

HOGAN & HARTSON
L.L.P.

Writer's Direct Dial:
(202) 637 - 5458

COLUMBIA SQUARE
555 THIRTEENTH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-1109
TEL (202) 637-5600
FAX (202) 637-5910

August 14, 2002

Ex Parte -- REDACTED -- FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

RECEIVED

BY HAND DELIVERY

AUG 14 2002

Marlene Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: WC Docket No. 02-148
Qwest Communications International Inc.
Consolidated Application for Authority to Provide
In Region, InterLATA Services in Colorado, Idaho,
Iowa, Nebraska and North Dakota

WC Docket No. 02-189
Qwest Communications International Inc.
Consolidated Application for Authority to Provide
In Region, InterLATA Services in Montana, Utah,
Washington and Wyoming

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Attached for filing in the above-referenced dockets are Qwest's responses to questions posed by the FCC staff concerning Reject Rates and Jeopardy Notices.

Pursuant to the Public Notice in this proceeding, Qwest is submitting an original and two redacted copies of the documents detailing these responses. Qwest separately is submitting an original and one copy of the confidential portion of this filing. Six copies each of the redacted and confidential versions of this filing (for each proceeding) also are being submitted to Janice Myles of the Wireline Competition Bureau.

Qwest submits the enclosed documents with the understanding that they will be subject to the Protective Order in this proceeding. Inquiries regarding access to the confidential portions of these documents (subject to the terms of the Protective Order) should be addressed to the following:

Marlene Dortch
Secretary
August 14, 2002
Page 2

C. Jeffrey Tibbels
Hogan & Hartson LLP
555 13th Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: (202) 637 - 6968
Fax: (202) 637 - 5910

The twenty-page limit does not apply to this filing. Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions.

Respectfully Submitted,



Yaron Dori

Enclosures

cc: M. Carowitz
E. Yockus
J. Myles
R. Harsch
J. Jewel
P. Baker
C. Post
P. Fahn
B. Smith
J. Stanley
S. Vick
C. Washburn
S. Oxley

Question

Provide information on reject rates, including reject rate volumes (in the aggregate and on a CLEC-specific basis) and ranges.

Answer

As described in paragraphs 95 through 99 of the OSS Reply Declaration, LSR rejection rates are captured by PID PO-4. PO-4A measures rejection rates for LSRs submitted through the IMA GUI; PO-4B measures rejection rates for LSRs submitted through the IMA EDI interface. LSRs are rejected for a number of standard reasons, most notably for failing to pass the edits included in the Business Processing Layer (BPL) of IMA; these mechanized rejects are reported in PO-4A-2 and PO-4B-2. Because not all CLEC errors can be caught by the IMA BPL, a smaller percentage of LSRs are manually rejected; these are reported in PO-4A-1 and PO-4B-1.

Qwest's reject rates over the past six months for CLECs (in the aggregate) under the PO-4 sub-measures, as reported on a region-wide basis and with volumes, are shown in the table below.¹

¹ See Colorado Commercial Performance Results at 57-58 (PO-4A-1, PO-4A-2, PO-4B-1, PO-4B-2); Idaho Commercial Performance Results at 54-55 (PO-4A-1, PO-4A-2, PO-4B-1, PO-4B-2); Iowa Commercial Performance Results at 56-57 (PO-4A-1, PO-4A-2, PO-4B-1, PO-4B-2); Nebraska Commercial Performance Results at 56-57 (PO-4A-1, PO-4A-2, PO-4B-1, PO-4B-2); North Dakota Commercial Performance Results at 50-51 (PO-4A-1, PO-4A-2, PO-4B-1, PO-4B-2).

Aggregate Reject Rates

| Category | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |
|----------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| PO-4A-1 | 3.61% (3,681/ 102,045) | 3.71% (3,142/ 84,615) | 3.81% (3,582/ 94,010) | 3.75% (3,402/ 90,804) | 4.05% (3,840/ 94,906) | 4.36% (3,754/ 86,121) |
| PO-4A-2 | 29.19% (29,785/ 102,045) | 29.62% (25,067/ 84,615) | 30.23% (28,421/ 94,010) | 30.92% (28,078/ 90,804) | 30.72% (29,158/ 94,906) | 31.30% (26,953/ 86,121) |
| PO-4B-1 | 5.37% (4,492/ 83,678) | 6.12% (3,544/ 57,897) | 5.24% (2,989/ 57,060) | 8.48% (6,587/ 77,654) | 7.62% (5,659/ 74,231) | 8.19% (6,144/ 74,983) |
| PO-4B-2 | 24.06% (20,133/ 93,678) | 23.14% (13,400/ 57,897) | 23.47% (13,392/ 57,060) | 22.73% (17,647/ 77,654) | 22.24% (16,508/ 74,231) | 24.11% (18,081/ 74,983) |

On July 17, 2002, Qwest provided the FCC with CLEC-specific reject rates under PO-4 in an ex parte filing. As shown in that filing, individual CLEC reject rates vary widely.² For example, individual CLEC results for May 2002 ranged from 0% to 50% for PO-4A-1 and 0% to 100% for PO-4A-2. Because all CLECs submit their LSRs against the same edits, whether manually applied or invoked by the BPL, it is clear that this wide range of results cannot be attributed solely to Qwest. In support of its position, Qwest has identified the CLECs with the largest volumes of LSRs submitted from January 2002 to June 2002. The following tables summarize the variation in reject rates for these high-volume CLECs (as well as restate the CLEC aggregate results for purposes of comparison).³

² See Qwest July 17 Ex Parte on CLEC-Specific Results for PO-2 and PO-4.

³ Confidential Attachment A discloses the identity of each CLEC discussed here.

PO-4A-1

| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| CLEC Aggregate | 3.61% (3,681/ 102,045) | 3.71% (3,142/ 84,615) | 3.81% (3,582/ 94,010) | 3.75% (3,402/ 90,804) | 4.05% (3,840/ 94,906) | 4.36% (3,754/ 86,121) |
| CLEC A | 0.83% (105/ 12,679) | 0.96% (80/ 8,355) | 0.60% (50/ 8,364) | 0.73% (72/ 9,828) | 0.93% (72/ 7,778) | 1.03% (79/ 7,682) |
| CLEC B | 3.45% (177/ 5,129) | 4.25% (256/ 6,023) | 5.56% (357/ 6,418) | 3.83% (254/ 6,628) | 3.93% (258/ 6,569) | 4.86% (242/ 4,979) |
| CLEC C | 1.69% (137/ 8,103) | 2.58% (149/ 5,768) | 2.12% (150/ 7,074) | 3.46% (190/ 5,487) | 3.76% (205/ 5,445) | 4.83% (199/ 4,118) |
| CLEC D | 5.26% (285/ 5,419) | 4.62% (233/ 5,048) | 6.01% (320/ 5,327) | 4.87% (314/ 6,442) | 6.11% (445/ 7,289) | 8.22% (600/ 7,299) |
| CLEC E | 3.39% (155/ 4,567) | 3.05% (106/ 3,476) | 3.61% (157/ 4,346) | 4.61% (204/ 4,427) | 5.41% (281/ 5,190) | 4.63% (214/ 4,627) |

The PO-4A-1 table above shows that while the largest-volume CLEC, CLEC A, has an extremely low reject rate, exceeding 1% for the first time this year in June, CLEC D, which had comparable volumes in May and June, had a significantly higher rejection rate. In fact, CLEC D's reject rate under this measure has consistently been at least 25% higher than the CLEC aggregate while CLEC A's result have been at least 70% below the CLEC aggregate. The reject rate for the other three CLECs shown above (CLECs B, C and E) have been closer to the CLEC aggregate; their results have been both above and below the CLEC aggregate in particular months.

PO-4A-2

| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| CLEC Aggregate | 29.19% (29,785/ 102,045) | 29.62% (25,067/ 84,615) | 30.23% (28,421/ 94,010) | 30.92% (28,078/ 90,804) | 30.72% (29,158/ 94,906) | 31.30% (26,953/ 86,121) |
| CLEC A | 9.02% (1,144/ 12,679) | 9.24% (772/ 8,355) | 9.92% (832/ 8,384) | 11.66% (1,146/ 9,828) | 12.42% (966/ 7,778) | 14.59% (1,121/ 7,682) |
| CLEC B | 16.61% (852/ 5,129) | 20.77% (1,251/ 6,023) | 20.58% (1,321/ 6,418) | 19.21% (1,273/ 6,628) | 18.37% (1,207/ 6,569) | 13.74% (684/ 4,979) |
| CLEC C | 20.40% (1653/ 8,103) | 23.91% (1379/ 5,768) | 19.99% (1414/ 7,074) | 17.64% (968/ 5,487) | 25.40% (1,383/ 5,445) | 21.10% (869/ 4,118) |
| CLEC D | 21.00% (1,138/ 5,419) | 23.71% (1,197/ 5,048) | 26.45% (1,409/ 5,327) | 27.85% (1,794/ 6,442) | 31.60% (2,303/ 7,289) | 32.29% (2,357/ 7,299) |
| CLEC E | 29.82% (1,362/ 4,567) | 27.68% (962/ 3,476) | 28.07% (1,220/ 4,346) | 30.02% (1,329/ 4,427) | 29.38% (1,525/ 5,190) | 29.28% (1,355/ 4,327) |

Reject rates for PO-4A-2 are higher than those under PO-4A-1 due to Qwest's continuing efforts to move edits into the IMA BPL so that CLECs receive faster feedback on their LSRs. Nevertheless, the above table shows that, once again, CLEC A has been consistently better than the CLEC aggregate result. CLEC B and CLEC C also have been able to consistently beat the aggregate result by significant factors.

PO-4B-1

| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| CLEC Aggregate | 5.37% (4,492/ 83,678) | 6.12% (3,544/ 57,897) | 5.24% (2,989/ 57,060) | 8.48% (6,587/ 77,654) | 7.62% (5,659/ 74,231) | 8.19% (6,144/ 74,983) |
| CLEC F | 6.05% (2,388/ 39,477) | 7.98% (1,772/ 22,196) | 7.31% (1,587/ 21,702) | 13.33% (5,229/ 39,222) | 9.55% (2,395/ 25,089) | 15.28% (4,450/ 29,125) |
| CLEC B | 2.37% (325/ 13,715) | 2.39% (307/ 12,854) | 2.74% (364/ 13,267) | 1.84% (250/ 13,569) | 1.88% (246/ 13,065) | 2.08% (232/ 11,174) |
| CLEC G | 7.44% (776/ 10,429) | 7.76% (550/ 7,086) | 3.75% (247/ 6,585) | 4.15% (295/ 7,114) | 3.86% (244/ 6,316) | 4.50% (271/ 6,024) |
| CLEC H | 4.94% (177/ 3,580) | 6.38% (223/ 3,498) | 2.27% (87/ 3,839) | 2.05% (91/ 4,433) | 1.65% (99/ 6,006) | 1.26% (81/ 6,441) |
| CLEC I | 8.67% (295/ 3,401) | 8.89% (297/ 3,339) | 10.98% (415/ 3,781) | 8.57% (412/ 4,810) | 4.23% (236/ 5,583) | 5.22% (185/ 3,546) |

With PO-4B-1, the analysis moves to LSRs submitted through the IMA-EDI interface. Only one CLEC, CLEC B, is among the largest-volume CLECs for both interfaces (IMA-EDI and the IMA-GUI). As demonstrated in the above chart, under PO-4B-1, the largest-volume CLEC, CLEC F, consistently had a higher percentage of rejects than the CLEC aggregate. However, three of the other high-volume CLECs consistently and easily bettered the aggregate result in each of the past four months, with both CLEC B and CLEC H showing a desirable downward trend. CLEC I's results were worse than the aggregate during the first four months shown but have since shown significant improvement.

PO-4B-2

| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| CLEC Aggregate | 24.06% (20,133/ 93,678) | 23.14% (13,400/ 57,897) | 23.47% (13,392/ 57,060) | 22.73% (17,647/ 77,654) | 22.24% (16,508/ 74,231) | 24.11% (18,081/ 74,983) |
| CLEC F | 18.46% (7,288/ 39,477) | 19.56% (4,341/ 22,196) | 16.55% (3,592/ 21,702) | 19.28% (7,562/ 39,222) | 15.62% (3,920/ 25,089) | 16.88% (4,915/ 29,125) |
| CLEC B | 15.01% (2,058/ 13,715) | 14.70% (1,889/ 12,854) | 18.15% (2,408/ 13,267) | 16.21% (2,199/ 13,569) | 10.71% (1,399/ 13,065) | 11.54% (1,290/ 11,174) |
| CLEC G | 41.44% (4,322/ 10,429) | 40.39% (2,862/ 7,086) | 39.21% (2,582/ 6,585) | 38.95% (2,771/ 7,114) | 35.64% (2,251/ 6,316) | 34.45% (2,075/ 6,024) |
| CLEC H | 14.58% (522/ 3,580) | 14.47% (506/ 3,498) | 23.34% (896/ 3,839) | 15.79% (700/ 4,433) | 9.26% (556/ 6,006) | 13.26% (854/ 6,441) |
| CLEC I | 30.05% (1,022/ 3,401) | 36.18% (1,208/ 3,339) | 36.92% (1,396/ 3,781) | 34.05% (1,638/ 4,810) | 29.52% (1,648/ 5,583) | 31.95% (1,133/ 3,546) |

The above chart again shows the wide variation in reject rates that exists among the five CLECS with the highest volumes.⁴ CLEC F and CLEC B consistently beat the CLEC aggregate result by a noticeable margin. At the other end of the spectrum, CLEC G was consistently above the CLEC aggregate.

* * *

In short, the data provided in the July 17 ex parte and the above analysis demonstrate that certain CLECs successfully submit a high-percentage of accurate LSRs. As stated above, because all CLECs submit their LSRs against the same edits, whether manually applied or included in the BPL, the wide range of reject rates, depending on the CLEC, indicates that high reject rates cannot be attributed solely to Qwest.

⁴ There also is variation among the lower-volume CLECs.

~~REDACTED FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION~~

CLEC Identities in Reject Rates Response

PO-4A-1 and PO-4A-2

CLEC A
CLEC B
CLEC C
CLEC D
CLEC E

PO-4B-1 and PO-4A-2

CLEC F
CLEC B
CLEC G
CLEC H
CLEC I

Questions

1. Please provide a definition of "non-designed" services, or, in the alternative, identify all services evaluated under PIDs PO-8A and PO-9A.
2. Please provide volumes under PIDs PO-8A and PO-9A for Feb-June 02.
3. Is there another explanation (other than the one provided in ¶¶ 263-264 of Qwest's ROC I Initial OSS Declaration and ¶¶ 14-16 of Qwest's Reply Declaration) for Qwest's PO-8A and PO-9A misses in the ROC I states?

Answers

1. Below is a description of the non-designed services evaluated under PIDs PO-8A and PO-9A.

Non-Design Products for PO-8A and PO-9A

| Wholesale Products | Retail Products |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Resale Residence | Business 1FB |
| Resale Centrex 21 | Residence 1FR |
| Resale Megabit | |
| Resale Business | |
| Resale Centrex | |
| Resale ISDN-BRS | |

2. Below are the denominators (on a region-wide basis) for PIDs PO-8A and PO-9A in the first six months of 2002. The denominators for PID PO-8A represent the number of orders for which a jeopardy notice was sent. The denominators for PID PO-9A represent the number of orders for which the due date was missed.

PO-8A Regional Denominators

| | Wholesale | Retail |
|------|-----------|--------|
| Jan | 90 | 5,527 |
| Feb | 63 | 4,919 |
| Mar | 57 | 5,173 |
| Apr | 66 | 5,474 |
| May | 73 | 5,645 |
| June | 74 | 5,725 |

PO-9A Regional Denominators

| | Wholesale | Retail |
|------|------------------|---------------|
| Jan | 141 | 10,920 |
| Feb | 92 | 9,814 |
| Mar | 81 | 8,257 |
| Apr | 71 | 7,526 |
| May | 86 | 7,259 |
| June | 90 | 6,907 |

3. In Qwest's Initial OSS Declaration and Reply Declaration, Qwest explained that the few instances in which it did not meet the parity standard under PO-8A could be explained by the fact that, in the commercial setting, Qwest often has more time to issue Retail jeopardy notices than Wholesale jeopardy notices. See ROC I OSS Initial Declaration at ¶¶ 263-264, Reply Declaration at ¶¶ 14-16. This is the primary explanation for why Qwest missed the parity standard on a few occasions in the ROC I states.

Nevertheless, as illustrated in the charts below (and discussed in Qwest's Initial and Reply Declarations), Qwest's performance under PIDs PO-8A and PO-9A in the ROC I states has been extremely strong over the past six months. Although Qwest missed PO-8A in Colorado in January, February and June, and in Idaho in June, it met the parity standard in every other month and in all six months in Iowa, Nebraska and North Dakota. Qwest's performance under PO-9A was even stronger, as Qwest missed the parity standard under that PID only in North Dakota in June.

Misses Under PO-8A (Jan-June 2002)

| | Jan 2002 | Feb 2002 | Mar 2002 | Apr 2002 | May 2002 | June 2002 |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Colorado | X | X | | | | X |
| Idaho | | | | | | X |
| Iowa | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | | | | | | |
| North Dakota | | | | | | |

Misses Under PO-9A (Jan-June 2002)

| | Jan 2002 | Feb 2002 | Mar 2002 | Apr 2002 | May 2002 | June 2002 |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Colorado | | | | | | |
| Idaho | | | | | | |
| Iowa | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | | | | | | |
| North Dakota | | | | | | X |

The FCC set forth its standard for the provision of jeopardy notices most recently in the *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order*. In that order, the FCC found that BellSouth provides jeopardy notices "in a manner that affords competitors a meaningful opportunity to compete" based on BellSouth's commercial performance data (for UNE-P).¹ See *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order* at ¶¶ 155-156.

In the *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order*, the FCC found BellSouth's performance adequate despite "a few scattered exceptions" where BellSouth missed the parity standard. See *id.* at ¶ 155, n.551 (noting that BellSouth missed parity in Georgia for one product from December through February, partly because of low volumes). Here, Qwest's performance has been equally strong. Although Qwest missed the parity standard under PO-8A in Colorado in January, February and June, volumes in those months – as in many months for this PID – were low, with only 14 jeopardy notices issued in January, 12 in February, and 14 in June. See Colorado Commercial Performance Results at 67 (PO-8A). In Idaho in June (the only other time Qwest missed PO-8A), only four jeopardy notices were issued. In the *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order*, the FCC explicitly stated that it "has declined to make a determination that a BOC fails to satisfy its section 271 obligation based on low volume performance measurements." See *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order* at ¶ 155, n.551. The FCC should do so as well here.

¹ That the FCC in the *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order* focused on jeopardy notices for UNE-P, as opposed to non-designed services (which we discuss here) is irrelevant. Qwest's performance under PO-8D and PO-9D, both of which pertain to UNE-P, is equally strong. In fact, Qwest met the parity standard under these PIDs in every state over the past six months, except for in Colorado, where it missed PO-9D in April and June.