

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)	
)	
INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE PROPRIETY)	
OF INTERLATA SERVICES BY BELL SOUTH)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. PURSUANT TO)	CASE NO.
THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996)	2001-105

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S
PETITION AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
SERVICE QUALITY MEASUREMENTS PLAN ("SQMP") AND SELF-
EFFECTUATING ENFORCEMENT PLAN ("SEEM") FOR THE SIX MONTH
REVIEW

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth") hereby respectfully submits its Petition and Proposed Changes To The Service Quality Measurements Plan ("SQMP"), and Self-Effectuating Enforcement Mechanism Plan ("SEEM") For The Six Month Review and states the following:

I. INTRODUCTION

In its Order dated October 19, 2001, the Commission adopted performance measures, benchmarks, retail analogs, and a penalty plan for BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth"). The plan was identical to that adopted by the Georgia Public Service Commission, with the exception of the LNP Disconnect Timeliness measurement. The October 19, 2001 Order required BellSouth to file a petition for changes to the performance measures in six months. BellSouth later requested, and received, an extension of 60 days, to June 19, 2002, in which to file its petition regarding performance measures. BellSouth petitioned the Commission on June 19, 2002 for an additional 120-day extension.

In its Order dated October 11, 2002, the Kentucky Public Service Commission (“Commission”) granted BellSouth’s request for a final delay in filing its petition. The Order requires BellSouth to file its petition no later than December 16, 2002. The Georgia Public Service Commission issued an Order on November 11, 2002. On December 5, 2002, BellSouth filed a Motion for Reconsideration of certain aspects of the Georgia Commission’s Order. The instant petition is filed in accordance with the Kentucky Commission’s Order.

In general, BellSouth’s proposed changes to the SQMP and SEEM plan in Kentucky are consistent with those ordered by the Georgia Commission. BellSouth has included the revisions proposed in its Motion for Reconsideration, along with its other proposed revisions, for adoption in Kentucky.

BellSouth proposes herein its changes to the Service Quality Measurements Plan (“SQMP”) and to the Self-Effectuating Enforcement Mechanism Plan (“SEEM”). The proposed changes to the SQMP and SEEM are listed in detail on five exhibits to this Petition. Exhibit 1 reflects BellSouth’s proposed changes to the existing measures in Kentucky that are of a substantive nature. These changes include modifications to business rules, exclusions, and performance standards of measurements. Exhibit 1 also contains measurements that BellSouth proposes to delete from the SQMP because either, 1) the data is already contained within another existing measurement, 2) the measurement is being replaced, or 3) the volume of activity is too low to warrant measurement. Exhibit 2 includes new measurements proposed by BellSouth. In some instances, measurements proposed in Exhibit 2 are in addition to existing measurements. In other cases, the new proposed measures are to replace existing measures. The changes set forth in Exhibits 1 and 2 are discussed in greater detail in Section II, below.

Also attached hereto are two Exhibits that include proposed SQMP changes that are either administrative in nature, or that implement the conclusions of the Auditor in Florida and Georgia. Specifically, Exhibit 3 includes changes to the SQMP that are administrative in nature, such as corrections in language or typographical errors. These changes are intended to clarify the existing measures, but do not change the calculations of any measurement in any way. Exhibit 4 includes changes to the SQMP that result from BellSouth's responses to both the Exceptions and Observations of KPMG during third party tests in Georgia and Florida and KPMG's Adequacy Review in Florida. These changes relate to measurements for which the observation or exception has been closed. As additional items that are currently open are closed, BellSouth will attempt to add these during the course of the review process. Finally, the proposed changes to the SEEM plan are shown in Exhibit 5.

BellSouth would also note that during the six-month review, the results that are produced on a monthly basis may indicate that other changes are necessary. If this occurs, BellSouth will propose these changes as soon as possible in the course of the six-month review.

II. BELLSOUTH'S PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SQMP

1. OSS-1 Average Response Time and Response Interval (Pre-Ordering/Ordering). BellSouth proposes the addition of two Exceptions to this measurement: (1) "Scheduled OSS Maintenance," and (2) "Retail Usage of LENSs." As to the first exception Scheduled OSS Maintenance time should be excluded from this measure because CLECs typically do not send queries to a system when it is down for scheduled maintenance. Systems are unavailable during maintenance, and this maintenance is normally scheduled and conducted outside of regular business hours. Further, since BellSouth publishes the time it plans to conduct maintenance on its OSS, this is a known and usually fixed outage. This exclusion

clarifies the intent and purpose of the measurement. Moreover, not excluding scheduled maintenance creates the potential for gaming by CLECs that might intentionally send queries when the system is down for scheduled maintenance. Thus, the time required for scheduled maintenance should be excluded from the measurement.

The second exclusion that BellSouth proposes is Retail Usage of LENS. Since some BellSouth Retail Operations have begun to use LENS to obtain pre-ordering information, this exclusion is now necessary. The retail usage of LENS should be excluded from the data used to compute the CLEC results compared to the benchmarks. When these measures were first built, BellSouth Retail was not using the LENS system. All of the SQMP reports are designed to keep the Retail data separate from the CLEC data. BellSouth Small Business agents plan to use LENS for pre-order/inquiry address validation and CSR inquiries. To maintain the integrity of the measure, retail usage of LENS must be factored out of the PMAP reports. This exclusion preserves the necessary separation.

2. **OSS-2 Interface Availability (Pre-Ordering/ Ordering); OSS-3 Interface Availability (Maintenance & Repair).** As a result of several Performance Measurement workshops conducted in Georgia in Docket 7892-U, *Performance Measurements for Telecommunications Interconnection, Unbundling and Resale*, BellSouth proposed in Georgia revisions to its measurements *OSS-2 Interface Availability (Pre-Ordering/ Ordering)* and *OSS-3 Interface Availability (Maintenance & Repair)*. These revisions have now been incorporated into the recent GPSC Performance Measurements Order.

During the course of the workshops in Georgia, BellSouth responded to CLEC issues concerning the definitions, exclusions, business rules, and calculations for these measurements and proposed solutions that were accepted in the workshops. These discussions have continued

during the 6-month review workshops in Louisiana in Docket U-22252-C. Further, in the CLEC Coalition's filing of August 16, 2002 in GA Docket No. 7892-U, the CLEC Coalition states (in regard to system availability) that, "CLECs recognize the improvements reached on this metric in Georgia for the time being but reserve the right to pursue further improvements in the future."

For OSS-2, BellSouth proposes to modify the definition to address the concerns expressed by CLECs regarding the meaning of the terms "Functional Availability" and "Scheduled Availability," which were not specified in the Definition of the existing measurement in Georgia and Kentucky. Functional Availability is defined as the cumulative total number of hours per application/interface in the reporting period that the application/interface components are available to users. Scheduled Availability is defined as the cumulative total number of hours per application/interface in the reporting period that the application/interface is scheduled to be available. In the Exclusions section, BellSouth proposes additional language to address troubles caused by factors outside of BellSouth's control, such as customer equipment and networks owned by other telecommunications companies.

BellSouth also seeks to add and define exclusions for degraded service outages and scheduled OSS maintenance. The exclusion for degraded service outages is appropriate because BellSouth already captures the effect of degraded service in the measurements, OSS-1 *Average Response Time and Response Interval (Pre-Ordering/ Ordering)*, O-8, Reject Interval and O-9, Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, each of which captures intervals that would be lengthened if the systems are degraded. Each of these measurements provides a report structure that demonstrates BellSouth performance against a benchmark. The exclusion for scheduled OSS maintenance is appropriate because (as described above in the context of OSS-1), CLECs should

not expect the OSS to be available when there is a published and scheduled maintenance period. Accordingly, this time should be excluded from the measurement.

In the Business Rules Section, BellSouth proposes to add the words “loss of functionality” to the measure, consistent with the change to the measure discussed above. BellSouth proposes additional clarification to the definition of full outages, to explain that an outage is defined by an occurrence of an incident that renders the application or system inaccessible to customers attempting to access the application or system. BellSouth also proposes to provide additional clarification to the SQMP Disaggregation section by adding “per OSS Interface” to the Regional level of Disaggregation. This makes it clear that the result will be displayed by interface, rather than some other aggregation. Lastly, BellSouth also proposes to add additional application availability reporting for the following systems: LAUTO (CLEC), COFFI (CLEC/BellSouth), LNP LCSC GUI (CLEC/BellSouth) and LFACs (CLEC/BellSouth).

3. O-1 Acknowledgement Message Timeliness. BellSouth proposes to modify the calculation for Average Response Interval. The goal of this measurement is to calculate how quickly the acknowledgement notice is returned, i.e., to compute the average interval in which acknowledgement notices are returned. The current calculation for average response interval describes the numerator as the Sum of all Response Intervals. BellSouth proposes to modify this definition to state: Sum of all Response Intervals “for returned acknowledgements.” This addition makes it clear that the measure only counts Acknowledgements Returned. (Of course, if the Acknowledgement is not returned there is no interval.) Likewise, the denominator (which represents the total number of electronically submitted Messages / LSRs) must also be changed to include the acknowledgement notices returned in the reporting period.

4. **O-2 Acknowledgement Message Completeness.** BellSouth proposes to change the benchmark for this measurement to 99.5%. The current benchmark of 100% is unreasonably high and cannot be attained. The TAG application is a transaction-based interface between BellSouth OSS systems and CLECs at external locations. The gateway provides protocol translation and security services, but does not directly provide any of the business functionality. TAG was not designed to meet a 100% Completeness benchmark. If the CORBA connection is broken during transmission of a Functional Acknowledgement, TAG has no means to “restore” the connection. This connection can be broken from either end of the circuit through no fault of BellSouth. Thus, TAG has no “resend” capability to provide Functional Acknowledgements to CLECs when this happens. As a result, BellSouth will never pass the metric because the benchmark is at a standard (100%) that is above and beyond the capability of the original architecture of the application. Also, for ordering transactions, this is not a critical measurement because the CLECs receive the equivalent of an acknowledgement when the CLEC is sent either a Firm order Confirmation or a Reject Notification.

5. **O-3 Percent Flow-Through Service Requests (Summary); O-4 Percent Flow-Through Service Requests (Detail).** For both of these measurements, BellSouth proposes to add a level of disaggregation for UNE-P. The benchmark for the UNE-P submeasure should be 85%, the current benchmark for UNE flow through set by this Commission. In Georgia, even though the benchmark is also generally 85% for UNEs, the Georgia Commission has set a 95% benchmark for UNE-P. BellSouth disagrees with the Benchmark set by the Georgia Public Service Commission and has asked reconsideration of the establishment of a 95% benchmark for UNE-P flow through for a number of reasons.

First, the FCC has found that BellSouth's OSS systems are currently capable of flowing through UNE orders in a manner that allows competitive carriers a meaningful opportunity to compete, at the current benchmarks for flow through. The FCC also found, in the recent Order granting BellSouth entry into long distance in North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi and Kentucky, that the ability of orders to flow through BellSouth's OSS is dependent, in part, on the ALECs.¹ For example, in this Order, the FCC stated the following:

We have previously stated that a BOC's ability to flow-through orders at high rates is dependent, in part, on the performance of competing carriers to place orders electronically. We find it particularly informative that several competing carriers are achieving much higher flow-through rates than other carriers. Specifically, data regarding UNE orders shows that the flow-through rates of the top five competitive LECs range from 77.06 percent to 94.64 percent for the first quarter of 2002. In addition, flow-through rates for three of these competitive LECs range from 90.19 percent to 94.64 percent during the first quarter. During the second quarter of 2002, data regarding UNE orders shows that the flow-through rates of the top five competitive LECs range from 75.50 percent to 95.10 percent. The flow-through rates for three of these competitive LECs range from 85.80 percent to 95.10 percent during the second quarter. This evidence indicates that BellSouth's systems are capable of flowing through UNE orders in a manner that allows competitive carriers a meaningful opportunity to compete. Because the record demonstrates that a number of competitive LECs experience high flow-through rates, we conclude that it is inappropriate to attribute the wide range of flow-through results entirely to BellSouth. As the Commission previously stated, a BOC is not accountable for orders that fail to flow-through due to competing carrier-caused errors. Our conclusion that BellSouth's OSS are capable of achieving high flow-through level is further bolstered by KPMG's Georgia testing.

(Memorandum Opinion, Par. 152)(emphasis added).

In addition to the rulings that BellSouth's flow-through is sufficient with the existing benchmark and that actual flow-through percentages may be attributable to the actions of ALECs, the FCC has also clarified that flow-through measurements are not the only (or even the

¹ *In the Matter of Joint Application by BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth Long Distance, Inc. for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina*, WC Docket No. 02-150, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, FCC 02-260 (rel. Sept. 18, 2002)("Memorandum Opinion").

best) way to determine whether an incumbent is providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS.

As the FCC stated in its Kansas/Oklahoma 271 Order²:

The Commission traditionally uses order ‘flow-through’ as a potential indicator of a wide range of problems that we consider in determining whether a BOC provides nondiscriminatory access to its OSS. (citations omitted). However, we have not considered flow-through rates as the sole indicium of parity and thus have not limited our analysis of a BOC’s ordering processes to a review of its flow-through performance data. Instead, we have held that factors that are linked to order flow-through but are more directly indicative of a BOC’s OSS performance, such as a BOC’s overall ability to return timely order confirmation and rejection notices, accurately process manually handled orders, and scale its systems, are relevant and probative for analyzing a BOC’s ability to provide access to its ordering functions in a nondiscriminatory manner.

(*Id.* at 6305, n. 397.)

Given the above, there is simply no reason to raise the flow-through benchmarks and, as a consequence, BellSouth has asked the Georgia Public Service Commission to reconsider the benchmark for UNE-P.

Again, the current benchmark for UNE flow through in Kentucky is 85%. Raising the benchmark for UNE-P (as Georgia did) is not required to provide incentive for UNE flow through improvement. BellSouth’s UNE flow-through performance has already shown steady improvement in relation to the current 85% benchmark. BellSouth’s UNE flow-through results for the six-month period from April to September 2002 are as follow:

<u>Month</u>	<u>UNE Flow Through</u>
April	84.8%
May	82.6%
June	83.8%
July	89.1%
August	87.9%
September	89.8%

² *In the Matter of Joint Application by SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Kansas and Oklahoma*, CC Docket No. 00-217, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 16 FCC Rcd 6237 (2001).

BellSouth is committed to improving flow through results, without any change in the UNE flow-through benchmark. With OSS Release 10.6, which was implemented on August 25, 2002, BellSouth has implemented thirty-five features or error and defect corrections to improve flow through. BellSouth also has undertaken an additional project to further improve flow-through rates, which is focused solely on reducing or eliminating items classified as "BST errors" in the current flow-through reporting process. "BST errors" are errors that require manual review by the Local Carrier Service Center ("LCSC") due to BellSouth system functionality. In other words, the CLEC orders are accepted by the BellSouth OSS and then the orders fall out for manual intervention by BellSouth. As part of this project to address "BST errors," BellSouth has added information technology resources, over and above those currently designated for the enhancements to the OSS requested by the CLECs. This project also is focusing on the Local Exchange Service Order Generator ("LESOG") application, and BellSouth has performed an analysis of the top error codes impacting flow-through and identified flow-through errors that are isolated to the LESOG application which BellSouth is taking steps to correct.

6. LSR Flow-Through Matrix BellSouth proposes that the LSR Flow-Through Matrix be removed from the SQMP. BellSouth also proposes to include in the SQMP directions for locating the latest version of the Flow-Through Matrix on the PMAP website. The rollout of new products and the continued improvement in the numbers of products that flow through has resulted in the need for frequent changes to the Flow-Through Matrix. Since it is relatively difficult to change the SQMP, the matrix should only be referenced in the measurement, and located on the PMAP website in order to allow necessary changes. Also, BellSouth would agree to notify the Commission before changing any product from "Yes" (it flows through) to "No" (it

no longer flows through). The Flow-Through matrix is, of course, a tool that CLEC Service Representatives use during the ordering process. However, CLECs are very familiar with the PMAP website, and the latest version of the Flow-Through Matrix is already posted on the PMAP website. Thus, this change would have no negative impact on the CLECs' access to the matrix.

7. O-8 Reject Interval; O-9 Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness

BellSouth proposes to reduce the benchmark intervals in the current Kentucky SQM for Reject Interval for Non-Mechanized LSRs from 85% <= 24 hours to 85% <= 18 Business hours. BellSouth proposes to reduce the benchmark intervals in the current Kentucky SQM for Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness for Non-Mechanized LSRs from 85% <= 36 hours to 90% <= 24 Business hours. For Partially Mechanized LSRs, BellSouth proposes a standard of 90% <= 10 hours rather than the current standard of 85% <= 10 hours. These proposed changes are included in Exhibit 1.

BellSouth's proposal for the benchmarks for measurements O-8, *Reject Interval* and O-9, *Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness* differs from benchmarks ordered by the Georgia Public Service Commission, because BellSouth does not believe that the benchmarks set by the Georgia Commission for Partially Mechanized LSRs are reasonable. Specifically, the Georgia Commission set the benchmark for Partially Mechanized LSRs for both Reject Interval and Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness at 90% <= 7 hours. The Georgia Public Service Commission has set the benchmark for Non-Mechanized LSRs for both Reject Interval and Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness at 95% <= 24 hours.

Again, BellSouth is proposing to reduce intervals and raise benchmarks from the current levels in the Kentucky SQMP. However, BellSouth does not believe that the even more

stringent benchmarks and intervals set by the Georgia Commission are necessary to provide the CLECs with a meaningful opportunity to compete. In fact, the benchmark levels set by the Georgia Commission for partially mechanized LSRs and non-mechanized LSRs are higher even than the benchmark levels in the Kentucky 271 application approved by the FCC. Given this, the Kentucky Commission should not raise benchmarks or shorten intervals beyond what this Commission deemed to be sufficient performance to qualify for the Commission's support of BellSouth's 271 application unless there is some specific evidence presented to justify the need for such a change. BellSouth does not believe that any such evidence exists.

At the same time, BellSouth's benchmarks for handling Fully Mechanized LSRs is consistent with the Kentucky Public Service Commission's existing benchmarks and the Georgia benchmarks for O-8, *Reject Interval* (97% <= 1 hour) and O-9, *Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness* (95% <= 3 hours). Most LSRs flow through and are captured by these measurements within the Fully Mechanized category. For example, in Kentucky, for O-9, *Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness*, the Fully Mechanized LSR category constituted approximately 80 % of the total orders for July, 81 % of the total orders for August, 86 % of the total orders for September, and 86 % of the total LSRs for October. For October 2002, only 14% of the LSRs for Kentucky were Partially Mechanized or Non-Mechanized. Since the majority of the LSRs are covered by the Fully Mechanized benchmarks, the standard for fully mechanized LSRs is the most significant. For this reason, BellSouth submits that this Commission should preserve the relationship of the benchmarks for the submeasures of O-8 and O-8 that currently exists in Kentucky, i.e., the fully mechanized level of product disaggregation in these two measurements should have the most stringent benchmarks.

8. O-7 Percent Rejected Service Requests; O-11 Firm Order Confirmation and Reject Response Completeness. BellSouth proposes to exclude from these ordering measurements LSRs that are identified as projects. Projects are treated differently in the LCSC than other LSRs, and often require a Project Manager to coordinate and negotiate due dates and implementation. This coordination is outside of the normal LSR process. For this reason, projects should be excluded from O-7 and O-11.

Moreover, this exclusion currently applies to measures O-8, *Reject Interval*, and O-9 *Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness*, the other Ordering measurements in BellSouth's SQMP. In order for BellSouth to synchronize the ordering measurements, the same programming logic needs to be applied consistently across the ordering measurements. Thus, for this additional reason, this exclusion should be applied uniformly to ordering measures.

9. O-13 LNP - Percent Rejected Service Requests; O-14 LNP – Reject Interval Distribution & Average Reject Interval; O-15 LNP - Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Interval Distribution & Firm Order Confirmation Average Interval BellSouth proposes to delete these measures. Due to systemic changes that have occurred after these measures were first implemented, the data reflected in these measures now duplicates that which is also reflected in other measures.

These measures were developed by BellSouth several years ago when the Local Number Portability process was relatively new and the LNP measurements had to be produced manually, rather than via PMAP. As a result, the LNP measurements were kept separate from other measurements until they could be brought into PMAP. Once LNP measurements could be produced by PMAP, the LNP - Percent Rejected Service Requests measure was added as a level of disaggregation to measure O-7 (Percent Rejected Service Requests). Since the percent of

LNP service requests that are rejected is shown separately as part of measure O-7, it is duplicative to also report the same results as a separate measure.

Similarly, the LNP – Reject Interval Distribution & Average Reject Interval measure was added as a level of disaggregation to measure O-8 (Reject Interval). Since the reject interval for LNP service requests is shown separately as part of measure O-8, it is duplicative to report the same results as a separate measure. Lastly, once LNP measurements were automated through PMAP, the LNP – Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Interval Distribution & Firm Order Confirmation Average Interval measure was added as a level of disaggregation to measure O-9 (Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness (FOC)). Since the FOC interval for LNP service requests is shown separately as part of measure O-9, it is duplicative to also report the same results as a separate measure. Therefore, BellSouth proposes to delete these measures.

10. P-2 Average Jeopardy Notice Interval & Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices. BellSouth proposes to split measurement P-2; *Average Jeopardy Notice Interval & Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices* into two measures: P-2A *Jeopardy Notice Interval* and P-2B *Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices*. Under this approach, BellSouth would report its performance with respect to the amount of advance notice provided to CLECs when a committed due date is in jeopardy and the percentage of orders for which jeopardy notices are issued under two separate measures rather than the current measure, P-2. Measure P-2A would be based on the calculation of a mean. Measure P-2B would be reported as a percentage. This change is merely a clarification of the documentation for these two measurements. The reporting would not change. The proposed exclusions, calculations, report structures and disaggregations for the two new measurements are included in Exhibit 2.

BellSouth also proposes to add two exclusions to measure measurement P-2A: (1) orders for which a jeopardy is identified on the due date; (2) Orders issued with a due date of 48 hours or less. The first proposed exclusion would only apply when the technician is on the premises attempting to provide service and must refer the order to Engineering or Cable Repair due to a facility jeopardy. Both of these exclusions are appropriate because the current standard is a benchmark with an interval of 48 hours or less. Clearly it is impossible to provide a jeopardy notice 48 hours in advance if the order is due in less than 48 hours.

11. **P-3 Percent Missed Installation Appointments; P-5 Average Completion Notice Interval** BellSouth proposes to add to these measures an additional SQMP level of disaggregation to address the Line Splitting, UNE UDC / IDSL products and UNE Enhanced Extended Link / Non-Switched Combinations. The appropriate retail analog for Line Splitting is ADSL Provided to Retail. For UNE UDC / IDSL the appropriate analog is Retail ISDN- BRI; For UNE Enhanced Extended Link / Non-Switched Combinations, the appropriate retail analog is Retail DS1 / DS3. These changes were approved by the Georgia Commission and included in their recent Order addressing performance measures.

BellSouth also proposes to expand the product disaggregation levels for these measures to include line sharing without loop conditioning, line sharing with loop conditioning, line splitting without loop conditioning, and line splitting with loop conditioning. In other words, the product disaggregation would include installation of the services both with conditioning and without conditioning. Although the Georgia Commission did not include in their Order this disaggregation, BellSouth believes that this is appropriate because UNE-Line Splitting and UNE-Line Sharing can be provisioned with or without loop conditioning. Therefore, the appropriate

retail analogs should address both provisioning situations. The retail analog, ADSL Provided to Retail, would also include BellSouth retail residential and business service both with and without loop conditioning. BellSouth's proposed changes are reflected in Exhibit 1.

12. P-4 Average Completion Interval & Order Completion Interval BellSouth proposes to add another SQMP level of disaggregation to measure P4 to address the UNE Line Splitting, UNE UDC / IDSL products and UNE Enhanced Extended Link / Non-Switched Combinations. The appropriate retail analog for UNE Line Splitting is ADSL Provided to Retail. For UNE UDC / IDSL the appropriate analog is Retail ISDN-BRI. There is no retail analog for the UNE Enhanced Extended Link/Non-Switched Combinations level of disaggregation in BellSouth because BellSouth does not provide this service to its retail customers. Therefore, the appropriate standard for P-4, for UNE Enhanced Extended Link/Non-Switched Combinations is 30% within 5 Days and 70% within 8 days.

BellSouth also proposes to expand the product disaggregation levels for P-4 to include line sharing without loop conditioning, line sharing with loop conditioning, line splitting without loop conditioning, and line splitting with loop conditioning. In other words, the product disaggregation would include installation of services both without conditioning and with conditioning. BellSouth proposes to use ADSL Provided to Retail as a retail analog for UNE Line Sharing and UNE Line Splitting, without conditioning. When conditioning is performed, however, for either line sharing or line splitting, the process is different from that which is generally utilized for retail ADSL service. In other words, BellSouth typically does not perform loop conditioning in the provision of retail ADSL service, which means that retail ADSL is not analogous to the line sharing or line splitting UNEs when conditioning is done. Therefore, for P4, BellSouth proposes as ≤ 12 days the appropriate interval for both UNE Line Sharing with

conditioning, and UNE Line Splitting with conditioning. This interval is appropriate since it includes the time required by BellSouth to perform the conditioning of the line.

The Georgia Commission did not include in their Order provisions for disaggregated submeasures to reflect whether loop conditioning occurs or does not occur. Nevertheless, BellSouth proposes this disaggregation herein because, when loop conditioning is performed, (1) the provisioning process takes longer than when loop conditioning is not required, and (2) this process is not analogous to the process of provisioning retail ADSL.

The proposed changes to the SQMP for this measure are included in Exhibit 1.

13. P-10 Total Service Order Cycle Time (TSOCT) BellSouth proposes to eliminate P-10, Total Service Order Cycle Time. This measure is duplicative of other measurements that are reported. Specifically, the TSOCT combines three measures: O-9, Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) Timeliness; P-4, Average Completion Interval (OCI) & Order Completion Interval Distribution; and P-5, Average Completion Notice Interval (ACNI). Thus, the components of TSOCT are already reported with established retail analogues or benchmarks, which makes the TSOCT measure duplicative. Further, reporting TSOCT has little value since there is nothing to compare it to on the retail side. Again, the component parts of TSOCT (*i.e.*, FOC, OCI and ACNI) each have standards, which address acceptable performance levels in the processes involved.

14. P-11 Service Order Accuracy; P-11 Service Order Accuracy – Mechanized Process BellSouth proposes to eliminate the existing P-11, Service Order Accuracy measurement and replace it with P-11, Service Order Accuracy – Mechanized Process which is

the measurement that complies with the November 14, 2002 order issued by the Georgia Public Service Commission in Docket No. 7892-U.

During the performance measurements workshops held in Georgia, substantial changes were made to this measure based on input from and negotiations between CLECs, BellSouth and the Georgia Commission Staff. Because the Service Order Accuracy measure is a regional measure, BellSouth proposes to delete the existing measure, and replace it with the new measure, which includes these changes (the new P-11 is included in Exhibit 2 as a proposed new measure).

The new metric P-11 continues to capture Service Order Accuracy. However, it also includes improvements to the measurement that were recommended during the Georgia workshops. Specifically, BellSouth currently calculates service order accuracy using a statistically valid sample of all service orders, regardless of the method of submission of the LSR that initiated the Service Order. The CLECs opined that only orders requiring manual handling should be addressed by the Service Order Accuracy measurement. This opinion was predicated on the assumption that orders that were processed entirely by mechanical means, without human intervention, would not likely have errors. To address these concerns, BellSouth proposed, and the Georgia Commission approved, two changes: (1) the measure will only include “partial mechanized” orders (i.e., orders for which the LSRs are submitted electronically, but some manual handling is required); (2) the measurement will utilize a census of these orders rather than a sample.

Also, the Georgia Commission ordered BellSouth to further modify P-11 in the following three ways: 1) the fields reviewed in determining service order accuracy shall be limited to

CLEC-impacting; 2) disaggregation will be based on three categories of products: Resale, UNEs, and UNE-P; and 3) the benchmark for P-11 will be reduced from 95% to 90%.

15. **P-13 LNP- Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval & Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution; P-13A LNP- Percent Out of Service < 60 Minutes, P-13B Percentage of Time BellSouth Applies the 10-digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date; P-13C LNP- Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval & Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution (Non-Trigger)**. BellSouth proposes to eliminate measure P-13, *LNP-Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval and Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution*. In place of this measurement, BellSouth proposes three new Local Number Portability (LNP) measurements; P-13A, *LNP- Percent Out of Service < 60 Minutes*, P-13B, *LNP- Percentage of Time BellSouth Applies the 10-digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due*, and P-13C, *LNP- Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval and Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution (Non-Trigger)*. BellSouth has proposed these measures in both Louisiana and Florida Performance Measurement Workshops. In the workshops, the CLECs agreed to these new measurements, which are contained in Exhibit 2. BellSouth proposed these replacement measurements because the current measure: (1) does not accurately capture the customer's experience when the customer's telephone number is ported; and (2) includes activities in the porting process over which BellSouth has no control.

Again, BellSouth proposes to implement P-13A, *LNP- Percent Out of Service < 60 Minute*, P-13B, *LNP- Percentage of Time BellSouth Applies the 10-digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date* and P-13C, *LNP- Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval and Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution (Non-Trigger)*. The proposed measure P-13A, *LNP- Percent*

Out of Service < 60 Minutes is based on Measure 101 from the Texas Plan Version 2.0. The proposed measure P-13B, *LNP- Percentage of Time BellSouth Applies the 10-digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date* is based on Measure 97 from the Texas Plan Version 2.0. The proposed P-13C, *LNP- Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval and Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution (Non-Trigger)* measures the LNP disconnect timeliness interval and effectively measures BellSouth's responsiveness by isolating it from impacts that are caused by CLEC related activities. The combination of these three metrics more accurately measures BellSouth's performance of the functions over which it has control, and the aspects of BellSouth's performance that effect service to the CLEC and its end user/customer.

Local number portability ("LNP"), allows a customer to keep his or her telephone number when telephone service is transferred from one local exchange company to another. The number portability feature works by utilizing a centralized database that houses all ported numbers and provides proper routing of calls to and from these numbers. When an order involving LNP is being worked to port a telephone number from BellSouth to the CLEC, both BellSouth and the CLEC must take certain actions in order to enable the CLEC's new end user to make and receive calls using the ported number.

On a great majority of LNP orders, BellSouth creates what is referred to as a "trigger" in conjunction with the order. This trigger gives the end user customer the ability to make and receive calls from other customers who are served by the customer's host switch at the time of the LNP activation. This ability is not dependent upon BellSouth working a disconnect order. In other words, when a trigger is involved, an end user customer can receive calls from other customers served by the same host switch before the disconnect order is ever worked.

On trigger orders, end user customers also can make and receive calls from customers not served by the same host switch before BellSouth works the disconnect order. This is because all the switches in the BellSouth network other than the host switch are updated via routing data that is delivered to each of BellSouth's Service Control Point ("SCP") databases. These routing messages are delivered by a system known as LSMS, which is operated by and under the control of BellSouth. Thus, the end user has the full ability to make and receive telephone calls on ported numbers involving a trigger as soon as the LSMS message is sent to all SCPs, even though BellSouth has not yet disconnected the customer from its translations in the BellSouth host switch.

However, as it currently exists, Performance Measure P-13 does not recognize the importance of triggers and their effect on the LNP process. Rather, the current measure calculates the end time of the LNP activity as the processing of the actual disconnect order in the host switch, even though, from a customer's perspective, this activity is totally meaningless. It is the activation of the LNP and the routing function accomplished by the LSMS that ultimately determines whether the end user is back in full service and is able to make and receive calls when a trigger is used in porting a telephone number.

Technical limitations in some switches prevent triggers from being created for some classes of service, most of which involve more complex services. In these cases, all of the switches in BellSouth's network are updated via messages to the SCPs, except for the home switch. In the case of the home switch, the customer's ability to receive calls from other customers served by his or her home switch is dependent on the processing of the disconnect order after receipt of the number ported message from the NPAC database. However, the timeliness of the disconnect is not under BellSouth's control. For example, the CLEC may begin

the porting process for a customer without notifying BellSouth or conduct the porting process after hours, which is specifically addressed in P-13C, *LNP- Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval and Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution (Non-Trigger)*. In either case, the porting process may begin and end without BellSouth becoming aware of the need to complete the disconnect order in the home switch, making it impossible for BellSouth to meet the time frames established in the original P-13, *LNP-Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval and Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution*.

16. B-4 Usage Data Delivery Completeness; B-5 Usage Data Delivery Timeliness; B-6 Mean Time to Deliver Usage. BellSouth proposes that benchmarks be adopted for these three billing measures, rather than retail analogs. While all three of these measures attempt to compare BellSouth's performance for delivery of usage data for itself to delivery of usage data for CLECs, completely different processes are used, which makes a valid comparison impossible. Specifically, BellSouth obtains usage data from CMDS files, which is created in a fundamentally different manner than ODUF and ADUF, from which CLECs obtain usage data. The inappropriateness of a retail analog is underscored by the significant difference in usage volumes being delivered. For example, in July 2001, BellSouth delivered 40,304 billing messages for its retail units; this compares with more than 220 million billing messages BellSouth delivered for the CLECs.

Under these circumstances, the use of benchmarks is more appropriate for these billing measures. This is consistent with the approach used in both New York and Texas. *See, e.g.,* SWB Performance Measurement Business Rules, Version 2.0, Measurement 19 (Daily usage Feed Timeliness); New York Performance Assurance Plan metrics and Corresponding Metric Guidelines, BI-1 (Timeliness of Daily Usage Feeds).

17. B-9 Percent Daily Usage Feed Errors Corrected in X Business Days; B-10 Percent Billing Mean Time to Deliver Usage. BellSouth proposes to add the measures *B-9 Percent Daily Usage Feed Errors Corrected in X Business Days*, and *B-10 Percent Billing Mean Time to Deliver Usage*, to the current set of Billing measurements in the SQMP. These measures have been implemented as a result of the Florida Public Service Commission’s Order in Docket No. 000121-TP (Final Order Requiring Performance Assessment Plan, Order No. PSC-01-1819-FOF-TP, issued September 10, 2002). The measures have also been included in the Georgia Public Service Commission’s November 14, 2002 order.

18. TGP-1 Trunk Group Performance – Aggregate; TGP-2 Trunk Group Performance – CLEC Specific. BellSouth proposes two changes to measures TGP-1, Trunk Group Performance - Aggregate and TGP-2, Trunk Group Performance - CLEC Specific.

First, BellSouth proposes a technical change to the retail analog, which currently refers to trunk blockage for “any two hour period in 24 hours.” BellSouth believes that the reference to a “two hour period” makes it clear that the subject interval is a consecutive two-hour period. However, to make this explicitly clear, BellSouth proposes to change the language to refer to “any two consecutive hour period in 24 hours.”

Second, the BellSouth affecting trunk categories should be modified to capture all of the trunk groups associated with local traffic that may experience blocking. Currently, the only “BellSouth affecting” trunk category reflected in these measures is category 9, which includes BellSouth End Office to BellSouth End Office trunks. BellSouth may also carry local traffic on trunks referenced in categories, 1, 10, and 16, and these categories should also be included in the measure. Category 1 trunks are from BellSouth End Offices to BellSouth Access Tandems, Category 10 trunks from BellSouth End Offices to the BellSouth Local Tandem. Also, at present,

only to portion of the common trunk groups from a BellSouth Tandem to a BellSouth Tandem, Category 16, relating to the CLEC is counted in this measure. For consistency purposes, Category 16 trunk groups should be added to the list of “BellSouth affecting categories” as well.

19. BFR-1 Percentage of BFR/NBR Requests Processed Within 30 Business Days; BFR-1 Percentage of Quotes Provided for Authorized BFR/NBR Requests Processed Within X (10/30/60) Business Days BellSouth proposes to delete these two measures from the SQMP. A Bona Fide Request is a formal request by a CLEC for something outside of BellSouth’s normal services or processes, and these requests can range from simple to extremely complex. Thus, activity in this measurement would only result if BellSouth cannot satisfy the service requirements of a CLEC through its existing offerings. Consequently, there is very little activity generated for this measurement. For example, in Kentucky, for the months of August, September and October 2002, there were 8, 8, and 3 requests, respectively. From January through July 2002, there were a total of only 11 requests in Kentucky. Further, the CLECs have not indicated that a substantial increase in the number of Bona Fide Requests is expected in the future. In fact, as the number of UNEs has grown, the need for BFRs has declined. Therefore, this measure is unnecessary and BellSouth proposes to delete it.

III. SEEM PLAN CHANGES

BellSouth has proposed only a few changes to the SEEM plan that was approved by the Kentucky Public Service Commission on October 19, 2001. These changes include a number of clarifications to the Administrative Plan section of SEEMs and modification of the number of measurements included in Tier I and Tier II of the SEEM plan. BellSouth’s Exhibit 5 includes

the SEEM Administrative plan, the SEEMs Submetrics included in the Penalty Plan, the Statistical Properties and Definitions, the statistical Formulas and Technical Description, and the SEEM Remedy Calculation Procedures for Kentucky.

BellSouth has made a number of changes to the tables in Appendix B: SEEM Submetrics. In Appendix B, Table B-1: Tier I Submetrics, BellSouth has added Tier I penalties for three measures. These measures are, (1) P-13A, LNP-Percent Out of Service < 60 Minutes; P-13B; (2) Percent of Time BellSouth Applies the 10-digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date; and (3) P-13C, LNP-Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval & Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution (Non-Trigger). BellSouth believes that these are critical measures, for which penalties should be paid to the CLECs.

Also, in Appendix B, Table B-2: Tier II Submetrics, BellSouth has added the three LNP measures listed above and corrected the SEEMs disaggregation for P-11, Service Order Accuracy to reflect the SEEM disaggregation ordered by the Georgia Commission for the new Service Order Accuracy - Mechanized Process measurement. BellSouth has also added to Appendix B three Change Management Measurements: CM-6, Percent of Software Errors Corrected in X (10,30,45) Business Days; CM-7, Percent of Change Requests Accepted or Rejected Within 10 Days; and CM-11, Percent of Change Requests Implemented Within 60 Weeks of Prioritization.

Finally, BellSouth has restructured Tables B-1, Tier I Submetrics and B-2, Tier II Submetrics to match the SQMP disaggregation levels for SEEM payments for each measurement. These changes are actually a disaggregation clarification to both tables. Each table now lists each product disaggregation that comprises the SEEMs penalties.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, BellSouth requests that the Commission adopt BellSouth's proposed modifications to the SQMP and SEEM plan.

Respectfully submitted, this 16th day of December 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

DOROTHY J. CHAMBERS
601 W. Chestnut Street, Room 407
P. O. Box 32410
Louisville, KY 40232
(502) 582-8219

R. DOUGLAS LACKEY
J. PHILLIP CARVER
Suite 4300, BellSouth Center
675 W. Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30375
(404) 335-0710

COUNSEL FOR BELLSOUTH
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.