ORIGINAL

Redacted For Public Inspection **BELLSOUTH**

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

BellSouth
Suite 900
1133-21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3351

kathleen.levitz@bellsouth.com

Kathleen B. Levitz
Vice President-Federal Regulatory

202 463-4113
Fax 202 463-4198

RECEIVED

MAR 27 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

March 27, 2002

WRITTEN EX PARTE

Mr. William Caton
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 02-35

Dear Mr. Caton:

This letter responds to questions that Common Carrier Bureau staff posed during a meeting with BellSouth representatives on March 13, 2002 related to issues discussed in BellSouth's application or in comments filed in response to that application. I am requesting confidential treatment for this letter because it contains CLEC-specific information to which such treatment should be accorded subject to the terms of the Protective Order issued in this docket on February 14, 2002.

Reconciliation Efforts

The staff has asked BellSouth to identify the data reconciliations it has recently undertaken. We are currently in the midst of a data reconciliation with AT&T on issues related to: (a) comparing flow through and acknowledgement raw data; and (b) comparing FOC and reject response completeness raw data and FOC and reject interval raw data; and (c) comparing order completion interval and average completion interval raw data. We have previously performed data reconciliation concerning hot cuts with AT&T, Mpower, and Allegiance (although that concluded last year).

There have also been several joint service order accuracy reviews conducted recently with Birch. In these reviews, Birch has analyzed a pre-specified number

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE

of service orders and then the LCSC has analyzed these same service orders for accuracy. In each case, a call has followed to verify agreement on the findings. BellSouth also has a joint endeavor underway with WorldCom in which the LCSC looks at each clarification for WorldCom before the clarification is sent to WorldCom. WorldCom is then supposed to look at the clarifications daily and provide feedback to the LCSC concerning the validity of those clarifications. WorldCom has sent 4 e-mails stating that no invalid clarifications were found. The e-mail sent on February 25, 2002 indicated that there were no invalid clarifications found for the following three days: February 22, 23 and 24, 2002. The e-mail sent on February 26, 2002 indicated that there were no invalid clarifications found for February 25, 2002, while e-mails sent on February 28 and March 5, 2002 indicated no invalid clarifications found for February 27 or March 4, respectively. No other data have been shared from WorldCom.

Although the current data reconciliation with AT&T is not being conducted under the supervision of the GPSC, the idea for BellSouth and AT&T to reconcile their data was an action item in the Georgia performance measurements workshops. The earlier hot cut reconciliation process with AT&T, Mpower, and Allegiance was conducted under the GPSC staff's supervision.

BellSouth will conduct data reconciliations upon request and upon BellSouth and the requesting CLEC reaching agreement that a valid issue exists.

Billing System Holds

In his reply affidavit, David Scollard had stated that the percentage of CLEC orders for which the Billing System found errors amounted to .5%. *See* Reply Affidavit of David P. Scollard filed November 13, 2001. In its Comments, WorldCom now argues that the fix to stop validating LSRs to RSAG will increase this percentage. The fix will not, however, have the effect that WorldCom predicts for the following reason. The billing system does not have an edit in place that checks to see if the information in the service address field of a service order matches the service address information on the CSR. Since the service address information on the order originates in RSAG, the billing system accepts that information without editing the content. Therefore, any differences between the address on the order and the CSR will not slow down CSR posting in billing.

January data demonstrate that WorldCom's fears are misplaced. In January, 0.6% of CLEC orders in Georgia where found to have errors by the billing system and sent to the "hold file" process for correction. In Louisiana the result was 0.5% of CLEC orders processed in the hold file. As a comparison, in Georgia, during January, 0.7% of BellSouth's retail orders were found to have errors while being processed in the billing system.

Billing Metrics

The staff also asked if BellSouth could explain why the non-recurring charge (NRC) completeness metrics dropped significantly for UNEs in GA and for interconnection in GA and LA in January 2002. The requested explanations follow.

January 2002 UNE NRC Billing Completeness Metric in Georgia

In January the results for Georgia dropped to 68.34% due to the back billing of OSS charges for LSRs issued and then subsequently cancelled by the CLECs. BellSouth is allowed to recover its OSS costs for the development of systems and centers that process the LSRs submitted by CLECs for local service. These OSS costs are recoverable by BellSouth on a per LSR basis, whether or not the LSRs continue completely through provisioning or the CLEC elects to cancel the LSRs. However, BellSouth's systems have not been equipped to apply the OSS charges associated with cancelled LSRs. Once a service order is cancelled, there is no order to which the billing charges can be applied. In an effort to close this revenue gap, BellSouth made the decision to manually back bill OSS charges for cancelled LSRs until an initiative to bill these charges on a current basis has been completed. It is expected that this initiative will be completed by the end of 2002. On November 13, 2001, BellSouth issued a Carrier Notification letter to inform all CLECs of its intent to back bill OSS charges for LSRs that were cancelled by the CLECs between July 2000 and November 2001. Billing of the charges took place in December 2001 and January 2002. The goal was to apply these charges by the end of 2001. However, gathering and processing of the necessary data took longer than expected and based upon the timing of various CLECs' respective billing cycles, billing of the charges took place in December 2001 and January 2002.

The transactions used to provide the CLECs with this billing were identified with dates back to July 2000. If a CLEC were billed for LSRs dating from July 2000 to November 2001 on the January 2001 bill, then all of that amount would be identified as being "late" (*i.e.,* identified as a charge related to prior bill periods) for purposes of the completeness measure. Since CLECs should be billing their end users from the records that they themselves maintain of service order activity, these back billed transactions did not hamper a CLEC's ability to bill its customers for services provided.

January 2002 Interconnection Billing Completeness Metric in Georgia

The results for Georgia dropped to 75.76% due to two issues. First, the decision to back bill for OSS charges for cancelled LSRs (see description above) negatively impacted this measure.

The second reason for the lower results was a delay in posting 7 service orders that were being corrected by the Local Interconnection Service Center. The bills for the affected CLECs had already been created by the time the corrections had been made to the orders. Therefore, they were considered late for purposes of the measure.

January 2002 Interconnection Billing Completeness Metric In Louisiana

The results for Louisiana dropped to 82.44% due to the decision to back bill OSS charges for LSRs that are issued by the CLECs and then subsequently cancelled. (*See* description above.)

Fall Out for Memory Call or Call Forwarding

In response to commenters' assertions about planned fall-out of LSRs associated with end users who had subscribed to BellSouth's Memory Call or call forwarding, the staff asked whether BellSouth had implemented or considered implementing any work-arounds for such orders.

The answer to this question is "yes." After CLECs had complained that UNE-P conversion activity had caused some customers to lose call forwarding and Memory Call capabilities, BellSouth implemented a work-around to be sure that end users were able to retain these features when that was their preference. BellSouth fully explained the work-around process to CLECs, including WorldCom. The work-around caused Unbundled Network Element-Platform, or UNE-P, conversion orders for end users that had subscribed to BellSouth's Memory Call or call forwarding features to fall out for manual handling so that a service representative in the LCSC could review these conversion service orders to verify whether the features were to be retained or "taken down." The Field Identifier (FID) on the service orders that would flag such orders for review is "ZLIG." The LCSC representatives would insert the necessary FIDs to ensure a conversion that kept the features the LSR indicated were to be preserved.

For purposes of Flow Through reporting, however, LSRs falling out as part of this workaround were never categorized as Planned Manual Fallout, but rather were counted as "BST Caused Errors."

Because CLECs no longer wanted these orders to fall out for manual handling, BellSouth implemented one process on March 23, 2002, with ENCORE Release 10.4, and will implement another on May 18, 2002 in Release 10.5 to eliminate this fall out. With the Single C order process implemented in Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi on March 23, 2002, the ZLIG FID is no longer required to assure retention of Memory Call or call forwarding on UNE-P conversion orders. Release 10.5 will eliminate the remaining fall out arising when a customer migrating to a CLEC has previously subscribed to Memory Call or call forwarding.

WorldCom has asserted that the workaround affected a "substantial number of customers." WorldCom Comments at p. 30. For December 2001 and January 2002, however, only around 2 percent of WorldCom's UNE-P LSRs were affected by the workaround.

	CallForward/Mem Call Errors	Total Orders	Pct
December 2001	***	***	2.29%
January 2001	***	***	2.5%

For the same period, the impact on all CLEC mechanized UNE-P LSRs sent to BellSouth was even less. As the data below show, less than 1% of these LSRs were affected.

	CallForward/Mem Call Errors	Total Orders	Pct
December 2001	2184	351231	.62%
January 2001	2217	434840	.51%

OSS Outage Measurements

The staff also asked whether the SQM business rules define outages to be any lack of availability greater than one minute. The answer to this question is that the criteria for determining when an outage has occurred do not exclude outages of one minute or less. Outages of less than one minute are included for purposes of calculating BellSouth's performance under metrics OSS-2 and OSS-3 of the SQM. It is true, however, that one minute is the lowest unit of measure for outages so that if an outage is actually less than one minute, that outage will be measured as a one-minute outage. For example, a 30-second outage would be measured as a one-minute outage.

Staff also asked what additional Loss of functionality outages will be included in the OSS Availability metrics if the Georgia Commission adopts the changes to OSS-2 and OSS-3 upon which BellSouth and the CLECs reached consensus in that Commission's Six Month Review of the SQM.

The SQM currently defines a Full outage as occurrences of either of the following:

- The application or system is down or totally inoperative.
- The application or system is inaccessible by customers attempting to access the application or system. This includes transport outages when they may be directly associated with a specific application.

Under the proposed changes to the SQM to which the parties have agreed, the SQM would define a Loss of Functionality outage as "a critical function that is normally performed by the CLEC or is normally provided by an application or system is temporarily unavailable to the CLEC." Under the proposal, the SQM

would define a Degraded outage as "a critical function that is normally performed by the CLEC or is normally provided by an application or system is available to the CLEC, but with significantly reduced response or processing time."

Currently only full outages are included in OSS Availability metrics calculations. The proposal would also include loss of functionality and degraded outages, both of which outages are now excluded from the calculations. If the Commission adopts the changes to which the parties agreed, in the future, full outages and loss of functionality outages will be included in OSS Availability metrics calculations. Degraded outages will continue to be excluded from the calculations.

The following two examples are actual loss of functionality outages for the LENS application that have occurred in recent months. These types of outages were not included in the calculations for OSS-2 and OSS-3, but would be included if the proposed changes described above are adopted.

Example 1

Date:	12/05/2001
Duration:	25 Minutes
Description:	LENS users timing out when attempting to login (note: users already logged in were not impacted).
Root Cause:	A LENS process needed to be closed and reopened to restore service on a LENS server.
Note:	LENS users already logged in were not impacted.

Example 2

Date:	12/26/2001
Duration:	39 Minutes
Description:	LENS users unable to view Features and Services information.
Root cause:	Database archive logs were full on a LENS server .
Note:	LENS users were able to perform all other pre-order activities and queries.

Full archives logs would cause CLECs to receive an error message indicating that they could not pull the requested information. To cure the problem, space on the logs must be freed. There are typically three ways to make more space available: delete the log file; copy and archive the file to another location; or purge specific records without deleting the entire log.

PMR 5 Match/Exception Issue

In reviewing the KPMG Interim Report, the staff noted that PMR-5 shows a match and also an exception associated with the metric Acknowledgement Message Completeness (AMC). The staff asked if BellSouth could discuss the

timing of the Interim Report relative to the exception closure process. In response, BellSouth provides the following explanation.

In October 2001, KPMG began replicating July 2001 data for Acknowledgment Message Completeness. KMPG could not replicate the measure and thus opened Georgia Exception 138. BellSouth responded to KPMG that KPMG's inability to replicate the measure was due to an error in the Raw Data User's Manual (RDUM) for July. BellSouth provided KPMG the revised RDUM and KPMG replicated September 2001 data. Once KPMG replicated the data, KPMG showed the measure as a "match" on the PMR-5 Detailed Status Report as of December 31, 2001, filed as part of the KPMG Interim Status Report. On January 8, 2002, subsequent to the December 31 cut-off for the Interim Status Report, KPMG announced it would close Exception 138. Thus, there was a period of time during which KPMG had replicated the measure, but the Exception remained outstanding.

In accordance with Commission rules, I am enclosing one original copy of this letter, including the confidential data, labeled CONFIDENTIAL – NOT FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION. I am also enclosing two copies of this letter from which those data have been redacted for public inspection. These copies are labeled REDACTED FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION. Inquiries about access to the confidential material submitted with this letter should be directed to Laura Brennan, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans, 1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C., 20036, 202.367.7821. Please call me if you have any questions about this filing.

Sincerely,

Kathleen B. Levitz

Kathleen B. Levitz

cc:	Renee Crittendon	Ian Dillner
	Pam Megna	Dennis Johnson
	Susan Pié	Aaron Goldberger
	James Davis-Smith	Daniel Shiman