

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	programs.		SBC Ameritech's Revised Instructions for Calculating SBC Midwest All Remedies document describes the process for making changes to the remedy calculation programs and specifies the parties responsible for each step.
PMR3B-7	The remedy recalculation process includes requirements for the archiving of restatements, recalculated remedy payment amounts, and original remedy payment amounts.	Satisfied	<p>Based on documentation reviews and interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Ameritech's remedy recalculation process includes requirements for the archiving of performance measurement restatements, recalculated remedy payment amounts, and original remedy payment amounts.</p> <p>SBC Ameritech's Retention Documentation and Revised Instructions for Calculating SBC Midwest All Remedies document contains the specific descriptions of file names and locations for archived remedy payment information and restatements of performance measurements.</p>
PMR3B-8	The performance measurement restatement and remedy process requires that new payment schedules are reviewed and approved by the appropriate subject matter experts (SMEs).	Satisfied	<p>Based on documentation reviews and interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Ameritech's remedy recalculation process requires that new payment schedules be reviewed and approved by appropriate SMEs.</p> <p>According to interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, once the final remedy payment totals, including recalculated payments resulting from performance measurement restatements, are calculated, SBC Ameritech SMEs review the payment totals, which are then approved by the appropriate authority. The level of management approval required depends on the dollar amount of the remedy payment.</p>
PMR3B-9	The remedy recalculation process requires that the impact of changes to remedy payments be analyzed and approved before being applied to existing payment schedules.	Satisfied	<p>Based on documentation reviews and interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Ameritech's remedy recalculation process requires that the impact of changes to remedy payments be analyzed and approved before being applied to existing payment schedules.</p> <p>According to interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, once the final remedy payment totals, including recalculated payments resulting from performance measurement restatements, are calculated, SBC Ameritech SMEs review the</p>

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>payment totals and assess the impact; payments are then approved by the appropriate authority and applied to the payment schedules. The level of management approval required depends on the dollar amount of the remedy payment.</p>
PMR3B-10	<p>The remedy recalculation process includes verification of the accuracy of the proposed recalculations of remedy payment schedules.</p>	Satisfied	<p>Based on documentation reviews and interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Ameritech has a process for verifying the accuracy of proposed recalculations of remedy payment schedules.</p> <p>According to an interview with SBC Ameritech personnel, two separate SBC Ameritech groups conduct a parallel processing of remedy calculations. The results from one group are cross-checked against the results from the other to verify the accuracy of the proposed recalculation of remedy payment schedules. SBC Ameritech identifies any discrepancies between the two results and fixes them through a collaborative process between the two groups.</p>
PMR3B-11	<p>The remedy recalculation process requires that a version of each prior remedy payment schedule with relevant documentation be preserved.</p>	Satisfied	<p>Based on documentation reviews, inspection of the CLEC Online Web site, and interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Ameritech retains the previous version of each remedy payment schedule.</p> <p>SBC Ameritech stores electronic copies of these payment schedules in read-only format on local hard drives in multiple locations, as specified in SBC Ameritech's internal Retention Documentation. In addition, CLECs are able to access their previous payment schedules via the CLEC Online Web site.</p>
PMR3B-12	<p>The critical steps in the remedy recalculation process and how those steps are to be performed are documented.</p>	Satisfied	<p>Based on documentation reviews and interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, BearingPoint has determined that the critical steps in the remedy recalculation process and how these steps are to be performed are documented.</p> <p>The steps and processes are described in SBC Ameritech's internal Revised Instructions for Calculating SBC Midwest All Remedies document.</p>

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR3B-13	The roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in the remedy recalculation process are documented.	Satisfied	<p>Based on documentation reviews and interviews with SBC Ameritech personnel, BearingPoint has determined that the roles and responsibilities of organizations and individuals involved in the remedy recalculation process are documented.</p> <p>BearingPoint reviewed the organization charts for the two organizations primarily concerned with calculating remedy payments. These organization charts indicate that the PMMO and the PRO are the two groups responsible for the calculation of remedy payments. The roles of the PMMO and PRO are defined in SBC Ameritech process flow documentation.</p>
PMR3B-14	The remedy recalculation process requires the documentation of restated measurements and of their impact on changes to remedy payments.	Satisfied	<p>Based on documentation reviews and observation of an SBC Ameritech demonstration, BearingPoint has determined that SBC Ameritech's remedy recalculation process requires the documentation of restated measurements and of their impact on changes to remedy payments.</p> <p>SBC Ameritech's Revised Instructions for Calculating SBC Midwest All Remedies document specifies that files identifying the restated performance measurements be received by the PRO from the PMMO. The PRO then incorporates these restated measurements into its overall monthly remedy calculation process to determine totals owed to CLECs and state regulatory agencies.</p>

4. PMR4: Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review

4.1 Results Summary

This section identifies the evaluation criteria and test results for the Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review. This test was conducted from March 2001 through June 2003. The evaluation method for this test included a comparison of unprocessed data with processed data for a sample of transactions. Both Competitive Local Exchange Carrier (CLEC) and retail data were included in this test, as well as retrospective data and data derived from transactions submitted by BearingPoint.

To conduct data comparison, BearingPoint selected transactions from reporting system repository points identified in the Metrics Calculation and Reporting Verification and Validation Review (PMR5) and used to generate either SBC Ameritech's January, May, July, August, December 2002, or February 2003 Performance Measurement Reports, respectively. In order to select these transactions, stratified random samples of transactions were generated using SBC Ameritech retail and CLEC data. BearingPoint requested from SBC Ameritech corresponding data from the earliest electronic capture point or system of record, where appropriate. These capture points were also identified as part of the Data Collection and Storage Verification and Validation Review (PMR1). In addition, BearingPoint reviewed Performance Measure Data Element Maps, Business Rules documentation, Data Flow Diagrams, and Measure Specific Business/Technical Requirements documentation.

BearingPoint examined each unprocessed log, file, and record separately. BearingPoint extracted and analyzed the fields in the unprocessed data files received from SBC Ameritech as responses to sample data requests. Each unprocessed field was compared to the corresponding field in the processed data used in the Metrics Calculation and Reporting Verification and Validation Review (PMR5). This process was based on verbal explanations and documentation received from SBC Ameritech.

BearingPoint also compared its own records of BearingPoint Test CLEC transactions (e.g., number of records submitted, confirmation time received, etc.) to SBC Ameritech's processed data.

Test findings were then reviewed against the evaluation criteria to determine whether the criteria were satisfied. The results of this test from March 2001 through June 10, 2003, except where noted, are presented in the following tables.



Table 4-1: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results At-A-Glance

Criteria	Measure Group																	
	Pre-ordering	Ordering	Provisioning	Maintenance & Repair	Billing	Miscellaneous Administrative	Interconnection Trunks	Directory Assistance / Operator Services	Local Number Portability	911	Poles, Conduits and Rights-of-Way	Collocation	Directory Assistance Database	Coordinated Conversions	NXX	Bona Fide Requests	Facilities Modification	Other
Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures.	S	I	I	S	S	NA	NA	NA	I	NA	NA	NA	NA	S	NA	NA	NA	I
Inappropriate records are not present in process data used to calculate measures.	S	I	I	S	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	I
Records in processed data used to calculate measures are consistent with unprocessed data from source systems.	I	I	I	I	I	NA	I	NA	I	N	NA	NA	NA	S	I	S	I	I
Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures are consistent with unprocessed data from source systems.	I	I	I	I	S	NA	I	NA	I	N	NA	NA	NA	N	I	S	I	I

KEY: I = Indeterminate S = Satisfied N = Not Satisfied NA = Not Applicable



Table 4-2: PM4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – Pre-Ordering

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-A	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Pre-Ordering Measure Group.	Satisfied	<p>Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Pre-Ordering Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of required source records are included for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>One measure set has been evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM¹ 2 <p>A second measure set was to be evaluated using BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records related to PM 4. It was later determined that the data for this PM could not be evaluated using the technique devised for this evaluation criterion.</p> <p>See Table 4-20 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-2-A	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Pre-Ordering Measure Group.	Satisfied	<p>Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Pre-Ordering Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that no more than five percent of processed records do not correspond to actual BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>A measure set consisting of records/values for PM 2 has been evaluated.</p> <p>A second measure set was to be evaluated using BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records related to PM 4. It was later determined that the data for this PM could not be evaluated using the technique devised for this evaluation criterion.</p>

¹ Performance measurement



Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			See Table 4-21 for additional details.
PMR4-3-A	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Pre-Ordering Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Pre-Ordering Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>One measure set has been evaluated, and one measure set is still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 1.1 2. PM 2, PM MI 10, PM MI 16 <p>Validation was planned for EDI/CORBA records for the measure set of PM 2, PM MI 10, and PM MI 16. It was later determined that the source data for January 2002 was not available and that the retention system is different from the source system. BearingPoint is conducting a review of the data transfer process from the source system to the retention system.</p> <p>Third and fourth measure sets were to be evaluated using samples of CLEC aggregate records related to PM 1.2 and PM 4, respectively. Data integrity analysis of the processed data was not performed because it was determined that SBC Ameritech uses unprocessed data to calculate these two measure sets for the CLEC aggregate.</p> <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-4-A	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Pre-Ordering Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether the data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Pre-Ordering Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets have been evaluated, and one measure set is still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 1.1 (CLEC Aggregate) 2. PM 2 (Test CLEC) 3. PM 2, PM MI 10, PM MI 16 (CLEC Aggregate) <p>Validation was planned for EDI/CORBA records for the measure set of PM 2, PM MI 10, and PM MI 16. It was later determined that the source data for January 2002 were not available and that the retention system is different from the source system. BearingPoint is conducting a review of the data transfer process from the source system to the retention system.</p> <p>A fourth measure set was to be evaluated using BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records related to PM 4. It was later determined that the data for this PM could not be evaluated using the technique devised for this evaluation criterion.</p> <p>Fifth and sixth measure sets were to be evaluated using a sample of CLEC aggregate records related to PM 1.2 and PM 4, respectively. Data integrity analysis of the processed data was not performed because it was determined that SBC Ameritech uses unprocessed data to calculate these two measure sets for the CLEC aggregate.</p> <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

Table 4-3: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – Ordering

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-B	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Ordering Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Ordering Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of required source records are included for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 5, PM 6, PM 7.1, PM 8, PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 10.4, PM 11, PM 11.1, PM 11.2, PM MI 2 2. PM 5.2 <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 6 on June 4, 2003, which states that SBC Ameritech did not completely transfer unprocessed records to processed records for PM 5.2. In order to evaluate SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 6, BearingPoint requested additional information on June 23, 2003.</p> <p>See Table 4-20 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-2-B	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Ordering Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether inappropriate records are present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Ordering Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that no more than 5 percent of processed records do not correspond to actual BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 5, PM 6, PM 7.1, PM 8, PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 10.4, PM 11, PM 11.1, PM 11.2, PM MI 2 2. PM 5.2

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			See Table 4-21 for additional details.
PMR4-3-B	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Ordering Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Ordering Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Eight measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 5, PM 6 2. PM 5.2 3. PM 7, PM 8 4. PM 7.1 5. PM 9, PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 11.1, PM 11.2 6. PM 10, PM 11 7. The wholesale component of PM MI 2, PM 10.4 8. The wholesale component of PM 13, PM 13.1 <p>A ninth measure set was to be evaluated using a sample of January 2002 CLEC aggregate records related to the retail portion of PM 13. It was later determined that the January 2002 source data was no longer available and that the retention system is different from the source system. BearingPoint will evaluate the process to transfer data from the source system to the retention system.</p> <p>A tenth measure set was to be evaluated for the CLEC aggregate component of the data integrity test using a sample of SBC Ameritech retail records used to calculate the retail parity portions of PM MI 2 and PM 10.4, respectively. SBC Ameritech does not generate retail Jeopardy Notices. For this reason, BearingPoint will not perform data integrity analysis for this measure set.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 1, Version 2 on June 3, 2003, which</p>



Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 5 and PM 6. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 1, Version 2 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 2, Version 2 on June 11, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 5.2. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 2, Version 2 on June 25, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 3 on May 21, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 7 and PM 8. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 3 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 4 on May 27, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 10.4 and PM MI 2. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 4 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 8 on June 6, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 13 and PM 13.1. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 8 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 9 on June 6, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 7.1. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>9 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 10 on June 11, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 9, PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 11.1, and PM 11.2. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 10 on June 25, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-4-B	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Ordering Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether the data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Ordering Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Ten measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 5, PM 6, PM 7.1, PM 8, PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 10.4, PM 11, PM 11.1, PM 11.2, PM MI 2 (Test CLEC) 2. PM 5.2 (Test CLEC) 3. PM 5, PM 6 (CLEC Aggregate) 4. PM 5.2 (CLEC Aggregate) 5. PM 7, PM 8 (CLEC Aggregate) 6. PM 7.1 (CLEC Aggregate) 7. PM 9, PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 11.1, PM 11.2 (CLEC Aggregate) 8. PM 10, PM 11 (CLEC Aggregate) 9. The wholesale component of PM MI 2, PM 10.4 (CLEC Aggregate) 10. The wholesale component of PM 13, PM 13.1 (CLEC Aggregate) <p>An eleventh measure set was to be evaluated using a sample of January 2002 records related to the retail portion of PM 13. It was later determined that the January 2002 source data were not available and that the retention system is</p>



Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>different from the source system. BearingPoint will evaluate the process to transfer data from the source system to the retention system.</p> <p>A twelfth measure set was to be evaluated for the CLEC aggregate component of the data integrity test using a sample of SBC Ameritech retail records used to calculate the retail parity portions of PM MI1 and PM 10.4, respectively. SBC Ameritech does not generate retail Jeopardy Notices. For this reason, BearingPoint will not perform data integrity analysis for this measure set. BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 1, Version 2 on June 3, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 5 and PM 6. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 1, Version 2 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 2, Version 2 on June 11, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 5.2. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 2, Version 2 on June 25, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 3 on May 21, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 7 and PM 8. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 3 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 4 on May 27, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 10.4 and PM MI 2. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 4 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 6 on June 4, 2003, which states that SBC Ameritech did not completely transfer unprocessed records to processed</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>records for PM 5.2. In order to evaluate SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 6, BearingPoint requested additional information on June 23, 2003.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 7 on June 5, 2003, which states that SBC Ameritech appears to be using incorrect data in its calculation of PM 5, PM 6, PM 7.1, PM 8, PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 10.4, PM 11, PM 11.1, PM 11.2, and PM MI 2 for the months of April 2002 through July 2002. BearingPoint is developing a Version 2 of Analysis Report 7 based on information received from SBC Ameritech.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 8 on June 6, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 13 and PM 13.1. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 8 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 9 on June 6, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 7.1. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 9 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 10 on June 11, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM 9, PM 10.1, PM 10.2, PM 10.3, PM 11.1, and PM 11.2. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 10 on June 25, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

Table 4-4: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – Provisioning

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-C	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Provisioning Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Provisioning Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of required source records are included for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets have been evaluated and one measure set is still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 58 2. PM 59 3. PM 27, PM 28, PM 29, PM 32, PM 33, PM 43, PM 44, PM 45, PM 49, PM 50, PM 55, PM 55.1, PM 55.2, PM 56, PM 56.1 <p>See Table 4-20 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-2-C	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Provisioning Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether inappropriate records are present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Provisioning Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that no more than 5 percent of processed records do not correspond to actual BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>A measure set consisting of records/values for PM 27, PM 28, PM 29, PM 32, PM 33, PM 43, PM 44, PM 45, PM 49, PM 50, PM 55, PM 55.1, PM 55.2, PM 56, PM 56.1, and PM 58 is still being evaluated.</p> <p>See Table 4-21 for additional details.</p>



Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-3-C	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Provisioning Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Provisioning Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Six measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ACIS portion of PM 12 2. CABS portion of PM 12 3. PM 27, PM 28, PM 29, PM 30, PM 31, PM 32, PM 33 4. PM 35, PM 46, PM 59 5. PM 43, PM 44, PM 45, PM 47, PM 48, PM 49, PM 50 6. PM 55, PM 55.1, PM 55.2, PM 55.3, PM 56, PM 56.1, PM 58, PM 60, PM 61, PM 62, PM 63 <p>BearingPoint issued Observation 842 on April 24, 2003, stating that SBC Ameritech appears to be capturing duplicate records of individual transactions in "Install_Hicap_Subrate_Detail" and "Pots_Install tables" for the July 2002 data month in Regulatory Reporting System (RRS) and may be "double counting" these records in 28 provisioning performance measurements (PM 27, PM 28, PM 29, PM 30, PM 31, PM 32, PM 33, PM 35, PM 43, PM 44, PM 45, PM 46, PM 47, PM 48, PM 49, PM 50, PM 55, PM 55.1, PM 55.2, PM 55.3, PM 56, PM 56.1, PM 58, PM 59, PM 60, PM 61, PM 62, and PM 63). SBC Ameritech issued a response on June 2, 2003. BearingPoint issued additional questions on June 20, 2003.</p> <p>As of June 10, 2003, one data request has not been fulfilled. This impacts PM 12.</p> <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-4-C	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Provisioning Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Provisioning Measure Group are not consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets have been evaluated and seven measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ACIS portion of PM 12 (CLEC Aggregate) 2. CABS portion of PM 12 (CLEC Aggregate) 3. PM 27, PM 28, PM 29, PM 30, PM 31, PM 32, PM 33 (CLEC Aggregate) 4. PM 27, PM 28, PM 29, PM 32, PM 33, PM 43, PM 44, PM 45, PM 49, PM 50, PM 55, PM 55.1, PM 55.2, PM 56, PM 56.1 (Test CLEC) 5. PM 35, PM 46, PM 59 (CLEC Aggregate) 6. PM 43, PM 44, PM 45, PM 47, PM 48, PM 49, PM 50 (CLEC Aggregate) 7. PM 55, PM 55.1, PM 55.2, PM 55.3, PM 56, PM 56.1, PM 58, PM 60, PM 61, PM 62, PM 63 (CLEC Aggregate) 8. PM 58 (Test CLEC) 9. PM 59 (Test CLEC) <p>BearingPoint issued Exception 134, Version 2 on April 16, 2003, which states that SBC Ameritech incorrectly populated the product name field in the Regulatory Reporting System (RRS). The product name is populated as "UNKNOWN" for up to 29,662 records in the January 2002 RRS "install_hicap_subrate_detail" table. This table supports the reporting of 20 Provisioning performance measurements (PM 43, PM 44, PM 45, PM 46, PM 47, PM 48, PM 49, PM 50, PM 55, PM 55.1, PM 55.2, PM 55.3, PM 56, PM 56.1, PM 58, PM 59, PM 60, PM 61, PM 62, and PM 63), all of which may have been affected by this error. BearingPoint issued a Disposition Report for Exception 134, Version 2 on June 30, 2003 indicating that this issue had been addressed.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Observation 810, Version 2 on June 10, 2003, stating that</p>



Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>SBC Ameritech appears to have incorrectly populated the "TOTAL_LOOP_LENGTH_DEC" field in the "Install_Hicap_Subrate_Detail" table in the Regulatory Reporting System (RRS). The field is blank for 66 records, out of 96 records, in the July 2002 "Install_Hicap_Subrate_Detail" table that are potentially used in the calculation of Performance Measurement 55.3. SBC Ameritech issued a response on June 11, 2003 and BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Observation 832 on April 14, 2002, stating that SBC Ameritech's processed data is not consistent with its unprocessed records from source systems for PM 58. SBC Ameritech issued a response on May 12, 2003. BearingPoint issued additional questions on June 2, 2003 and SBC Ameritech responded on June 16, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the SBC Ameritech response.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Observation 842 on April 24, 2003, stating that SBC Ameritech appears to be capturing duplicate records of individual transactions in "Install_Hicap_Subrate_Detail" and "Pots_Install tables" for the July 2002 data month in Regulatory Reporting System (RRS) and may be "double counting" these records in 28 provisioning performance measurements (PM 27, PM 28, PM 29, PM 30, PM 31, PM 32, PM 33, PM 35, PM 43, PM 44, PM 45, PM 46, PM 47, PM 48, PM 49, PM 50, PM 55, PM 55.1, PM 55.2, PM 55.3, PM 56, PM 56.1, PM 58, PM 59, PM 60, PM 61, PM 62, and PM 63). SBC Ameritech issued a response on June 2, 2003. BearingPoint issued additional questions on June 20, 2003.</p> <p>As of June 10, 2003, one data request has not been fulfilled. This impacts PMf PM 12.</p> <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

Table 4-5: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – Maintenance and Repair

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-D	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Maintenance and Repair Measure Group.	Satisfied	<p>Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Maintenance and Repair Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of required source records are included for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>A measure set consisting of records/values for PM 38, PM 39, PM 40, PM 52, PM 66, PM 67, and PM 68 has been evaluated.</p> <p>See Table 4-20 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-2-D	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Maintenance and Repair Measure Group.	Satisfied	<p>Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Maintenance and Repair Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that no more than 5 percent of processed records do not correspond to actual BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>A measure set consisting of records/values for PM 38, PM 39, PM 40, PM 52, PM 66, PM 67, and PM 68 has been evaluated.</p> <p>See Table 4-21 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-3-D	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Maintenance and Repair Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Maintenance and Repair Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Four measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 38, PM 39, PM 40, PM 41, PM 42 2. PM 52, PM 53, PM 54 3. PM 66, PM 67, PM 68, PM 69 4. PM 37, PM 37.1, PM 54.1, PM 65, PM 65.1 <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-4-D	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Maintenance and Repair Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Maintenance and Repair Measure Group are not consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Five measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 38, PM 39, PM 40, PM 52, PM 66, PM 67, PM 68 (Test CLEC) 2. PM 38, PM 39, PM 40, PM 41, PM 42 (CLEC Aggregate) 3. PM 52, PM 53, PM 54 (CLEC Aggregate) 4. PM 66, PM 67, PM 68, PM 69 (CLEC Aggregate) 5. PM 37, PM 37.1, PM 54.1, PM 65, PM 65.1 (CLEC Aggregate) <p>BearingPoint issued a request for analysis (MT749_DR_PMR4_Test CLEC M&R Field Errors [RRS]) on May 20, 2003 and a supplemental data request</p>



Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>(MT749_DR_PMR4_Test CLEC M&R Field Errors [RRS] Additional Information) on June 16, 2003 regarding discrepancies in fields used in the calculation of PM 38, PM 39, PM 40, PM 52, PM 66, PM 67, and PM 68.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued an additional information document for Exception 134 on January 17, 2003 and Exception 134, Version 2 on April 16, 2003, in which BearingPoint reported that SBC Ameritech appears to have incorrectly populated the product name field in the "Design Specials Inventory" table in the Regulatory Reporting System (RRS). The product name is populated as "UNKNOWN" for 158,009 records in the July 2002 "Design Specials Inventory" table. This table supports the reporting of two Maintenance and Repair performance measurements (PM 54 and PM 54.1), both of which may have been affected by this error. BearingPoint has completed retesting this component of Exception 134 for the February 2003 data month. BearingPoint issued a Disposition Report for Exception 134, Version 2 on June 30, 2003 indicating that this issue had been addressed.</p> <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

Table 4-6: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – Billing

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-E	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Billing Measure Group.	Satisfied	<p>Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Billing Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of required source records are included for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets have been evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 16 2. PM 19 <p>BearingPoint issued Exception 176, Version 2 on January 10, 2003, which states that SBC Ameritech's March, April, and May 2002 performance measurement data is missing daily usage file (DUF) records used in the calculation of PM 19. In SBC Ameritech's response to Exception 176, provided on November 22, 2002, SBC Ameritech agreed that Category 11 DUF records were not included in the data provided for the calculation of PM 19. BearingPoint retested this Exception using February 2003 data. BearingPoint initially issued a Disposition Report for Exception 176, Version 2 on June 10, 2003, as BearingPoint was able to match 97.6 percent of the Category 11 DUF records for all five states in SBC Ameritech's PM 19 processed data to the date provided by the volunteer CLEC. BearingPoint issued Observation 860 on June 10, 2003 to address the outstanding 2.4 percent of missing DUF records.</p> <p>In response to Observation 860, SBC Ameritech stated that there was a problem with the transfer of data initially provided to BearingPoint for Category 11 DUF record review. SBC Ameritech subsequently resent the data on June 23, 2003. BearingPoint used this resent data to evaluate Exception 176, Version 2.</p> <p>As a result of this reevaluation, BearingPoint issued the Disposition Report for Exception 176, Version 2 on June 24, 2003 and proposed to close the Exception 176, Version 2 and Observation 860 on the June 24, 2003</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>Observation and Exception call. BearingPoint indicated that it was able to match 100 percent of the Category 11 DUF records for all five states in SBC Ameritech's February 2003 Performance Measurement 19 processed data to the data provided by the volunteer CLEC.</p> <p>A third measure set was to be evaluated using BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records related to PM 17. It was later determined that there were no record-level unique identifiers to map the unprocessed data to SBC Ameritech's processed data.</p> <p>See Table 4-20 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-2-E	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Billing Measure Group.	Satisfied	<p>Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Billing Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that no more than 5 percent of processed records do not correspond to actual BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>A measure set consisting of records/values for PM 16 has been evaluated.</p> <p>A second measure set was to be evaluated using BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records related to PM 17. It was later determined that there were no record-level unique identifiers to map the unprocessed data to SBC Ameritech's processed data.</p> <p>A third measure set was to be evaluated using BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records related to PM 19. It was later determined that the data for this measure set could not be evaluated using the technique devised for this evaluation criterion.</p> <p>See Table 4-21 for additional details.</p>



Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-3-E	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Billing Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Billing Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>One measure set has been evaluated and three measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 14 2. ACIS portion of PM 17 3. AEBS portion of PM 18 4. PM 19 <p>A fifth measure set was to be evaluated using a sample of CLEC aggregate records related to PM 16. It was later determined that SBC Ameritech uses unprocessed data to calculate the numerator of PM 16. Therefore, data integrity analysis for the numerator of PM 16 was not performed. Additionally, processed data used to calculate the denominator of PM 16 is the same data used to calculate the denominator of PM 19. Therefore, the analysis of the data for PM 19 also applies to the denominator of PM 16.</p> <p>A sixth measure set was to be evaluated using a sample of CLEC aggregate records related to PM 15, the CABS portion of PM 18, and PM 20. It was later determined that there was no transaction-level detail available for analysis. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure set.</p> <p>A seventh measure set was to be evaluated using samples of CLEC aggregate records related to the CABS portion of PM 17. Data integrity analysis of the processed data was not performed because it was determined that SBC Ameritech uses unprocessed data to calculate the CABS portion of this measure.</p>
June 30, 2003			<p>As of June 10, 2003, two data requests have not been fulfilled. This impacts the following measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 14 2. ACIS portion of PM 17