

BellSouth Corporation
Suite 900
1133-21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-3351

glenn.reynolds@bellsouth.com

Glenn T. Reynolds
Vice President -
Federal Regulatory

202 463 4112
Fax 202 463 4142

August 14, 2002

EX PARTE

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 12th St. SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: WC Docket 02-150

Dear Ms. Dortch:

In the course of recent ex parte meetings in the above-referenced proceeding, Commission staff has requested that BellSouth respond to a number of specific questions. The following information is a partial response to those requests. We will provide responses to the remainder of the staff's questions as soon as possible.

Question: In the Stacy Reply affidavit, in footnote 1, BellSouth explains that the 70% figure was derived by excluding certain change requests for complex services. Please explain this statement?

Response: BellSouth excluded certain change requests (CR0728, CR0135, and CR0367) from the calculation because BellSouth and the CLECs are still defining the parameters of these requests.

Those change requests are described in footnote 15 of the Reply Affidavit of William Stacy filed on August 5, 2002. Footnote 15 states; "BellSouth and the CLECs via the Flow-through Task Force are working to separate CR0728 (LNP w/Complex Services; Type 2) into individual change requests. BellSouth and AT&T are partnering at the Ordering and Billing Forum to support the field required to implement CR0135 (Type 5) - Merging of Accounts. BellSouth and AT&T are working together to clarify the scope of CR0367 (Type 5) - Use of LEAN/LEATN fields."^[1]

^[1] LEAN means Line Existing Account Number; LEATN means Line Existing Account Telephone Number.

On May 22, 2002, change requests CR0135 and CR0367 were prioritized by the CLECs as #15 and #19, respectively. Change request CR0728 is a Type 2 (regulatory mandate) change request because it is a Flow-through Task Force (FTTF) change request. On April 9, 2002, it was ranked as #4 by participants in the FTTF. Change requests CR0135 and CR0367 are also discussed in paragraphs 35-36 of the Reply Affidavit of William Stacy filed on August 5, 2002.

Question: Is BellSouth going to seek reconsideration or to appeal the FLPSC decision on August 6 to require BST to implement change requests within 60 weeks of whatever start point the commission selected for defining 60 weeks?

Response: BellSouth has not sought and does not intend to seek reconsideration or appeal the Florida PSC's decision.

Question: Please supply the percentage of CLEC lines served by UNE-P in MS and SC using June data.

Response: The percentage of CLEC lines served by UNE-P in Mississippi as of June 2002 is 45%. In South Carolina the percentage is 21%.

Question: Please supply CLEC loop numbers for June 2002.

Response: June 2002 CLEC specific loop data and total loop counts for CLECs serving ten lines or more can be found in Exhibits ES-2, ES-4, ES-6, ES-8, and ES-10 of the Stockdale Reply affidavit.

Question: Please provide June data for the number of unbundled loops by state. The data should be disaggregated into stand-alone loops, DSL loops, digital loops, and high capacity loops by state. All this data should include Georgia.

Response: The requested loop information is provided in the table below.

LOOPS (JUNE 30, 2002)

	Ala.	Ky.	Ms.	N.C.	S.C.	Ga.	BST
<i>SL1 voice grade loops</i>	0	27	333	113	826	30,069	109,233
<i>SL2 voice grade loops</i>	11,699	2,308	3,353	42,565	10,288	31,032	227,431
<i>Two-wire ISDN digital grade loops</i>	315	127	162	1,062	138	1,482	6,338
<i>Two-wire ADSL loops</i>	1,268	378	869	1,534	256	3,472	16,925
<i>Two-wire HDSL loops</i>	61	1	42	17	5	69	465
<i>Four-wire HDSL loops</i>	0	0	0	9	1	0	63
<i>Four-wire DS-1 digital grade loops</i>	1,518	578	744	3,215	2,460	3,272	25,301
<i>56 or 64 Kb/s digital grade loops</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	15
<i>Unbundled Copper Loop ("UCL") loops (both Long and Short)</i>	311	0	53	81	107	469	2,531
<i>DS3 loops</i>	0	0	4	4	6	9	34
<i>Unbundled Copper Loops-Non-designed ("UCL-ND")</i>	26	18	214	80	0	14	605
<i>Universal Digital Carrier ("UDC") loops</i>	715	404	484	2,549	814	3,465	15,680

Question: At para. 224 of the Varner Reply affidavit, it is stated in relation to performance metric B.2.1.18.1.1 that the disparity for this metric is because CLEC products have longer intervals than the ILEC products. Why are the CLEC intervals longer?

Response: The key reason for the difference in Order Completion interval (OCI) for this measurement is in the mix of products ordered by the CLECs as compared to the mix of products ordered by retail. The CLEC products consist largely of ISDN and xDSL services that are designed and have longer installation intervals.

The key component of the retail product mix is ADSL, which is a non-designed service offering and is provisioned by simply adding high frequency spectrum capabilities to an existing retail subscriber loop. This capability can typically be provisioned in less than 5 days. In contrast, the products ordered by the CLECs include designed DSL circuits as well as Unbundled Digital Channels. These DSL circuits ordered by the CLEC differ from the retail ADSL in that they are a new stand-alone service and require new facilities to provision, rather than utilizing existing voice lines as does retail ADSL. Therefore when increased volumes of retail ADSL occur relative to other orders in the retail mix there is the potential for a lower OCI interval for the retail analog used in the comparison measure.

Question: For high capacity loops, the Varner Reply affidavit at Exhibit PM-27 provides revised maintenance and repair data for the other design category through May. Please provide the June data.

Response: June data is included in attached file "Item 3.pdf."

Question: In regard to Line sharing, the Varner Reply affidavit says that the line sharing data in Kentucky are unreliable because of a coding issue relating to the retail data. Please provide accurate line sharing data.

Response: The updated information is attached as file "Item 4.pdf."

Question: Please provide a general discussion of the % provisioning troubles within 30 days performance metric, specifically addressing UNE digital loops.

Response: CLEC UNE orders are provisioned with few troubles within 30 days of the installation. As an example, for the period January through June 2002 in the 5 states, in excess of 96% of all UNE orders did not experience a provisioning trouble report. (This figure was derived by dividing all of the UNE provisioning troubles by the number of orders - or CLEC volume on the MSS.) Therefore, when comparing Provisioning Trouble Report Rates between CLEC and Retail where the CLEC results are not in parity with retail, the focus is essentially on the 4% of the orders that have a trouble report. While BellSouth did miss this measure on a few occasions over the 5 month period in the 5 states, small ordering volumes can often make the comparison of retail and CLEC provisioning trouble reports less meaningful. Thus it is important to look at the underlying data.

Focusing just on UNE digital loops, while BellSouth considers the quality of installation to be excellent, BellSouth has implemented several initiatives to reduce provisioning troubles even more. See Ainsworth Direct Affidavit at ¶ 139 and 148. In addition, CWINS and Network Operations initiated a DS1 process improvement trial from December 2001 to February 2002 to identify provisioning improvements for DS1 service. The trial identified a need for more specific qualification test for HDSL to be provided by the network personnel to assure DS1 loop qualification at provisioning. These test included margin (signal to noise) and pulse attenuation tests to further validate DS1 loop conformance. These improvements were implemented in March 2002 and are today part of the DS1 turn-up process. Furthermore, DS1 digital pattern test requirements are now required documentation for DS1 turn-up to validate operational capability of the DS1 loop and that the loop meets data and line coding requirements. Finally, the CWINS continues to offer cooperative testing for CLECs to validate that a provisioned DS1 service meets end to end provisioning requirements. This process allows the CLEC the opportunity to validate service criteria prior to placing the DS1 in service.

Question: Paragraph 108 in the Milner affidavit provides loop conditioning data for March 31st. Please provide the numbers for loop conditioning orders in each of the 5 states through June 30th.

Response: Through June 30, 2002, CLECs in Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and BellSouth's nine-state region made requests for loop conditioning as follows:

	<i>Loop Conditioning Requests</i>
Alabama	0
Kentucky	0
Mississippi	1
North Carolina	6
South Carolina	14
BellSouth Region	159

Question: In the Milner Reply affidavit, it is stated that the majority of LNP gateway orders are processed mechanically. Please provide an actual percent for June or another representative month.

Response: In June, 92% of LNP gateway orders were processed mechanically.

Question: Did BellSouth implement the LESOG fix referenced in ¶ 157 of Varner Direct Affidavit? If so, are you aware of any complaints regarding the fix?

Response: The fix was implemented with June data. BellSouth is not aware of any complaints or indications that it does not work.

Question: Please provide March and June PMAP 4.0 restated data for FOC timeliness and reject interval.

Response: The following table contains the results for FOC timeliness. BellSouth will provide data on reject intervals in a subsequent ex parte to be filed soon.

MARCH**B.1.9.15 (FOC FM UNE Other Non Des)**

	AL	KY	MS	NC	SC
Measure Benchmark	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Volume	764	769	71	93	233
Old Numerator	727	741	37	65	198
Old CLEC	95.16%	96.36%	52.11%	69.89%	84.98%
Net Improvement	37	28	34	27	34
New Numerator	764	769	71	92	232
New CLEC	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.92%	99.57%

B.1.12.15 (FOC PM UNE Other Non Des)

	AL	KY	MS	NC	SC
Measure Benchmark	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Volume	251	69	32	48	101
Old Numerator	176	44	8	33	74
Old CLEC	70.12%	63.77%	25.00%	68.75%	73.27%
Net Improvement	8	8	22	9	7
New Numerator	184	52	30	42	81
New CLEC	73.31%	75.36%	93.75%	87.50%	80.20%

June**B.1.9.15 (FOC FM UNE Other Non Des)**

	AL	KY	MS	NC	SC
Measure Benchmark	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Volume	1,164	880	54	255	287
Old Numerator	1,077	862	28	105	251
Old CLEC	92.53%	97.95%	51.85%	41.18%	87.46%
Net Improvement	31	17	25	148	15
New Numerator	1,108	879	53	253	266
New CLEC	95.19%	99.89%	98.15%	99.22%	92.68%

B.1.12.15 (FOC PM UNE Other Non Des)

	AL	KY	MS	NC	SC
Measure Benchmark	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Volume	394	272	18	50	110
Old Numerator	362	251	11	33	100
Old CLEC	91.88%	92.28%	61.11%	66.00%	90.91%
Net Improvement	7	(1)	4	13	1
New Numerator	369	250	15	46	101
New CLEC	93.65%	91.91%	83.33%	92.00%	91.82%

Question: Explain the CPNI safeguards that are in place to prevent a BellSouth retail service representative from viewing a CLEC pending service order.

Response: The legacy systems (primarily SOCS) used to process service orders are common to both retail and wholesale (CLEC) services. Pending service orders in this system therefore need to be accessed by both BellSouth retail and BellSouth wholesale service representatives to handle issues dealing with the order while it is in progress.

BellSouth was not able to develop a mechanical solution to segregate the retail and wholesale pending orders, since the wholesale service representative needs to be able to view all orders for both retail and wholesale. Instead, BellSouth has put a series of practices related to CPNI in place that prohibit the retail service representative from viewing a CLEC pending order. These policies are strictly enforced and are reinforced by periodic training and by severe penalties, including loss of employment, if they are violated.

Question: In its original comments at page 17, USLEC makes allegations about "blind FOCs", when BellSouth sends US LEC a firm order confirmation date and then on or near the delivery date notifies US LEC that the facility is not available and will not be delivered on the date. Please provide the current status of this issue.

Response: When BellSouth receives a complete and correct local service request (LSR), the Firm Order Confirmation is returned to confirm that we have received the order. During the next stage of order processing, a check of the databases, including the facilities database is made to determine if the facilities are available to work the order. If the database indicates a problem, a jeopardy is returned to the CLEC, otherwise, the order processing continues.

If the information contained in the database is wrong (which would be true for either BST or the CLEC), a facilities problem may not be detected until the due date, when a technician is dispatched to the end-users premise to install the service. If BST is not able to rectify the problem on the due date, the issue described can occur, but again this is true for either retail or wholesale.

In accordance with Commission rules, I am filing copies of this notice and attachment and request that they be included in the record of the proceeding identified above.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Glenn T. Reynolds". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "G" and "R".

Glenn T. Reynolds

cc: Michelle Carey
Aaron Goldberger
Susan Pie
James Davis-Smith (Department of Justice)