B. Test Results: TAG Functional Test (O&P-2)

1.0 Description

The objective of the Telecommunications Access Gateway (TAG) Functional Test (O&P-2) was to evaluate the functionality of BellSouth's ordering systems in processing Local Service Requests (LSRs) for Unbundled Network Element (UNE) services submitted via the TAG Client Application Program Interface (API).

2.0 Methodology

This section summarizes the test methodology.

2.1 Business Process Description

See Section V, "Ordering & Provisioning Overview" for a description of the BellSouth ordering process via TAG.

2.2 Scenarios

KCI generated and transmitted LSRs based on the 100 UNE scenarios outlined in the *Master Test Plan (MTP).* The *MTP* defined the TAG order scenarios to be tested in O&P-2, and outlined the specific products and services to be ordered as well as the applicable activity types. The scenarios defined requirements for the testing of different customer types (business and residential), migration activity (partial and full migration)[1], and Flow-Through[2] designations.

Please refer to Section V, Tables V-2.2 and V-2.3 for a list of the UNE scenarios developed for this test.

2.3 Test Targets & Measures

The test target was BellSouth's UNE ordering process for LSRs submitted via the TAG interface. Sub-processes, functions, and evaluation criteria are summarized in Table V-2.1: Test Target Cross-Reference. The last column "Test Cross-Reference" indicates where the particular measures are addressed in section 3.1 "Results & Analysis."

---

[1] A CLEC requests a partial migration for a multi-line customer retaining at least one line with BellSouth. A CLEC requests a full migration to convert all of a customer's lines to a new service provider.

[2] For electronically submitted LSRs, a Flow-Through service request proceeds through BellSouth's OSS to generate an FOC without manual intervention. A Non-Flow-Through service request falls out for manual handling prior to generation of an FOC.

Table V-2.1: Test Target Cross-Reference

Sub-Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Cross-Reference
Submit an Order	Send order in LSR format	Presence of Functionality	O&P-2-1-1; O&P-2-2-1; O&P-2-2-2
	Receive acknowledgment	Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-1
	Receive FOC / error / reject notification	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-1; O&P-2-4-2; O&P-2-4-3
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-1; O&P-2-4-2
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-2a; O&P-2-3-2b; O&P-2-3-3a; O&P-2-3-3b
	Send expedited order transaction	Presence of Functionality	O&P-2-1-1; O&P-2-2-1; O&P-2-2-2
Submit an Error	Send error in LSR format	Presence of Functionality	O&P-2-1-1; O&P-2-2-1; O&P-2-2-2
	Receive acknowledgement	Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-1
	Receive planned error / reject notification	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-2
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-2
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-2a; O&P-2-3-2b
	Correct error(s)	Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-2
	Re-send order	Presence of Functionality	O&P-2-1-1; O&P-2-2-1; O&P-2-2-2
	Receive FOC	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-1; O&P-2-4-3
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-1
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-3a; O&P-2-3-3b
Supplement an Order	Send supplement	Presence of Functionality	O&P-2-1-1; O&P-2-2-1; O&P-2-2-2
	Receive acknowledgment	Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-1
	Receive FOC / error / reject notification	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-1; O&P-2-4-2; O&P-2-4-3
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-1; O&P-2-4-2
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-2a; O&P-2-3-2b; O&P-2-3-3a; O&P-2-3-3b
	Correct error(s)	Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-2
	Re-send supplement	Presence of Functionality	O&P-2-1-1; O&P-2-2-1; O&P-2-2-2
	Receive FOC	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-1; O&P-2-4-3

Sub-Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Cross-Reference
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-1
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-3a; O&P-2-3-3b
Pre-Order / Order Integration	Populate integration orders with information returned from designated pre-order response	Clarity of Information	O&P-2-5-1; O&P-2-5-2; O&P-2-5-3; O&P-2-5-4; O&P-2-5-5; O&P-2-5-6; O&P-2-5-7
	Submit integration orders	Presence of Functionality	O&P-2-1-1; O&P-2-2-1; O&P-2-2-2
	Receive acknowledgment	Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-1
	Receive error / reject notification	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-2
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-2
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-2a; O&P-2-3-2b
	Correct error(s)	Clarity of information	O&P-2-4-2
	Re-send integration order	Presence of functionality	O&P-2-1-1; O&P-2-2-1; O&P-2-2-2
	Receive FOC	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-1; O&P-2-4-3
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-1
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-3a; O&P-2-3-3b
Receive Completion Notice (CN)	Receive CN transaction	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-4
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-4
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-4
Receive Jeopardy Notification	Receive jeopardy notification and missed appointment notification transaction	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-5; O&P-2-4-6
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-5; O&P-2-4-6
		Timeliness of Response	O&P-2-3-5; O&P-2-3-6
Check Service Order Status	Check service order status	Accuracy of Response	O&P-2-4-7
		Clarity of Information	O&P-2-4-7

2.4 Data Sources

The data collected for the test are summarized in the table below.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.2: Data Sources for TAG Functional Test

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Local Exchange Ordering (LEO) Implementation Guide, Volume 1. Issues 7J, 7K, 7L, 7M, 7N, 7O, and 7P	No Electronic Copy	O&P-2-B-1	BLS
LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 2. Issue 6B, July 99	No Electronic Copy	O&P-2-B-2	BLS
LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 3. Issue 3A, August 98	No Electronic Copy	O&P-2-B-3	BLS
Product and Services Interval Guide	No Electronic Copy	O&P-2-B-4	BLS
Local Service Request Error Messages (Version TCIF 7)	O&P_errors.pdf	O&P-2-A-4	BLS
CLEC Service Order Tracking System (CSOTS) *Users Guide*	O&P_csots.pdf	O&P-2-A-1	BLS
Local Number Portability (LNP) Ordering Guide (Issue 1b-October 1999)	O&P_LNPgd.pdf	O&P-2-A-3	BLS
Facility-Based Activation Requirements	No Electronic Copy	O&P-2-B-5	BLS
Telecommunications Access Gateway (TAG) API Reference Guide (Versions 2.2.0.4, 2.2.0.5, and 2.2.0.7)	No Electronic Copy	O&P-2-B-6	BLS
TAG Programmers Job Aid (Version 5.1)	O&P_TAGjobaid.pdf	O&P-2-A-2	BLS
Miscellaneous Account Numbers provided by BLS	O&P_MANs.doc Hard Copies	O&P-2-A-5	BLS
KCI Company Codes and Billing Account Numbers	O&P_OCN.xls	O&P-2-A-6	BLS
TAG Interface Testing Agreement – LNP	O&P_TAGvlaid.doc	O&P-2-A-7	BLS
Cable Pair Assignments	O&P_cablepair.xls	O&P-2-A-9	BLS
Initial State Customer Service Records (CSRs)	O&P_PreCSR.mdb	O&P-2-A-10	BLS
Post-Order Activity CSRs	O&P_PostCSR.mdb	O&P-2-A-11	BLS
CLEC information for LNP orders (Proprietary)	O&P_CLECLNP.xls	O&P-2-A-12	CLECs
Pending Order Status Job Aid	O&P_Pendingstat.pdf	O&P-2-A-13	BLS
Additional Test Bed Addresses	O&P_newad.doc	O&P-2-A-14	BLS
O&P Test Bed Specifications	O&P_Testbed_specs.x	O&P-2-A-15	KCI

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
	ls		
LNP Test Bed Specifications	O&P_LNPTestbed_specs.xls	O&P-2-A-16	KCI
Test Case Master	O&P_Testcasemaster.xls	O&P-2-A-17	KCI
Order Transaction Submission Schedule	O&P_editagsced.xls	O&P-2-A-18	KCI
KCI Help Desk Log	O&P_HelpDesklog.xls	O&P-2-A-19	KCI
KCI Issues Log	O&P_TestIssues.xls	O&P-2-A-20	KCI
Pre-Order / Order Integration Log	O&P_integration.xls	O&P-2-A-21	KCI
TAG System Availability Logs	O&P_TAGsystem.mdb	O&P-2-A-23	HP
Expected Results Analysis - TAG	O&P_TAGExpected	O&P-2-A-24	KCI

2.4.1 *Data Generation/Volumes*

Data for this test was generated through order transaction submission via TAG. The number of transactions submitted during functional testing was determined based on the number of different requisition and activity (REQ ACT) type combinations available to CLECs via the TAG interface.

This test is a feature / function test and did not rely on volume testing.

2.5 Evaluation Methods

To allow for service request submission, BellSouth provided KCI with test bed accounts[3] that were provisioned according to KCI's specifications. Test cases and instances, correlating to Local Service Requests (LSRs), were developed using test bed accounts, pre-order data, and BellSouth ordering documentation, which included the *Local Exchange Ordering Guide (LEO Guide), Volume 1.*

Transactions (LSRs) were submitted and the results logged and compared to expected results, based on our knowledge of the ordering and provisioning system functionality and business processes. These processes are outlined in Section V, "Ordering & Provisioning Overview."

TAG orders were submitted as both stand-alone transactions and as integrated pre-order / order transactions[4].

[3] See Section V, "Ordering & Provisioning Overview" for a detailed description of the Ordering and Provisioning test bed.

[4] See Section V, "Ordering & Provisioning Overview" for a description of the Pre-Order / Order Integration Sub-Test.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

2.6 Analysis Methods

The TAG Functional Test included a checklist of evaluation criteria developed by KCI during the initial phase of the BellSouth - Georgia OSS Evaluation. These evaluation criteria provided the framework of norms, standards, and guidelines for the TAG Functional Test.

The Georgia Public Service Commission (GPSC) voted on June 6, 2000 to approve a set of Service Quality Measurement- (SQM-) related measures and standards to be used for purposes of this evaluation[5]. In many cases, results in this section were calculated based on KCI/HP time stamps, which may differ significantly from the BellSouth time measurement points reported in the SQMs. For those evaluation criteria that do not map to the GPSC-approved measures, or where BellSouth does not specify and publish a standard business interval for a given procedure, KCI applied its own standard, based on our professional judgment.

For quantitative evaluation criteria where the test result did not meet or exceed the established standard or KCI benchmark, KCI conducted a review to determine whether the differential was statistically significant.

3.0 Results Summary

This section identifies the evaluation criteria and test results.

3.1 Results & Analysis

The results of this test are presented in the table below. Definitions of evaluation criteria, possible results, and exceptions are provided in Section II.

Table V-2.3: Evaluation Criteria and Results

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
Interface Availability			
O&P-2-1-1	TAG order transaction capability is consistently available	Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard is 99.5% system availability during scheduled hours of operation[6].

[5] On January 16, 2001, the GPSC issued an order requiring BellSouth to report for business purposes a set of measures that differs in some cases from the requirements of the June 6, 2000 test standards.

[6] Regular scheduled hours of availability for the TAG interface are published on the BellSouth Interconnection Web site (www.interconnection.bellsouth.com/oss/oss_hour.html). Notices of specific scheduled system downtime (e.g., for a new system release or fix) are communicated through Carrier Notifications posted on the BellSouth Web site.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	during scheduled hours of operation.		During the course of this test, Hewlett Packard attempted to maintain a constant connection to BLS's TAG interface by implementing regular system 'pinging.'[7] Based on an analysis of HP's TAG system availability logs between 2/15/00 and 7/27/00[8], KCI observed that the TAG interface was available during 99.5% of scheduled hours of availability.
System Functionality			
O&P-2-2-1	The TAG interface provides expected system responses.	Not Satisfied	The KCI standard is 99% of expected system or representative responses received. Of the 756[9] order transactions submitted during the initial Functional Evaluation, 100% received responses (Functional Acknowledgements, subsequent errors or confirmations, and expected completion notifications) from BLS. During initial testing, some electronically submitted LSRs received responses via facsimile[10]. According to BLS, these faxes were generated as a result of BLS ordering representative error in failing to populate one of several particular data elements within the BLS service order[11]. The missing internal field(s) precluded an electronic response from being generated. On January 15, 2000, BLS implemented a system enhancement to ensure that

[7] KCI could not conclusively determine the root source (BellSouth or CLEC) for all recorded downtime.

[8] HP maintained detailed logs of system availability beginning on 2/15/00. Comprehensive system availability data for the test period prior to this date is unavailable.

[9] This number does not include those transactions receiving interface errors (i.e., those that did not reach BellSouth back-end systems).

[10] Less than one percent of total transactions were received via Fax.

[11] Particular fields include: AECN (on UNE orders); sales code beginning with "YAXQ"; PON; MAN (UNE orders); RESH (Resale orders); and RMKR.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			FOCs and CNs are electronically generated even when an ordering representative fails to enter one of these data elements. Following this system enhancement, KCI did not observe any additional occurrences of missing electronic FOC or CN responses that were attributable to BLS representatives during initial functional testing. See Exception 9 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 9 to the GPSC. KCI initiated a functional re-test on 8/25/00[12]. During this re-test, KCI failed to receive Completion Notices (CNs) on 16% of transactions for which a CN was expected. For some of these orders, BLS indicated that they were mistakenly canceled by BLS service representatives[13]. See Exception 118 for additional information on this issue. As no subsequent re-testing activities are planned, KCI has recommended closure of Exception 118 to the GPSC.

[12] This re-test was initiated to address deficiencies identified in other evaluation criteria; however, results were monitored across all relevant evaluation criteria.

[13] According to BellSouth, some of these orders fell into error status following confirmation (for billing- and directory listing-related errors). A BellSouth Error Resolution Group, charged with working orders in this error status, mistakenly viewed the KCI Company Codes as belonging to internal BellSouth test orders and cancelled them out of the system. Additional orders were affected by other service rep errors or cancellations.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-2-2	BLS systems and representatives provide required order functionality[14].	Satisfied	BLS systems and representatives provided the required order functionality for most transaction types evaluated (see Section V, Tables V-2.2 and V-2.3). However, the following deficiencies in UNE ordering functionality have been observed[15]: — Loop service with directory listing requests require two separate LSRs. BLS has indicated that system modifications to allow loop and directory changes on a single service order are not operationally feasible. To relate the due dates of the two orders, BLS advised CLECs to submit the DL request after the related Loop request has received confirmation, using the Due Date provided on the Loop confirmation as the Desired Due Date for the DL request. KCI submitted a set of Loop Service orders with DL orders to re-test this process. KCI received Firm Order Confirmations on all separate service requests for Loop Service and DL, indicating that BLS ordering systems successfully processed the requests. In addition, KCI experienced no significant problem with obtaining the same confirmed Due Date for

[14] A number of ordering scenarios outlined in the Master Test Plan are not electronically orderable via BellSouth TCIF 7 interfaces. BellSouth does not allow stand-alone UNE Loop partial migrations or various types of "UNE-to-UNE migrations", converting a CLEC customer from one service delivery platform (e.g., UNE Loop-Port Combination) to another delivery method (e.g., UNE Loop). KCI has issued Exception 39 (UNE Loop partial migration) and Exception 54 (UNE-to-UNE migration) to address these issues. BellSouth has submitted requests via the Change Control Process to introduce this ordering functionality into its OSS '99 (TCIF 9) interface release. KCI is closing these exceptions due to the fact that they are not electronically orderable in TCIF 7. Pursuant to the Georgia Public Service Commission's Order, KCI is evaluating the electronically-orderable services in TCIF 7. KCI will not be testing Issue 9 electronic ordering interfaces in Georgia.

[15] All deficiencies referenced in this criterion have been addressed and successfully re-tested. The related exceptions are closed.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			DL service as the Due Date received on corresponding Loop Service requests. See Exception 31 for additional information on this issue. Exception 31 is closed[16]. – On three UNE Loop migration service requests, BLS ordering representatives incorrectly processed the service order, resulting in the disconnection of the customer's retail service without reconnection of the UNE component. BLS instituted a system edit to prohibit service representatives from improperly coordinating BLS internal service order activity. Following implementation of this system edit, no further instances of inappropriate disconnection activity were noted during initial testing. In addition, KCI executed re-test transactions designed to evaluate this BLS edit. KCI monitored subsequent responses to Loop migration service requests in error status and observed no instances of improper service disconnection. See Exception 22 for additional information on this issue. Exception 22 is closed. – A BLS defect preventing coordinated hot cuts without specified frame due times was identified for non-designed (SL1) loops. BLS implemented a system fix with TAG Version 2.2.0.7 to resolve this issue. KCI

[16] KCI recommended closure of Exception 31 based on the presence of adequate LS and DL ordering functionality. While BellSouth electronic ordering systems do not have the ability to handle Loop Service with DL orders on a *single* LSR, the basic functionality to process these orders does exist. KCI believes that the additional effort required of CLECs to develop two distinct service requests and to coordinate their Due Dates is not a significant impediment to timely execution of these order types.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			successfully re-tested this service request type. See Exception 40 for additional information on this issue. Exception 40 is closed. – A BLS defect preventing the electronic processing of Loop-Port Combination partial migrations was identified. BLS implemented a system fix on 01/17/00 to correct this deficiency. Subsequent re-testing of this order type indicated partial migrations are successfully supported. See Exception 4 for additional information on this issue. Exception 4 is closed. – A BLS systems defect preventing the migration of a customer's Billing Telephone Number (BTN) during a partial migration to UNE Loop-Port Combinations was identified. BLS implemented a system fix to address this issue on 4/29/00. KCI successfully re-tested BTN migrations on 5/30/00. See Exception 51 for additional information on this issue. Exception 51 is closed. – TAG does not support a blank space in a data element. This defect prevents a two-word entry in the billing address fields. BLS indicates that this issue has been resolved with the release of the OSS '99 version of TAG. KCI did not test OSS '99.
Timeliness of Response			
O&P-2-3-1	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs)[17].	Satisfied	The KCI standard is 95% of FAs received within 30 minutes. LSRs submitted for functional testing received FAs within the following timeframe: 100% of 753 FAs were

[17] BellSouth documentation does not provide any information on the expected interval for return of an FA.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			received in less than 30 minutes.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-3-2a	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Fully Mechanized (FM)order errors (Fatal Rejects and Auto Clarifications).	Satisfied [18]	The GPSC-approved standard for fully mechanized (FM) errors is 97% received within one hour[19]. LSRs submitted during the entire period of initial functional testing received FM errors within the following timeframes [20] (See Table V-2.5): – 93% of FM errors were received in less than one hour. KCI initiated an initial re-test of error response timeliness on August 25, 2000. This re-test was designed to evaluate the effects of process improvements implemented in BLS ordering centers. LSRs submitted during the first re-test received FM errors within the following timeframes (See Table V-2.6): — 67% of FM errors were received in less than one hour. An additional 13% were received within 1-2 hours. KCI initiated a second re-test on January 19, 2001 to evaluate FM EDI error timeliness. LSRs submitted during this second re-test received FM errors within the following timeframes (See Table V-2.7): — 94% of FM errors were received in less than one hour. An additional 3% were received within 2 hours. See Exception 77 for additional information on this issue. The issues in Exception 77 that relate to this criterion are resolved.

[18] Although the test percentage is below the benchmark of 97%, the statistical evidence is not strong enough to conclude that the performance is below the benchmark with 95% confidence. In other words, the inherent variation in the process is large enough to have produced the substandard result, even with a process that is operating above the benchmark standard. The p-value, which indicates the chance of observing this result when the benchmark is being met, is 0.1297, above the 0.0500 cutoff for a statistical conclusion of failure.

[19] Results are based on the actual Flow-Through status of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a clarification was fully mechanized (FM) or partially / non-mechanized (PM) by analyzing BellSouth

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-3-2b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Partially Mechanized (PM) order clarifications (CLRs).	Satisfied[21]	The GPSC-approved standard for partially mechanized (PM) CLRs is 85% received within 24 hours[19]. LSRs submitted during initial functional testing received PM CLRs within the following timeframes[20] (See Table V-2.5): – 60% of PM errors were received in less than 24 hours. An additional 33% were received within 24-48 hours. KCI initiated a re-test of error response timeliness on August 25, 2000. This re-test was designed to evaluate the effects of process improvements implemented in BLS ordering centers. LSRs submitted during re-testing received PM CLRs within the following timeframes (See Table V-2.6): — 82% of PM errors were received in less than 24 hours. An additional 8% were received within 48 hours. See Exception 98 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 98 to the GPSC.

back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FM / PM classification. During initial testing, KCI was unable to obtain actual FM / PM classifications on a number of Local Number Portability (LNP) service requests. Responses to 12% of these non-categorized service requests were received within one hour, and 75% were received within 24 hours. During re-testing, KCI was unable to obtain actual FM / PM classifications on a number of LNP and non-LNP orders. Of the 42 orders without a FM or PM classification, 71% were received within 24 hours.

[20] On 2 / 7 / 00, BellSouth completed a systems and process fix to address timeliness of response issues. This set of results is provided for the testing period beginning after the fix implementation. For the testing period beginning after the fix implementation, 93% of FM errors were received in less than one hour and 67% of PM errors were received in less than 24 hours.

[21] Although the test percentage is below the benchmark of 85%, the statistical evidence is not strong enough to conclude that the performance is below the benchmark with 95% confidence. In other words, the inherent variation in the process is large enough to have produced the substandard result, even with a process that is operating above the benchmark standard. The p-value, which indicates the chance of

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-3-3a	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Flow-Through (FT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) .	Not Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for Flow-Through (FT) FOCs is 95% received within three hours[22]. LSRs submitted during the entire period of initial functional testing received FT FOCs within the following timeframes [23] [24] (See TableV-2.8): – 92% of FOCs were received in less than three hours for FT LSRs. KCI initiated a re-test of FOC response timeliness on August 25, 2000. LSRs submitted during the first re-test received FT FOCs within the following timeframes (See Table V-2.9): — 56% of FOCs were received in less than three hours for FT LSRs. An additional 37% were received within 24 hours. KCI initiated a second re-test of FT FOC response timeliness on January 19, 2001. LSRs submitted during the second re-test received FT FOCs within the following timeframes (See Table V-2.10): — 84% of FOCs were received in less than three hours for FT LSRs. An additional 11% were received within 24 hours. See Exception 78 for additional information on this issue. As no subsequent re-test activities are planned, KCI has recommended closure of Exception 78 to the GPSC.

observing this result when the benchmark is being met, is 0.2643, above the 0.0500 cutoff for a statistical conclusion of failure.

[22] Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow-Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FM / PM classification. During initial testing, KCI was unable to obtain actual FT / NFT classifications on a number of Local Number Portability (LNP) service requests. Responses to 8% of these non-categorized service requests were received within three hours, and 87% were received within 36 hours.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-3-3b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Non-Flow-Through (NFT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).	Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for Non-Flow-Through (NFT) FOCs is 85% received within 36 hours. LSRs submitted during the entire period of initial functional testing received NFT FOCs within the following timeframes[22] [23] [24] (See TableV-2.8): – 79% of FOCs were received in less than 36 hours for NFT LSRs. An additional 14% were received within 36-48 hours. KCI initiated a re-test of FOC response timeliness on August 25, 2000. LSRs submitted during re-testing received NFT FOCs within the following timeframes (See Table V-2.9): — 92% of FOCs were received in less than 36 hours for NFT LSRs. An additional 3% were received within 48 hours. See Exception 97 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 97 to the GPSC.

During re-testing, KCI was unable to obtain actual FT/NFT classifications on a number of LNP and non-LNP service requests. Of the 35 FOC responses not classified, 20% were received within three hours and 86% were received within 36 hours.

[23] Beginning with the February Flow-Through Report, BellSouth no longer categorized as Flow-Through those service requests which proceeded through BellSouth electronic ordering systems to the Service Order Communication System (SOCS) and fell out for manual handling after failing a SOCs edit. Previously categorized as FT, these service request types are now defined by BellSouth to be NFT due to the required manual intervals. As a result of BellSouth Flow-Through calculation modifications, some FT FOCs previously categorized as "late" would be considered NFT if submitted in the future. FOC response timeliness re-testing activity (initiated on August 25, 2000) occurred after this FT definition change was implemented. As a result, evaluation of re-test FOC timeliness is performed based on consistent classification of FT or NFT categories.

[24] On 2/7/00, BellSouth completed a systems and process fix to address timeliness of response issues. The results are from the period beginning after the fix implementation. For the testing period beginning after the fix implementation, 97.5% of FOCs were received in less than three hours for FT LSRs and 83% of FOCs were received in less than 36 hours for NFT LSRs.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-3-4	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Completion Notifications (CNs) within agreed upon standard intervals.	No Result Determination Made[25]	BLS delivers CNs upon the conclusion of "field provisioning"[26] activities as well as all subsequent downstream (listing and billing) provisioning activities[27]. Within the CN, BLS provides the field provisioning completion date (located in the 'DD' field). BLS does not offer a guideline for the standard interval between field and billing completion activities. LSRs submitted for initial functional testing received CNs within the following timeframes (See Table V-2.11): • 89% of CNs were received within one business day after the field provisioning completion date. • 2% were received within two business days after field provisioning completion. • 5% were received within three-to-five days after field provisioning completion. • The remaining 4% of CNs were received within six or more days following field provisioning completion.

[25] KCI is unable to provide an evaluation result for this criterion and provides the test results as diagnostic information only. Although the GPSC Service Quality Measurement (SQM), 'Average Completion Notice Interval' is related to CN delivery and has an associated standard of "Parity with Retail," KCI is unable to accurately compare its functional transaction results to this SQM within a reasonable degree of accuracy. BLS calculates this metric using the following data points: 1)Completion date and time (as entered by a BLS field technician for dispatched orders or 5pm on the due date for non-dispatched orders); and 2) Date and time of conclusion of all downstream (listing, billing, and - for LNP orders - TN porting) activities. Within the CN response file delivered to CLECs, BLS provides the work completion date (but not the time); BLS does not provide a date / time stamp associated with downstream provisioning completion. While the CN Timeliness results calculated using CLEC data measurement points (and presented in the comment section of this criterion) provide a reasonable representation of the time between receipt of a CN and completion of field provisioning activities, the differences between KCI and BLS calculation points is large enough to prevent an accurate assignment of a Satisfied / Not Satisfied result relative to the SQM standard.

[26] The "field provisioning" date is defined as the date on which actual service completion occurred.

[27] For Local Number Portability (LNP) orders, BellSouth returns CNs following all provisioning activities and after the CLEC completes the porting of associated Telephone Numbers with the Number Portability Administration Center (NPAC).

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			KCI initiated a re-test of CN response timeliness on August 25, 2000. LSRs submitted during re-testing received CNs within the following timeframes (See Table V-2.12): • 89% of CNs were received within one business day after the field provisioning completion date. • 5% were received within two business days after field provisioning completion. • 5% were received within three-to-five business days after field provisioning completion. • The remaining 1% of CNs were received six or more days following field provisioning completion. See Exception 26 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 26 to the GPSC.
O&P-2-3-5	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Jeopardy Notifications.	Satisfied	The BLS proposed standard is 95% of Jeopardy Notifications received at least 48 hours before the confirmed Due Date (DD). Of the 5 Jeopardy Notifications received via TAG, BLS has returned 100% at least 48 hours before the FOC DD. See Table V-2.15 for additional detail.
O&P-2-3-6	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Missed Appointment (MA) notifications.	Satisfied	The KCI standard is 95% of MA notifications received within one business day after the latest confirmed Due Date (DD). Of the 15 MAs received via TAG, BLS has returned 100% (15 / 15) within 1 business day after the DD. See Exception 67 for additional information on this issue[28]. Exception 67 is closed.

[28] KCI drafted Exception 67 to address late MA notifications received. Upon further investigation, the majority of responses initially categorized as 'late' were determined to be 'on-time.' For a number of

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
Accuracy of Response			
O&P-2-4-1	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs)	Satisfied	A sample of FOCs was examined for clarity, accuracy, and completeness relative to the BLS Business Rules (*LEO Guide, Volume 1*)[29]. A number of FOCs were received in response to invalid service requests. For these orders, KCI expected to receive error messages. KCI initiated a re-test on 9/25/00 to monitor the accuracy of FOC responses. KCI determined that 99% of FOCs received during re-test activities were accurate response types (i.e., received in response to valid LSRs). See Exception 95 for additional information on this issue. The issues in Exception 95 that relate to this criterion are resolved. During KCI's initial review of FOC completeness, KCI observed a number of discrepancies between BLS-documented data requirements and actual data returned on FOC responses. For example, Frame Due Time (FDT) and Circuit ID (ECCKT) were listed as required fields but were not populated on all responses. In addition, CHAN/PAIR was populated when it was not an applicable field according to *BellSouth Business Rules*. KCI issued Exception 68 to address these response completeness issues. To address these issues, BLS published an updated version of *LEO Guide*, Volume I on August 28, 2000 to

PONs, due date modifications were initiated by CLEC representatives during conversations with BellSouth UNE-Center personnel. New FOCs (containing the new Due Dates) are not transmitted in these cases. As a result, KCI initially compared the original FOC DD with the MA receipt time. The MA receipt times were subsequently compared to the modified Due Dates. In all cases, the MAs were delivered in a timely manner relative to the new DD.

[29] KCI defined an accurate FOC as a correct response type relative to the LSR submitted (i.e., the FOC was received in response to a valid LSR) that contains: a) all expected data elements (fields); b) no unexpected data elements (fields); c) all required data values in the expected format; d) no prohibited values. Expected and prohibited values were developed based on the *LEO Guide, Volume 1.*

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			more accurately reflect FOC data requirements. This version (7S) did not adequately define usage requirements, by specific order types, for some response fields[30]. On 1/31/01, BLS issued a modified LEO Guide (Issue 7U) that included additional usage information for response transactions. Based on this updated documentation, KCI validated that all expected data fields were populated on FOC responses. See Exception 68 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 68 to the GPSC.
O&P-2-4-2	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete order rejects and clarifications (CLRs).	Not Satisfied	A sample of errors was examined for clarity, accuracy, and completeness relative to the *BellSouth Business Rules* (*LEO Guide, Volume 1*)[31]. A number of CLRs were received in response to valid service requests. BLS performed additional training of its ordering representatives to correct this problem. CLRs received following the implementation of rep training were found to be accurate[32]. However, KCI noted additional occurrences of inaccurate CLRs during re-test activities initiated on 9/25/00. Of the sample reviewed, approximately 7% of partially-mechanized CLRs (i.e., issued by BLS representatives) received during re-testing were found to be inaccurate. See Exception 47 for

[30] The following response fields have inadequate usage requirements: ORD, RORD, FDT, EBD, LOCBAN, BAN1, BAN2. For these fields, KCI was initially unable to determine what the "expected" results should be.

[31] KCI defined an accurate error as a correct response type relative to the LSR submitted (i.e., the ERR/CLR was received in response to an erred LSR) that contains: a) all expected data elements (fields); b) no unexpected data elements (fields); c) all required data values in the expected format; d) no prohibited data values.

[32] Three additional inaccuracies were observed, representing less than 5% of total partially-mechanized CLR responses reviewed following BellSouth rep training.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			additional information on this issue. As no subsequent re-testing activities are planned, KCI has recommended closure of Exception 47 to the GPSC. In addition, several error messages received in response to Local Number Portability (LNP) service requests did not contain clear and comprehensive error descriptions. These responses were populated with an error message stating "Other LNP Error." KCI contacted its BLS Customer Service Manager to obtain the detailed error message. BLS has opened a feature change request to prevent this message from being delivered on LNP responses. A target date for the implementation of this feature has not yet been established. This deficiency did not prevent KCI from continuing its ordering activity and was not significant enough to effect the overall evaluation. For some initial functional test transactions, a BLS representative generated a CLR in response to a Line Class of Service (LNE CLS SVC) entry on an LSR that had previously returned a system-generated FOC. BLS has proposed a feature enhancement within its internal change control process to ensure system-representative consistency in service request validation. BLS plans to implement this feature in its OSS'99 version of TAG. KCI is not testing OSS '99. See Exception 18 for additional information on this issue. Exception 18 is closed[33].

[33] KCI closed this exception based on the fact that BellSouth has updated its documentation to more clearly reflect the valid data entries in the LNE CLS SVC field, and because the BellSouth feature will not be implemented in TCIF 7. KCI is not testing the ordering functionality of the TCIF 9 release in Georgia.

[34] The following response fields have inadequate usage requirements: ORD, RORD, FDT, EBD, LOCBAN, BAN1, BAN2. For these fields, KCI was unable to determine what the "expected" results should be.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			During KCI's initial review of error completeness, the *Local Exchange Ordering (LEO)Implementation Guide*, Issue 7S did not adequately define usage requirements, by specific order types, for some response fields[34]. On 1/31/01, BLS issued a modified *LEO Guide* (Issue 7U) that included additional usage information for response transactions. Based on this updated documentation, KCI validated that all expected data fields were populated on error responses. See Exception 68 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 68 to the GPSC. This criterion has been assigned a Not Satisfied as a result of the inaccurate CLRs noted above.
O&P-2-4-3	Service order provisioning due dates (FOC DDs[35]) identified within BLS's order confirmation delivered through TAG are consistent with the CLEC's valid due date (LSR DDD[36]) request (i.e., a due date selected in accordance with the product's standard interval or acquired from a Calculate Due Date (CDD) pre-order	No Result Determination Made[37]	KCI obtained valid DDD information for population on an LSR from one of two sources: 1) BLS *Product and Services Interval Guide.* 2) A combination of pre-order queries. KCI performed a Calculate Due Date (CDD) query to determine the earliest possible due date for an order type. An Appointment Availability Query (AAQ) was then run to confirm that the appointment time was available in the necessary Central Office.

[35] FOC Due Date (DD) is defined as the due date provided in the FOC. It is the date on which BellSouth commits to complete provisioning of a customer's service.

[36] LSR Desired Due Date (LSR DDD) is defined as the due date requested in a customer's LSR.

[37] A Georgia Service Quality Measurement (SQM) addressing the correlation between confirmed due dates and requested due dates does not exist. In addition, BellSouth does not have an established commitment or guideline for the percentage of confirmed due dates that should equal the requested due date. In the absence of an SQM-related benchmark, a BellSouth-defined guideline, or general industry-approved standards or business rule thresholds that can be used for evaluation purposes, KCI provided the test results as diagnostic information only.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	query).		For LSRs submitted during initial testing and populated with a DDD obtained from BLS documentation[38]: – 88% of DDs were equal to the LSR DDD. – 3% of DDs were earlier than the LSR DDD. – 9% of DDs were later than the LSR DDD. For LSRs submitted during initial testing and populated with a DDD obtained from electronic pre-order queries[39], 100% of DDs were equal to the LSR DDD. BLS implemented training for Local Carrier Service Center (LCSC) representatives on 3/9/00 to prevent earlier DDs from being issued on manually handled service requests. Based on a review of FOCs received after 3/9/00, 9% of DDs were earlier than the requested DDD. KCI initiated a subsequent re-test of Due Date accuracy on August 25, 2000. For LSRs submitted during re-testing and populated with a DDD obtained from BLS documentation[40]: — 90% of DDs were equal to the LSR DDD. — 8% of DDs were later than the LSR DDD. — 2% of DDs were earlier than the LSR DDD. For LSRs submitted during re-testing and populated with a DDD obtained from electronic pre-order queries:

[38] Results are based on 239 LSRs submitted using BellSouth documentation to obtain input for the DDD field.

[39] Results are based on nine LSRs submitted using electronic pre-orders to obtain input for the DDD field.

[40] LSRs for which KCI requested an invalid DDD (i.e., earlier than the documented or pre-order-obtained standard interval) have been excluded from this analysis.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			— 95% of DDs were equal to the LSR DDD. — 5% of DDs were later than the LSR DDD. See Exception 38 and Tables V-2.13 and V-2.14 for additional details. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 38 to the GPSC.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-4-4	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Completion Notifications (CNs).	Satisfied	A sample of CNs was examined for clarity, accuracy, and completeness relative to the BLS Business Rules (*LEO Guide, Volume 1*)[41]. CNs were received in response to completed service requests. During KCI's initial review of CN completeness, KCI observed a number of discrepancies between BLS-documented data requirements and actual data returned on CN responses. For example, Frame Due Time (FDT) and Circuit ID (ECCKT) were listed as required fields but were not populated on all responses. In addition, CHAN / PAIR was populated when it was not an applicable field according to *BellSouth Business Rules*. KCI issued Exception 68 to identify these response completeness issues. To address these issues, BLS published an updated version of *LEO Guide, Volume I* on August 28, 2000 to more accurately reflect CN data requirements. This version (7S) did not adequately define usage requirements, by specific order types, for some response fields[42]. On 1 / 31 / 01, BLS issued a modified *LEO Guide* (Issue 7U) that included additional usage information for response transactions. Based on this updated documentation, KCI validated that all expected data fields were populated on CN responses. See Exception 68 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 68

[41] KCI defined an accurate CN as a correct response type relative to the LSR submitted (i.e., the CN was received in response to a completed LSR) that contains: a) all expected data elements (fields); b) no unexpected data elements (field); c) all required data values in the expected format; d) no prohibited data values. Expected and prohibited values were developed based on the *LEO Guide, Volume 1.*

[42] The following response fields have inadequate usage requirements: ORD, RORD, FDT, EBD, LOCBAN, BAN1, BAN2. For these fields, KCI was unable to determine what the "expected" results should be.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			to the GPSC.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-4-5	BLS systems and representatives return clear and complete Jeopardy Notifications[43].	Satisfied	BLS documentation available during initial testing did not adequately define the process for categorizing and delivering Jeopardy Notifications[44]. BLS updated its *Pending Order Status Job Aid* in a 6/12/00 release to clarify the Jeopardy Notification process. See Exception 72 for additional information on this issue. Exception 72 is closed. KCI reviewed a sample of Jeopardy responses for completeness relative to the *BellSouth Business Rules* (*LEO Guide, Volume 1*). During KCI's initial review of Jeopardy response completeness, the BLS Business Rules (Issue 7S) did not adequately define usage requirements, by specific order types, for some response fields[45]. On 1/31/01, BLS issued a modified *LEO Guide* (Issue 7U) that included additional usage information for response transactions. Based on this updated documentation, KCI validated that all expected data fields were populated on Jeopardy responses. See Exception 68 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 68 to the GPSC.

[43] Please see O&P-5 Results for additional information on Jeopardy Notification accuracy and completeness.

[44] For example, a response containing an indicator code of "Jeopardy" is not necessarily counted as a Jeopardy Notification in BellSouth Service Quality Measurement (SQM) calculations.

[45] The following response fields have inadequate usage requirements: ORD, RORD, FDT, EBD, LOCBAN, BAN1, BAN2. For these fields, KCI was unable to determine what the "expected" results should be.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-4-6	BLS systems provide clear, accurate, and complete Missed Appointment notifications.	Satisfied	BLS documentation available during initial testing did not adequately define the process for categorizing and delivering Missed Appointment Notifications[46]. BLS updated its *Pending Order Status Job Aid* in a 6/12/00 release to clarify the Missed Appointment notification process. See Exception 72 for additional information on this issue. Exception 72 is closed. KCI reviewed a sample of Missed Appointment responses for completeness relative to the *BellSouth Business Rules* (*LEO Guide, Volume 1*). During KCI's initial review of Missed Appointment response completeness, the *BellSouth Business Rules* (Issue 7S) did not adequately define usage requirements, by specific order types, for some response fields[47]. On 1/31/01, BLS issued a modified *LEO Guide* (Issue 7U) that included additional usage information for response transactions. Based on this updated documentation, KCI validated that all expected data fields were populated on Missed Appointment responses. See Exception 68 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 68 to the GPSC.

[46] For example, a response containing an indicator code of "Jeopardy" could be considered a Missed Appointment Notification.

[47] The following response fields have inadequate usage requirements: ORD, RORD, FDT, EBD, LOCBAN, BAN1, BAN2. For these fields, KCI was unable to determine what the "expected" results should be.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-4-7	BLS service order tracking systems (CSOTS) provide accurate LSR status.	Satisfied	KCI compared a sample of order status queries in CSOTS[48] to the order status in KCI's Order Management Tool (i.e., the most recent response file message received by KCI). Based on this sampling, CSOTS queries (Confirmed, Pending, or Completed) matched the responses received by KCI in most cases. During a functional re-test initiated on 8/25/00, KCI reviewed BLS's service order status accuracy. Based on re-test results, KCI noted four instances of Local Number Portability (LNP) service requests where the Completion Date provided on the CN response was later than the Completion Date identified within CSOTS. In addition, in response to one service request for an inside move, BLS delivered the CN response in advance of actual order completion[49]. In response to these issues, BLS opened a defect change request to populate LNP CNs with the date of actual completion. BLS opened an additional feature change to ensure that CNs are not sent until all applicable BLS service orders have been completed. A target date for implementation of these two releases has not yet been established. See Exception 125 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 125 to the GPSC. The deficiencies noted are not significant enough to affect the overall

[48] CSOTS provides the status of service requests once BellSouth has received Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs). The status of service requests in a pre-FOC state is not available via CSOTS.

[49] To perform customer moves, BellSouth generates two internal service orders. Although the customer's service request is not complete until the conclusion of both service orders, BellSouth delivered the CN response after completion of the first service order. The second service order completed several days later.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			evaluation.

Table V-2.4: Integration Test Evaluation Criteria and Results

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
Pre-order/Order Integration			
O&P-2-5-1	Information returned in response to pre-order System Availability Queries is compatible with requirements on corresponding orders.	Satisfied	Information transferred between fields received in response to Service Availability Queries and the three corresponding fields in the Order forms was inconsistent with respect to field name and format. To provide information on the relationship between pre-order responses and order fields, BellSouth plans to publish a "*Pre-Order to Firm Order Mapping Matrix*" on 3/30/01 (see Carrier Notification SN91082241 for additional information). While the names and formats of the pre-order and order fields did not agree, data content returned on the pre-order responses adequately fulfills order form input requirements. (See Table V-2.16)
O&P-2-5-2	Information returned in response to pre-order Appointment Availability Queries is compatible with requirements on corresponding orders.	Satisfied	Information transferred between fields received in response to Appointment Availability Queries and the two corresponding fields in the Order form was inconsistent with respect to field name and format. To provide information on the relationship between pre-order responses and order fields, BellSouth plans to publish a "*Pre-Order to Firm Order Mapping Matrix*" on 3/30/01 (see Carrier Notification SN91082241 for additional information). While the names and formats of the pre-order and order fields did not agree, data content returned on the pre-order responses adequately fulfills order form input requirements. (See

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			Table V-2.16)
O&P-2-5-3	Information returned in response to pre-order Calculate Due Date Queries is compatible with requirements on corresponding orders.	Satisfied	Information transferred between one field received in responses to Calculate Due Date queries and the two corresponding fields in the Order form was inconsistent with respect to field name and format. To provide information on the relationship between pre-order responses and order fields, BellSouth plans to publish a "*Pre-Order to Firm Order Mapping Matrix*" on 3/30/01 (see Carrier Notification SN91082241 for additional information). While the names and length of the pre-order and order fields did not agree, data content returned on the pre-order response adequately fulfills order form input requirements. (See Table V-2.16)
O&P-2-5-4	Information returned in response to pre-order Address Validation with Telephone Number Queries is compatible with requirements on corresponding orders.	Satisfied	Information transferred between the nine fields received in response to Address Validation Query by Telephone Number and six corresponding fields in the Order form was inconsistent with respect to field name, format and length. To provide information on the relationship between pre-order responses and order fields, BellSouth plans to publish a "*Pre-Order to Firm Order Mapping Matrix*" on 3/30/01 (see Carrier Notification SN91082241 for additional information). In addition to the field name and length inconsistencies, the data content returned on the pre-order response was inadequate to fulfill order form input requirements. For example, the length of the combined responses provided by the AVQ-TN (which must be concatenated prior to entry on the order form) may be greater then the length of the subsequent order field. While the documentation implies that potential address field length discrepancies could exist, KCI

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			did not experience any actual instances of pre-order response field lengths exceeding subsequent order field length requirements. BLS has opened a feature request to close the gap in the field size / length differences between pre-order and firm order requirements. An implementation date is currently being negotiated. (See Table V-2.16)
O&P-2-5-5	Information returned in response to pre-order Address Validation Queries is compatible with requirements on corresponding orders.	Satisfied	Information transferred between the nine fields received in response to Address Validation Queries and six corresponding fields in the Order form was inconsistent with respect to field name, format and length. To provide information on the relationship between pre-order responses and order fields, BellSouth plans to publish a "*Pre-Order to Firm Order Mapping Matrix*" on 3 / 30 / 01 (see Carrier Notification SN91082241 for additional information). In addition to the field name and length inconsistencies, the data content returned on the pre-order response was inadequate to fulfill order form input requirements. For example, the length of the combined responses provided by the AVQ-TN (which must be concatenated prior to entry on the order form) may be greater then the length of the subsequent order field. While the documentation implies that potential address field length discrepancies could exist, KCI did not experience any actual instances of pre-order response field lengths exceeding subsequent order field length requirements. BLS has opened a feature request to close the gap in the field size / length differences between pre-order and firm order requirements. An implementation date is currently being negotiated. (See Table V-2.16)

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
O&P-2-5-6	Information returned in response to pre-order Telephone Number Availability Queries is compatible with requirements on corresponding orders.	Satisfied	Information transferred between one field received in response to Telephone Number Availability Queries and one corresponding field in the Order form was consistent with respect to field name, format, and length. (See Table V-2.16)
O&P-2-5-7	Information returned in response to pre-order Telephone Number Selection Queries is compatible with requirements on corresponding orders.	Satisfied	Information transferred between one field received in response to Telephone Number Selection Queries and one corresponding field in the Order form was consistent with respect to field name, format, and length. (See Table V-2.16)

Table V-2.5, Part 1: Error/Clarification Timeliness, Summary View – Initial Test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail – Aggregate								
Fully Mechanized								
	<1 hr	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FM	98	2	0	3	1	2	0	0
% FM	93%	2%	0%	3%	1%	2%	0%	0%
Partially Mechanized								
					<24hrs	**24-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
PM					141	77	10	9
% PM					60%	33%	4%	4%

Table V-2.5, Part 2: Error/Clarification Timeliness, On/After 2/8/00 – Initial Test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail – On/After 2/8/2000								
Fully Mechanized								
	<1 hr	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FM	52	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
% FM	93%	4%	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%
Partially Mechanized								
					<24hrs	**24-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
PM					120	57	1	1
% PM					67%	32%	1%	1%

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.5, Part 3: Error/ Clarification Timeliness, Disaggregated View – Initial Test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail – Disaggregated View								
Fully Mechanized								
Service Type	**<1 hr**	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop-Design	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop-Design	96%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop-Non Design	27	0	0	3	0	1	0	0
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design	87%	0%	0%	10%	0%	3%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non-Design	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non Des.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Des.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
INP (Standalone)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
% INP (Standalone)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LNP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
% Switch Ports	92%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%
Loop-Port Combination	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Loop-Port Combination	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	**85**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**0**
	91%	**2%**	**0%**	**3%**	**1%**	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**
Partially Mechanized								
Service Type					**< 24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop-Design					17	15	0	1
% 2-wire Loop-Design					52%	45%	0%	3%
2-wire Loop-Non Design					36	14	1	1
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design					69.2%	26.9%	1.9%	1.9%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design					0	1	0	1
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design					0%	50%	0%	50%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non-Design					4	1	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non Des.					80%	20%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design					0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design					0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design					0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Des.					0%	0%	0%	0%
INP (Standalone)					2	1	0	0

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Clarification Timeliness Detail – Disaggregated View								
% INP (Standalone)					67%	33%	0%	0%
LNP (Standalone)					0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)					0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports					11	17	5	4
% Switch Ports					29.7%	45.9%	13.5%	10.8%
Loop-Port Combination					39	20	4	2
% Loop-Port Combination					60%	31%	6%	3%
TOTALS					**109**	**69**	**10**	**9**
					55%	**35%**	**5%**	**5%**

Notes:
(Notes apply to Table V-2.5, Parts 1, 2, and 3)

1. Initial test results include data from November 9, 1999 through May 31, 2000.
2. A fully mechanized (FM) response occurs when an electronically submitted LSR receives a clarification generated by BellSouth systems with no manual intervention. FM responses include Fatal Rejects and Auto Clarifications.
3. A partially mechanized (PM) response occurs when an electronically submitted LSR falls out for manual handling and receives a clarification generated by a BellSouth representative. PM responses include LCSC-issued Clarifications.
4. Results are based on the actual performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a clarification was fully mechanized or partially/non-mechanized by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team KCI also created an algorithm, based on BLS Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FM/PM classification.
5. On 2/7/00 BellSouth completed a systems and process fix to address timeliness of response issues. In addition to aggregate results for the entire test period, results for the period beginning after the implementation fix are also presented.
6. Timeliness information pertaining to the LNP service requests for which BellSouth was unable to provide actual FM/PM data is not included in the above table.
7. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
8. The disaggregated breakdown of ERR/CLR timeliness reflects the GPSC's disaggregation levels outlined in the June 6, 2000 – test-specific Service Quality Measurements.
9. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table V-2.6, Part 1: Error/Clarification Timeliness, Summary View – First Re-test Data

Error/Clarification Timeliness Detail								
Fully Mechanized								
	<1 hr	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FM	16	3	1	0	2	0	2	0
% FM	67%	13%	4%	0%	8%	0%	8%	0%
Partially Mechanized								
					<24hrs	**24-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
PM					84	8	4	6
% PM					82%	8%	4%	6%

Table V-2.6, Part 2: Error/Clarification Timeliness, Disaggregated View – First Re-test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail -- Disaggregated View								
Fully Mechanized								
Service Type	**<1 hr**	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop Design	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop -Design	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop -Non Design	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop -Non Design	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP - Design	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP - Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP - Non Design	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP - Non Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Design	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Non Design	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Non Design	0%	0%	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%	0%
INP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% INP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LNP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Switch Ports	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Loop Port Combination	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
% Loop Port Combination	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%
DL	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
% DL	63%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	16	3	1	0	2	0	2	0
	67%	13%	4%	0%	8%	0%	8%	0%

Partially Mechanized								
Service Type					<24 hrs	24-48 hrs	48-72 hrs	>72 hrs
2-wire Loop Design					26	1	1	0
% 2-wire Loop-Design					93%	4%	4%	0%
2-wire Loop-Non Design					29	2	0	2
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design					88%	6%	0%	6%
2-wire Loop w/ INP - Design					0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP - Design					0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP - Non Design					0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP - Non Design					0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Design					3	1	2	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Design					50%	17%	33%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Non Design					10	3	0	1
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Non Design					71%	21%	0%	7%
INP (Standalone)					0	0	0	0
% INP (Standalone)					0%	0%	0%	0%
LNP (Standalone)					0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)					0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports					5	0	0	2
% Switch Ports					71%	0%	0%	29%
Loop Port Combination					2	0	1	0
% Loop Port Combination					67%	0%	33%	0%
DL					9	1	0	1
% DL					82%	9%	0%	9%
TOTALS					84	8	4	6
					82%	8%	4%	6%

Notes:
(Notes apply to Table V-2.6, Parts 1, 2, and 3)

1. First re-test results reflect data from August 25 through November 15, 2000.
2. Results are based on actual Fully Mechanized (FM) and Partially Mechanized (PM) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a ERR/CLR was FM or PM by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FM.PM classification.
3. On 2/7/00 BellSouth completed a systems and process fix to address timeliness of response issues. In addition to aggregate results for the entire test period, results for the period beginning after the implementation fix are also presented.
4. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
5. The disaggregated breakdown of ERR/CLR timeliness reflects the GPSC's disaggregation levels outlined in the June 6, 2000 – test-specific Service Quality Measurements.
6. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table V-2.7, Part 1: Error/Clarification Timeliness, Summary View – Second Re-test Data

Error/Clarification Timeliness Detail								
Fully Mechanized								
	<1 hr	1-2 hrs	2-4 hrs	4-12 hrs	12-24 hrs	24-48 hrs	48-72 hrs	>72 hrs
FM	84	3	0	0	0	1	1	0
% FM	94%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%

Table V-2.7, Part 2: Error/Clarification Timeliness, Disaggregated View – Second Re-test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail -- Disaggregated View								
Fully Mechanized								
Service Type	**<1 hr**	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop Design	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% 2-wire Loop-Design	**100%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
2-wire Loop-Non Design	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design	**100%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Design	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Design	**50%**	**50%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Non Design	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Non Design	**80%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**10%**	**10%**	**0%**
Loop Port Combination	**61**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% Loop Port Combination	**97%**	**3%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
TOTALS	**84**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**
	94%	**3%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**1%**	**1%**	**0%**

Notes:
(Notes apply to Table V-2.7, Parts 1 and 2)

1. Second re-test results reflect data from January 19 through February 27, 2001.
2. Results are based on actual Fully Mechanized (FM) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a ERR/CLR was FM by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FM classification.
3. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
4. The disaggregated breakdown of ERR/CLR timeliness reflects the GPSC's disaggregation levels outlined in the June 6, 2000 – test-specific Service Quality Measurements.
5. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.8, Part 1: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Summary View – Initial Test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail - Aggregate						
Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FT	48	0	1	2	0	1
% FT	92%	0%	2%	4%	0%	2%
Non-Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
NFT	54	79	31	30	7	7
% NFT	26%	38%	15%	14%	3%	3%

Table V-2.8, Part 2: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, On/After 2/8/00 – Initial Test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail - On/After 2/8/00						
Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FT	39	0	0	1	0	0
% FT	98%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%
Non-Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
NFT	42	65	23	24	3	0
% NFT	27%	41%	15%	15%	2%	0%

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.8, Part 3: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Disaggregated View – Initial Test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – Disaggregated View						
Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop-Design	1	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop-Design	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop-Non Design	7	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non-Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non Des.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Des.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
INP (Standalone)	0	0	0	1	0	0
% INP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
LNP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports	7	0	1	1	0	1
% Switch Ports	70%	0%	10%	10%	0%	10%
Loop-Port Combination	21	0	0	0	0	0
% Loop-Port Combination	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	**36**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**
	92%	**0%**	**3%**	**3%**	**0%**	**3%**
Non-Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop-Design	6	11	7	3	0	0
% 2-wire Loop-Design	22%	41%	26%	11%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop-Non Design	7	13	2	6	1	1
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design	23%	43%	7%	20%	3%	3%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0	0	1	0	0	1
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non-Design	0	3	1	1	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non Des.	0%	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0	4	0	1	1	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0%	67%	0%	17%	17%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0	5	0	3	1	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0%	56%	0%	33%	11%	0%
INP (Standalone)	0	1	2	0	0	0
% INP (Standalone)	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – Disaggregated View						
LNP (Standalone)	1	1	0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports	8	14	10	9	1	2
% Switch Ports	18%	32%	23%	20%	2%	5%
Loop-Port Combination	21	18	6	7	2	2
% Loop-Port Combination	38%	32%	11%	13%	4%	4%
TOTALS	**43**	**70**	**29**	**30**	**6**	**6**
	23%	**38%**	**16%**	**16%**	**3%**	**3%**

Notes:
(Notes apply to Table V-2.8, Parts 1, 2, and 3)

1. Initial functional test results reflect data from November 9, 1999 through May 31, 2000.
2. Directory Listing disaggregation is provided as supplemental information, to maintain consistency in total counts between Part 1 and Part 2. This category is not required by the GPSC's requested levels of disaggregation.
3. Results are based on actual Fully-Mechanized (FM) and Partially Mechanized (PM) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FM or PM by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FM/PM classification. In addition, KCI placed all Fatal Reject responses (ERRs) within the FM category, in line with the BLS Service Quality Measurement (SQM) definitions.
4. 'Discrepancies' refer to those orders for which KCI was unable to obtain actual FM/PM classifications from BellSouth.
5. The disaggregated breakdown of FOC timeliness reflects the GPSC's disaggregation levels outlined in the June 6, 2000 – test-specific Service Quality Measurements.
6. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.9, Part 1: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Summary View – First Re-test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail						
Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FT	33	22	3	1	0	0
% FT	56%	37%	5%	2%	0%	0%
Non-Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
NFT	20	42	6	2	0	4
% NFT	27%	57%	8%	3%	0%	5%
Discrepancy						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Discrepancy	7	15	8	1	4	0
Discrepancy %	20%	43%	23%	3%	11%	0%

Table V-2.9, Part 2: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Disaggregated View – First Re-test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – Disaggregated View						
Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop -Design	0	3	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop -Design	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop -Non Design	11	4	1	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop -Non Design	69%	25%	6%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non-Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non Des.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0	5	0	1	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0%	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0	4	2	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Des.	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
INP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0
% INP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LNP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports	1	0	0	0	0	0
% Switch Ports	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Directory Listing	16	0	0	0	0	0
%Directory Listing	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – Disaggregated View						
Loop-Port Combination	6	6	0	0	0	0
% Loop-Port Combination	50%	50%	0	0	0%	0
TOTALS	**34**	**22**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**
	57%	**37%**	**5%**	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**
Non-Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop-Design	7	13	1	0	0	1
% 2-wire Loop-Design	32%	59%	5%	0%	0%	5%
2-wire Loop-Non Design	10	4	2	1	0	0
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design	59%	24%	12%	6%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non-Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non Des.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
INP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0
% INP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LNP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports	0	11	3	1	0	1
% Switch Ports	0%	69%	19%	6%	0%	6%
Directory Listings	3	4	0	0	0	0
% Directory Listings	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Loop-Port Combination	0	10	0	0	0	2
% Loop-Port Combination	0%	83%	0%	0%	0%	17%
TOTALS	**20**	**42**	**6**	**2**	**0**	**4**
	27%	**57%**	**8%**	**3%**	**0%**	**5%**
Discrepancy						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop-Design	3	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop-Design	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop-Non Design	2	0	0	0	2	0
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Design	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non-Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ INP – Non Des.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0	7	1	1	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Design	0%	78%	11%	11%	0%	0%
2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0	5	7	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP – Non-Design	0%	42%	58%	0%	0%	0%
INP (Standalone)	0	0	0	0	0	0

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – Disaggregated View						
% INP (Standalone)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LNP (Standalone)	0	2	0	0	0	0
% LNP (Standalone)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Switch Ports	0	1	0	0	0	0
% Switch Ports	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Directory Listings	2	0	0	0	0	0
% Directory Listings	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Loop-Port Combination	0	0	0	0	2	0
% Loop-Port Combination	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
TOTALS	**7**	**15**	**8**	**1**	**4**	**0**
	20%	**43%**	**23%**	**3%**	**11%**	**0%**

Notes:
(Notes apply to Table V-1.9, Part 1 and 2)

1. Initial re-test results reflect data from August 25, 2000 through November 15, 2000.
2. Directory Listing disaggregation is provided as supplemental information, to maintain consistency in total counts between Part 1 and Part 2. This category is not required by the GPSC's requested levels of disaggregation.
3. Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow-Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FT / NFT classification.
4. 'Discrepancies' refer to those orders for which KCI was unable to obtain actual FT / NFT classifications from BellSouth.
5. The disaggregated breakdown of FOC timeliness reflects the GPSC's disaggregation levels outlined in the June 6, 2000 – test-specific Service Quality Measurements.
6. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.10, Part 1: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Summary View – Second Re-test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail						
Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FT	38	5	1	0	1	0
% FT	84%	11%	2%	0%	2%	0%

Table V-2.10, Part 2: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Disaggregated View – Second Re-test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail -- Disaggregated View						
Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
2-wire Loop Design	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% 2-wire Loop-Design	**100%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
2-wire Loop-Non Design	**5**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**
% 2-wire Loop-Non Design	**71%**	**0%**	**14%**	**0%**	**14%**	**0%**
2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Design	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Design	**50%**	**50%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Non Design	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% 2-wire Loop w/ LNP - Non Design	**0%**	**100%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Loop Port Combination	**27**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% Loop Port Combination	**96%**	**4%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
DL	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
% DL	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
TOTALS	**38**	**5**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**
	84%	**11%**	**2%**	**0%**	**2%**	**0%**

Notes:
(Notes apply to Table V-2.10, Parts 1 and 2)

1. Second re-test results reflect data from January 19 through February 27, 2001.
2. Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FT classification.
3. Timeliness information pertaining to the LNP service requests for which BellSouth was unable to provide actual FT / NFT data is not included in the above table.
4. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).

5. The disaggregated breakdown of FOC timeliness reflects the GPSC's disaggregation levels outlined in the June 6, 2000 – test-specific Service Quality Measurements.
6. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.11, Part 1: Completion Notice Due Date (CN DD) vs. Completion Notification Delivery Date – Initial Test Data

	TOTAL		Flow-Through					
	CNs Received	% of Total CN	Flow-Through[1]	% Flow -Through[2]	% of Total Flow-Through[3]	Non-Flow-Through[4]	% Non-Flow -Through[5]	% of Total Non-Flow -Through[6]
CN Date Received = CN DD	134	77%	29	22%	88%	91	68%	72%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 1 day	21	12%	2	10%	6%	19	900%	15%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 2 days	3	2%	0	0%	0%	3	100%	2%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 3-5 days	8	5%	1	13%	3%	7	88%	6%
CN Date Received = CN DD + >=6 days	7	4%	1	14%	3%	6	86%	5%
TOTAL	**173**	**100%**	**33**		**100%**	**126**		**100%**

Notes:

1. Initial test results include data from November 9, 1999 through May 31, 2000.
2. Flow-Through = The number of CNs received on within the specified timeframe that were Flow-Through LSRs.
3. % Flow-Through = The percentage of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Flow-Through LSRs.
4. % of Total Flow-Through = The percentage of total Flow-Through LSRs that received CNs within the specified timeframe.
5. Non Flow-Through = The number of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Non-Flow-Through LSRs.
6. % Non-Flow-Through = The percentage of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Non-Flow- Through LSRs.
7. % of Total Non-Flow-Through = The percentage of total Non-Flow-Through LSRs that received CNs within the specified timeframe.
8. Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow-Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FT / NFT classification.
9. CN Timeliness information pertaining to the LNP service requests for which BellSouth was unable to provide actual FT / NFT data *is* included in the above table. However, the FT-specific detail in not included. As a result, the Total CNs Received will not equal the sum of FT Received and NFT Received columns.
10. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).

11. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table V-2.11, Part 2: Completion Notice Due Date (CN DD) vs. Completion Notification Delivery Date – Initial Test Data

	TOTAL		Product Delivery Analysis														
	CNs Received	% of Total CNs	No. of Loops[1]	Loops as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Loops3	No. of Ports[1]	Ports as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Ports[3]	No. Of Combos[1]	Combos as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Combos[3]	No. NP[1]	NP as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total NP[3]	No. DL[1]	NP as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total DL[3]
CN Date Received = CN DD	134	77%	32	24%	80%	26	19%	72%	38	28%	78%	17	13%	74%	21	16%	84%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 1 day	21	12%	6	29%	15%	5	24%	14%	5	24%	10%	2	10%	9%	3	14%	12%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 2 days	3	2%	0	0%	0%	1	33%	3%	1	33%	2%	1	33%	4%	0	0%	0%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 3-5 days	8	5%	1	13%	3%	2	25%	6%	3	38%	6%	1	13%	4%	1	13%	4%
CN Date Received = CN DD + >=6 days	7	4%	1	14%	3%	2	29%	6%	2	29%	4%	2	2%	9%	0	0%	0%
TOTAL	**173**	**100%**	**40**		**100%**	**36**		**100%**	**49**		**100%**	**23**		**100%**	**25**		**100%**

Notes:

1. The number of CNs by product type (Loop, Port, Port-Loop Combo, Number Portability, Directory Listing) that received LSRs within the specified timeframe.
2. The percentage of CNs by product type (Loop, Port, Port-Loop Combo, Number Portability, Directory Listing) that received LSRs within the specified timeframe.
3. The percentage of Total LSRs by product type (Loop, Port, Port-Loop Combo, Number Portability, Directory Listing) that were received within the specified timeframe.
4. Calculations are based on business days (i.e. weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
5. Loop with Number Portability LSRs are included in the NP column.
6. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table V-2.12, Part 1: Completion Notice Due Date (CN DD) vs. Completion Notification Delivery Date – Re-test Data

	TOTAL		Flow-Through					
	CNs Received	% of Total CN	Flow-Through [1]	% Flow-Through[2]	% of Total Flow-Through3	Non- Flow-Through[4]	% Non-Flow-Through[5]	% of Total Non-Flow-Through[6]
CN Date Received = CN DD	57	70%	20	35%	67%	37	65%	73%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 1 day	15	19%	5	33%	17%	10	67%	20%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 2 days	4	5%	3	75%	10%	1	25%	2%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 3-5 days	4	5%	2	50%	7%	2	50%	4%
CN Date Received = CN DD + >=6 days	1	1%	0	0%	0%	1	100%	2%
TOTAL	**81**	**100%**	**30**		**100%**	**51**		**100%**

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.12, Part 2: Completion Notice Due Date (CN DD) vs. Completion Notification Delivery Date – Re-test Data

	TOTAL		Product Delivery Analysis														
	CNs Received	% of Total CNs	No. of Loops[1]	Loops as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Loops3	No. of Ports[1]	Ports as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Ports[3]	No. Of Combos[1]	Combos as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Combos[3]	No. NP[1]	NP as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total NP[3]	No. DL[1]	DL as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total DL[3]
CN Date Received = CN DD	40	83%	10	25%	91%	9	23%	82%	13	33%	72%	4	10%	100%	4	10%	100%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 1 day	5	10%	1	20%	9%	1	20%	9%	3	60%	17%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 2 days	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 3-5 days	2	4%	0	0%	0%	1	50%	9%	1	50%	6%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%
CN Date Received = CN DD + >=6 days	1	2%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	1	100%	6%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%
TOTAL	**48**	**100%**	**11**		**100%**	**11**		**100%**	**18**		**100%**	**4**		**100%**	**4**		**100%**

	TOTAL		Product Delivery Analysis														
	CNs Received	% of Total CNs	No. of Loops[1]	Loops as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Loops3	No. of Ports[1]	Ports as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Ports[3]	No. Of Combos[1]	Combos as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total Combos[3]	No. NP[1]	NP as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total NP[3]	No. DL[1]	DL as a % of CNs Received[2]	% of Total DL[3]
CN Date Received = CN DD	57	70%	12	21%	52%	12	21%	80%	15	26%	65%	10	18%	91%	8	14%	89%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 1 day	15	19%	9	60%	39%	2	13%	13%	3	20%	13%	1	7%	9%	0	0%	0%

CN Date Received = CN DD + 2 days	4	5%	1	25%	4%	0	0%	0%	2	50%	9%	0	0%	0%	1	25%	11%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 3-5 days	4	5%	1	25%	4%	1	25%	7%	2	50%	9%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%
CN Date Received = CN DD + >=6 days	1	1%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	1	100%	4%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%
TOTAL	**81**	**100%**	**23**		**100%**	**15**		**100%**	**23**		**100%**	**11**		**100%**	**9**		**100%**

Notes:

1. Re-test results include data from August 25, 2000 through November 15,2000.
2. The number of CNs by product type (Loop, Port, Port-Loop Combo, Number Portability, Directory Listing) that received LSRs within the specified timeframe.
3. The percentage of CNs by product type (Loop, Port, Port-Loop Combo, Number Portability, Directory Listing) that received LSRs within the specified timeframe.
4. The percentage of Total LSRs by product type (Loop, Port, Port-Loop Combo, Number Portability, Directory Listing) that were received within the specified timeframe.
5. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
6. Loop with Number Portability LSRs are included in the NP column.
7. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table V-2.13: Desired Due Date from KCI's Local Service Request (LSR DDD) vs. Committed Due Date from BLS's Firm Order Confirmation (FOC DD)

	Total		**Flow-Through Analysis**				**Delivery Method Analysis**									
	Number	Percent	FT	% FT	NFT	%NFT	Loops	% Loops	Ports	% Ports	Port-Loop Combo	% Port-Loop Combo	NP	%NP	DL	% DL
LSR DDD = FOC DD	219	88%	37	80%	188	90%	55	95%	42	84%	52	79%	45	96%	25	93%
LSR DDD not = FOC DD	29	12%	9	20%	20	10%	3	5%	8	16%	14	21%	2	4%	2	7%
Total	**248**	**100%**	**46**	**100%**	**208**	**100%**	**58**	**100%**	**50**	**100%**	**66**	**100%**	**47**	**100%**	**27**	**100%**
Distribution of Earlier Due Dates																
DD = DDD - 1 day	3	38%	0	0%	3	43%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD - 2 days	1	13%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD - 3-5 days	3	38%	0	0%	3	43%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	100%
DD = DDD - >=6 days	1	13%	0	0%	1	14%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Earlier (DD before DDD)	**8**	**3%**	**1**	**3%**	**7**	**4%**	**1**	**2%**	**3**	**6%**	**3**	**5%**	**1**	**2%**	**1**	**4%**
Distribution of Later Due Dates																
DD = DDD + 1 day	10	48%	4	50%	6	46%	0	0%	4	80%	5	46%	1	50%	0	0%
DD = DDD + 2 days	4	19%	3	38%	1	8%	0	0%	1	20%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD + 3-5 days	3	14%	1	13%	2	15%	1	50%	0	0%	1	9%	1	50%	0	0%
DD = DDD + >=6 days	4	19%	0	0%	4	31%	1	50%	0	0%	2	18%	0	0%	1	100%
Total Later (DD after DDD)	**21**	**9%**	**8**	**25%**	**13**	**7%**	**2**	**3%**	**5**	**10%**	**11**	**17%**	**2**	**4%**	**1**	**4%**

Notes:

1. Initial test results include data from November 9, 1999 through May 31, 2000.
2. LSRs on which KCI's Desired Due Date was earlier than the standard interval for the order type (as documented in BellSouth's *Product and Services Interval Guide*) were excluded from this report.
3. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
4. Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow-Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FT / NFT classification.
5. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table V-2.14: Desired Due Date from KCI's Local Service Request (LSR DDD) vs. Committed Due Date from BLS's Firm Order Confirmation (FOC DD) – Re-test Data

	Total		**Flow-Through Analysis**				**Delivery Method Analysis**									
	Number	Percent	FT	% FT	NFT	% NFT	Loops	% Loops	Ports	% Ports	Port - Loop Combo	% Port - Loop Combo	NP	% NP	DL	% DL
LSR DDD = FOC DD	135	90%	53	87%	82	92%	50	91%	11	65%	20	83%	31	100%	23	100%
LSR DDD not = FOC DD	15	10%	8	13%	7	8%	5	9%	6	35%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	**150**	**100%**	**61**	**100%**	**89**	**100%**	**55**	**100%**	**17**	**100%**	**24**	**100%**	**31**	**100%**	**23**	**100%**
Distribution of Earlier Due Dates																
DD = DDD - 1 day	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD - 2 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD - 3-5 days	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD - >=6 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Earlier (DD before DDD)	2	1%	2	3%	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Distribution of Later Due Dates																
DD = DDD + 1 day	2	18%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD + 2 days	2	18%	0	0%	2	29%	1	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD + 3-5 days	7	64%	2	50%	5	71%	2	67%	5	83%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD + >=6 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Later (DD after DDD)	11	7%	4	7%	7	8%	3	5%	6	35%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%

Notes:

1. Re-test results include data from August 25, 2000 through October 9, 2000. The re-test has not yet completed.
2. LSRs on which KCI's Desired Due Date was earlier than the standard interval for the order type (as documented in BellSouth's *Product and Services Interval Guide*) were excluded from this report.
3. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
4. Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow-Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BLS-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FT/NFT classification. For those cases where KCI was unable to obtain Actual Flow-Through Indicators from BellSouth, KCI placed the orders in a FT/NFT category based on their *expected* FT status.
5. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.53: Jeopardy Notification Timeliness Detail

Jeopardy Notification Detail – Disaggregated View Jeopardy Date Received versus FOC DD						
Service Type	**>48 hrs before DD**	**24-48 hrs before DD**	**Same day as DD**	**24 hrs after DD**	**24-48 hrs after DD**	**TOTAL**
UNE Loop-Port Combination	2	0	0	0	0	2
% Loop-Port Combination	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
UNE 2-wire Loop with Number Portability	0	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop with NP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
UNE 2-wire Loop without Number portability	3	0	0	0	0	0
% 2-wire Loop without NP	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
UNE Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
% UNE Other	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	100%	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**

Notes:

1. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
2. KCI has included the following service order types in the "UNE Other" category: UNE Port; UNE Stand Alone Directory Listing; and UNE Stand Alone Number Portability.
3. The disaggregated breakdown of Jeopardy timeliness reflects the GPSC's disaggregation levels outlined in the June 6, 2000 – test-specific Service Quality Measurements.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table V-2.16: Pre-Order-Order Integration Test Results

Pre-Order Response			Order Form		Comments
Form Name	**Field Name**	**Format**	**Field Name**	**Format**	
SAQ					
1.	USOC	5 A / N Characters	FEATURE	3-6 A / N Characters	The pre-order response returns the USOC data in the correct format to populate an order form. However, the corresponding field name in the PS order form is FEATURE.
2.	CLLI	11 A / N Characters	LST	11 A / N Characters	The pre-order response returns the CLLI data in the correct format to populate an order form. However, the corresponding field name in the LSR order form is LST.
3.	CIC	4 Numeric Characters	PIC / LPIC	4 A / N Characters	The pre-order response returns the PIC / LPIC data in the correct format to populate an order form. However, the RS order form has two fields, PIC and LPIC. There is no notation on the pre-order form indicating whether the number returned is the PIC or LPIC.
AVQ					
1.	HOUSE-NUM THOROUGHFARE STREET-NAME 1 STREET-SUFFIX	13 A / N Characters 35 A / N Characters 44 A / N Characters 4 A / N Characters	EU-STREET 1	35 A / N Characters	The order field EU-STREET 1 is constructed by concatenating the four fields from the pre-order query. The combined length of the four pre-order fields could exceed the maximum length of the order field.
2.	CITY	32 A / N Characters	EU-CITY	25 A / N Characters	The pre-order response returns the data in the correct format. However, the field name is different on the order form. The pre-order response could exceed the size limitation of the EU-CITY field on the order form.
3.	STATE	2 Alpha Characters	EU-STATE	2 Alpha Characters	The pre-order response returns the data in the correct format. However, the field name is different on the order form.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Pre-Order Response			Order Form		Comments
Form Name	**Field Name**	**Format**	**Field Name**	**Format**	
4.	FLR	14 A / N Characters	EU-FLOOR	12 A / N Characters	The pre-order returns the data in an incorrect format. The response added the FLR abbreviation to the data. The field name is also different on the order form. The pre-order response could exceed the size limitation of the EU-FLOOR field on the order form.
AAQ					
1.	COAVAIL DAYS	Mon-Sun (Y or N) XXXXXXX	DDD	YYMMDD	The pre-order response returned the data in Y or N form, specifying the days of the week available to perform service. The response is incompatible with the field DDD on the order form which requires Year, Month, and Date numerals.
2.	COAVAIL DAYS	Mon-Sun (Y or N) XXXXXXX	DDDO-CC	CC	The pre-order response returned the data in Y or N form, specifying the days of the week available to perform service. The response is incompatible with the field DDDO-CC order form, which requires two Century numerals.
CDD					
1.	CDD	CCYYMMDD	DDD DDDO-C	YYMMDD	The pre-order response returned the data in the form Century, Century, Year, Year, Month, Month, and Day, Day. The response is inconsistent with the order form requirement, which splits the date into two fields.
AVQ-TN					
1.	HOUSE-NUM THOROUGHFARE STREET-NAME 1 STREET SUFFIX	13 A / N Characters 10 A / N Characters 44 A / N Characters 4 A / N Characters	EU-STREET 1	35 A / N Characters	The order field EU-STREET 1 is constructed by concatenating the four fields from the pre-order query. The combined length of the four pre-order fields could exceed the maximum length of the order field.

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Pre-Order Response			Order Form		Comments
Form Name	**Field Name**	**Format**	**Field Name**	**Format**	
2.	CITY	32 A / N Characters	EU-CITY	25 A / N Characters	The pre-order response returns the data in the correct format. However, the field name is different on the order form. The pre-order response could exceed the size limitation of the EU-CITY field on the order form.
3.	STATE	2 Alpha Characters	EU-STATE	2 Alpha Characters	The pre-order response returns the data in the correct format. However the field name is different on the order form.
4.	ZIPCODE	5 Numeric Characters	EU-ZIPCODE	5 Numeric Characters	The pre-order response does not return any data that can be used for the EU-ZIPCODE field on the order form. Therefore, an error was returned when submitting an order with this field left blank.
5.	UNIT-ROOM	RM 14 A / N Characters	EU-ROOM	9 A / N Characters	The pre-order response returns the data in an incorrect format. The response added the RM abbreviation to the data. The field name is also different on the order form. The pre-order response could exceed the size limitation of the EU-ROOM field on the order form field.
6.	ELEV-FLOOR	FLR 14 A / N Characters	EU-FLOOR	12 A / N Characters	The pre-order returns the data in an incorrect format. The response added the FLR abbreviation to the data. The field name is also different on the order form. The pre-order response could exceed the size limitation of the EU-FLOOR field on the order form.
TNAQ					
1.	TN	10 A / N Characters	TN	10 A / N Characters	The Telephone Numbers were returned in the correct format. The numbers were entered into the TNSQ pre-order.
TNSQ					
1.	TN	10 A / N Characters	TN	10 A / N Characters	The Telephone Numbers were confirmed in the correct format

Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.