

2 A DeVito: That's a good question.

3 No, because we want them as  
4 accurate as humanly possible. I'm not saying  
5 they're not materially significant in the final  
6 result.

7 Q But you've not done any analysis,  
8 have you done any analysis - -

9 MR. COHEN: I would ask the  
10 President to please allow the witness to  
11 answer the question.

12 MR. PAPPALARDO: Go ahead.

13 I'm sorry to interrupt you.

14 A (DeVito) I think I lost my train  
15 of thought.

16 Q Can you provide me any written  
17 analysis that has been conducted showing that  
18 these data corrections would not have a material  
19 impact on Verizon's performance for those months?

20 A DeVito: I can assess them by  
21 reading many of these things about - - let me say  
22 this. On some of the ones that have been closed,  
23 what I would do, I would look over the last few  
24 months to see are we still in line with what the  
25 reported results are, and in many cases, the

2 answer is yes.

3 In many cases, it may be we added  
4 two orders to a base of 50,000. Is that  
5 materially significant? I don't think so.

6 Q So let me see if I have this  
7 correct.

8 Verizon can revise these reports  
9 and reissue them, it did in February 2001,  
10 correct?

11 A DeVito: Correct.

12 Q But based on whatever analysis  
13 Verizon has done, it has determined not to  
14 reissue those reports and take it on faith that  
15 any changes and corrections are not material.

16 Is that correct?

17 A DeVito: Could you repeat your  
18 statement.

19 Q Well, Verizon has not reissued any  
20 of these reports for these sub-metrics for those  
21 months that were impacted. Is that correct?

22 A DeVito: That's correct.

23 Q So you are telling us here today,  
24 without any analysis before us, without any new  
25 performance report, just take it on faith that if

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Panel - cross

215

they were corrected, Verizon's performance would not be materially different in the new reports as it was in the incorrect reports.

Isn't that correct?

A DeVito: That's correct.

2 Q Now, Verizon has a policy of not  
3 revising past reports, correct?

4 A DeVito: We generally do not  
5 refile past reports.

6 It's a very complex process.

7 Q You state in your reply  
8 declaration at note 3, page 5, that the Board has  
9 not established requirement for refiling of  
10 reports.

11 Do you see that?

12 A DeVito: Yes.

13 Q Is it possible that the reason a  
14 policy was not established for refiling of  
15 reports is because they're supposed to be  
16 accurate when they're issued?

17 MR. COHEN: Objection, Your Honor.

18 Same question, asking for speculation as  
19 to the Board's intent behind it's own  
20 Order.

21 PRESIDENT HUGHES: I agree.

22 Q Well, if reports are going to be  
23 inaccurate at the time of issue, shouldn't there  
24 be a policy to go back and correct them?

25 A Canny: I don't think that one's

2 necessary. If a CLEC sees an issue, there's a  
3 process, they get raw data files of looking at  
4 their own data.

5 If there's a question, we can  
6 certainly address it through the process that we  
7 established. I think there's a number of  
8 vehicles for addressing it. I don't necessarily  
9 think that it's necessary to refile a whole  
10 report.

11 Q Well, even on just the CLEC side  
12 of the data, which is only one-half of the  
13 performance reports, I cannot go out and  
14 replicate WorldCom's data, can I?

15 A Canny: Nor should you.

16 Q So only Verizon has all the CLEC  
17 aggregate data that would have to be correct,  
18 correct?

19 A Canny: No, but you would be  
20 looking at your reports.

21 Q That wasn't my question.

22 Only Verizon has all of the CLEC  
23 aggregate data that might need to be corrected?

24 A Canny: That's correct.

25 Q Now, let's just take a

2 Q Incomplete would be - -

3 A DeVito: The report was literally  
4 just forgotten to be put in the pack to be  
5 delivered.

6 Q So notwithstanding the July  
7 report, which was missing one of the pieces, the  
8 only reports that have been refiled were the June  
9 through October 2000, the January 2001, and the  
10 February 2001.

11 Is that correct?

12 A DeVito: That's correct.

13 Q Those were all refiled based on  
14 corrections that were made to the data?

15 A DeVito: That's correct.

16 Q Can you explain to me what  
17 standard Verizon uses to determine whether they  
18 will refile a report with the Board or not?

19 A Canny: We generally don't refile.  
20 In these circumstances, I believe my  
21 understanding is that KPMG had identified some  
22 mapping issues. What mapping issues are is  
23 almost like a typo, but it's a computer making  
24 it.

25 The wrong data went on the wrong

2 line or the wrong file got put in the wrong line.  
3 So there were a number of those identified by  
4 KPMG, so we refiled those reports.

5 Q Is that the case for all of the  
6 reports that were refiled?

7 A DeVito: That's the case for the  
8 June through October; however, the January 2001,  
9 as I previously stated, the permutation test took  
10 extra time to run that particular month, so it  
11 delayed the completion of the report.

12 So we filed as much as we could  
13 without the few metrics where that test is  
14 required, and then in February of 2001, as I  
15 said, we refiled them because some provisioning  
16 results were inaccurate and we wanted to correct  
17 them.

18 Q So is it fair to say that Verizon  
19 would not refile any of their performance reports  
20 based on any changes in the issues log or the  
21 change management notices?

22 MR. COHEN: That calls for specu-  
23 lation, President Hughes.

24 "Has not" might be the question.  
25 You said "would" didn't you, Lewanda?

2 MS. GILBERT: Yes, I phrased the  
3 question as "would", based on the policy  
4 that Ms. Canny just stated that normally  
5 they would not.

6 I'm asking her based on that  
7 policy does she believe that Verizon would  
8 file any changes, any, rather, revisions  
9 to the reports based on anything in the  
10 issues log or change control notices,  
11 that's what I'm basing it on.

12 MR. COHEN: Okay.

13 A Canny: I'm not going to say we  
14 would never refile because I think that there may  
15 be circumstances where if we find something  
16 material we may, but generally we don't.

17 A DeVito: Could I just also, let me  
18 just add to that.

19 Yesterday I looked at the three  
20 change controls that we completed for the  
21 September 2001 report. I itemized each and every  
22 submetric that was impacted by the particular  
23 change control.

24 I looked to see then was there a  
25 difference in the August or September value and

2 did it change it by either a - - was it met in  
3 August and then missed in September, the reverse.

4 When I did that, and you look at  
5 all the measures that were involved, there were  
6 90 of those submeasures, such as OR-101, OR-102,  
7 involved a total 90 for the three change  
8 controls, and then when I look at those 90, 76 of  
9 those had no change at all as to whether it was  
10 missed originally or met originally.

11 Seven of them had changed from  
12 August to September, and it changed it from a met  
13 to a miss, and 7 changed it the reverse way, from  
14 a miss to a met.

15 So the accuracy of the reports is  
16 very, very good. The changes on the issues that  
17 we're doing are really very tiny, minute things  
18 at this point to get them as accurate as  
19 possible.

20 Q Now, the description you just gave  
21 us of the information you looked at, is that the  
22 type of analysis you would be doing to determine  
23 whether Verizon would refile a report?

24 A DeVito: Not typically. I did  
25 that because I wanted to see if there was a

1 it for?

2 A Greaves: Yes, I think it was February  
3 through October.

4 A Blockus: Of 2000.

5 Q Of 2000?

6 A Greaves: Of 2000, yes.

7 Q Wait a second. So we're getting our  
8 years correct now, February of 2000 to October 2000 or  
9 October 2000 to February 2001?

10 A Greaves: October to February.

11 Q Okay.

12 A Greaves: Yes.

13  
14 Panel - cross

1022

15 Q Because I don't think the reports were  
16 actually required to be provided in February.

17 A Greaves: Yes, it's October to February.

18 Q Now, are you aware that in terms of  
19 retail analogs, Verizon has stated that for at least one  
20 metric, PO105, it doesn't use the appropriate retail  
21 analog, and that deals with address validation, telephone  
22 number reservation?

23 A Sears: No, I'm not aware of that.

24 Q That was not something that arose during

1 the course of the test?

2 A Sears: I don't believe so.

3 Q For that submetric or any other  
4 submetrics, you didn't go back and look whether or not it  
5 was the appropriate retail analog because that was not  
6 part of the test, right?

7 A Sears: We looked at a lot of the retail  
8 analogs, so, for example, on UNE loops there are retail  
9 analogs. It's kind of hard to argue. There are  
10 appropriate retail analogs for UNE loops, but it was not  
11 a structured element of the test to look at the retail  
12 analog

13  
14 Panel - cross

1023

15 that was chosen and comparing it to the wholesale  
16 standard or metric.

17 Q Now, in reviewing the metrics data, did  
18 you just review the CLEC aggregate reports as opposed to  
19 the CLEC specific reports?

20 A Sears: No, we reviewed the CLEC  
21 aggregate report and we reviewed the CLEC report foro the  
22 KPMG CLEC.

23 Q Now, there were a number of observations  
24 that were addressed that were resolved in connection with

1 provided data from it's first appearance in the  
2 collection system.

3 So the point where that data could be  
4 used and manipulated, because they are huge volumes of  
5 data to actually calculate the metrics is where that  
6 would take place.

7 Q And did you review whether the correct  
8 retail analog data was being collected, or did you just  
9 assume that it was?

10 A Sears: We did not test - - there was  
11 not a test od what I would call appropriateness. I mean  
12 in a lot of these cases, if we saw a situation where it  
13 looked like the retail analog wasn't remotely comparable  
14 to the wholesale analog, you would have noted that and  
15 challenged that.

16 But, there is not a test point in

17  
18 Panel - cross

1017

19 the Master Test Plan that discusses on a point by point  
20 basis to evaluate the appropriateness of the retail  
21 analog compared to the wholesale analog.

22 A King: But if a retail analog was  
23 defined in the carrier to carrier guidelines as being the  
24 one that should be used, our test did determine to make

**ATTACHMENT 2**

Deborah Haraldson  
Counsel



Verizon New Jersey Inc.  
540 Broad Street, Floor 17  
Newark, NJ 07101  
Phone 973.649.2806

Fax 973.482.8466  
deborah.haraldson@verizon.com

January 29, 2001

By Hand

Frances L. Smith  
Secretary  
Board of Public Utilities  
Two Gateway Center  
Newark, NJ 07102

Re: Verizon NJ Performance Reports  
Docket No. TX98010010

Dear Secretary Smith:

Enclosed are the original and ten copies of an updated list of issues associated with submetrics, and the status of efforts to resolve them. The updated list is also being provided to parties on the service list.

Please contact me at 973-649-2806 if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Enclosures

cc: TSFT Service List (with enclosures)  
Anthony Centrella  
James Corcoran

VERIZON  
NEWLY IDENTIFIED METRIC ISSUES  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
<b>OSS</b>							
<b>Pre-Order</b>							
PO-2-01,-02 & -03	CORBA		Aggregate	The wrong files were used to populate September and October.	September & October	November	
PO-2-01,-02 & -03	EB		Aggregate	June through August, the performance was correctly reported but the "observations" reported were "hours of operation" and should have been "hours of downtime." In September, the observations were correct but the wrong file was used for performance. In October, both the performance and observations were properly reported.	June - September	October	
PO-3-03 & 3-04			Aggregate	Both June and July were missing NJ calls that were answered in the Richmond, Virg. Call Center. August forward captures all calls.	June- July	August	
PO-4-01, 02 & 03				Erroneously reported separately when the metric should be combined for notices, ocnfirmations and types 1-5.	June - December	January	
PO-7-01, 02 & 03			Aggregate	The metric is populated as system updates occur. November report should have reflected a system update. This issue has been resolved going forward.	November	At Next System Release	
<b>BILLING</b>							
BI-02			KPMG report and CLEC Specific reports	This metric is incorrectly numbered on the November KPMG report. It should read "BI 3-03."	November	December	O-74
BI-1 All			CLEC Specific	CLEC Specific template for billing was reformatted to breakout "Total" into the following categories: "Resale," "UNE," and "Total" for all of the billing metrics.	November-December	January	O-74
<b>Maintenance &amp; Repair</b>							
MR-1-01 to 1-06		OSS		Provider excluded certain "hours of operation and holidays" which are not supported by the guidelines.	June - December	January	
MR-1-01, 02, 03 04 & 06	EB	OSS		Rounding error introduced by the way 'C' Language Code handles time calculation. Modified method to calculate time.	June - November	December	
MR-2-05	Specials	UNE		Incorrect data.	November	December	
MR 2-05	2-Wire Digital	UNE	State and GEOs	Mapping error.	June - November	December	
MR 2-01, 4-01, 4-04 through 4-08 and MR 5-01.		Trunks		Results erroneously included test data.	June - November	December	
MR 2, 3, 4 & 5	POTS	Resale & Retail		POTS values erroneously included POTS/Complex combined.	June - December	January	
MR 2-02 & 2-05	Platform	UNE		Mapping error	June-November	December	
MR 2-03	CO Platform & CO Loop	UNE		Mapping error	June-November	December	
MR 2-04	Platform	UNE		Mapping missing denominator	June-October	November	
MR 2-05	2 Wire Dig	UNE		CLEC values not mapped.	August - October	November	
MR 4-01, 02, 03, 04	2 Wire xDSL	UNE		Incorrectly captured troubles cleared the same day.	June - December	January	
MR 4-04		Resale, Retail, UNE		Result calculated by NORD provides troubles cleared "<" 24 hours; should be "<=" 24 hours.	June-December	January	
<b>Operator Services &amp; Databases</b>							
OD 3-01 & 3-02				CLEC sampling data does not exclude test accounts	June - December	January	
<b>Ordering</b>							

VERIZON  
NEWLY IDENTIFIED METRIC ISSUES  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
OR 1-13		Trunks		Calculation includes ">" 192 trunks and should only include "<=192" trunks.	June - November	December	
OR 1-19		Trunks		Modify language describing standard to match guidelines.	June - December	January	
OR 7-01		Resale and UNE		Data disaggregation for this metric is not available as described in guidelines. VZ currently reports results for Resale and UNE that encompass more than POTS.	June - December	Modification of Guidelines Required	
<b>Provisioning</b>							
PR 4-01, 4-02, 4-03, 4-09	EEL	Retail		Incorrectly reported Retail trunks instead of Retail Specials.	June-December	January	
PR -2-05	POTS Platform	UNE		PR 2-05 was incorrectly linked/mapped to PR 2-04	June - October	November	
PR 4-14 to 4-17	xDSL	UNE		Erroneously included ISDN service orders.	June - December	January	
PR 6-01 to 6-03	POTS			2 Wire Digital and 2 Wire DSL erroneously included in the numerator.	August - December	January	
PR 6-03		Trunks		Incorrectly mapped	June- November	December	
PR 9-02, 9-04, 9-06	Hot Cuts			Incorrect data reported.	October	November	
<b>Network Performance</b>							
NP-1		Trunks	Aggregate	Mapping error.	August	September	
NP-1		Trunks	CLEC Specific	Some of the CLEC Specific reports were reported as "NA" when they should have been "0".	June-September & November	December	

VERIZON  
OPEN METRIC ISSUES PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
OSS							
Pre-Order							
PO 1-04(PSA)		Resale, UNE		Change Control Request to change the retail PSA transaction to retrieve the same data as the wholesale PSA transactions	June- December	January	
<b>BILLING</b>							
<b>Ordering</b>							
OR 1-03 through OR 1-10 OR 2-03 through OR 2-10 &				Duplicate transactions may be included in the data for a very low volume of UNE ASR Specials. System solution under review.	June 00 - February 01	March	
<b>Provisioning</b>							
PR-1, PR-2 PR-3				Weekends and Holidays to be excluded from Provisioning intervals	June-January	February	
PR-8-01 PR-8-02	2 wire dig, EEL, IOF, POTS-Tot, Spec, TRUNKS, xDSL			Results erroneously include miscoded orders and CLEC delay days.	July - November	March	
<b>Maintenance &amp; Repair</b>							
MR-1	WEB GUI			Case Worker Issue: Back-up data for November and first week of December lost due to system error. Reported metrics will not be able to be replicated.	November-December	January	
MR 2-02, MR 2-03, MR2-04, MR2-05	UNE Platform, 2 Wire Digital, 2WirexDSL	Resale, Retail, UNE		Data calculation correction to provide additional POTs line count product breakdown	June-December	January	
MR-4-01		Trunks		Performance data reported correctly. Z score was not calculated because the sampling error data was not included.	June- February 01	March	E-7

VERIZON  
CLOSED METRIC ISSUES THAT APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
OSS							
Pre-Order							
PO-1-05		Resale, UNE		EnView EDI system data underreported	June-September	October	
PO-1-06	CORBA			Reported production results rather than EnView -- cannot recapture June or July	June - July	August	
	EDI			Reported production results rather than EnView -- cannot recapture June or July	June - July	August	
	WEB GUI	Retail		Retail data UD -- cannot recapture June or July	June - July	August	
PO-1-07	CORBA			Reported production results rather than EnView -- cannot recapture June or July	June - July	August	
PO-1-09	CORBA			Reported production results rather than EnView -- cannot recapture June or July	June - July	August	
PO-1-10	CORBA			Reported production results rather than EnView -- cannot recapture June or July	June - July	August	
	EDI			Reported production results rather than EnView -- cannot recapture June or July	June - July	August	
	WEB GUI			Reported production results rather than EnView -- cannot recapture June or July	June - July	August	
PO-2	WebGui			Utilized incorrect hours of operation	June-November	December	E-7
PO-2-01	WEB GUI	Resale, Retail, UNE, Trunks		Utilized BA-South maintenance data instead of NJ data. The June data can not be recovered.	June	July	E-7
PO-2-01	WEB GUI	Resale, Retail, UNE, trunks		Data collected based on scheduled hours instead of downtime hours.	June-September	October	
PO-2-01	EB			Revised report issued after the report was submitted	October	November	
PO-2-02	EDI and WEB GUI	Resale, Retail, UNE, Trunks		Utilized BA-South pre-order data instead of NJ data. The June data can not be recovered.	June	July	
PO-2-02 PO-2-03	WEB GUI	Resale, Retail, UNE, Trunks		BA-South maintenance data instead of NJ data. The June data can not be recovered.	June	July	
				Data collected based on scheduled hours instead of downtime hours.	June-September	October	
				Utilized incorrect scheduled availability for WEB GUI maintenance for prime and non-prime.	June-September	October	
PO-3-02 PO 3-04				Reported for 30 sec. instead of 20 sec. -- cannot recapture June but was corrected in July	June	July	
PO-4-01, PO-4-02 & PO-4-03				Excluded confirmations. Confirmations were added to October template separate from notices. Clarification on this metric indicates that there should not be two separate categories, but one combined category.	June-October	November	O-41

VERIZON  
CLOSED METRIC ISSUES THAT APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
PO-5-01			CLEC Specific	Metric was incorrectly reported as UD on a CLEC specific basis. Metric measures interface availability which is identical whether on an aggregate or a CLEC specific basis.	June-September	October	
PO-6				Should have been populated as "NA" in August	August	September	
<b>BILLING</b>							
BI-1			Aggregate Only	Incorrectly populated with July's performance	September	October	
BI-1			CLEC Specific	This metric will be marked UR at the CLEC Specific level due to format changes that are under review.	September & October	November	
BI-1-01			Aggregate	Metric should measure business day, is measuring calendar day. These metrics also include KPMG and Verizon test data.	June - September	October	
BI-1-02 - BI-1-04			Aggregate	Metric should measure business day, is measuring calendar day. These metrics also include KPMG and Verizon test data.	June - September	October	
BI-2			Aggregate	Metric requires CRIS and CABs paper billing records, however CABs paper billing records were omitted and certain electronic data were erroneously included. This metric includes KPMG and Verizon test data.	June - November	December	
BI-2			CLEC Specific	Metric requires CRIS and CABs paper billing records, however CABs paper billing records were omitted and certain electronic data were erroneously included. This metric includes KPMG and Verizon test data.	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-3			Aggregate	Metric requires CRIS paper records only but CABs records were also erroneously included. This metric includes KPMG and Verizon test data	June - November	December	
BI-3			CLEC Specific	Metric requires CRIS paper records only but CABs records were also erroneously included.	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-4			CLEC Specific	Verizon and KPMG test data in denominator	June - November	December	
BI-4			Aggregate	Verizon and KPMG test data in denominator	June - October	November	
BI-5			CLEC Specific	Verizon and KPMG test data in denominator	June - November	December	
BI-5			Aggregate	Verizon and KPMG test data in denominator	June - October	November	
BI-6, BI-7 and BI-8			Aggregate and CLEC Specific.	Metric requires CRIS paper bills only. Currently provides CRIS and CABs, all media types.	June - November	December	
BI-6-01			Aggregate	May include KPMG and Verizon test data.	June - November	December	
BI-6-01			CLEC Specific	May include KPMG and Verizon test data.	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-6-02			Aggregate	Metric should exclude order activity post completion discrepancies (PCDs) from the numerator and denominator, however, PCDs are currently only excluded from the numerator. In addition VNJ is verifying that only charges billed late due to PCDs are excluded. Reported as Under Review (UR).	June 00 - January 01	February-01	

VERIZON  
CLOSED METRIC ISSUES THAT APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
BI-6-02			CLEC Specific	Metric should exclude order activity post completion discrepancies (PCDs) from the numerator and denominator, however, PCDs are currently only excluded from the numerator. In addition VNJ is verifying that only charges billed late due to PCDs are excluded. Reported as Under Review (UR).	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-7-01			Aggregate	May include KPMG and Verizon test data.	June - November	December	
BI-7-01			CLEC Specific	May include KPMG and Verizon test data.	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-7-02			Aggregate	Metric should exclude order activity post completion discrepancies (PCDs) from the numerator and denominator, however, PCDs are currently only excluded from the numerator. In addition VNJ is verifying that only charges billed late due to PCDs are excluded. Reported as Under Review (UR).	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-7-02			CLEC Specific	Metric should exclude order activity post completion discrepancies (PCDs) from the numerator and denominator, however, PCDs are currently only excluded from the numerator. In addition VNJ is verifying that only charges billed late due to PCDs are excluded. Reported as Under Review (UR).	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-8-01			Aggregate	May include KPMG and Verizon test data.	June - November	December	
BI-8-01			CLEC Specific	May include KPMG and Verizon test data.	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-8-02			Aggregate	Metric should exclude order activity post completion discrepancies (PCDs) from the numerator and denominator, however, PCDs are currently only excluded from the numerator. In addition VNJ is verifying that only charges billed late due to PCDs are excluded. Reported as Under Review (UR).	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-8-02			CLEC Specific	Metric should exclude order activity post completion discrepancies (PCDs) from the numerator and denominator, however, PCDs are currently only excluded from the numerator. In addition VNJ is verifying that only charges billed late due to PCDs are excluded. Reported as Under Review (UR).	June 00 - January 01	February-01	
BI-6-02, BI-7-02 and BI-8-02			Aggregate and CLEC Specific reports were affected. The KPMG report correctly displayed "UR"s.	Incorrectly populated with data when the performance should have had code UR.	October	November	
<b>Operator Services &amp; Databases</b>							
OD-1-02				Populated with incorrect data	September	October	

VERIZON  
 CLOSED METRIC ISSUES THAT APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS  
 INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
OD-1-02 OD-1-03				Incorrect denominators were used	June-September	October	
OD-1			CLEC Specific	This metric was incorrectly reported as UD on CLEC Specific reports. CLEC specific data is not required by the Guidelines.	June-September	October	

VERIZON  
CLOSED METRIC ISSUES THAT APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
Ordering							
OR 1-01 OR 1-02				Incorrectly excluded some flow through orders.	July and August	September	
				During last week of September excluded low volume of UNE ASR Specials.	September	October	
OR 1-03 through OR 1-10 & OR 2-03 through OR 2-10				Response times incorrectly calculated when confirmation or query occurred Friday evening or evening prior to Holiday on a low volume of UNE ASR.	July - September	October	
OR-1-05 OR-1-06		Resale, UNE		Product number switched on template between non-DS's and DS3	October	November	
OR-1-07		UNE		Wrong item in formula.	October	November	
OR-1-11		TRUNKS		Mapped item was converted to percentage in error	October	November	
OR 1-13		Trunks		Correct ED database process to include only DLRs <=192 Forecasted Trunks as per guidelines	July - December	January	
OR 2-01 OR 2-02				Missing Flow Through Indicator caused some flow through orders to be classified as not flow-through.	July & August	Sept	
OR-2-06	Specials	UNE		Correct Calculation in ED to include ASRs>=6 lines	Sept- Dec	January	
OR-4-06, OR-4-07, OR-4-08				Incorrect data reported through September. October data reported days instead of hours.	July-October	Nov	E-7
OR 4-09  OR-4-10 OR 4-11			Aggregate	Correct the ordering metrics process retroactive to July. Current feed is EDI but should be NetLink only. Retroactive to July.	July - November	December	E-7
OR-4-10, OR-4-11			CLEC Specific	This metric has been produced manually since August at the aggregate level only and there has been no activity. The CLEC Specific information will be provided when the metric is mechanized in November. It will be marked UD until the December report month.	June - November	December	
OR-5-01, OR-5-02				During last week of September excluded low volume of UNE ASR Specials.	September	October	
OR-5-01		UNE		Observation mapped to Numerator instead of Denominator	October	November	
OR-6-01 OR-6-02		Resale, UNE		Wrong file loaded in Data Load. File revised 11/15/00 but 11/14/00 file was loaded. The Denominator remained the same but the Performance changed.	October	November	
OR-7-01				Current feed is EDI but should be NetLink only; Additionally June's performance did not match EDI value.	June - November	December	E-7

VERIZON  
CLOSED METRIC ISSUES THAT APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
OR-8-01			CLEC Specific	Consistent with the Guidelines, this metric has been reported at the aggregate level using NY data through October. CLEC Specific information was marked UD starting in August. Beginning with the November data month, NJ data will be reported at both the aggregate & CLEC Specific levels.	August - October 2000	November-00	
OR-9-01			All CLEC Specific reports were affected except KPMG.	Prior to October, the CLEC specific performance was marked "UD" because the aggregate report (per the guidelines) reflected NY's performance. NJ data became available for October, and the CLEC specific reports should have been updated to capture the NJ numbers; instead they were published with "UD"s	October	November	
<b>Provisioning</b>							
PR-ALL				Identify all UNE orders by CLEC name	June - November	December	
PR-1-01 through PR-1-08, PR-2-01 through PR-2-08	2W Digital, Complex, EEL, IOF, LNP, Platform, Specials, xDSL	Resale, UNE, Retail, trunks		1st business day of valid order counted as day 1 instead of day 0.	June - November	December	
<del>PR 1-01 - 1-08, PR 1-10, 1-11, PR 2-01 - 2-08, PR 2-10 - 2-17, PR 3, PR 4-01 - 4-06, PR 4-08 - 4-18, PR 5, PR 6, PR 7</del>	<del>2-Wire Dig, Complex, EEL, IOF, Platform, Rots-Bus, Rots-Res, Rots-Tot, Specials, xDSL</del>	<del>Retail, Resale, UNE</del>		<del>Change control request to change provisioning metric base from SOP to bill completions. (Note: This item deleted because data was correctly reported)</del>	<del>June - November</del>	<del>December</del>	
PR 1-01 - 1-08, PR 2-01 - 2-08, PR 3, PR 4, PR 5		EEL, IOF		Correct ASOP (CABS) counting of offered and completed intervals and delay days	June -October	November	
PR-1-10 (aggregate Retail Special Services PR-2-01 (DSL Retail all GEO's)		Retail on Resale		Mapped to Average Interval Completed instead of Offered.	October	November	

VERIZON  
CLOSED METRIC ISSUES THAT APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS  
INFORMATION AS OF 1/26/01

Metric #	Product	Service	Report (1)	Issue	"Report Months" Affected to Date	Expected "Report Month" Delivery	Related KPMG Exceptions/ Observations
PR-1-10 (aggregate Retail Special Services PR-2-01 (DSL Retail all GEO's)		Retail on UNE pages		Linked to Resale error.	October	November	
PR-1, PR-2 PR-6, PR-7, PR-8	All	Resale, UNE, Retail, trunks		Erroneously included Disconnect "C" orders.	June through October (except for August to October for PR 2-13 through 2-17 and PR-6)	November	
PR-3, PR-4, PR-5	2W Digital, complex, EEL, IOF, LNP, Platform, Specials, xDSL	Resale, UNE, Retail, trunks, xDSL		Erroneously included Disconnect "C" orders.	June through October except: 1) July through October for PR-4 EEL & IOF; 2) August through October for PR 3-10 for Pots-Res 2nd line retail. UNE 2 wire digital and xDSL.	November	
				1st business day of valid order counted as day 1 instead of day 0.	See above; June - November	December	
PR-3-10	Complex Svcs 2-Wire Digital	UNE	Aggregate	Erroneously populated with NA when there were in fact 3 observations. Performance Result is 33.33.	June	July	E-7
PR-3-10	Complex Svcs 2-Wire xDSL	UNE	Aggregate	Erroneously populated with "1" and 3 observations, should have been "2.71" because there were 479 observations DUPLICATES ENTRY ABOVE?	June	July	E-7
PR4-01 PR-4-02	Specials	UNE		Specials were omitted from template	June - September	October	O-41
PR-4-01, PR-4-02 and PR-4-09			Aggregate and CLEC specific reports excluding KPMG reports for September and October.	These metrics were omitted from the UNE Special product for both the aggregate and CLEC specific reports.	June through October	November	
PR 4-07	Pots and Specials	UNE		Erroneously reported as NA although there were 218 incidents. Performance was 95.87%	September	October	
PR-4-08	POTS - Other	UNE	Aggr & Hud/Berg	Erroneously reported as NA although there was one observation. Result should have been 0.	June	July	
PR-4-11	POTS - Other	UNE	Aggregate	Erroneously reported as NA. Should have been "4" because there were 625 observations	June	July	