

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
1	SWBT	13c-08	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL	MO	Mar - Sept	The primary driver was the Advanced Services affiliates limiting deployment to loops under 14kft. Since these loops are shorter than many of those ordered by non-affiliates, they require less conditioning and are less likely to generate facility-related trouble tickets.
2	SWBT	2-16	Avg. Resp. for OSS Pre-Order - Actual Loop Makeup - Actual Data Returned - DATAGATE	SWBT Region	Jan - Oct	The OSS processes all loop qualification transactions in the same way. Any variation in resulting roundtrip time is due to the type of query issued.
3	SWBT	2-24	Avg. Resp. for OSS Pre-Order - Actual Loop Makeup - Actual Data Returned - VERIGATE	SWBT Region	Jan - Oct	The OSS processes all loop qualification transactions in the same way. Any variation in resulting roundtrip time is due to the type of query issued.
4	SWBT	3-02	Order Process % Flow Through - LEX	AR, MO	Jan, Feb, Apr - Oct	First, this flow through measure is a parity metric comparing non affiliate aggregate results with Retail results. Affiliate results are for informational purposes only. The mix of products and services ordered differs between Retail and the Affiliate. Retail orders, for example, have

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
						<p>significantly more “features only” orders which in turn have higher flow through rates. As a result, ordering scenarios are not comparable.</p> <p>Second, higher-than-anticipated manual interventions contributed to the decreased flow through performance reflected in the out-of-parity months. Orders failed to flow through due to numerous edits encountered in the SORD (“Service Order Retrieval and Distribution”) system and difficulties retrieving embedded end user customer service records.</p> <p>Third, manual processes involving table updates containing information on points of presence in a geographic area also contributed to the decreased flow through. These processes have since been modified and are monitored daily to attain greater performance.</p>

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
5	SWBT	4c-09B	% SWBT Missed Dates Due - DSL - Line Sharing	MO	Jan - Mar, May - Sep	There were two primary causes. First, database issues associated with the inventory and assignment of miscellaneous equipment (i.e., splitters) impact the completion of orders by the ILEC. The second factor was the affiliate increased the number of orders for shorter loops that flowed through automatically.
6	SWBT	4d-02	% Mech. Completions Returned Within One Day - EDI	MO	Mar - May	The initial implementation of an automated program on March 6, 2001 caused the disparity during the period of March - May, 2001. The ILEC experienced a number of problems that forced many orders to fall out for manual completion by the LSC. Most of these orders would normally have completed automatically. Through the efforts of the LSC and WFA administration staff, the ILEC was able to make all of the necessary adjustments to correct the program problems.
7	SWBT	5c-08A	% Trouble Reports within 30 Days - UNE - DSL - No Line Sharing	AR, MO	Jan - Apr	Central office wiring issues were the primary cause. Additionally, non affiliates were not making themselves available to perform acceptance testing on the due date, which would have identified these problems prior to order completion. Additional Central Office testing was also

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
						implemented.
8	SWBT	6c-04.1	% Installed Within 3 Days - UNE - DS1 Loop (1-10 Loops)	MO	Jan - May, Aug	Due date misses were related to a backlog of facility infrastructure orders in the St. Louis area that resulted in DS1 held orders. An ILEC interdepartmental team was assigned to clear the associated roadblocks and complete the orders.
9	SWBT	7c-09B	Avg. Delay Days for SWBT Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL - Line Sharing	MO	Feb - May	This measure has a direct correlation to PM 4c-09B (item 5 above). The delay days were the result of the same miscellaneous equipment issue and the days required to resolve the assignment issues.
10	Ameritech	1.17	% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Man Sub - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - < 24 hrs	MI, WI	Feb - Apr	Manual orders are generally submitted by non-affiliates 1) when they are in start-up mode, 2) when they are having system problems with their interface, or 3) when they want to expedite an order. As the data show, these are infrequent, but due to the nature of the request, many of these go longer than 24 hours.
11	Ameritech	1.23	% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	IN	Jan - Jul, Dec	After investigation, the misses appear to be an anomaly. Processing of electronically submitted orders is driven by system architecture. There were no system differences at the ILEC that would have had a differential impact on just one disaggregation in just one state. During

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
						2001, there were a number of initiatives within the LSCs and system improvements. It appears that these were sufficient for the measure to attain parity from August forward.
12	Ameritech	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	IL, IN, MI, OH, WI	Jan - Dec	Flow through measures require a parity comparison with retail POTS which is appropriate for Resale and UNE-P. UNE Loops, however, take the flow of a designed service, which is considerably longer.
13	Ameritech	8.1088	Average Installation Interval - DSL - With Line Sharing - Without Conditioning	IL, IN, OH	Jan - Jul, Nov, Dec	Ameritech Network Operations recognized these service problems and launched a major initiative to improve service levels by prioritizing non-affiliate orders.
14	Ameritech	8.137	Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing - With Conditioning	IL, WI	Mar, May, Jul, Aug, Oct - Dec	This is a low-volume product making the average interval susceptible to wide swings in variation. In addition, Ameritech corrected the issues surrounding the criteria used to track the due dates for performance measurements.

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
15	Ameritech	8.138	Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing - Without Conditioning	WI	Jan - Apr, Jul - Sep	Non-affiliates are less likely than the affiliate to prequalify loops, resulting in a greater number of orders being held for lack of facilities which in turn delays the due date.
16	Ameritech	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	IL, IN, MI, WI	Jan - Dec	Ameritech Network Operations recognized these problems and launched an initiative to improve service levels. As process improvements were rolled out for installation and repair of DSL loops, the relative volume of trouble reports decreased. In addition, this is a benchmark rather than a parity comparison, and service to the non-affiliates was comparable to service levels to the affiliate.
17	Ameritech	12c.1875	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops -- No Line Sharing - Dispatch	IL, MI	Aug - Nov	These trouble reports are infrequent, and therefore, the mean is susceptible to wide swings in variation. For example, the August non-affiliate results for Michigan were skewed by just one trouble ticket.
18	Ameritech	12c.257	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops -- No Line Sharing	MI	Jul - Sep	The version 1.7 business rules changed this measure from a parity comparison to a benchmark. As part of the implementation of this measure, Ameritech subsequently disaggregated results by dispatch/no

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
						dispatch which demonstrated the issue was localized to only those dispatched tickets discussed immediately above.
19	Ameritech	4c.1248	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	IL, OH	Mar - Sep, Nov, Dec	Ameritech Network recognized these issues and created the Overall Control Office in the fall of 2001 to centrally manage these types of orders and monitor performance on a daily basis. This resulted in improved performance.
20	Ameritech	4c.182	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	IL, IN, MI, OH	Jan - Jun, Sep	Performance results were negatively affected by a coding error. This coding error caused programs that report orders to not identify changes in due dates associated with unsolicited FOCs, resulting in overstating the number of orders missed. The coding error was discovered and fixed which resulted in a complete count of orders. Also during this time period, Ameritech was cleaning up a backlog of orders from the previous period.
21	Ameritech	4d.26	% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One Day of Work Completion	MI	Apr - Jun	Several system issues impacted the automated flow of orders/completions in these months. An internal software update in late March 2001 and subsequent adjustments caused UNEs to stop flowing temporarily in April 2001. The adjustment

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
						causing the problem was reversed and orders then flowed normally but some orders missed the 1-day target. In May, a software utility was applied to the service order system causing orders to error. This software release was backed out and orders then flowed normally again. In June 2001, a software queue problem delayed Michigan completions, but was subsequently discovered and fixed.
22	Ameritech	5c.197	% Installation Rpts (Trouble Rpts) w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Inst - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	WI	Aug - Oct	Ameritech Network Operations recognized the problem and launched a series of initiatives to improve service levels including weekly calls to prioritize DSL. As process improvements were rolled out for installation and repair of DSL loops, the relative volume of trouble reports decreased. In addition, this is a benchmark rather than a parity comparison. Service to non-affiliates was comparable to service to the affiliate.
23	Ameritech	7c.1271	Average Delay Days for AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	IL	Mar - Jun, Oct, Nov	Ameritech Network recognized the problem and created the Overall Control Office in the fall of 2001 to manage these orders and monitor performance on a daily basis.

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
24	Ameritech	7c.212	Average Delay Days for AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	OH	Mar - May	Ameritech Network Operations recognized the problem and launched a project to improve service levels. As process improvements were rolled out for installation and repair of DSL loops, the number of orders with missed due dates decreased, as did the average installation interval. In addition, this is a benchmark rather than a parity comparison. Service to non-affiliates was comparable to service to the affiliate.
25	Pacific Bell	2.1035	#2--Average Response Time (to Pre-Order Queries) - Manual Loop Qualification / K1023   Manual xDSL and High Bandwidth Line Sharing UNE Loop Qualification (in hours)	CA	Mar, May - Oct	The Engineering Dept. did two studies in July and August 2001. The studies showed that the affiliate sent requests for data already available in their pre-ordering systems and requests for loop make-up for addresses in GTE territory. These requests accounted for almost 90% of the affiliate's total requests. The requests were either 1) responded to quickly by Engineers (because data was readily available) or 2) rejected by the Engineers. Per the business rules, however, rejects are to be tracked in their own submeasure. By including them in the loop qual disaggregation, these fast turnaround items positively impacted the affiliate average response. In contrast,

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
						these types of requests were infrequently made by non-affiliates. The coding was changed with a Decision Document that allowed PB to properly categorize rejected requests. The affiliate increased service representative training, and new logic was applied with November 2001 data. Since these changes were implemented, the measurement has been in parity.
26	Pacific Bell	2.1056	#2--Average Response Time (to Pre-Order Queries) - Mechanized Verigate   Mechanized Loop Qualification - Actual   Roundtrip	CA	Mar - Dec	The number of loops per query determines how quickly a loop qual query completes. Root cause studies have determined that generally a transaction by a non-affiliate pulls more than twice as many loops versus an affiliate transaction. The larger transaction pull causes a longer system response time.
27	Pacific Bell	2.1057	#2--Average Response Time (to Pre-Order Queries) - Mechanized Verigate   Mechanized Loop Qualification -	CA	Mar - Dec	The Loop Qual Design depends on LFACS transactions, but not all Designs need LFACS. Transactions that make a call to LFACS take additional time. It appears that the affiliate is not performing those back-end transactions and that non-affiliates are performing them which in turn increases the non-affiliate's average

SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period						
Item	ILEC	Measure ID	Measure	States	Period in Disparity	Explanation
			Design   Roundtrip			response time.
28	Pacific Bell	9.118106	#9--Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information - UNE Loop 2w Digital xDSL capable - includes Line Sharing	CA	Mar, May - Oct	The Engineering Dept. did two studies in July and August 2001. The studies showed that the affiliate sent requests for data already available in their pre-ordering systems and requests for loop make-up for addresses in GTE territory. These requests accounted for almost 90% of the affiliate's total requests. The requests were either 1) responded to quickly by Engineers (because data was readily available) or 2) rejected by the Engineers. Per the business rules, however, rejects are to be tracked in their own submeasure. By including them in the loop qual disaggregation, these fast turnaround items positively impacted the affiliate average response. In contrast, these types of requests were infrequently made by non-affiliates. The coding was changed with a Decision Document that allowed PB to properly categorize rejected requests. The affiliate increased service representative training, and new logic was applied with November 2001 data. Since these changes were implemented, the measurement has been in parity.
29	Pacific Bell	11c.2394000	#11c--Frequency	CA	Jun - Aug	Non-affiliates were experiencing a

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
			of Repeat Troubles in 30 Day Period - - UNE - Statewide   UNE Loop 2 wire Digital Line Sharing			significant number of trouble reports that were closed out to Central Office codes involving synch problems. Early in 2001 Pacific Bell began a trial to synch-test line sharing installations prior to service order completion. While this trial was open to all affiliated and non-affiliated companies, only the affiliate requested to participate. As a result, the affiliate's repeat troubles decreased. This trial is ending at present, and Pacific Bell will introduce synch testing as a product offering.
30	Pacific Bell	13c.1994100	#13c--Customer Trouble Report Rate -- UNE - Statewide   UNE Loop 2 wire Digital Line Sharing	CA	Jan - Mar	During this period, non-affiliate participation in ordering line sharing was in the new product phase, and volumes in service were low. It is common for the report rate to be disproportionately higher during the new product phase until volumes in service increase. The affiliate in service volumes at this point were over 500K while non-affiliate volumes ranged from 10 to 18K during this period.
31	Pacific Bell	4d.1800700	#4d--Average Completion Notice Interval - All Other Interfaces   (% within 24	CA	Mar - May	This datapoint relates to a system that was being used to track order completions for UNE PONs faxed into the LSC by both non-affiliates and the affiliate. The process required the service representative to

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
			hours)   Manual Fax - CESAR			search any orders associated with the PON, check for their completion and then fax back the completion notification to the non-affiliate or affiliate. Because of the complexity of this process, benchmarks were easy to miss on an individual company basis. Additionally, in April and May 2001, the LSC launched an initiative to clean up the backlog. As the benchmark is "within 24 hours," these were all misses. In June, 2001, the last of these late completions were sent, better processes were put in place by the LSC and the benchmark has been made every month since July 2001. Since this datapoint is impacted by small volumes per company, the affiliate's larger volumes made it more likely they would not be impacted by late notifications than a non-affiliate who had under 10 transactions and one or two misses.
32	SNET	1.100070	#1--Percent Firm Order Commitment (FOC) Received Within "X" Hours - PRE-	CT	Jan - Mar	Training was provided to the Local Exchange Carrier Center ("LECC") to increase awareness of Manual FOC requirements. Job aids and tools were provided to increase efficiency. A web site was created to monitor the status of open

SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period						
Item	ILEC	Measure ID	Measure	States	Period in Disparity	Explanation
33	SNET	1.100080	ORDERING / ORDERING - % FOCs Rec. Within "X" Hours - RES & BUS - MAN. RECEIVED (100070) #1--Percent Firm Order Commitment (FOC) Received Within "X" Hours - PRE- ORDERING / ORDERING - % FOCs Rec. Within "X" Hours - COMPLEX BUS (1 - 200 LINES) - MAN. RECEIVED (100080)	CT	Jan - May	manual FOCs in real time.  Training was provided to the LECC to increase awareness of Manual FOC requirements. Job aids and tools were provided to increase efficiency. A web site was created to monitor the status of open manual FOCs in real time.
34	SNET	7.700010	#4d--Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day of Work	CT	Oct - Dec	MSAP is scheduled to be phased out in the third quarter of 2003. There is currently very little MSAP activity. This system is scheduled to be replaced by the other SBC standard systems associated with the Plan

SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period						
Item	ILEC	Measure ID	Measure	States	Period in Disparity	Explanation
			Co - PRE-ORDERING / ORDERING (WHOLESALE) - % Mech. Comps Returned - MSAP (700010)			of Record ("POR").
35	SNET	10.1000131	#5c--Percent Installation Reports (Trouble Reports) Within 30 Days (I- - PROVISIONING (WHOLESALE) - % Trouble Reports Within 30 Days - UNE DSL LINE SHARING (1000131)	CT	Jul - Dec	Extensive training was given to the Central Office personnel with respect to DSL Line Sharing Orders. A process was put into place to ensure that cross-connects are properly assigned. A DSL Oversight Committee was formed to improve service for the DSL Line Share process.
36	SNET	29.2900131	#13c--Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Maintenance(WHOLESALE) - Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL LINE SHARING	CT	Jun - Dec	Extensive training was given to the Central Office personnel with respect to DSL Line Sharing Orders. A process was put into place to ensure that cross-connects are properly assigned. A DSL Oversight Committee was formed to improve service for the DSL LS process.

<b>SBC Explanations of Performance Measurement Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Performance for Three Consecutive Months or Six Months or More During the Engagement Period</b>						
<b>Item</b>	<b>ILEC</b>	<b>Measure ID</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Period in Disparity</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
			(2900131)			
37	SNET	3.300050	#3--Order Process Percent Flow Through - PRE-ORDERING / ORDERING (WHOLESALE) - Order Process % Flow Through - MSAP (300050)	CT	May - Oct	MSAP is scheduled to be phased out in the third quarter of 2003. There is currently very little MSAP activity. This system is scheduled to be replaced by the other SBC standard systems associated with the Plan of Record (POR).

<b>Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results</b>													
<b>Service Category 1: Successful Completion According to Customer Desired Due Date</b>													
		<b>Month</b>											
<b>Product</b>	<b>Entity</b>	<b>Jan-01</b>	<b>Feb-01</b>	<b>Mar-01</b>	<b>Apr-01</b>	<b>May-01</b>	<b>Jun-01</b>	<b>Jul-01</b>	<b>Aug-01</b>	<b>Sep-01</b>	<b>Oct-01</b>	<b>Nov-01</b>	<b>Dec-01</b>
<b>California Results</b>													
DS0	BOC & Affiliates	29.60%	54.70%	49.00%	42.86%	62.30%	72.73%	59.18%	62.50%	63.75%	72.73%	83.64%	85.53%
DS0	Non-Affiliates	72.10%	81.50%	83.20%	83.61%	84.85%	86.62%	89.01%	90.15%	87.69%	86.73%	89.08%	91.45%
DS1	BOC & Affiliates	61.60%	64.70%	67.90%	75.34%	76.51%	83.11%	84.32%	85.93%	88.61%	89.28%	86.14%	91.94%
DS1	Non-Affiliates	67.20%	77.50%	77.30%	77.44%	78.99%	81.53%	82.33%	84.96%	83.95%	87.35%	87.78%	86.24%
DS3	BOC & Affiliates	69.30%	72.50%	81.90%	83.52%	83.72%	89.18%	87.91%	83.22%	83.04%	84.42%	87.90%	88.37%
DS3	Non-Affiliates	74.80%	74.90%	75.40%	74.64%	73.23%	78.81%	80.39%	75.55%	76.82%	78.23%	73.20%	71.56%
<b>Illinois Results</b>													
DS0	BOC & Affiliates	58.82%	38.03%	42.31%	72.00%	61.54%	62.16%	39.68%	61.11%	67.80%	77.55%	31.58%	80.36%
DS0	Non-Affiliates	71.82%	68.96%	72.21%	69.49%	72.91%	65.94%	79.87%	79.50%	78.05%	75.48%	73.29%	78.70%
DS1	BOC & Affiliates	46.15%	53.85%	49.47%	54.78%	51.28%	40.30%	47.56%	49.23%	52.50%	60.82%	60.00%	42.98%
DS1	Non-Affiliates	64.07%	63.53%	59.93%	59.69%	60.08%	57.15%	62.62%	62.62%	56.15%	54.61%	65.25%	59.33%
DS3	BOC & Affiliates	50.94%	73.53%	50.00%	44.12%	66.04%	77.78%	55.88%	48.00%	35.71%	68.57%	40.00%	55.00%
DS3	Non-Affiliates	65.17%	56.36%	69.16%	72.97%	75.39%	78.57%	76.15%	69.78%	60.14%	65.05%	38.46%	66.36%
<b>Kansas Results</b>													
DS0	BOC & Affiliates	94.23%	91.30%	93.33%	94.74%	94.87%	100.00%	96.15%	95.24%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
DS0	Non-Affiliates	88.51%	88.86%	93.48%	77.16%	91.58%	82.86%	81.97%	88.28%	83.78%	91.18%	87.74%	89.29%
DS1	BOC & Affiliates	96.18%	81.82%	95.65%	91.55%	93.62%	99.40%	94.51%	90.27%	96.49%	95.12%	95.65%	93.68%

<b>Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results</b>													
<b>Service Category 1: Successful Completion According to Customer Desired Due Date</b>													
		<b>Month</b>											
<b>Product</b>	<b>Entity</b>	<b>Jan-01</b>	<b>Feb-01</b>	<b>Mar-01</b>	<b>Apr-01</b>	<b>May-01</b>	<b>Jun-01</b>	<b>Jul-01</b>	<b>Aug-01</b>	<b>Sep-01</b>	<b>Oct-01</b>	<b>Nov-01</b>	<b>Dec-01</b>
DS1	Non-Affiliates	75.52%	84.34%	81.46%	88.19%	81.43%	82.52%	82.53%	88.50%	79.64%	80.30%	91.44%	85.04%
DS3	BOC & Affiliates	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	85.71%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
DS3	Non-Affiliates	91.80%	84.62%	73.68%	75.00%	80.00%	91.67%	96.00%	87.50%	85.29%	100.00%	90.00%	93.33%
<b>Missouri Results</b>													
DS0	BOC & Affiliates	94.44%	93.75%	90.48%	100.00%	96.00%	95.83%	100.00%	94.44%	90.91%	95.83%	100.00%	100.00%
DS0	Non-Affiliates	87.16%	80.06%	93.92%	95.52%	75.88%	80.57%	86.64%	90.71%	94.39%	89.30%	92.65%	89.83%
DS1	BOC & Affiliates	69.50%	82.61%	91.35%	95.69%	95.38%	94.79%	68.04%	91.56%	97.56%	97.13%	90.81%	90.61%
DS1	Non-Affiliates	67.53%	72.80%	79.73%	82.59%	76.69%	80.02%	82.62%	79.57%	86.98%	82.48%	87.47%	91.52%
DS3	BOC & Affiliates	100.00%	94.29%	92.16%	100.00%	95.65%	100.00%	94.12%	100.00%	100.00%	92.00%	93.94%	100.00%
DS3	Non-Affiliates	84.96%	91.34%	86.79%	81.58%	90.36%	88.06%	82.72%	86.96%	93.94%	84.88%	78.48%	91.57%
<b>Texas Results</b>													
DS0	BOC & Affiliates	90.91%	94.95%	92.45%	85.94%	93.55%	96.55%	92.11%	84.62%	87.50%	82.93%	90.32%	95.24%
DS0	Non-Affiliates	87.72%	91.54%	94.34%	92.61%	86.91%	80.81%	81.57%	82.22%	79.73%	86.48%	92.50%	96.03%
DS1	BOC & Affiliates	77.04%	84.51%	82.41%	85.64%	77.06%	80.64%	82.07%	81.59%	85.36%	91.38%	92.06%	91.95%
DS1	Non-Affiliates	74.40%	81.31%	81.43%	84.34%	79.06%	80.81%	79.85%	81.91%	80.14%	87.07%	84.49%	86.01%
DS3	BOC & Affiliates	80.77%	78.40%	74.63%	79.86%	91.67%	77.08%	91.78%	87.67%	82.35%	98.80%	94.25%	96.77%
DS3	Non-Affiliates	86.83%	90.11%	90.22%	91.54%	86.29%	89.97%	91.57%	92.67%	93.06%	86.11%	89.21%	80.54%

**Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results**  
**Service Category 1: Successful Completion According to Customer Desired Due Date**

		<b>Month</b>											
<b>Product</b>	<b>Entity</b>	<b>Jan-01</b>	<b>Feb-01</b>	<b>Mar-01</b>	<b>Apr-01</b>	<b>May-01</b>	<b>Jun-01</b>	<b>Jul-01</b>	<b>Aug-01</b>	<b>Sep-01</b>	<b>Oct-01</b>	<b>Nov-01</b>	<b>Dec-01</b>
<b>Wisconsin Results</b>													
DS0	BOC & Affiliates	85.71%	100.00%	66.67%	100.00%	85.71%	100.00%	60.00%	75.00%	60.00%	100.00%	25.00%	45.45%
DS0	Non-Affiliates	81.37%	79.64%	76.39%	72.85%	70.31%	74.84%	67.20%	77.46%	72.82%	72.22%	70.09%	61.82%
DS1	BOC & Affiliates	64.71%	73.33%	76.92%	90.91%	72.00%	50.00%	60.00%	47.06%	30.77%	51.85%	57.14%	55.00%
DS1	Non-Affiliates	68.45%	71.81%	72.82%	72.08%	72.82%	63.07%	70.56%	68.72%	60.76%	69.15%	69.42%	70.08%
DS3	BOC & Affiliates	70.00%	70.00%	44.44%	38.46%	75.00%	25.00%	100.00%	57.14%	50.00%	71.43%	75.00%	60.00%
DS3	Non-Affiliates	88.89%	85.71%	80.77%	77.05%	78.21%	91.18%	39.13%	62.50%	55.17%	72.86%	76.92%	63.04%

**Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results**  
**Service Category 2: Time from BOC Promised Due Date ("DD") to Circuit Being Placed in Service**

		Month												
Product	Entity		Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01
<b>California Results</b>														
DS3	BOC & Affiliates	DD Met	99.50%	100.00%	99.50%	99.43%	99.42%	100.00%	99.45%	100.00%	100.00%	96.10%	100.00%	100.00%
DS3	Non-Affiliates	DD Met	98.20%	99.20%	99.40%	99.39%	99.14%	99.79%	99.75%	99.60%	99.36%	99.38%	99.82%	98.89%
DS1	BOC & Affiliates	DD Met	92.10%	90.30%	94.90%	96.61%	98.80%	99.12%	98.89%	98.33%	97.72%	99.01%	98.92%	98.24%
		DD + 1 day	92.70%	91.10%	96.10%									
		DD + 2 days	93.10%	91.80%										
		DD + 3 days	93.40%	92.20%										
		DD + 4 days	93.60%	93.90%										
		DD + 5 days	94.10%	94.10%										
		DD + 6 days	94.30%	94.20%										
		DD + 7 days	94.70%	94.40%										
		DD + 8 days	94.90%	94.60%										
		DD + 9 days	95.60%	94.80%										
		DD + 10 days		94.80%										
		DD + 11 days		94.80%										
		DD + 12 days		95.00%										
DS1	Non-	DD Met	91.70%	94.20%	94.50%	95.49%	96.45%	96.20%	96.36%	96.96%	97.48%	97.95%	98.68%	98.29%

Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results														
Service Category 2: Time from BOC Promised Due Date ("DD") to Circuit Being Placed in Service														
Product	Entity		Month											
			Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01
<b>California Results</b>														
	Affiliates													
		DD + 1 day	92.40%	94.90%	95.40%									
		DD + 2 days	93.10%	95.60%										
		DD + 3 days	93.60%											
		DD + 4 days	94.00%											
		DD + 5 days	94.50%											
		DD + 6 days	94.90%											
		DD + 7 days	95.40%											
DS0	BOC & Affiliates	DD Met	98.60%	96.90%	98.00%	95.92%	100.00%	98.48%	100.00%	97.50%	100.00%	98.70%	100.00%	98.68%
DS0	Non-Affiliates	DD Met	90.0%	92.9%	92.4%	93.22%	94.77%	97.02%	96.77%	97.38%	96.81%	97.70%	97.24%	96.87%
		DD + 1 day	92.5%	93.8%	94.0%	94.63%	95.16%							
		DD + 2 days	93.4%	94.7%	95.1%	95.42%								
		DD + 3 days	94.0%	95.4%										
		DD + 4 days	94.3%											
		DD + 5 days	94.7%											
		DD + 6 days	95.3%											

Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results														
Service Category 2: Time from BOC Promised Due Date ("DD") to Circuit Being Placed in Service														
Product	Entity		Month											
			Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01
<b>Illinois Results</b>														
DS3	BOC & Affiliates	DD Met	93.02%	100.00%	89.66%	94.00%	93.65%	97.37%	85.71%	94.29%	72.73%	82.50%	100.00%	100.00%
		DD + 1 day	93.02%		89.66%	94.00%	95.24%		91.43%	94.29%	72.73%	87.50%		
		DD + 2 days	93.02%		89.66%	94.00%			94.29%	94.29%	77.27%	90.00%		
		DD + 3 days	93.02%		89.66%	94.00%			94.29%	94.29%	77.27%	90.00%		
		DD + 4 days	93.02%		93.10%	94.00%			97.14%	94.29%	77.27%	90.00%		
		DD + 5 days	93.02%		93.10%	94.00%				94.29%	77.27%	90.00%		
		DD + 6 days	93.02%		93.10%	96.00%				94.29%	77.27%	90.00%		
		DD + 7 days	93.02%		93.10%					97.14%	86.36%	90.00%		
		DD + 8 days	93.02%		93.10%						86.36%	90.00%		
		DD + 9 days	93.02%		93.10%						90.91%	90.00%		
		DD + 10 days	93.02%		93.10%						100.00%	90.00%		
		DD + 11 days	93.02%		93.10%							92.50%		
		DD + 12 days	93.02%		93.10%							92.50%		
		DD + 13 days	93.02%		93.10%							95.00%		
		DD + 14 days	93.02%		93.10%									
		DD + 20 days	93.02%		96.55%									
		DD + 25 days	93.02%											
		DD + 37 days	95.35%											

Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results														
Service Category 2: Time from BOC Promised Due Date ("DD") to Circuit Being Placed in Service														
			Month											
Product	Entity		Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01
<b>Illinois Results</b>														
DS3	Non-Affiliates	DD Met	79.68%	87.50%	84.38%	87.30%	86.15%	86.54%	84.91%	83.63%	84.69%	84.33%	92.11%	95.69%
		DD + 1 day	79.68%	87.96%	85.16%	91.01%	86.49%	87.02%	84.91%	84.34%	86.22%	85.45%	92.83%	
		DD + 2 days	80.08%	87.96%	86.33%	91.53%	86.82%	87.50%	85.53%	85.41%	87.76%	88.81%	93.55%	
		DD + 3 days	80.48%	87.96%	87.89%	93.65%	87.50%	87.50%	86.16%	86.83%	88.78%	89.55%	93.55%	
		DD + 4 days	80.48%	89.35%	88.28%	94.71%	88.18%	87.98%	86.16%	87.90%	89.29%	89.55%	93.91%	
		DD + 5 days	81.27%	89.35%	88.67%	96.30%	88.51%	91.35%	88.68%	91.10%	90.31%	90.30%	94.27%	
		DD + 6 days	82.47%	90.28%	88.67%		88.85%	92.31%	89.94%	91.10%	90.31%	90.30%	94.62%	
		DD + 7 days	84.06%	90.74%	89.06%		89.86%	92.31%	91.82%	91.46%	91.33%	91.42%	94.62%	
		DD + 8 days	84.06%	92.13%	89.06%		90.88%	93.75%	91.82%	91.81%	92.35%	91.42%	94.62%	
		DD + 9 days	84.06%	92.13%	89.06%		90.88%	93.75%	93.08%	91.81%	94.39%	91.42%	94.62%	
		DD + 10 days	84.06%	92.13%	90.23%		91.89%	93.75%	94.34%	92.17%	94.39%	91.79%	94.62%	
		DD + 11 days	84.06%	92.59%	91.02%		92.23%	93.75%	94.34%	92.17%	95.41%	93.28%	96.42%	
		DD + 12 days	84.06%	92.59%	91.80%		92.23%	93.75%	94.34%	92.17%		93.66%		
		DD + 13 days	84.06%	92.59%	92.19%		92.91%	94.23%	94.34%	92.17%		93.66%		
		DD + 14 days	84.46%	92.59%	92.19%		92.91%	94.71%	94.97%	93.59%		93.66%		
		DD + 15 days	84.46%	93.06%	92.58%		96.28%	94.71%	95.60%	93.95%		93.66%		
		DD + 16 days	84.46%	93.06%	92.58%			95.19%		94.31%		93.66%		
		DD + 17 days	84.46%	93.52%	92.58%					94.56%		93.66%		
		DD + 18 days	85.26%	93.52%	92.97%					94.56%		93.66%		

Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results														
Service Category 2: Time from BOC Promised Due Date ("DD") to Circuit Being Placed in Service														
Product	Entity		Month											
			Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01
<b>Illinois Results</b>														
		DD + 19 days	85.26%	93.98%	93.75%					95.37%		93.66%		
		DD + 20 days	85.26%	93.98%	93.75%							93.66%		
		DD + 21 days	85.26%	93.98%	94.53%							93.66%		
		DD + 22 days	85.26%	93.98%	94.92%							93.66%		
		DD + 23 days	85.26%	93.98%	95.31%							93.66%		
		DD + 24 days	85.66%	93.98%								94.03%		
		DD + 25 days	85.66%	93.98%								94.03%		
		DD + 26 days	85.66%	93.98%								94.40%		
		DD + 28 days	86.06%	93.98%								94.40%		
		DD + 29 days	86.85%	93.98%								95.15%		
		DD + 30 days	87.65%	93.98%										
		DD + 31 days	87.65%	93.98%										
		DD + 32 days	87.65%	93.98%										
		DD + 33 days	88.05%	93.98%										
		DD + 34 days	88.05%	93.98%										
		DD + 35 days	88.05%	93.98%										
		DD + 38 days	88.05%	93.98%										
		DD + 40 days	88.05%	93.98%										
		DD + 41 days	88.45%	93.98%										
		DD + 42 days	88.84%	93.98%										

Section 272(e)(1) Performance Measurements Results														
Service Category 2: Time from BOC Promised Due Date ("DD") to Circuit Being Placed in Service														
Product	Entity		Month											
			Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01
<b>Illinois Results</b>														
		DD + 44 days	88.84%	93.98%										
		DD + 45 days	88.84%	93.98%										
		DD + 46 days	88.84%	93.98%										
		DD + 47 days	89.24%	93.98%										
		DD + 48 days	89.24%	94.44%										
		DD + 49 days	89.24%	94.44%										
		DD + 53 days	89.64%	94.44%										
		DD + 54 days	90.04%	94.44%										
		DD + 55 days	90.44%	94.44%										
		DD + 56 days	91.63%	94.44%										
		DD + 58 days	92.03%	94.91%										
		DD + 61 days	92.03%	95.37%										
		DD + 63 days	92.83%											
		DD + 65 days	93.23%											
		DD + 66 days	93.63%											
		DD + 69 days	93.63%											
		DD + 71 days	94.02%											
		DD + 72 days	96.81%											
DS1	BOC &	DD Met	35.52%	39.15%	50.19%	72.39%	75.63%	75.78%	86.42%	87.46%	86.04%	91.45%	96.02%	93.37%