions triggered by the TGSR process are often complex, collaborative projects requiring 2-3 months to design and 4-6 months to complete. Engineering and project management teams meet multiple times to design, modify designs to accommodate switch capacities and desired due dates, and then coordinate these additions. TGSR-to-ASR time may vary from 5 days to 6 months, depending on the complexity of such a project, and is highly dependent on the CLECs data and responsiveness to design discussions.)

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

rebuttal of specific MCI concerns

Disaggregation	The Georgia interim standards added further disaggregation, and BLS has proposed significantly greater disaggregation in data filed for the July 5-7 hearing, including xDSL, unbundled IDSN loops, and line sharing (Attachment 3)
Metric Definitions	Being tested by KPMG, as part of POP, M&R and Billing tests, including definitions, business rules, and accuracy. (PMR 1-5)

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

rebuttal of specific MCI concerns

Standards	As MCI noted, KPMG filed a recommended set of standards. The Georgia PSC has added to and modified this recommendation in the interim standards adopted June 6, 2000, and is proceeding with a hearing on permanent standards July 5-7, 2000. BLS has recommended standards in conjunction with this hearing (Attachment 3)
Standards - Collocation	MCI and BLS are currently arbitrating multiple contract issues, including the appropriate standards for collocation arrangements. This matter is also a part of the Georgia Metrics and Standards Hearings. Collocation will be discussed in detail in those forums. BLS is meeting the existing standards established by the Georgia PSC

Georgia 3rd party OSS Test

- Summary
 - The Georgia PSC has addressed non-discriminatory access to OSS as part of checklist item 2 in a variety of forums over a 5 year period, including adversarial hearings, arbitrations, workshops, and performance and OSS development monitoring.
 - The current 3rd party OSS testing being conducted by KPMG and the Performance Measurements and Standards hearing scheduled for July 5-7 will conclude that portion of the 271 process
 - These tests, measures, and standards will allow BLS to present data to demonstrate that it is providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS.

Attachment 1 - Georgia Test Domains

Pre-Ordering Domain

- A. TAG Pre-Ordering Functional Test (PRE-1)
- B. Pre-Ordering Performance Results Comparison (PRE-2)
- C. TAG Pre-Ordering Documentation Evaluation (PRE-3)
- D. TAG Pre-Ordering Normal Volume Test (PRE-4)
- E. TAG Pre-Ordering Peak Volume Test (PRE-5)
- F. Pre-Order Processing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation (PRE-6)

Ordering and Provisioning Domain

- A. EDI Functional Test (O&P-1)
- B. TAG Functional Test (O&P-2)
- C. EDI/TAG Normal Volume Performance Test (O&P-3)
- D. EDI/TAG Peak Volume Performance Test (O&P-4)
- E. Provisioning Verification Test (O&P-5)
- F. Order Processing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation (O&P-6)
- G. Ordering & Provisioning Performance Results Comparison (O&P-7)
- H. EDI Documentation Evaluation (O&P-8)
- I. TAG Documentation Evaluation (O&P-9)
- J. EDI/TAG Production Volume Performance Test (O&P-10)

Billing Domain

- A. CRIS/CABS Invoicing Functional Test (BLG-1)
- B. ODUF/ADTF Usage Functional Test (BLG-2)
- C. Billing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation (BLG-3)
- D. Billing Performance Results Comparison (BLG-4)
- E. CRIS/CABS Invoicing Documentation Evaluation (BLG-5)
- F. ODUF/ADUF Documentation Evaluation (BLG-6)

Attachment 1 - Georgia Test Domains

Maintenance and Repair Domain

- A. TAFI Functional Test (M&R-1)
- B. ECTA Functional Test (M&R-2)
- C. ECTA Normal Volume Performance Test (M&R-3)
- D. ECTA Peak Volume Performance Test (M&R-4)
- E. TAFI Capacity Management Evaluation (M&R-5)
- F. ECTA Capacity Management Evaluation (M&R-6)
- G. Maintenance and Repair Performance Results Comparison (M&R-7)
- H. TAFT Documentation Evaluation (M&R-8)
- U. ECTA Documentation Evaluation (M&R-9)
- J. Maintenance and Repair Process Evaluation (M&R-10)

Change Management Domain

- A. Change Management Practices Review (CM-1)

Performance Measurement Reporting

- A. Data Collection and Storage Validation and Verification (PMR-1)
- B. Metrics Definition Documents and Implementations Verification (PMR-2)
- C. Metrics Change Management Verification and Validation (PMR-3)
- D. Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation (PMR-4)
- E. Metrics Calculations and Reporting Verification and Validation (PMR-5)

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

Benchmarks / Analogs		
Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	Ga Docket
Pre-Ordering	Percent Response Received within "X" seconds	
	Average Response Time – Customer Service Record [LENS - hal/cris TAG - crsecsr/crseinit]	Parity + 4 sec
	Average Response Time – Due Date Avail [DSAP]	Parity + 4 sec
	Average Response Time – Address Validation [RSAG - tn / address]	Parity + 4 sec
	Average Response Time – Product and Service Availability [TAG LENS - coffi/usoc psims/orb]	Parity + 4 sec
	Average Response Time – Tel. No Availability and Reservation [ATLAS]	Parity + 4 sec
	Service Inquiry with Firm Order (Manual)	95% in 7 bus days (inc FOC)
	Loop Makeup Inquiry (Manual)	95% in 7 bus days
	Loop Makeup Inquiry (Electronic)	85% < 4 hrs
	OSS Interface Availability (all systems)	99.5%
General	% Change Management Notices sent on Time	95% on time
	% Change Management Notice - Delay 8 plus days	0% > 8 days
Ordering	% Functional Acknowledgements returned on time	EDI 75% in 90 min TAG 95% in 30 min
	Percent Flow-Through Service Request	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence	95%
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business	90%
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE	85%
	Percent Rejected Service Request (Electronic / Partial Electronic / Manual)	Diagnostic
	Reject Interval (Electronic)	97% in 1 hr
	Reject Interval (Partial Electronic / Manual)	85% < 24 hr
	Reject Interval (Interconnection Trunks)	4 days
	Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness (Electronic)	95% < 3 hrs
	Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness (Partial Electronic / Manual)	85% < 36 hrs
	Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness (Interconnection Trunks)	24 days
	Speed of Answer in Ordering Center	Parity w retail
	Provisioning	Mean Held Order Interval
<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence		Parity w retail
<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business		Parity w retail
<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design		Parity w retail
<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX		Parity w retail
<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex		Parity w retail

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

		Benchmarks / Analogs
Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	Ga Docket
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Analog Loop	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Digital Loop < DS1	Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Digital Loop >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)	Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)	Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated	Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)	Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)	Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)	Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL	Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing	Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks	Parity w retail
	Average Jeopardy Notice Interval (Electronic)	95%>= 48 hrs
	% of Orders given jeopardy notice (Electronic)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Non-Design	Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design	Retail Design
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)	Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated	Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)	Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)	Retail Res, Bus & Design
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Other - Non-Design	Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Other - Design	Retail Design
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)	Retail DS1
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL	Retail ISDN - BRI
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing	Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
	% Missed Installation Appointments	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design	Parity w retail

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

Benchmarks / Analogs	
Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Analog Loop
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Digital Loop < DS1
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Digital Loop >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks
	Order Completion Interval
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Analog Loop
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Digital Loop < DS1
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Digital Loop >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks
	Average Completion Notice Interval – (Electronic)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business

Ga Docket

Parity w retail
 Parity w retail
 Parity w retail
 Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
 Retail Design - Dispatch
 Retail DS1 - Dispatch
 Retail POTS
 Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
 Retail Res & Bus
 Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
 Retail DS1 - Dispatch
 Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
 Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
 Parity w retail
 Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
 Retail Design - Dispatch
 Retail DS1 - Dispatch
 Retail POTS
 Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
 Retail Res & Bus
 Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
 Retail DS1 - Dispatch
 Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
 Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
 Parity w retail
 Parity w retail
 Parity w retail

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

Benchmarks / Analogs		Ga Docket
Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Non-Design	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design	Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Other Non-Design	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Other Design	Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)	Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated	Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)	Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)	Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)	Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL	Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing	Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
	% Provisioning Troubles within 30 Days	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Analog Loop	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Digital Loop < DS1	Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Digital Loop >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)	Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)	Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated	Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)	Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)	Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)	Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL	Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing	Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks	Parity w retail
	Total Service Order Cycle Time	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence	Parity w retail

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

Benchmarks / Analogs		
Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	Ga Docket
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Non-Design	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design	Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Other Non-Design	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Other Design	Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)	Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated	Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)	Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)	Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL) (Include Service Inquiry)	Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL (Include Service Inquiry)	Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing	Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
Maintenance	Customer Trouble Report Rate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN	Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Non-Design	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design Voice/Data	Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)	Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)	Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated	Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)	Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)	Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)	Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL	Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing	Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks	Parity w retail

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	Benchmarks / Analogs	Ga Docket
	Percent Missed Repair Appointments		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Non-Design		Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design Voice/Data		Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)		Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)		Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated		Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)		Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)		Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)		Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL		Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing		Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks		Parity w retail
	Maintenance Average Duration		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Non-Design		Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design Voice/Data		Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)		Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)		Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated		Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)		Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)		Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)		Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL		Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing		Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	Benchmarks / Analogs	Ga Docket
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks		Parity w retail
	% Repeat Troubles within 30 Days		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Non-Design		Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design Voice/Data		Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)		Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)		Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated		Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)		Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)		Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)		Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL		Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing		Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks		Parity w retail
	Out of Service > 24hrs		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Residence		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Business		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Design		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale PBX		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale Centrex		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resale ISDN		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Non-Design		Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design Voice/Data		Retail Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE Loop Design >= DS1 (Includes HDSL)		Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Switching (ports)		Retail POTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Unbundled Interoffice Transport - Dedicated		Retail DS1 / DS3 - Interoffice
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (loop + port)		Retail Res & Bus
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Combo (other)		Retail Res, Bus & Design - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - xDSL - UL (ADSL, UCL)		Retail DS1 - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - ISDN - UL		Retail ISDN - BRI - Dispatch

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	Benchmarks / Analogs	Ga Docket
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Line Sharing		Tariffed ADSL Provided to Dot Net
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Interconnection Trunks		Parity w retail
	OSS Interface Availability		99.5%
	OSS Response Interval and %		
	<input type="checkbox"/> TAFI (Front End)		Parity w retail
	<input type="checkbox"/> CRIS, DLETH, DLR, OSPCCM, LMOS, LMOSUP, MARCH, Predictor, SOCS, LNP		Parity by Design
	Average Answer Time – Repair Center		Parity w retail
Billing	Invoice Accuracy		Parity w retail
	Mean Time To Deliver Invoices		
	(CABS)		Parity w retail
	(CRIS)		Parity w retail
	Usage Data Delivery Accuracy		Parity w retail
	Usage Data Delivery Timeliness		Parity w retail
	Usage Data Delivery Completeness		Parity w retail
	Mean Time to Deliver Usage		Parity w retail
Operator Services (Toll)	Average Speed to Answer		Parity by Design
	% Answered in “X” Seconds		Parity by Design
Directory Assistance	Average Speed to Answer		Parity by Design
	% Answered in “X” Seconds		Parity by Design
E911	Timeliness		Parity by Design
	Accuracy		Parity by Design
	Mean Interval		Parity by Design
Trunk Group Performance (Blockage)	Trunk Group Service Report (Percent Trunk Blockage) SUMMARY		

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

		Benchmarks / Analogs
Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	Ga Docket
	Trunk Group Performance Report	Any 2 hour period in 24 hours where CLEC blockage exceeds BST blockage by more than 0.5% = a miss using trunk groups 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 16 for CLECs and 9 for BST.
	Trunk Group Service Report (Percent Trunk Blockage) DETAIL	Parity w retail
	Trunk Blocking Report	Parity w retail
LNP	Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval	95% < 24 hrs
	% Missed Installation Appointments	
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - LNP (Standalone)	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Loop w LNP	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	FOC Electronic	95% < 3 hrs
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - LNP (Standalone)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Loop w LNP	
	FOC Manual and Partial Electronic	85% < 36 hrs
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - LNP (Standalone)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Loop w LNP	
	% Reject Service Request	Diagnostic
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - LNP (Standalone)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Loop w LNP	
	Average Reject Interval Electronic	97% in 1 hr
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - LNP (Standalone)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Loop w LNP	
	Average Reject Interval Manual and Partial Electronic	85% < 24 hrs
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - LNP (Standalone)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Loop w LNP	
	TSOC (& CO OFFERED)	Retail Res & Bus - Dispatch
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - LNP (Standalone)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNE - Loop w LNP	
	% Flow Through	TBD
Customer	Coordinated Customer Conversions – UNE Loops w NP	95% <= 15 min
Coordinated	Coordinated Customer Conversions – UNE Loops w/o NP	95% <= 15 min

GEORGIA PROPOSED STANDARDS

		Benchmarks / Analogs	
Category	Measures & Sub-Metrics	Ga Docket	
Conversions	Hot Cut Timeliness Report	95% +- 15 min of schedule cut	
Collocation +	% of Due Dates Missed (Virtual & Physical)	<=10% com dates	
	Average Response Time (Virtual & Physical)	V = 20 days	P = 30 days
+A contract with each CLEC required.	Average Arrangement Time (Virtual & Physical) (Calendar Days)	V Ord = 90 days P Ord = 120 days	V ExOrd = 120 days P ExOrd = 180 days