

Appendix H

CLECs' Suggestions for Missing Metrics

“Missing Metric” Topic	Potential Domain	Check List No.	Interested Parties
Web GUI outage & slow response time. <u>Proposed</u> : AT&T OSS Ex. 2	PO	2	AT&T
Responsiveness of Verizon PA Help Desk(s) to trouble reports; measuring time to resolve a trouble ticket, including EDI notifiers, from Verizon PA. <u>Proposed</u> : Ex. 3 to AT&T OSS Dec.	PO	2	AT&T
Order “flow through” from end-to-end for efficiency and avoiding human errors. <u>Proposed</u> : NY’s OR-5-03	OR	2	AT&T, MCIW
Dark Fiber, providing access to it.	OR, <u>et al.</u>	2, 4, 5	Cavalier
Line-splitting, allowing two CLECs to share one loop.	OR, <u>et al.</u>	2, 4	Covad, MCIW
Collocation, provisioning intervals. <u>Proposed</u> : See Collo Order	PR	1, 2	Covad, MCIW, & others
Trunking – Several issues, including interconnection Verizon PA and CLEC facilities and blockage issues.	PR	1, 2, 5	MCIW
Loops, delivery of.	PR		Covad
Loops, delivered but found not working. <u>Proposed</u> : Texas’s “outages on conversion” metric, deemed “useful” by FCC in <u>TX 271 Order</u> at ¶273.	PR	2, 4	Covad
Directory Listings, accuracy.	GE	2, 8	AT&T, CTSI, XO, OCA
Directory Listings, timeliness.	GE	2, 8	AT&T, OCA
Responsiveness of Account Managers to queries and problems.	GE	1 – 14, esp. 2	Staff
Making telephone poles ready for new facilities owned by CLECs.	GE	3	RCN
Billing Completion Notices. <u>Proposed</u> : NY’s OR-4 and all submetrics thereunder.	PR or OR	2, 14	AT&T, MCIW, MetTel, Staff, others

Appendix I

Secretarial Letter – June 6, 2001

Verizon PA Acceptance Letter – June 7, 2001



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE
M-00001435

June 6, 2001

Julia A. Conover, Esquire
Vice President and General Counsel
Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc.
1717 Arch Street, 32 N
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Re: Consultative Report on Application of Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc. for FCC
Authorization to Provide In-Region InterLATA Service in Pennsylvania;
Docket No. M-00001435

Dear Ms. Conover:

On January 8, 2001, Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc. ("Verizon") filed with this Commission its notice of intent to seek authorization from the Federal Communications Commission to provide in-region interLATA service in Pennsylvania. In accordance with our *Procedural Order* entered November 30, 2000 at the above-referenced docket, we examined Verizon's filing, received comments, held 24 days of technical conferences, received responses to data requests, and held three days of *en banc* hearings.

After a thorough and comprehensive investigation of Verizon's compliance with the statutory requirements enumerated in section 271(c) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("Section 271"),¹ the Commission finds, based on the record developed in this proceeding, that Verizon has demonstrated its compliance in most respects. Verizon has made substantial progress in developing the tariffs, interconnection agreements, processes and procedures necessary to develop a competitive market in Pennsylvania.

However, we also find that Verizon must take further action in order to demonstrate to the Commission's full satisfaction that the local exchange and

¹ 47 U.S.C. § 271.

exchange access markets in Pennsylvania are fully and irreversibly open to competition in accordance with standards set forth in the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Today's findings are the culmination of years of effort by the Commission, its staff, Verizon, and many interested parties to ensure strict and full compliance with each of the 14-point Checklist items listed in Section 271(c).

Staff has prepared an exhaustive analysis of each Checklist item. The analysis reflects the Commission's intensive review of both Verizon's January 8 filing, as supplemented during the last five months, and Verizon's commercial operations data for the months of January, February, and March 2001. The overall examination is based on the paper filings and testimony, as well as countless hours of informal discussions with Verizon, competing carriers ("CLECs") and interested governmental agencies to the extent permitted by our *ex parte* rules.² Moreover, it has focused on every aspect of Verizon's wholesale operations and service to CLECs. It incorporates by reference the comprehensive review of Verizon's operation support systems ("OSS") completed in December 2000. This test of Verizon's OSS was conducted by a third-party evaluator, KPMG Consulting, L.L.C. ("KPMG"), acting under the direct supervision of the Commission.³

Our findings are also based on our consideration of our recent decisions in a number of other dockets, including our *Functional/Structural Separations Order* (adopted March 22, 2001, at Docket No. M-00001353), *UNE Pricing Order* (adopted May 24, 2001 at Docket Nos. R-00005261, *et al.*), and *Collocation Order* (adopted May 24, 2001 at Docket Nos. R-00994697, *et al.*) We hereby take administrative notice of these other proceedings.

Findings of Section 271 Compliance

Based on our review of the evidence, we find that Verizon has demonstrated compliance with most aspects of Section 271. We find specifically that Verizon complies with the statutory requirements of Section 271(c)(1)(A) regarding the presence of facilities-based competitors. Verizon also complies with its statutory obligations under Section 271(c)(2)(B) as follows:

1. Interconnection: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(i).

² Interested governmental agencies included the United States Department of Justice, the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, the Pennsylvania Office of Small Business Advocate, and this Commission's Office of Trial Staff.

³ KPMG also acted as an advisor to the Commission during the commercial operations period.

2. Network Elements: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ii) with respect to pricing and non-pricing obligations, except as described below concerning the Performance Assurance Plan (“PAP”) and electronic billing.
3. Poles, Ducts, Conduits and Rights-of-Way: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iii).
4. Local Loops: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iv).
5. Local Transport: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(v).
6. Local Switching: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vi).
7. 911/E-911, Directory Assistance, Operator Services: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii).
8. White Pages: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(viii).
9. Numbering Administration: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ix).
10. Call-Related Databases and Signaling: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(x).
11. Number Portability: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xi).
12. Local Dialing Parity: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xii).
13. Reciprocal Compensation: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii).
14. Resale: Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv), except for PAP and electronic billing as described below.

Further Evidence of Compliance Required

In our judgment, Verizon needs to take further action in the following critical areas in order to demonstrate to the Commission’s satisfaction that the local exchange and exchange access markets in Pennsylvania are fully and irreversibly open to competition in accordance with the requirements of Section 271(c)(2)(B). We find that the Pennsylvania markets will not be fully open to competition absent the following:

Performance Assurance Plan: A permanent Performance Assurance Plan (“PAP”), together with self-executing remedies, appropriate penalty levels, performance standards, and other features, is essential to properly incent Verizon to provide and to continue to provide adequate and non-discriminatory service to CLECs after Section 271 approval is achieved. Moreover, absent withdrawal of Verizon’s pending appeal challenging the Commission’s legal authority to impose remedies, no PAP can be considered adequate and permanent so as to prevent backsliding. Therefore, to implement a PAP that is adequate for Section 271 purposes, Verizon must agree to augment the current PAP as follows:

- (1) withdraw the current appeal regarding alleged lack of statutory authority to impose remedies;
- (2) effective for performance beginning July 1, 2001, the Tier II remedies payments for metrics that are missed beyond ninety (90) days shall be set at

the amount of \$25,000 and shall be self-executing and applicable to all metrics; and,

- (3) in the further proceeding called for in ordering paragraph 16 of our *Functional/Structural Separations Order*, there will be a rebuttable presumption that the features of the NY remedies plan should be made applicable and tailored to Pennsylvania.⁴ In the interim, the present Pennsylvania metrics and PAP will continue to apply.

Electronic Billing: Without timely and accurate electronic bills, CLECs are unable to verify the accuracy of Verizon's wholesale bills in a timely manner. Verizon is now prepared to allow CLECs to choose the BOS-BDT bill format as the official bill of record. Verizon has also indicated that the last of its scheduled modifications to the BOS-BDT formatted bills will be completed on or about June 16, 2001, and that it will maintain a manual review process for a minimum of three (3) bill cycles to ensure that its processes have captured and corrected all issues. Nevertheless, given the importance of accurate electronic billing, for a finding of full compliance with its obligations under subsections (ii) and (xiv) of Section 271(c)(2)(B), Verizon PA must be subject to a greater remedies liability until the conclusion of the further proceeding called for in ordering paragraph 16 of our *Functional/Structural Separations Order* to incent timely and effective implementation. Therefore, Verizon must also agree to augment the current PAP as follows:

- (1) update, in consultation with staff, the Pennsylvania billing metrics applicable to the paper bill so as to make them applicable to electronic billing effective for performance beginning July 1, 2001;
- (2) increase billing remedies payments as follows: for violations up to 30 days, \$50,000 per metric per affected CLEC; for violations up to 60 days, \$75,000 per metric per affected CLEC; and for violations up to 90 days and each month thereafter, \$100,000 per metric per affected CLEC; and
- (3) increased billing remedies will remain in effect until conclusion of the further proceeding called for in ordering paragraph 16 of our *Functional/Structural Separation Order*, or for performance through December 31, 2001, whichever comes first.

⁴ Given that the participants in this proceeding have agreed to adopt the New York metrics, we anticipate that this further proceeding will address whether to conform the Pennsylvania metrics to New York metrics, as proposed by Verizon, and well as an appropriate transition to such metrics.

State Public Interest Findings

In the Commission's judgment, the Pennsylvania local telephone markets will be fully and irreversibly open to competition upon satisfactory completion of the actions and conditions stated herein. The Commission further finds that allowing Verizon into Pennsylvania's in-region long distance market will provide additional public benefit by giving Pennsylvania customers greater choice in that market as well. With open local markets supported by functional/structural separation of Verizon retail and wholesale operations, as well as more long distance choice, the Commission concludes that approval of Verizon's application is in the public interest. Therefore, upon satisfactory completion of the required actions and conditions set forth herein, the Commission will recommend that the Federal Communications Commission approve Verizon's Section 271 application to offer in-region, long distance telephone service in Pennsylvania.

Conclusion

Verizon is hereby directed to review these further actions and conditions deemed necessary to demonstrate that the market is fully and irreversibly open to competition in Pennsylvania and to respond within ten (10) business days as to whether it is willing to undertake and accomplish these actions and conditions. If Verizon declines to agree to these further actions and conditions, the Commission will be unable to make a positive consultative report and the Law Bureau will be directed to finalize the draft report based upon the present state of the record.

If Verizon agrees to these conditions, it shall notify the Commission within ten (10) business days of its unconditional acceptance of all conditions contained herein. Upon acceptance of same, as well as verification that Verizon has withdrawn its current PAP appeal (alleging lack of statutory authority to impose remedies), the Law Bureau shall issue a positive consultative report to the Federal Communications Commission.

Sincerely,


James J. McNulty
Secretary

Commissioner Nora Mead Brownell – Dissenting – Statement attached
Commissioner Terrance J. Fitzpatrick – Dissenting – Statement attached

cc: Parties of record
Chief Administrative Law Judge Christianson

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Harrisburg, PA 17105

**Consultative Report on Application
of Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc. for
FCC Authorization to Provide
In-Region Inter-LATA Service
in Pennsylvania**

**Public Meeting – June 6, 2001
JUN-2001-L-67
Docket No. M-00001435**

DISSENTING STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER NORA MEAD BROWNELL

Today, the Commission is addressing whether Verizon Pennsylvania has satisfied the requirements of Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This is necessary to determine whether Verizon should be permitted to provide in-region inter-LATA service in Pennsylvania. The central theme of the Section 271 requirements is that we must determine whether Verizon has irretrievably opened its local calling markets to competition.

I have long advocated for competitive markets for both local and long distance communications services. Unfortunately, I cannot join to approve the proposed Secretarial Letter now before us. I cannot, in good conscience affirm that these markets are open as envisioned under the act.

In my judgment, Verizon Pennsylvania must take further action to demonstrate that the local exchange and exchange access markets in Pennsylvania are fully and irreversibly open to competition. Unless Verizon makes the following adjustments, Verizon's Pennsylvania's markets cannot be said to be irreversibly open.

First, regarding electronic billing - Verizon must implement adjustments to its electronic billing systems to insure that CLECs are able to obtain timely and accurate electronic bills. In addition, I believe that the system must successfully complete at least two billing cycles. Without confidence that the billing systems are absolutely able to deliver adequate services and billing support to its customers, I cannot see how the market can work.

Second, carrier-to-carrier data integrity and the change management process is still inadequate. Throughout the 271 process KPMG, our third party consultant, as well as our staff often found inconsistencies in the

carrier-to-carrier data due to differences in their interpretation of the metrics and Verizon's business rules. That KPMG could not certify the accuracy of the data is a matter of great concern. A common understanding is essential to not only securing the integrity of the carrier-to-carrier reports but also to our subsequent analysis of those reports. In addition, and equally important to the success of the process, is the requirement of advance notice of any changes to the calculation or interpretation of metrics. During the 271 process Verizon generally did not provide advance notice to either the Commission or the CLECs of its intention to change its interpretation or calculations of a metric. These processes should be transparent to the Commission and to the CLECS. Changes in a mutually agreed upon protocol cannot be made unilaterally by one party if a system is to work. These issues should be fully addressed and resolved prior to Verizon obtaining Commission approval.

Third, in order to obtain full compliance with Section 271 for local loops, Verizon must complete two tasks. One, Verizon must commit to an implementation schedule for improved access to remote terminal information (as outlined in Verizon's Supplemental Checklist Declaration, Attachment 239). Two, it must satisfactorily explain and, if necessary, correct any apparent failures in commercial performance with respect to its obligation to provide non-discriminatory access to local loops as measured by the appropriate metrics (including but limited to PR-1-01, PR-2-02, PR-4-02, PR-5-01, PR-6-01, PR-8-01, and MR-5-01).

Fourth, in order to obtain full compliance with Section 271 for local transport, Verizon should also satisfactorily explain, and, if necessary, correct apparent poor commercial performance with respect to its obligation to provide non-discriminatory access to local transport by the appropriate metrics (including but not limited to PR-4-01, PR-4-09, PR-8-01, and PR-8-02).

Fifth, compliance by Verizon for the resale of Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) service is required for non-discriminatory access. Currently, Verizon does not appear to comply because Verizon and its data affiliate, Verizon Advanced Data, Inc. (VADI) market and sell a combination of voice and DSL service on the same line to retail customers. However, this package of voice and data service is not available for resale. While each component is available for resale, the voice/data package is not. In order to be compliant, a voice/data package for resale should be made available. Verizon's June 5, 2001, letter may offer to have this package, but the letter does not cogently distinguish between line sharing and resold lines. Thus, Verizon's must give its unequivocal commitment to delivering this product.

Sixth, a permanent Performance Assurance Plan, together with appropriate self-executing remedies, performance standards, and other features is essential for a positive recommendation to the FCC. Everyone must understand the definition and consequences of performance failure. A plan with these features would properly incent Verizon to provide and to continue to provide adequate and non-discriminatory service to CLECs after Section 271 approval is obtained. Since the parties to this proceeding have agreed to adopt the New York metrics, adoption of a remedies plan modeled upon the New York remedies plan is also appropriate, especially regarding the level of remedies exposure. In addition, Verizon must withdraw its pending appeal challenging the Commission's legal authority to impose remedies. Absent such a withdrawal, no PAP can be considered adequate and permanent to prevent backsliding.

It is true that Verizon's efforts to date have yielded some improvement in relevant areas and for that I commend them. However, full compliance in these areas is clearly lacking. I can only speculate whether this process will move forward based on promises by Verizon. But based on Verizon's past performance in following other Commission orders, it is difficult to imagine that such action will accomplish the desired result. Therefore, I cannot support a positive report based on speculation.

My reluctance to cast a vote based on promises of future action is further supported by our experience with the separation of Verizon's advanced data affiliate, VADI. On April 26, 2001 John Cullina, VADI's counsel, testified at the Commission's en banc hearing that no decision had been made about folding VADI back into Verizon as a result of the Ascent decision. (Trans. En Banc Hearing, April 26, 2001, p. 274) However, on that very day Verizon filed a request with the Federal Communications Commission to accelerate Verizon's right to provide advanced services directly without using the separate advanced data affiliate. (Verizon's April 26, 2001 cover letter and filing with the FCC) Consequently, while I would like to believe that Verizon will fulfill all of its promises, given the circumstances I find it difficult to have a confidence in a company which has apparently misled this Commission on the record. This, too, needs clarification.

I believe the Commission must ensure full compliance with resolution of the above matters. By not ensuring absolute compliance we not only jeopardize having a fully and irreversibly open local telephone markets in Pennsylvania for competitive phone companies, but also Pennsylvania consumers who will not have greater choice in telecommunications. There

may be some immediate benefits for consumers, but I believe they will be short term and ephemeral.

For the above reasons, I respectfully dissent from the majority. This market is not sustainable absent a guarantee of full open access, as well as, certainty on rules and accountability.

Please let me express my sincere appreciation to each of the Commission's Section 271 team members for the enormous amount of time, energy and effort you expended regarding the Section 271 process. I applaud your commitment and integrity.

6/6/2001
Date

Nora Mead Brownell
Nora Mead Brownell
Commissioner

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17105**

**CONSULTATIVE REPORT ON
APPLICATION OF VERIZON
PENNSYLVANIA, INC. FOR FCC
AUTHORIZATION TO PROVIDE
IN-REGION INTER-LATA
SERVICE IN PENNSYLVANIA**

**PUBLIC MEETING JUNE 6, 2001
MAR-2001-L-67
Docket No. M-00001435**

**STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER TERRANCE J. FITZPATRICK
CONCURRING IN PART, AND DISSENTING IN PART**

The majority concludes that Verizon will have satisfied, upon acceptance of certain conditions, every item on the fourteen-point checklist for determining whether its local market is open to competition, and that we should recommend that the Federal Communications Commission allow Verizon to enter the long-distance market in Pennsylvania. I agree that Verizon has satisfied most of the checklist items; however, as explained below, I do not believe that it has satisfied checklist items 2 (due to a deficient billing system) 4, or 5. Accordingly, I dissent in part.

At the outset, I must say that I wish I could give Verizon an unqualified endorsement. I recognize the benefits of allowing Verizon to provide long-distance service in Pennsylvania. However, the Telecommunications Act plainly requires Verizon to satisfy the fourteen-point checklist before it enters the long-distance market. If my view prevailed, the Commission could establish a process that would allow Verizon to correct the remaining problems and file a Section 271 Application within less than six months. Unfortunately, I must conclude that the majority is overlooking certain problems in reaching a conclusion that Verizon should be allowed into the long-distance market immediately without resolution of the problems.

CHECKLIST ITEM 2

Checklist item 2 requires that Verizon provide non-discriminatory access to network elements in accordance with the requirements of Sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1). Because of the lack of timely and accurate electronic bills, I find that Verizon has not met Checklist item no. 2.

The problem here is that, despite its efforts over the past two years, Verizon has yet to provide CLECs with an electronic bill which is sufficiently reliable that Verizon will consider it the official "bill of record." The practical effect of this on CLECs is that every month they are required to sort through and read hundreds of boxes of paper bills in order to check the accuracy of their bills.¹ This is an impossible task for the CLECs, and it is ironic that they are forced to endure such a procedure in this high-tech industry. One CLEC even testified that it estimates what it owes Verizon and pays that amount, and Verizon accepts that payment because it cannot prove otherwise.²

Verizon states that CLECs can now receive an electronic bill, and it has recently made an offer to CLECs to allow them to use the electronic bill as the "bill of record." However, Verizon still needs to work through various open issues, complete certain system changes on June 16, 2001, and run it through several billing cycles. (4/25/01, Tr. 102, 146) Thus, the fact remains that the e-billing system is unreliable.³

The FCC has granted Section 271 Applications in Massachusetts, New York, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. In all of these states, there was an operational electronic billing system in place.⁴ The majority accepts Verizon's promise that it will soon provide the "official bill" in electronic form, and relies on penalties to attempt to ensure compliance. However, the FCC has stated that :

¹ MCI testified that it receives "box after box of unauditible paper bills. 150 boxes per month, growing by 30 boxes a month" and it continues "to have errors in crediting. . .[and] problems with the ability to audit the BOS-BDT." (4/25/01 Tr., 97)

² John Curry, of Curry Communications, testified that: "As far as what we owe Verizon, it's pretty much a gut feeling, and I think all resellers can attest that we pay them what we believe we owe them, and some day we will all be in disputes because...there is no tracking of credits....We have no idea what [the credits are] for." 4/25/01, Tr. 97-98. Ms. Rubino of Z-tel testified "We estimate what our bills should be, and we pay that amount, and we dispute the rest of it." 3/7/01, Tr. at 137.

³ During the en banc hearings, when asked when the e-bills will become the official bill of record, Verizon responded: "at such time that Verizon feels that the BOS/BDT has met all of the issues that were identified by the CLEC community and we [Verizon] have had an opportunity to work through several billing cycles. Verizon would be, at that point in time, in the position to attest that the BOS/BDT, if elected by a CLEC, would become their official bill of record." (4/25/01 Tr., 102) CLECs claim to have identified at least 10 billing problems that CLECs have brought up over the past 10 months, "most" of which Verizon claims to have resolved. (4/25/01 Tr., 102) Later, Verizon refers to 66 billing issues mutually identified by Verizon and the CLECs as being open in October 2000, 41 of which were resolved prior to April 21. Ten were to have been fixed on April 21 (with BOS/BDT Version 35), 7 were to have been fixed on May 19, and the remainder on June 16. The April 21 fixes did not happen as planned, and the change notice to the CLECs of the delay in implementing Version 35 was late. (4/25/01 Tr., 103-107) Other failed fixes are detailed in the transcript.

⁴ The FCC's prior Section 271 Orders do not address any issues with respect to lack of electronic billing. After conversations with the FCC, it is staff's understanding that BA NY, SWBT TX, SWBT KS/OK and VZ MA all had properly-functioning electronic billing systems in place at the time of Section 271 approval in their respective states.

"[A] BOCs promises of *future* performance to address particular concerns raised by commenters have no probative value in demonstrating its *present* compliance with the requirements of Section 271. In order to gain in-region, interLATA entry, a BOC must support its application with actual evidence demonstrating its present compliance with the statutory conditions for entry, instead of prospective evidence that is contingent on future behavior. Thus, we must be able to make a determination based on the evidence in the record that a BOC has actually demonstrated compliance with the requirements of Section 271."⁵

Based upon the evidence and the FCC's standard of review, I find that the electronic billing system available to CLECs today is not in compliance. Therefore, I would require, for a finding of full compliance with its obligations under subsections (ii) and (xiv) of Section 271 (c)(2)(B), that Verizon PA must implement the scheduled fixes⁶ to its electronic billing system and the billing products must run through two billing cycles successfully.

Another problem with Verizon's billing system is missing billing completion notices (BCNs). BCNs represent the final confirmation for CLECs that an order has been completed by Verizon. Untimely or missing BCNs can result in double billing to customers, and can prevent customers from being able to change products and services. The New York experience of backsliding with missing notifiers puts this Commission on notice that missing notifiers can be so problematic as to actually halt competitive development within a state.⁷

Currently, Pennsylvania does not have a metric to measure missing BCNs; however this is being addressed in a further proceeding stemming from our *Functional/Structural Separations Order* (adopted March 22, 2001, at Docket

⁵ *In the Matter of 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*, CC Docket No. 99-295, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 99-404 (rel. December 22, 1999) at ¶ 37; *In the Matter of Application by SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, And Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Texas*, CC Docket No. 00-65, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 00-238 (rel. June 30, 2000) at ¶ 38.

⁶ I note that Verizon plans to implement a new billing system called "ExpressTRAK" at some point in the future. Staff has advised that ExpressTRAK is intended to comply with a merger obligation on Verizon to have uniform billing footprint wide. It was believed to be scheduled for introduction in PA for the summer 2000, then later to October 2000. It is yet to be installed.

⁷ Missing notifiers became so problematic in New York that Verizon paid over \$13,000,000 in penalties and was forced to install a new system to correct the problem.

No. M-00001353). Verizon admitted that if the NY metric for BCNs were applied to PA data, Verizon would have failed the metric for all three months⁸ of commercial operations. (4/4/01, Tr. 47) For this reason also, I find that Verizon's billing system is deficient.

CHECKLIST ITEMS 4 AND 5

Checklist item 4 requires local loop transmission from the central office to the customers premises, unbundled from local switching or other services. Checklist item 5 requires local transport from the trunk side of a wireline local exchange carrier switch unbundled from switching or other services. With respect to checklist items 4 and 5, discrepancies exist between our staff's findings and KPMG's final report. I am hesitant to summarily dismiss staff's findings, as the majority does.

It appears that KPMG's evaluation of Verizon's marketplace performance during the commercial availability period was limited in scope. KPMG limited the scope of their review to discrepancies between CLECs and Verizon data during the commercial availability period. If Verizon's data indicated that performance was poor, and CLECs did not dispute the data, then KPMG did not consider it.

Staff evaluated Verizon's marketplace performance using Verizon's own data. While CLECs filed comments on the performance data, the CLEC comments did not form the principal basis of staff's analysis because of timing and data integrity issues. Staff analyzed Verizon's data using three tools (all prepared by Verizon): (1) Carrier-to-Carrier reports for January, February and March; (2) C2C Guidelines (dated 2/5/01), which define the performance requirements established by the PUC in the PMO; and (3) Verizon's Measurements Declaration Attachment 403 (dated 4/18/01), which sorts the metrics by checklist item.

Staff identified the instances where Verizon's performance met the standard and the instances where Verizon's performance was sub-standard. In defining sub-standard performance, staff took a conservative approach by defining sub-standard performance more narrowly to allow for checklist compliance where Verizon missed a standard by an inch rather than a mile.

The conclusion reached by staff was that sub-standard performance occurred as to certain metrics applicable to several checklist items. Staff concluded that checklist items 4 and 5 had significant sub-standard performance as to certain metrics, and staff could not find a consistent trend of improvement, including into April. Staff has considered the totality of the commercial operations data on a checklist-by-checklist basis as reported and summarized by

⁸ This would include all of January, February and March on a prorated basis, and this assumes a 95% performance standard. While I note that January and March are marginal misses, in February, performance dropped to 86.99%. I believe that the February performance is significant enough to warrant implementation of a BCN metric with corresponding remedies.

Verizon in Measurements Declaration Attachment 403 (dated April 18, 2001). Accepting Verizon's C2C reports as accurately reflecting Verizon's performance, staff found that Verizon's own data shows poor performance with respect to loops and transport.

Because of the gravity of staff's findings, I would have preferred to have the parties comment on the analysis done by staff. There would have been time to conduct this review if we had required Verizon to prove that its billing system is working.

CONCLUSION

I emphasize, again, that it is not my desire to unduly delay Verizon's entry into the long-distance business. If my preferred approach were followed, and if Verizon proved that the problems with the electronic billing system were corrected, and if Verizon satisfied the other requirements I have described, I could fully support Verizon's Application. Unfortunately, I cannot conclude that Verizon has satisfied all of the checklist items at this time.

DATE: June 6, 2001

Terrance J. Fitzpatrick
TERRANCE J. FITZPATRICK
COMMISSIONER

Julia A. Conover
Vice President and General Counsel
Pennsylvania



1717 Arch Street, 32N
Philadelphia, PA 19103

June 7, 2001

Tel: (215) 963-6001
Fax: (215) 563-2658
Julia.A.Conover@Verizon.com

Via Overnight Express Mail
James J. McNulty, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120


**Re: Consultative Report on Application of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
for FCC Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service
in Pennsylvania, Docket No. M-00001435**

Dear Secretary McNulty:

Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. ("Verizon PA") hereby notifies the Commission of its acceptance of the conditions contained in the June 6, 2001 Secretarial Letter issued in this matter. I have also attached our Praecipe to withdraw our Petition for Review of the Commission's Order on the Performance Assurance Plan (No. 1902 C.D. 2000), which was filed today.

We look forward to the issuance of a positive consultative report to the Federal Communications Commission.

Respectfully submitted,


Julia A. Conover

JAC/dkf
Att.

Via Overnight Express Mail
cc: **Chairman John Quain**
Vice Chairman Robert Bloom
Commissioner Nora Mead Brownell
Commissioner Aaron Wilson
Commissioner Terrence Fitzpatrick
The Honorable Wayne Weismandel
The Honorable Michael Schnierle
Maryanne Martin
Gary Wagner
Louise Fink-Smith
Bohdan Pankiw
Attached Certificate of Service

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA INC.,
Petitioner

v.

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY
COMMISSION,
Respondent

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

No. 1902 C.D. 2000

JUN 7 2 31 PM '01

PRAECIPE TO DISCONTINUE APPEAL

TO THE PROTHONOTARY:

Please discontinue the above-captioned appeal, pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 1973(a).

Respectfully submitted,



Of Counsel:
Mary L. Coyne, Esq.

Kevin J. McKeon, ID # 30488
MALATESTA HAWKE & MCKEON LLP
100 North Tenth Street
Post Office Box 1778
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Julia A. Conover, ID # 27491
VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA, INC.
1717 Arch Street, Floor 32N
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Paul A. Rich, ID #23455
VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA, INC.
1320 North Courthouse Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201

DATED: June 7, 2001

Counsel for
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Julia A. Conover, Esq., hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.'s letter to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, accepting the conditions contained in the June 6, 2001 Secretarial Letter issued in Docket No. M-00001435, upon the participants listed below in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code Section 1.54 (related to service by a participant) and 1.55 (related to service upon attorneys).

Dated at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, this 7th day of June, 2001.

VIA OVERNIGHT EXPRESS MAIL

John F. Povilaitis, Esquire
Ryan, Russell, Ogden & Seltzer LLP
800 North Third Street
Suite 101
Harrisburg, PA 17102-2025
Jpovilaitis@ryanrussell.com
[Covad Communications Company]
[Rhythms Links]
[ACSI Local Switched Services, Inc.
d/b/a e.spire Communications, Inc.]

Alan Kohler, Esquire.
Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen
212 Locust Street, Suite 300
Harrisburg, PA 17101
Akohler@wolfblock.com
[AT&T Communications
of Pennsylvania, Inc.]
[Conestoga Communications, Inc.]
[Telebeam, Inc. t/a CEI Networks]
[Full Service Computing Corporatino
t/a Full Service Networks]
[Central Atlantic Payphone Association]

Robin Cohn, Esquire
Swidler, Berlin, Shereff Friedman LLP
3000 K Street
Washington, DC 20007
Rfcohn@swidlaw.com
[CTSI, Inc.]
[Winstar Wireless of Pennsylvania, LLC]
[A.R.C. Networks, Inc.
t/a InfoHighway Communications Corp.]

Robert C. Barber, Esquire
AT&T Communications of Pennsylvania, Inc.
3033 Chain Bridge Road
Oakton, VA 22185
Rcbarber@att.com

Philip McClelland
Barrett Sheridan
Office of Consumer Advocate
Forum Place, 5th Floor
555 Walnut Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
pmcclelland@paoca.org
bsheridan@paoca.org

Angela Jones, Esquire
Office of Small Business Advocate
Commerce Building, Suite 1102
300 North Second Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
anjones@state.pa.us

Kandace F. Melillo, Esquire
Office of Trial Staff
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120
Melillo@puc.state.pa.us

Anna Sokolin-Maimon, Esquire
Elliot Goldberg
Metropolitan Telecommunications
44 Wall Street – 14th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Amaimon@mettel.net
Egoldberg@mettel.net

Martin Arias
Cavalier Telephone Mid-Atlantic, LLC
965 Thomas Drive
Warminster, PA 18974
marias@cavtel.com

Chris Kallaher
Vice President & General Counsel
Essential.com, Inc.
1 Burlington Woods Drive
Burlington, MA 01803
Ckallaher@essential.com

Pamela C. Polacek, Esquire
Derrick C. Williamson, Esquire
Charis M. Burak, Esquire
McNees, Wallace & Nurick
100 Pine Street
Harrisburg, PA 17108
ppolacek@mwn.com
dwilliam@mwn.com
cburak@mwn.com
[Pennsylvania Cable & Telecommunications
Association]

Susan Wittenberg
U.S. Dept. of Justice, Antitrust Division
1401 H Street, NW, Suite 8000
Washington, DC 20530
susan.wittenberg@usdoj.gov

Michelle Painter, Esquire
Carl Giesy
Kimberly Wild
Merwin Sands
MCI WorldCom
1133 19th Street, NW, 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Michelle.Painter@wcom.com
Carl.D.Giesy@wcom.com
Kimberly.Wild@wcom.com
Merwin.Sands@wcom.com

Antony R. Petrilla, Esquire
Covad Communications Company
600 14th Street, NW
Suite 750
Washington, DC 20005
Apetrilla@covad.com

Michael D. Croce
Conectiv Communications
Christiana Building
252 Chapman Road
Newark, DE 19714

Mark DeFalco
Lawrence A. Walke
Winstar Wireless
1615 L Street, NW - Suite 1260
Washington, DC 20036
mdefalco@winstar.com
lwalke@winster.com

Ross A. Buntrock, Esq.
Michael Hazzard, Esquire
Aspasia A. Paroutsas, Esquire
Kelley, Drye & Warren, LLP
1200 19th Street NW - 5th Flr
Washington, DC 20036
rbuntrock@kelleydrye.com
mhazzard@kelleydrye.com
aparoutsas@kelleydrye.com
[Z-Tel Communications, Inc.]

Robert Aamoth, Esquire
Andrew M. Klein, Esquire
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Raamoth@KelleyDrye.com
Aklein@Kelleydrye.com
[Comptel]

Mark Becker, Esquire
e.spire Communications, Inc.
131 National Bus. Pkwy, Ste. 100
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701
mark.becker@espire.net

Ronald L. Reeder
CTSI, Inc.
3950 Chambers Hill Road
Harrisburg, PA 17111
rlreeder@epix.net

Sue Benedek, Esquire
Sprint/United Telephone Company of PA
240 N. Third Street - Suite 201
Harrisburg, PA 17101
sue.e.benedek@mail.sprint.com

Peggy Rubino, Regional VP
Z-Tel Communications, Inc.
601 S. Harbour Island Blvd.
Tampa, FL 33602
prubino@z-tel.com

Donald S. Sussman
VP of Reg. Affairs/Vendor Rel.
Network Access Solutions, Corp.
13650 Dulles Technology Dr.
Herndon, VA 20121
dsussman@nas-corp.com

Rodney L. Joyce, Esquire
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP
600 14th Street, NW – Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005-2004
rjoyce@shb.com
[Network Access Solutions, Corp.]

James H. Cawley, Esquire
Rhoads & Sinon LLP
One South Market Square
12th Floor
P.O. Box 1146
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1146
jcawley@rhoads-sinon.com
[XO Communications, Inc.]
[The Honorable Mary Jo White and
The Honorable Roger A. Madigan]
[FiberNet Telecommunications
of Pennsylvania, LLC]

Steven Hamula
Director of Regulatory Affairs
FiberNet Telecommunications of Pa, LLC
211 Leon Sullivan Way
Charleston, WV 25301
shamula@wvfiber.net

Mark Cooper, Ph.D.
Citizens Research
504 Highgate Terrace
Silver Spring, MD 20904
markcooper@aol.com

Chris Holt
ATX Telecommunications Services, Inc.
Christopher A. Holt
CoreComm Limited
110 East 59th St, 26 Floor
New York, NY 10022

Robert A. Sutton, Esquire
City of Philadelphia Law Department
One Parkway Building- 17th Floor
1515 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102-1595
robert.sutton@phila.gov

Renardo L. Hicks, Esquire
XO Communications
2690 Commerce Drive
Harrisburg, PA 17110
rhicks@xo.com

The Honorable Robert M. Tomlinson
188 Capitol Building
Senate Box 203006
Harrisburg, PA 17120
rtomlinson@pasen.gov

The Honorable Gibson E. Armstrong
1281 Capitol Building
Senate Box 203013
Harrisburg, PA 17120
Garmstrong@pasen.gov

Kenneth Zielonis, Esquire
Stevens and Lee
208 North Third Street – Suite 301
P.O. Box 12090
Harrisburg, PA 17108
Kz@stevenslee.com

William L. Fishman, Esquire
RCN Telecom Services of Philadelphia, Inc.
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman LLP
3000 K Street NW – Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007
WLFishman@SWIDLAW.com

John LaPenta, Esquire
FairPoint Communications Solutions, Corp.
6324 Fairview Rd. – 4th Floor
Charlotte, NC 28210
jlapenta@fairpoint.com


Julia A. Conover, Esquire
VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA INC.
1717 Arch Street, 32NW
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 963-6506

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing document upon the parties and in the manner indicated below, which service evidences compliance with Pa. R.A.P. 121:

Service by First Class Mail:

Philip McClelland, Esquire
Barrett Sheridan, Esquire
Office Of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
5th Floor Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Robert C. Barber, Esquire
f/b/o AT&T Communications Of PA Inc.
3033 Chain Bridge Road
Oakton, VA 22185

Anna Sokolin Maimon, Esquire
f/b/o Metropolitan Telecommunications
44 Wall Street 14th Floor
New York, NY 10005

Susan Wittenberg
US Department of Justice Antitrust Division
1401 H Street NW, Suite 8000
Washington, DC 20530

Robin Cohn, Esquire
f/b/o CTSI Inc.
InfoHighway Communications Corporation
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman LLP
3000 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20007

Michelle Painter, Esquire
Carl Giesy, Esquire
f/b/o MCI Worldcom Communications Inc.
1133 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

John F. Povilaitis, Esquire
f/b/o Covad Communications Co.
Rhythms Links, Inc.
E.Spire Comm., Inc.
Ryan Russell Ogden & Seltzer
800 N. Third Street, Suite 101
Harrisburg, PA 17102-2025

Angela Jones, Esquire
Office of Small Business Advocate
300 N. Second Street, Suite 1102
Commerce Bldg.
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Charis M. Burak, Esquire
f/b/o Pa. Cable & Telecommunications Association
McNees Wallace & Nurick
100 Pine Street
PO Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166

Martin Arias
f/b/o Cavalier Telephone Mid Atlantic LLC
965 Thomas Drive
Warminster, PA 18974

Ross A. Buntrock, Esquire
f/b/o Z-Tel Communications Inc.
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
1200 19th Street NW Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Christopher A. Holt, Esquire
f/b/o ATX Telecommunications Svcs Inc
Corecomm Limited
110 East 59th Street, 26th Floor
New York, NY 10022

John La Penta, Esquire
Michael Kent, Esquire
f/b/o Fair Point Comm. Solutions Corp
6324 Fairview Road, 4th Floor
Charlotte, NC 28210

Rodney L Joyce, Esquire
f/b/o Network Access Solutions Corporation
Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP
600 14th Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005-2004

Alan Kohler, Esquire
f/b/o Conestoga Com Inc & CEI Networks
Full Service Networks & Central Atlantic
Payphone Association
Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
212 Locust Street, Suite 300
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Kenneth Zielonis, Esquire
f/b/o Assoc. of Communications Enterprises
Stevens and Lee
208 N. Third Street, Suite 301
PO Box 12090
Harrisburg, PA 17108-2090

Sue Benedek, Esquire
f/b/o Sprint/United Telephone Company of PA
240 N Third Street, Suite 201
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Chris Kallaher, Vice President & General Counsel
f/b/o Essential.Com Inc.
1 Burlington Woods Drive
Burlington, MA 01803

Robert A. Sutton, Senior Attorney
City of Philadelphia Law Department
One Parkway Bldg. 17th Floor
1515 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102-1595

James H. Cawley, Esquire
f/b/o XO Pennsylvania Inc
The Honorable Mary Jo White
Fibernet Telecommunications Of Pa LLC
Rhoads & Simon LLP
One S. Market Square 12th Floor, PO Box 1146
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1146

Renardo L Hicks, Esquire
XO Communications
2690 Commerce Drive
Harrisburg, PA 17110

The Honorable Gibson E. Armstrong
1281 Capitol Bldg.
Senate Box 203013
Harrisburg, PA 17120


The Honorable Robert M Tomlinson
188 Capitol Building
Senate Box 203006
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Debra M. Kriete
f/b/o AT&T Communications of PA
Rhoads & Simon LLP
P O Box 1146
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1146

Kandace Melillo, Esquire
Public Utility Commission
Office Of Trial Staff Common Keys Bldg.
P O Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

UPS Overnight Delivery:

Julia A Conover, Esquire
f/b/o Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc.
1717 Arch Street 32 NW
Philadelphia, PA 19103



Robert J. Longwell
Deputy Chief Counsel

Pa. Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
(717) 787-8866

June 25, 2001