

satisfies the Act and the Commission's rules, and the same is therefore true here. See Massachusetts Order ¶¶ 182-193. As in Massachusetts, real-world experience in Rhode Island proves that Verizon is able to meet the large and increasing demand for interconnection. And Verizon's performance in providing interconnection to CLECs in Massachusetts, where volumes are even higher than in Rhode Island, also continues to be excellent.

**1. Interconnection Trunks.**

Verizon provides competing carriers in Rhode Island with the same kinds of interconnection trunks that Verizon provides in Massachusetts, and provides them using the same processes and procedures that it uses in that state. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 12. In Massachusetts, the Commission found that Verizon's provision of interconnection to competing carriers was "equal in quality to the interconnection Verizon provides to its own retail operations, and on terms and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory." Massachusetts Order ¶ 183. The Commission also found that Verizon "makes interconnection available at any technically feasible point," and that it therefore demonstrates checklist compliance. Id.<sup>20</sup> The same is true in Rhode Island.

Through September 2001, Verizon has provided approximately 15 competing carriers with more than 45,000 interconnection trunks in Rhode Island. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 13. This is approximately 90 percent as many trunks as Verizon has connecting its switches in the entirety of its own interoffice network in the State. See id. Through these trunks, CLECs are

---

<sup>20</sup> Verizon provides interconnection trunks under interconnection agreements. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 12. Verizon provides interconnection to the trunk sides of end office and tandem switches, and to Verizon's signaling network, and provides both one-way and two-way trunks, 64 Kbps Clear Channel trunks, and traditional 56 Kbps trunks. See id. ¶¶ 12, 17-18. Verizon also will accept requests from CLECs for interconnection at other technically feasible points. See id. ¶ 12.

exchanging an average of nearly 280 million minutes of traffic per month with Verizon. See id. ¶ 15.

Verizon provides interconnection trunks on time, even in the face of strong commercial demand. From July through September, Verizon met the various intervals for providing interconnection trunks to CLECs 100 percent of the time in Rhode Island. See id. ¶ 23. In Massachusetts, Verizon completed more than 97 percent of CLEC orders for interconnection trunks on time from July through September. See id. ¶ 24.

Verizon also has undertaken extraordinary efforts to accommodate the demand for interconnection trunks. For example, Verizon added nearly 20,000 trunk terminations in 2000, which nearly doubled the number of trunks between Verizon's network and CLEC networks. See id. ¶ 14. Verizon also has continued to add new interconnection trunks in 2001. See Brief Att. A, Ex. 2. Moreover, Verizon has adopted the same trunk forecasting process that it uses in Massachusetts. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 20.

Finally, Verizon provides trunks to competing carriers that are of equal or better quality than those it provides to itself. For example, from July through September, 0.00 percent of the dedicated final trunk groups provided to CLECs in Rhode Island exceeded their engineering blocking design. See id. ¶ 33. In addition, from January through September 2001, the ratio of "trunks required" — which is the number of trunks a carrier needs to handle its traffic volume — to "trunks in service" — which is the number of trunks actually in place to handle traffic for that carrier — was even better for competing carriers in Rhode Island (25.4 percent) than it was for Verizon's own common final trunk groups (53.2 percent). See id. ¶ 32. In Massachusetts, from July through September, only 0.10 percent of the trunks provided to CLECs exceeded their blocking design, compared to 0.80 percent for Verizon, and no dedicated final trunk groups

provided to CLECs exceeded the engineering design level for more than three months. See id. ¶ 34.

## 2. Collocation.

Verizon provides competitors in Rhode Island with the same forms of collocation as it provides in Massachusetts, using the same processes and procedures. See id. ¶ 36. In Massachusetts, the Commission found that Verizon’s collocation offerings “satisfy the requirements of sections 251 and 271 of the Act,” and that Verizon has taken “steps necessary to implement the collocation requirements contained in the [Collocation Order] and the Collocation Reconsideration Order.”<sup>21</sup> Massachusetts Order ¶ 194. The same is therefore true in Rhode Island. Verizon also has modified its collocation offerings and processes since the Massachusetts Order to comply with the Collocation Remand Order.<sup>22</sup> See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 36.

Through September 2001, Verizon has placed in service more than 200 collocation arrangements in central offices located throughout Rhode Island. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 42. These arrangements give competitors access to central offices that serve more than 92 percent of Verizon’s access lines in Rhode Island — 96 percent of its business lines and 90 percent of its residential lines. See id.; RI Local Comp. Rpt. ¶ 10.

---

<sup>21</sup> Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 14 FCC Rcd 4761 (1999) (“Collocation Order”); Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, Order on Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 15 FCC Rcd 17806 (2000) (“Collocation Reconsideration Order”).

<sup>22</sup> Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, Fourth Report and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 15435 (2001) (“Collocation Remand Order”).

As in Massachusetts, Verizon provides every form of collocation that is required by the Commission's rules.<sup>23</sup> *First*, in addition to standard physical arrangements, Verizon provides mini, shared, adjacent, and "cageless" forms of collocation in accordance with the Commission's rules. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶¶ 55, 57; Collocation Order ¶¶ 41-42. Cageless collocation arrangements now represent approximately one-half of the collocation arrangements in Verizon's central offices. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 42. *Second*, Verizon permits CLECs the option of establishing controlled-environment vaults or similar structures adjacent to Verizon central offices in which physical collocation space is unavailable. See id. ¶ 59; Collocation Order ¶ 44; Collocation Reconsideration Order ¶¶ 45-47. *Third*, Verizon provides virtual collocation; however, no CLEC in Rhode Island has ordered a virtual arrangement. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶¶ 37, 42. *Fourth*, Verizon offers collocation at remote terminals in the same manner as the Commission found compliant in Massachusetts. See id. ¶ 66.<sup>24</sup> *Finally*, Verizon provides collocation within intervals adopted by the Rhode Island PUC (76 business days for physical arrangements, and 105 business days for virtual arrangements). See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 44; Rhode Island Collocation Order, App. A (Joint Stipulation) at

---

<sup>23</sup> As in Massachusetts, Verizon's state tariff charges CLECs in Rhode Island for power based on the quantity of load amps they request rather than the quantity of fused amps. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 79. CLECs in Rhode Island also may determine for themselves the quantity of load amps they desire for each feed. See id. ¶ 80. These are the same practices as in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, where the Commission found that Verizon's collocation power charges were "just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory." Massachusetts Order ¶ 199; Application of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc., et al., for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Pennsylvania, Memorandum Opinion and Order ¶ 104, CC Docket No. 01-138, FCC 01-269 (rel. Sept. 19, 2001) ("Pennsylvania Order"). Moreover, the Rhode Island PUC has reviewed and approved these rates. See Verizon Rhode Island Collocation Arrangements and Tariff Provisions, Report and Order, Docket No. 2937, at 5 (RI PUC June 15, 2001) ("Rhode Island Collocation Order") (App. H, Tab 24).

<sup>24</sup> See Massachusetts Order ¶ 196 (finding Verizon in compliance with requirements from the UNE Remand Order); Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 15 FCC Rcd 3696 (1999) ("UNE Remand Order").

2, 6; see also Massachusetts Order ¶ 195 (finding that comparable intervals satisfied the checklist); New York Order ¶¶ 73-75 (same).

Verizon also has modified its collocation offerings in Rhode Island to comply with the Commission's recent Collocation Remand Order. On September 28, 2001, Verizon filed amendments to both its federal collocation tariff and its Rhode Island collocation tariff to incorporate the requirements of that order. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 54 & Att. 7. For example, Verizon's tariffs now permit CLECs to collocate all the kinds of equipment that the Commission in that order held are necessary for interconnection or access to UNEs within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(6). See id. ¶¶ 53-54. Verizon also has made cross-connects available to CLECs under tariff. See id. ¶¶ 61, 63.

Verizon is providing collocation in a timely manner. For example, from July through September 2001, Verizon met the standard or agreed-upon interval 100 percent of the time for physical collocation arrangements and collocation augments provided to CLECs in Rhode Island. See id. ¶ 44. During that same period, Verizon also completed 100 percent of the much larger volume of collocation arrangements in Massachusetts on time. See id. ¶ 45.

Finally, Verizon has taken the same extraordinary steps as in Massachusetts to make collocation space available in its central offices. For example, Verizon will allow CLECs to tour the central offices within 10 days in those rare instances where it cannot accommodate a request for physical collocation, and it will file space exhaustion notifications as required by the Rhode Island PUC upon determining that space is not available. See id. ¶¶ 48, 52. Verizon also has implemented methods and procedures to identify when a central office runs out of space for physical collocation, and to post this information on its Website within 10 days of when this occurs. See id. ¶ 49.

**B. Unbundled Network Elements (Checklist Items 2, 4, 5, and 6).**

Verizon provides competing carriers in Rhode Island with commercial volumes of unbundled network elements, including unbundled local loops, local switching, and local transport. Moreover, it does so using the same processes and procedures that it uses in Massachusetts, where the Commission found that Verizon satisfies the requirements of the Act. See Massachusetts Order ¶¶ 20, 124, 208, 222. Through September 2001, Verizon has provided approximately 32,000 unbundled loops to CLECs, including approximately 4,000 that were provided as part of an unbundled element platform that also included switching and transport. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 86. Moreover, Verizon has kept pace with rapidly increasing demand; it consistently delivers unbundled elements on time, when competing carriers request them.

**1. Unbundled Local Loops.**

Verizon makes available to competing carriers in Rhode Island the same types of unbundled loops it makes available in Massachusetts, and provides them using substantially the same processes and procedures as it uses in that state. See id. ¶¶ 83-84; see also Massachusetts Order ¶ 124 (finding that Verizon's provision of unbundled loops satisfies the Act).<sup>25</sup> Through September 2001, Verizon has provided competing carriers in Rhode Island with approximately 32,000 loops (including DSL loops and platforms). See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 86. Moreover, Verizon's performance in Rhode Island has been excellent across the board.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Verizon provides unbundled loops pursuant to interconnection agreements and its generally available tariff. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 84. Verizon provides analog and digital, two-wire and four-wire loops, which permit CLECs to offer a full range of services including Integrated Services Digital Network ("ISDN"), Asymmetrical Digital Subscriber Line ("ADSL"), High-bit-rate Digital Subscriber Line ("HDSL"), 1.544 Mbps digital ("DS1") transmission, and 45 Mbps digital ("DS3") transmission. See id.

<sup>26</sup> The Commission has correctly concluded that its "analysis of this checklist item cannot

Verizon's performance also has continued to be excellent in Massachusetts, where volumes are higher than in Rhode Island.

**a. Stand-Alone Voice-Grade Loops.**

Through September 2001, Verizon has provided competing carriers in Rhode Island with approximately 24,000 voice-grade (i.e., POTS) loops on a stand-alone basis, and approximately 4,000 additional loops as part of unbundled network element platforms. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶¶ 86, 88. The demand for loops has been steady, with competitors adding more than one-third of all stand-alone voice-grade loops and virtually all of the approximately 4,000 platforms in the first nine months of this year. See Brief Att. A, Ex. 2. Moreover, Verizon's processes for providing stand-alone voice-grade loops have earned the prestigious ISO 9000 certification from the International Organization for Standardization, an independent worldwide federation of national standards bodies that awards this certification to companies that demonstrate they meet the expectations of their customers. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 89.

As demand has increased, Verizon has continued to provide stand-alone voice-grade loops on time, when competitors ask for them. For example, from July through September 2001, Verizon met more than 98 percent of its appointments for stand-alone voice-grade loop orders in Rhode Island, compared to about 96 percent of its appointments for the retail comparison group adopted by the PUC. See id. ¶ 90; see also Massachusetts Order ¶ 162 (finding 93-percent

---

focus on [Verizon's] performance with respect to any single metric or any single type of loop," but rather should be based on a "comprehensive picture of whether [Verizon] is providing unbundled local loops in accordance with the requirements of checklist item 4." New York Order ¶ 278; see also AT&T Corp. v. FCC, 220 F.3d 607, 624 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (affirming determination that the checklist focus is on "overall provisioning of loops, as opposed to mandating pass-fail analysis with respect to" a single category). As explained in text below, however, Verizon's loop performance in Rhode Island is excellent both for loops overall and for the various subsets of loops.

performance under this measurement acceptable). In Massachusetts, Verizon met nearly 98 percent of its installation appointments for stand-alone voice-grade loops from July through September, compared to approximately 94 percent of its appointments for the retail comparison group. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 91. During this same period, Verizon met more than 99 percent of its installation appointments for platform orders in both Rhode Island and Massachusetts. See id. ¶ 222.

During the relevant period, Verizon also reported its average completed interval for stand-alone loops (as well as other loop types). See id. ¶ 92. As Verizon has previously explained, however, these measurements are seriously flawed and do not accurately reflect Verizon's performance. See id.; see also New York Order ¶ 205 (“we also find persuasive Bell Atlantic's argument that its average completed interval data for competing carriers' non-dispatch orders reflects a disproportionate share of order types with longer-than-average standard intervals (the 'order mix' problem)”). Because of the recognized flaws in the average completed interval measurements, Verizon and CLECs agreed that these measurements should be eliminated; based on their consensus proposal, the New York PSC issued an order eliminating these measurements from the Carrier-to-Carrier Performance Reports. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 93. These changes will be implemented in the Performance Reports in New York and Massachusetts beginning with the November 2001 report month, and should likewise be implemented in Rhode Island. See id. Accordingly, the Commission should not rely on Verizon's performance under the average completed interval measurements for purposes of this Application.

Verizon also provides stand-alone voice-grade loops to competitors with a high degree of quality. From July through September, CLECs reported installation troubles within 30 days on

fewer than 2 percent of stand-alone voice-grade loops in Rhode Island compared to more than 4 percent for the retail comparison group. See id. ¶ 96. In Massachusetts, the rate of installation troubles within 30 days during this same period was 1.74 percent for CLECs, compared to 3.63 percent for the retail comparison group. See id. ¶ 97.

Verizon's performance in maintaining and repairing stand-alone voice-grade loops also is excellent. In fact, from July through September, fewer than 1 percent of CLEC voice-grade loops had any reported troubles at all in both Rhode Island and Massachusetts. See id. ¶¶ 98-99. Moreover, for the small number of these loops that did experience troubles, Verizon's maintenance and repair performance is excellent. With respect to most maintenance and repair performance measurements for stand-alone voice-grade loops — including both the missed repair appointment rate and the mean time to repair — Verizon's reported performance for CLECs in Rhode Island and Massachusetts is comparable to or better than Verizon's reported performance for the retail comparison group. See id. ¶¶ 100-103. For the single measurement that shows a difference in reported results in both states — the repeat trouble report rate — Verizon's performance for CLECs also is in parity when calculated under the business rules that have recently been adopted in New York and that will soon be submitted to the Rhode Island PUC for adoption. See id. ¶¶ 104-105.

**b. Hot Cuts.**

Just as Verizon's performance in providing new stand-alone voice-grade loops has been strong overall, so has its performance on the subset of voice-grade loops provisioned through hot cuts. Verizon uses the same methods and procedures to perform hot cuts in Rhode Island as it uses in Massachusetts, see id. ¶ 106, and its performance in Rhode Island and Massachusetts has been and continues to be excellent. As with Verizon's processes for stand-alone voice-grade loops, its hot-cut processes have earned the prestigious ISO 9000 certification. See id. ¶ 107.

From July through September 2001, Verizon completed nearly 98 percent of CLECs' hot-cut orders on time in Rhode Island. See id. ¶ 111; Massachusetts Order ¶ 160 (finding 96-percent performance acceptable); New York Order ¶¶ 291-296 (finding 91- to 94-percent performance acceptable); see also AT&T Corp., 220 F.3d at 625-28 (upholding Commission's decision in New York). Verizon also completed more than 98 percent of CLECs' hot-cut orders on time in Massachusetts, where volumes are higher. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 112.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, in its Massachusetts test, KPMG confirmed that Verizon satisfied all the evaluation criteria with respect to the hot-cut process. See KPMG MA Report at 400-03; Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 106.<sup>28</sup>

Verizon also continues to provide hot cuts at a very high level of quality. From July through September, CLECs reported troubles within seven days of installation on only 0.59 percent of their hot cuts, which is substantially better than the 2-percent benchmark. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 115. In Massachusetts, CLECs reported troubles within seven days of installation on less than 0.5 percent of their hot cuts. See id. ¶ 116.

**c. DSL-Capable Loops.**

Verizon's performance in providing access to the subset of loops used to provide DSL services also is strong.

Through September 2001, roughly 2,200 of the approximately 28,000 stand-alone unbundled loops that Verizon provided to competing carriers in Rhode Island were DSL-capable

---

<sup>27</sup> Verizon also has consistently completed hot cuts for orders of 1-9 loops within less than a day of the standard five-day interval in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶¶ 113-114. As noted above, however, the New York PSC and CLECs have agreed to eliminate the average completed interval measurements from the Carrier-to-Carrier Performance Reports. See id. ¶ 113.

<sup>28</sup> KPMG, Bell Atlantic OSS Evaluation Project, Version 1.4 (Sept. 7, 2000) ("KPMG MA Report") (App. E, Tab 1).

loops. See RI Local Comp. Rpt. ¶ 22. Verizon uses the same processes and procedures to provide competing carriers access to DSL loops in Rhode Island as those used in Massachusetts, see Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 133, where the Commission found that Verizon satisfies the checklist, see Massachusetts Order ¶¶ 60, 130, 133, 136, 142, 149. And, as with Verizon's processes for stand-alone POTS loops and hot cuts, Verizon's DSL processes have earned the prestigious ISO 9000 certification. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 133.

Verizon reports its performance in providing access to DSL-capable loops in Rhode Island using measurements that are identical to those used in Massachusetts. See Guerard/Canny/Abesamis Decl. ¶ 13. The reported results under these measurements show that Verizon's performance has been and continues to be excellent.

Pre-ordering. Verizon provides CLECs with the same ways of obtaining access to loop qualification and make-up information as in Massachusetts, see McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. ¶ 44 & Att. 2, where the Commission found that Verizon provides "nondiscriminatory access to OSS pre-ordering functions associated with determining whether a loop is capable of supporting xDSL advanced technologies." Massachusetts Order ¶ 60.

Moreover, since the time of the Massachusetts application, Verizon has implemented several new pre-ordering capabilities for CLECs.<sup>29</sup> In October 2001, Verizon implemented a new pre-ordering transaction for manual loop qualifications, which enables CLECs to request a manual loop qualification through their existing pre-ordering interface rather than by submitting a Local Service Request ("LSR") (which they may still do, if they choose). See McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. ¶ 45; see also Massachusetts Order ¶ 58 (noting that "Verizon has begun implementing access to manual loop qualification as a pre-order function," "with

---

<sup>29</sup> Verizon implemented these new capabilities in conformance with the Change Management process. See McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. ¶¶ 45-46.

complete implementation expected in October 2001”). Since Verizon implemented this new capability, CLECs have used it for fewer than 20 transactions across the entire former Bell Atlantic footprint. See McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. ¶ 45.

In addition, Verizon has implemented a long-term arrangement for CLECs to obtain electronic access to the limited loop information available in LFACS. See id. ¶ 46; see also Pennsylvania Order ¶ 45 (noting that Verizon was “on track to provide access to loop qualification information through the permanent fix described in its Massachusetts application by October 2001”). This new capability enables CLECs to use any of the three pre-ordering interfaces (EDI, CORBA, Web GUI) to access LFACS, and to submit requests using either the telephone number or the service address of the line for which they seek loop information. See McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. ¶ 46. Since Verizon implemented this new capability, CLECs have used it for fewer than 20 transactions across the entire former Bell Atlantic footprint. See id.

Verizon not only provides access to the required loop information, but also does so on a timely basis. For example, from July through September 2001, Verizon consistently met or bettered the relevant standards for responding to mechanized and manual loop qualification requests in Rhode Island. See id. ¶¶ 47-49; see also Massachusetts Order ¶¶ 133-134 (relying on comparable performance). And Verizon has generally responded to the few requests for information from LFACS within two hours. See McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. ¶¶ 47-48 & Att. 2.

Ordering. Verizon is providing competing carriers in Rhode Island with access to ordering systems in a timely manner. Specifically, CLECs in Rhode Island have a choice of submitting unbundled DSL loop orders using the same two interfaces that Verizon makes available in Massachusetts: the Web GUI and EDI interfaces. See id. Att. 2. And Verizon’s performance has been and continues to be excellent for all ordering categories that include

unbundled DSL-loop orders. For example, from July through September 2001, Verizon returned 99.25 percent of all order confirmation notices and 95.81 percent of all order rejection notices on time in Rhode Island. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 141; see also Massachusetts Order ¶ 135 & n.424 (relying on comparable performance).

Provisioning. Verizon also installs DSL loops on time, as demonstrated by the same New York and Massachusetts measurements that have been adopted in Rhode Island.

*First*, Verizon consistently is meeting its installation appointments for CLEC DSL loops. For example, from July through September 2001, Verizon met approximately 99 percent of its installation appointments for CLECs in Rhode Island. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 144. In Massachusetts, where volumes were higher, Verizon met a similarly high percentage of its installation appointments. See id. ¶ 145. These results are even better than what the Commission has found acceptable in the past. See, e.g., Massachusetts Order ¶ 137 & n.429 (finding 6.4 percent missed appointment rate for CLECs acceptable).<sup>30</sup>

*Second*, Verizon's performance under the average completed interval measurements also is strong. While the Commission has analyzed these measurements in prior applications, it need not do so here. As noted above, the New York PSC and CLECs have agreed to eliminate these measurements. See id. ¶ 146. Nonetheless, from July through September, Verizon installed CLEC DSL loop orders where a dispatch was required in an average of six days in Rhode Island.

---

<sup>30</sup> Verizon's performance also is strong under two measurements that the Commission has not relied on in the past (and need not rely on here): the measurement that tracks how often Verizon meets the six-day interval for DSL loops that have been pre-qualified; and the measurement that tracks how often Verizon meets the nine-day interval for all DSL loops, including both loops that have been pre-qualified and those for which a CLEC requested a manual loop qualification. For example, from July through September, Verizon completed within these respective intervals more than 98 percent of CLEC orders for pre-qualified DSL loops and more than 99 percent of CLEC orders for DSL loops as a whole. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶¶ 149-153.

See id. ¶ 147. This is equal to the standard six-day interval for 1-5 loops, see id., and better than what the Commission previously has found acceptable, see Massachusetts Order ¶ 139 & n.434 (finding acceptable average completion interval for CLECs that was “one and one-half days longer than the standard six-day interval”). In Massachusetts, from July through September, Verizon completed DSL-loop orders requiring a dispatch within an average of 5.79 days, which is less than the standard interval for orders of between one and five loops. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 148.

Installation Quality. Verizon provides unbundled DSL-capable loops to competing carriers that are equal in quality to Verizon’s retail services.

The measurement that the Commission previously has used to evaluate installation quality is the subset of total trouble reports that are reported within 30 days of installation (so-called “I-codes”). The reported performance results from July through September in Rhode Island show that CLECs that test DSL loops at installation did not have any I-codes on their DSL loop orders requiring a dispatch, whereas the I-code rate for the retail comparison (POTS service) was greater than 4 percent. See Guerard/Canny/Abesamis Decl. Att. 1. In Massachusetts, the I-code rate for CLECs during this same period also was lower than the rate for the retail comparison group (3.61 percent compared to 3.63 percent). See id. Att. 2.

As Verizon has explained in previous applications, Verizon and the CLECs reached a consensus to change the business rules for this measurement in two ways: the retail comparison group will be POTS orders that require a dispatch; and trouble reports for all CLECs will be counted, not just the trouble reports of CLECS that participate in cooperative acceptance testing with Verizon. See Massachusetts Order ¶ 146; Pennsylvania Order ¶ 81 & nn.282 & 284. The New York PSC has recently approved this revision to the installation quality measurement. See

Guerard/Canny/Abesamis Decl. ¶ 17. When Verizon's installation quality performance is calculated under the revised New York business rules, its performance is also at parity. From July through September 2001, the I-code rate in Rhode Island for all CLECs was 6.09 percent, compared to 5.43 percent for Verizon's own dispatched POTS orders. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 155; see also Pennsylvania Order ¶ 81 & n.284 (finding comparable performance acceptable); Massachusetts Order ¶ 146 (finding acceptable I-code rate of 7 percent for CLECs compared to 2.3 percent for Verizon retail). In Massachusetts, where volumes are higher, the I-code rate for CLECs under the revised New York business rules was 6.28 percent from July through September, compared to 6.64 percent for the new retail comparison group. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 156.

Maintenance and Repair. As described above, competing carriers experience troubles on a very small fraction of their unbundled DSL loops, and therefore generally do not need Verizon to provide them with maintenance and repair. On the small fraction of DSL loops for which Verizon does need to provide maintenance and repair, however, it does so in a nondiscriminatory manner.

*First*, the total trouble report rate for unbundled DSL loops confirms that Verizon provides reliable loops to CLECs. From July through September, 1.11 percent of CLECs' DSL loops in Rhode Island had reported troubles found in either the outside plant or the central office, and performance was even better in Massachusetts. See id. ¶¶ 157-158; see also Pennsylvania Order ¶ 80 & n.278 (relying on comparable performance under this measurement).

*Second*, Verizon meets the scheduled repair appointments for CLECs. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 159; see also Pennsylvania Order ¶ 80 (relying on similar performance under this measurement); Massachusetts Order ¶ 150 n.471 (noting as relevant

Verizon's performance under this measurement). In July and September, Verizon missed only one repair appointment each month for competing carriers' customers in Rhode Island, and in August Verizon missed only two appointments. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 159. In Massachusetts, from July through September, Verizon missed approximately 8.65 percent of its repair appointments for competing carriers' customers, compared to 19.14 percent of the appointments for the retail comparison group. See id. ¶ 160.

*Third*, Verizon's mean time to repair competing carriers' DSL loops is shorter than the mean time to repair for the retail comparison group adopted by the PUC. For example, from July through September, the mean time to repair CLEC DSL loop troubles was 16.25 hours for troubles outside the central office and 5.69 hours for troubles within the central office, compared to 23.04 hours and 15.70 hours, respectively, for the retail comparison group. See id. ¶ 161. In Massachusetts, the mean time to repair CLEC DSL loop troubles from July through September also was significantly shorter than for the retail comparison group. See id. ¶ 162. Moreover, these results are better than what the Commission has found acceptable in the past. See, e.g., Massachusetts Order ¶ 150 (finding eight-hour disparity in mean time to repair performance acceptable).

*Finally*, Verizon's repeat trouble report rate is comparable for CLECs and the retail comparison group adopted by the PUC, when calculated under the consensus business rules agreed to in the New York carrier working group and recently approved by the New York PSC. For example, from July through September, the repeat trouble report rate for CLECs was approximately 31 percent compared to approximately 36 percent for the retail comparison group. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 163 & Att. 40. And, in Massachusetts, where volumes are higher, the repeat trouble report rate also was in parity. See id. ¶ 164.

**d. Line Sharing.**

Just as Verizon's performance in providing access to DSL-capable loops is excellent, so is its performance in providing access to the "high frequency portion of the loop" through so-called "line sharing." Through line sharing, a competing carrier may provide high-speed data service over the same loop on which a customer receives basic local voice service from Verizon.<sup>31</sup>

As is the case with DSL-capable loops overall, Verizon provides line sharing in Rhode Island using the Massachusetts processes and procedures. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 166. As the Commission found, these processes and procedures "provide[] nondiscriminatory access to the high-frequency portion of the loop." Massachusetts Order ¶ 165.<sup>32</sup> Verizon also reports its line-sharing performance in Rhode Island using the same line-sharing specific measurements as in Massachusetts, see Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 178, which the Commission found "adequately show that Verizon has met its line sharing obligation," Massachusetts Order ¶ 168.

Verizon has provisioned only a few line-shared loops for CLECs in Rhode Island, although Verizon has provisioned more than \*\*\* line-shared loops for its own separate data affiliate, Verizon Advanced Data, Inc. ("VADI"). See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 175; Massachusetts Order ¶ 165 n.518 (relying on line-sharing volumes provided to VADI).<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> The Rhode Island PUC has reviewed and approved Verizon's line-sharing tariff. See RI PUC Tariff No. 18, Part B § 12 (App. N, Tab 5); see Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 166.

<sup>32</sup> Through interconnection agreements and its generally available tariff, Verizon makes available in Rhode Island the same two types of line-sharing arrangements that it provides in Massachusetts. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 166; Massachusetts Order ¶¶ 164 n.512, 165 n.519.

<sup>33</sup> On September 26, 2001, the Commission granted Verizon's request to accelerate Verizon's right under the Bell Atlantic/GTE Merger Order to provide advanced services without using its separate data affiliate. See GTE Corporation and Bell Atlantic Corporation For Consent

While demand in Rhode Island has been limited, experience in Massachusetts demonstrates that Verizon can readily handle whatever additional demand may develop in Rhode Island. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 174. Through September 2001, Verizon has completed more than 3,600 line-sharing orders for CLECs in Massachusetts. See id. ¶ 175.

Moreover, although Verizon's line-sharing performance was not part of the original KPMG test in Massachusetts, KPMG has conducted a stand-alone test of Verizon's line-sharing performance as part of its examination of Verizon's systems in Rhode Island. Because line-sharing volumes are very low in Rhode Island, KPMG examined Verizon's line-sharing performance in Massachusetts, where it found that Verizon's technicians executed 99 percent of the tasks as defined in the methods and procedures documentation, which is better than the relevant standard. See id. ¶ 176; KPMG, Verizon Rhode Island OSS Evaluation Project, Version 2.0, at 93 (POP 4-3-2) (Oct. 16, 2001) ("KPMG RI Report") (App. E, Tab 11).

Pre-ordering. Verizon uses the Massachusetts pre-ordering interfaces, systems, and processes to provide line sharing in Rhode Island, see Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 180, which the Commission found provide CLECs with nondiscriminatory access, see Massachusetts Order ¶ 60. As in Massachusetts, Verizon's pre-ordering performance for line sharing is reported together with its performance for unbundled DSL-capable loops. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz

---

to Transfer Control of Domestic and International Section 214 and 310 Authorizations and Applications to Transfer Control of a Submarine cable Landing License, Order, CC Docket No. 98-184, DA 01-2203 (rel. Sept. 26, 2001). While Verizon is no longer obligated to provide advanced services through a separate affiliate, during the time period covered by this application, Verizon provided DSL services in Rhode Island exclusively through VADI and will continue to do so until Verizon completes the reintegration of VADI into its core business. VADI currently purchases line sharing from Verizon using the same interfaces available to all CLECs and, as a separate office or division, VADI will continue to use those interfaces for a substantial majority of its orders once VADI is reintegrated into Verizon. See McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. Att. 2.

Decl. ¶ 179. And, as described above, Verizon's pre-ordering performance has been excellent in both Rhode Island and Massachusetts. See id.

Ordering. Just as with pre-ordering, Verizon uses the Massachusetts interfaces, systems, and processes for ordering in Rhode Island. See id. ¶ 183. The Commission found that Verizon's ordering systems and processes for line sharing fully satisfy the Act. See Massachusetts Order ¶ 135.

As in Massachusetts, Verizon reports its ordering performance for line sharing under two different sets of measurements. For line-sharing orders that have been pre-qualified — which now make up the majority of line-sharing orders — Verizon reports its ordering performance together with its performance for unbundled DSL-capable loops. As described above, Verizon's ordering performance for such loops has been excellent. For line-sharing orders that require a manual loop qualification, Verizon reports its ordering performance separately. From July through September, Verizon did not receive any such orders in Rhode Island. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 182. In Massachusetts, during this same period, Verizon received only six such orders and completed all but one of them on time. See id.

Provisioning. Verizon installs line-sharing orders in a timely and nondiscriminatory manner, as demonstrated by its performance under several different measurements adopted in the New York Carrier-to-Carrier proceedings. As noted above, CLECs have placed only a small number of line-sharing orders in Rhode Island. See id. ¶ 175. Verizon has been provisioning substantial volumes of line-sharing orders in Massachusetts, however, and its performance has been strong.

*First*, Verizon's performance under the missed appointment measurement demonstrates that its performance in providing line sharing to CLECs is strong.<sup>34</sup> Through September 2001, Verizon completed only four CLEC line-sharing orders in Rhode Island, and it completed all of those orders on time. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 184. In Massachusetts, Verizon met more than 99 percent of its installation appointments for CLECs' non-dispatch line-sharing orders. See id. This on-time performance is both excellent in its own right and comparable to the results for Verizon's separate data affiliate. See id.

*Second*, Verizon reports the percentage of line-sharing orders that it completes within three business days, which is the standard provisioning interval for line-sharing orders (in both Rhode Island and Massachusetts). See id. ¶ 186. From July through September, Verizon provisioned line-sharing orders in Rhode Island within three business days when that interval was requested 100 percent of the time for CLECs, compared to 98 percent of the time for its own separate data affiliate. See id. In Massachusetts, Verizon provisioned line-sharing orders within three business days when that interval was requested 98 percent of the time for both CLECs and Verizon's own affiliate. See id.

*Finally*, as noted above, both the CLECs and the New York PSC have agreed that the average completed interval measurement should be eliminated. Nonetheless, while the Commission should not rely on this measurement here, Verizon's reported performance has been good. See id. ¶ 185. From July through September, Verizon's average interval for completing non-dispatch orders in both Rhode Island and Massachusetts was three days for both CLECs and

---

<sup>34</sup> During the period at issue here, Verizon performed a splitter signature test in order to ensure that the splitter was working properly on the line before marking a CLEC's line-sharing order as complete. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 187; Massachusetts Order ¶ 168 n.531.

Verizon's own affiliate. See id.; Massachusetts Order ¶ 170 & n.541 (finding comparable results acceptable).

Installation Quality. Verizon also provides line sharing to its CLEC customers in Rhode Island that is equal in quality to what it provides its own advanced services affiliate. From July through September 2001, there were no installation troubles reported within 30 days on any of the line-sharing orders installed for CLECs in Rhode Island, compared to an I-code rate of less than 1 percent for Verizon's own separate data affiliate. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 188. In Massachusetts, during this same period, the rate of installation troubles reported within 30 days was less than 2 percent for both CLECs and Verizon's own affiliate. See id.; Massachusetts Order ¶ 171 (finding comparable performance acceptable).

Maintenance and Repair. Just as Verizon provides line-shared loops that are equal in quality to the loops that it provides to its own affiliate, when these loops do experience troubles, Verizon repairs them just as quickly for CLECs as it does for its own affiliate.

From July through September, CLECs did not submit any line-sharing trouble tickets in Rhode Island. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 189. Likewise, CLECs in Massachusetts have submitted an extremely small number of trouble tickets on line-sharing orders — fewer than 30 from July through September. See id. As the Commission has recognized, “performance data based on low volumes of orders or other transactions is not as reliable an indicator of checklist compliance as performance based on larger numbers of observations.” Kansas/Oklahoma Order ¶ 36. This is because, “where performance data is based on a low number of observations, small variations in performance may produce wide swings in the reported performance data.” Id.; see also, e.g., Massachusetts Order ¶ 93 n.296 (“Due to the low volume of competitors’ orders, a handful of trouble reports can cause seemingly large variations in the monthly trouble reports.”).

Nonetheless, the limited performance data available demonstrate that Verizon's performance is excellent.

The first maintenance and repair measurement tracks the percentage of time that Verizon completes repairs on the date of its scheduled repair appointments. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 189; Massachusetts Order ¶ 172 & n.547 (relying on Verizon's performance under this measurement). In Massachusetts, from July through September, CLECs submitted approximately two dozen trouble tickets for central office troubles, which is not enough observations to draw meaningful conclusions about Verizon's performance. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 189; see also Kansas/Oklahoma Order ¶ 36. Nonetheless, during this period, Verizon met all but four CLEC repair appointments on time. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 189.

A second maintenance and repair measurement tracks the number of repeat trouble reports within 30 days of an initial repair. See id. ¶ 190. Here, too, the very low volumes skew the reported results. See id. From July through September, Verizon received only eight repeat trouble reports from CLECs in Massachusetts. See id.

The third measurement of Verizon's maintenance and repair performance tracks the mean time to repair line-sharing orders. See id. ¶ 191. Although CLECs in Massachusetts submitted only a small number of trouble tickets for central office troubles, Verizon's mean time to repair during this period was at parity — 9.07 hours for CLECs, compared to 13.49 hours for Verizon's own affiliate. See id.; see also Massachusetts Order ¶ 172 & n.547 (finding that 16-hour mean time to repair for CLECs compared to slightly longer than 10 hours for VADI was “nondiscriminatory”).

Finally, the total trouble report rate — which measures the overall reliability of line-shared loops — demonstrates that there were no troubles found on more than 99 percent of the CLEC line-shared loops in service in Massachusetts from July through September. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 192.

Line Splitting. Verizon permits CLECs to engage in line splitting in precisely the same manner that the Commission found met its requirements in Massachusetts. See id. ¶ 193. As the Commission explained, Verizon “offers competitors nondiscriminatory access to the individual network elements necessary to provide line-split services and that nothing prevents competitors from offering voice and data services over a single unbundled loop.” Massachusetts Order ¶ 175; see id. ¶ 176.

As Verizon has made clear in its formal policy statement provided to CLECs on this issue, CLECs may engage in line splitting by using Verizon’s existing systems “to order and combine in a line splitting configuration an unbundled xDSL capable [I]oop terminated to a collocated splitter and DSLAM equipment provided by a participating CLEC, unbundled switching combined with shared transport, collocator-to-collocator connections, and available cross-connects.” Verizon, Line Splitting Policy (Feb. 14, 2001), at [http://128.11.40.241/east/wholesale/html/clec\\_01/02\\_14.htm](http://128.11.40.241/east/wholesale/html/clec_01/02_14.htm). Verizon also has added line splitting to its Model Interconnection Agreement. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 194. As noted above, the Commission previously has found that Verizon’s line-splitting policy fully complies with the Commission’s rules. See Massachusetts Order ¶¶ 176-180.

Moreover, since the Massachusetts Order, Verizon has implemented additional OSS capabilities for line splitting, including the ability for competing carriers to migrate from a UNE platform arrangement or a line-sharing arrangement to a line-splitting arrangement using a single

local service request. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 198; McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. Att. 2; Line Sharing Reconsideration Order ¶¶ 18-21.<sup>35</sup> Verizon began work on establishing these additional capabilities in the New York DSL collaborative, even before the Line Sharing Reconsideration Order was issued. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶¶ 200-201; McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. Att. 2. Pursuant to the schedule established in the New York collaborative, Verizon began a pilot of these new OSS capabilities in New York in June 2001, and implemented them throughout the Verizon East territory (i.e., the former Bell Atlantic footprint) — including Rhode Island — on October 20, 2001. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 202; McLean/Wierzbicki Decl. Att. 2. The New York PSC has approved consensus line-splitting measurements that Verizon will begin reporting in New York and Massachusetts beginning with the November 2001 report month, and these measurements should likewise be adopted in Rhode Island. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 203.

**e. High-Capacity Loops.**

Verizon's performance also has been strong in providing competing carriers access to high-capacity loops. These loops make up less than 1 percent of all unbundled loops provided to competitors in Rhode Island, and, from July through September 2001, Verizon provided only about 10 high-capacity loops per month. See id. ¶¶ 118-119. Nonetheless, Verizon's performance in providing high-capacity loops to competitors in Rhode Island has been strong, and the same continues to be true in Massachusetts.

---

<sup>35</sup> Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, Third Report and Order Third Report and Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 98-147, Fourth Report and Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-98, Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 98-147, Sixth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 96-98, 16 FCC Rcd 2101 (2001) ("Line Sharing Reconsideration Order").

From July through September, Verizon met 100 percent of its installation appointments for CLEC high-capacity loop orders in Rhode Island. See id. ¶ 120.<sup>36</sup> In Massachusetts, Verizon met approximately 93 percent of its installation appointments for CLEC high-capacity loops during this period, which is better than for the retail comparison group adopted by the PUC. See id. ¶ 121.

Verizon also provides high-capacity loops with a high degree of quality. The installation quality measurements for high-capacity loops report Verizon's performance on these loops together with its performance for high-capacity interoffice facilities. See id. ¶ 124. In Rhode Island, CLECs reported only one installation trouble on high-capacity loops and interoffice transport facilities in July, only three troubles in August, and no troubles in September. See id.

Verizon's performance in maintaining and repairing high-capacity loops is equally strong. From July through September, the trouble report rate for high-capacity loops and interoffice facilities was less than 2 percent both for CLECs and the retail comparison group adopted by the PUC, and the same was true in Massachusetts. See id. ¶¶ 125-126. Moreover, the mean time to repair CLEC high-capacity loops in Rhode Island was comparable to the mean time to repair for the retail comparison group, see id. ¶ 127, and in Massachusetts the mean time to repair for CLECs was shorter than for the retail comparison group, see id. ¶ 128. Finally, from July through September, Verizon had only 10 repeat trouble reports in Rhode Island, and in Massachusetts the repeat trouble report rate was better for CLECs (7.69 percent) than for the retail comparison group (20.07 percent). See id. ¶¶ 129-130.

---

<sup>36</sup> As with the other average completed interval measurements discussed above, the CLECs and the New York PSC have agreed to eliminate the average completed interval measurement for high-capacity loops. See Lacouture/Ruesterholz Decl. ¶ 122. Accordingly, the Commission should not consider this measurement here. In any event, there were too few observations reported under these measurements in both Rhode Island and Massachusetts to provide meaningful results. See id.