

B. Ordering and Provisioning (O&P)

This section provides a summary of the Ordering and Provisioning (O&P) domain testing activities. For more information on planned testing, refer to Section V: *Ordering and Provision Test* in the *Master Test Plan*. For more detailed information on the test design, analysis, and results from the execution of the tests, refer to Section V: Ordering and Provisioning Test Section in this document.

1.0 O&P-1: EDI Functional Test

This section provides a summary of the O&P-1: EDI Functional Test.

1.1 Objective

The objective of this test was to evaluate the existence of EDI functionality for electronically ordered UNEs in accordance with EDI documentation.

1.2 Evaluation Methods

The EDI Functional Test included a checklist of evaluation criteria developed by the test manager during the initial phase of the BellSouth - Georgia OSS Evaluation. These evaluation criteria, detailed in the Master Test Plan, provided the framework of norms, standards and guidelines for the EDI Functional Test.

1.3 Analysis Methods

The data collected from the EDI Functional Test was analyzed, and the results were assessed employing *test specific evaluation criteria*.

1.4 Summary Results

The following table presents the summary results for the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

Table III-B.1: O&P-1: EDI Functional Test – Summary Results

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-1-2-2	BLS systems and representatives provide required order functionality.
O&P-1-3-1	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs).
O&P-1-3-2b	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Partially Mechanized (PM) order clarifications (CLRs).
O&P-1-3-3a	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Flow-Through (FT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-1-3-3b	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Non-Flow-Through (NFT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-1-3-5	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Jeopardy Notifications.
O&P-1-3-6	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Missed Appointment (MA) notifications .

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-1-4-1	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs)
O&P-1-4-4	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Completion Notifications (CNs).
O&P-1-4-5	BLS systems and representatives return clear and complete Jeopardy Notifications.
O&P-1-4-6	BLS systems provide clear, accurate, and complete Missed Appointment Notifications.
O&P-1-4-7	BLS service order tracking systems (CSOTS) provide accurate LSR status.
O&P-1-5-1	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Service Availability Queries are compatible.
O&P-1-5-2	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Appointment Availability Queries are compatible.
O&P-1-5-3	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Calculate Due Date queries are compatible.
O&P-1-5-4	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Address Validation Query with Telephone Number are compatible.
O&P-1-5-5	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Address Validation Queries are compatible.
O&P-1-5-6	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Telephone Number Availability Queries are compatible.
O&P-1-5-7	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Telephone Number Selection Queries are compatible.
Evaluation Criteria – Not Satisfied	
O&P-1-2-1	The EDI interface provides expected system responses.
O&P-1-3-2a	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Fully Mechanized (FM) order errors (ERRs)/clarifications (CLRs).
O&P-1-4-2	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate and complete order errors (ERRs)/clarifications (CLRs).
Evaluation Criteria – No Result Determination Made	
O&P-1-1-1	EDI order transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation.
O&P-1-3-4	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Completion Notifications (CNs) within agreed upon standard intervals.
O&P-1-4-3	Service order provisioning due dates (FOC DDs) identified within BLS's order confirmation delivered through EDI are consistent with the CLEC's valid due date (LSR DDD) request (e.g., a due date selected in accordance with the product's standard interval or acquired from a Calculate Due Date (CDD) pre-order query).

2.0 O&P-2: TAG Functional Test

This section provides a summary for the O&P-2: TAG Functional Test.

2.1 Objective

The objective of this test was to evaluate the existence of TAG functionality for electronically ordered UNEs in accordance with EDI documentation.

2.2 Evaluation Methods

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

2.3 Analysis Methods

The data collected from the TAG Functional Test was analyzed, and the results were assessed employing test specific evaluation criteria.

2.4 Summary Results

The following tables present the summary results for the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

Table III-B.2: O&P-2: TAG Functional Test – Summary Results

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-2-1-1	TAG order transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation.
O&P 2-2-2	BLS systems and representatives provide required order functionality.
O&P-2-3-1	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs).
O&P-2-3-2a	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Fully Mechanized (FM) order errors (ERRs)/clarifications (CLRs).
O&P-2-3-2b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Partially Mechanized (PM) order errors clarifications (CLRs).
O&P-2-3-3b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Non -Flow-Through (NFT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) .
O&P-2-3-5	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Jeopardy Notifications.
O&P-2-3-6	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Missed Appointment (MA) Notifications.
O&P-2-4-1	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs)
O&P-2-4-4	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Completion Notifications (CNs).
O&P-2-4-5	BLS systems and representatives return clear and complete Jeopardy Notifications.
O&P-2-4-6	BLS systems provide clear, accurate, and complete Missed Appointment Notifications.
O&P-2-4-7	BLS service order tracking systems (CSOTS) provide accurate LSR status.
O&P-2-5-1	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Service Availability Queries are compatible
O&P-2-5-2	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Appointment Availability Queries are compatible.
O&P-2-5-3	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Calculate Due Date queries are compatible.

O&P-2-5-4	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Address Validation Query with Telephone Number are compatible.
O&P-2-5-5	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Address Validation Queries are compatible.
O&P-2-5-6	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Telephone Number Availability Queries are compatible.
O&P-2-5-7	Pre-Order and Order field names and field formats for Telephone Number Selection Queries are compatible.
Evaluation Criteria – Not Satisfied	
O&P-2-2-1	The TAG interface provides expected system responses.
O&P-2-3-3a	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Flow Through (FT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) .
O&P-2-4-2	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete order rejects (ERRs)/clarifications (CLRs).
Evaluation Criteria – No Result Determination Made	
O&P-2-3-4	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Completion Notifications (CNs) within agreed upon standard intervals.
O&P-2-4-3	Service order provisioning due dates (FOC DDs) identified within BLS's order confirmation delivered through TAG are consistent with the CLEC's valid due date (LSR DDD) request (e.g., a due date selected in accordance with the product's standard interval or acquired from a Calculate Due Date (CDD) pre-order query).

3.0 O&P-3: EDI/TAG Normal Volume Test

This section provides a summary of the O&P-3: EDI/TAG Normal Volume Test.

3.1 Objective

The objective of this test was to evaluate the behavior and performance of the EDI and TAG interfaces under “normal” YE01 projected transaction load conditions. This test was executed in a manner consistent with the forecasted daily usage patterns and transaction mix by submitting large volumes of order test cases.

3.2 Evaluation Methods

The EDI/TAG Normal Volume Performance Test (O&P-3) tested BellSouth's interfaces at year-end, 2001 (YE01) projected order volumes in BellSouth's Reengineered Services, Installation and Maintenance Management System (RSIMMS) environment for two ten-hour periods. This test was executed by submitting Resale and UNE orders against BellSouth test-bed accounts.

In order to fully test the robustness of BellSouth's OSS, the test was conducted simultaneously with the TAG Normal Volume Performance Test (PRE-4). The order transaction loads were distributed geographically across multiple Central Offices in the state of Georgia. BellSouth established and configured customer test accounts prior to initiation of the test.

3.3 Analysis Method

The data collected from the EDI/TAG Normal Volume Test were analyzed, and the results were assessed employing test specific evaluation criteria.

4.0 Summary Results

The following tables present the summary results for the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

Table III-B.3: O&P-3: EDI/TAG Normal Volume Test – Summary Results

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-3-1-1	EDI order transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation.
O&P-3-1-2	TAG order transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation.
O&P-3-2-1	The EDI interface provides expected system responses.
O&P-3-2-2	The TAG interface provides expected system responses.
O&P-3-3-2	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs).
O&P-3-3-3	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-3-3-4	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-3-4-1	BLS systems provide accurate Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-3-4-2	BLS systems provide accurate order errors (ERRs)/clarifications (CLRs).
Evaluation Criteria – Not Satisfied	
O&P-3-3-1	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs).

4.0 O&P-4: EDI/TAG Peak Volume Performance Test

This section provides a summary of the O&P-4: EDI/TAG Peak Volume Test.

4.1 Objective

The objective of this test was to evaluate the behavior and performance of the EDI and TAG interfaces under “peak” YE01 projected transaction load conditions. This test was executed in a manner consistent with the forecasted daily usage patterns and transaction mix by submitting large volumes of order test cases.

4.2 Evaluation Methods

The EDI/TAG Peak Volume Performance Test (O&P-4) tested BellSouth's interfaces at year-end, 2001 (YE01) projected order volumes in BellSouth's Reengineered Services, Installation and Maintenance Management System (RSIMMS) environment for two eight-hour periods. This test was executed by submitting Resale and UNE orders against BellSouth test-bed accounts.

In order to fully test the robustness of BellSouth's OSS the test was conducted simultaneously with the TAG Peak Volume Performance Test (PRE-5). The order transaction loads were distributed geographically across multiple Central Offices in the state of Georgia. BellSouth established and configured customer test accounts prior to initiation of the test.

4.3 Analysis Method

The data collected from the EDI/TAG Peak Volume Test were analyzed, and the results were assessed employing test specific evaluation criteria.

4.4 Summary Results

The following tables present the summary results for the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

Table III-B.4: O&P-4: EDI/TAG Peak Volume Test – Summary Results

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-4-1-1	EDI order transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation.
O&P-4-1-2	TAG order transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation.
O&P-4-2-1	The EDI interface provides expected system responses.
O&P-4-2-2	The TAG interface provides expected system responses.
O&P-4-3-2	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs).
O&P-4-3-3	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-4-3-4	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-4-4-1	BLS systems provide accurate Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-4-4-2	BLS systems provide accurate order errors (ERRs)/clarifications (CLRs).
Evaluation Criteria – Not Satisfied	
O&P-4-3-1	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs).

5.0 O&P-5: Provisioning Verification Test

This section provides a summary of the O&P-5: Provisioning Verification Test.

5.1 Objective

The objective of this test was to evaluate BellSouth's performance in the provisioning of UNEs as described in the Georgia Order.

5.2 Evaluation Methods

Operational analysis techniques were used to evaluate BellSouth systems and processes related to provisioning. Observations of live CLEC provisioning activities were made.

Test instances utilized in pre-order and order functional testing were verified for provisioning accuracy and coordination.

The Provisioning Verification Test was conducted through post activity validation of Customer Service Records (CSRs), switch translation reports, and Central Office validation on a sample of accounts. Interviews were held with BellSouth-GA provisioning personnel and with CLECs that purchase UNEs from BellSouth to provide a better understanding of the provisioning process from end-to-end. In addition, Loop “hot cuts” were observed for accuracy of provisioning as well as procedural adherence.

5.3 Analysis Methods

The data collected from the Provisioning Verification Test were analyzed, and the results were assessed employing test specific evaluation criteria.

5.4 Summary Results

The following tables present the summary results for the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

Table III-B.5: O&P-5: Provisioning Verification Test – Summary Results

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-5-1-1	Provisioning activity occurs on the date and time (if applicable) confirmed to the CLEC.
O&P-5-2-2	Provisioning was completed accurately for orders placed in O&P-1 EDI Functional Test and O&P-2 TAG Functional Test – Customer Service Record (CSR) Verification.
O&P-5-2-3	Coordinated Customer Conversions (Hot-Cuts) are completed on time by BLS technicians.
O&P-5-2-4	The coordinated provisioning procedures are practiced in the Central Office locations – Methods and Procedures.
O&P-5-2-5	Provisioning was completed accurately for orders placed in O&P-1 EDI Functional Test and O&P-2 TAG Functional Test – Directory Listings
O&P-5-2-6	Jeopardy (Pending Facilities) Notifications provide complete information.
O&P-5-2-7	Design Layout Records are provided for SL2 (Design) Loops.
O&P-5-3-1	Procedures in the coordination process are in place.
O&P-5-3-2	Procedures for Central Office work are defined and utilized.
O&P-5-3-3	Procedures for placing an order into Missed Appointment (MA) Status are defined.
O&P-5-3-4	CLEC procedures for escalation are defined.
O&P-5-3-5	Non-available facilities (Pending Facilities) policy is clearly defined.
O&P-5-3-6	Policy for acceptance of complete orders is clearly stated.
Evaluation Criteria – Not Satisfied	
O&P-5-2-1	Provisioning was completed accurately for orders placed in O&P-1 EDI Functional Test and O&P-2 TAG Functional Test – Switch Translations Verification.

6.0 O&P-6: Order Processing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation

This section provides a summary for the O&P-6: Order Processing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation.

6.1 Objective

The objective of this evaluation was to analyze the capabilities of BellSouth capacity management functions in relation to the order processing applications and determine whether the procedures were adequate to identify and implement capacity increments to satisfy projected customer business volumes on a timely basis.

6.2 Evaluation Methods

The capacity management evaluation began with a review of systems documentation and process flows for order processing. Interviews were conducted with system administration personnel responsible for the operation of EDI, LEO, LESOG, LNP, SOCS, and TAG order processing systems. These interviews were supplemented with an analysis of BellSouth capacity management procedures as well as a collection of evidence of related activities such as: periodic capacity management reviews; system reconfiguration/load balancing; load increase induced upgrades; and resource utilization and performance management reporting.

6.3 Analysis Methods

The Order Processing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation included a checklist of evaluation criteria developed by KCI during the initial phase of the BellSouth - Georgia OSS Evaluation. The data collected from inspections and interviews were analyzed employing test specific evaluation criteria.

6.4 Summary Results

The following tables present the summary results of the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

Table III-B.6: O&P-6: Order Processing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation – Summary Results

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-6-1 -1	There is an established process for capturing business and transaction volumes.
O&P-6-1 -2	There is an established process for capturing resource utilization.
O&P-6-1 -3	Resource utilization is monitored for system components and elements.
O&P-6-1 -4	Instrumentation and other tools are used to collect resource utilization data.
O&P-6-1 -5	Performance is monitored at all applicable levels (e.g. network, database server, application server, client, etc.).
O&P-6-1 -6	Instrumentation and other tools are used to monitor performance.

O&P-6-1-7	There is an established process for forecasting business volumes and transactions.
O&P-6-1-8	The business volume tracking and forecasting data is at an appropriate level of detail to use for capacity management.
O&P-6-1-9	There is an established process for reviewing the performance of the business and transaction volume forecasting process.
O&P-6-1-10	There is an established process for verification and validation of performance data.
O&P-6-1-11	Performance monitoring results are compared to service level agreements and other metrics.
O&P-6-1-12	Capacity Management process is defined and documented.
O&P-6-1-13	Resource usage and capacity is considered in the planning process for capacity management.
O&P-6-1-14	Performance monitoring results are considered in the planning process for capacity management.
O&P-6-1-15	Capacity Management procedures define performance metrics to trigger the addition of capacity, load re-balancing or system tuning.

7.0 O&P-7: Ordering & Provisioning Performance Measures Evaluation

This section provides a summary for the OP-7: Ordering & Provisioning Performance Measures Evaluation.

7.1 Objective

One objective of this test was to assess the accuracy and completeness of the Ordering & Provisioning Service Quality Measurements (SQMs) calculated and reported by BellSouth for the KCI test CLEC. The other objective was to assess the accuracy of the raw data used by BellSouth to perform these calculations.

7.2 Evaluation Methods

In order to accomplish the first objective, KCI calculated the SQMs based on instructions provided by BellSouth. KCI used the raw data provided by BellSouth to perform its calculations and then compared its results to the reported SQM values, using the pre-established evaluation criteria. To accomplish the second objective, KCI collected data on its test transactions and compared the values in the collected data to the raw data values to determine whether they agreed according to the evaluation criteria.

7.3 Analysis Methods

Using the calculation instructions, KCI developed its own computer programs to perform independent calculations of SQMs. To prepare for the data comparisons, KCI mapped its test data elements to the corresponding elements in BellSouth's raw data for Ordering & Provisioning SQMs.

7.4 Summary Results

The following tables present the summary results for the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

**Table III-B.7: OP-7: Ordering & Provisioning Performance Results Comparison
Evaluation– Summary Results**

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-7-1-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Percent Rejected Service Requests.
O&P-7-1-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Percent Rejected Service Requests.
O&P-7-2-1	BLS Reports are correctly disaggregated and complete – Reject Interval.
O&P-7-2-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values – Reject Interval.
O&P-7-3-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness.
O&P-7-3-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness.
O&P-7-4-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Speed of Answer in Ordering Center.
O&P-7-4-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Speed of Answer in Ordering Center.
O&P-7-5-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Mean Held Order Interval and Distribution Intervals.
O&P-7-5-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Mean Held Order Interval and Distribution Intervals.
O&P-7-5-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data - Mean Held Order Interval and Distribution Intervals.
O&P-7-6-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Average Jeopardy Notice Interval and Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices.
O&P-7-6-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Average Jeopardy Notice Interval and Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices.
O&P-7-7-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Percent Missed Installation Appointments.
O&P-7-7-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Percent Missed Installation Appointments.
O&P-7-7-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data - Percent Missed Installation Appointments.
O&P-7-8-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Average Completion Interval Order Completion Interval Distribution.
O&P-7-8-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Average Completion Interval Order Completion Interval Distribution.
O&P-7-8-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data - Average Completion Interval Order Completion Interval Distribution.

O&P-7-9-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Average Completion Notice Interval.
O&P-7-9-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Average Completion Notice Interval.
O&P-7-9-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data - Average Completion Notice Interval.
O&P-7-10-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Coordinated Customer Conversions.
O&P-7-10-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Coordinated Customer Conversions.
O&P-7-11-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Percent Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Activity.
O&P-7-11-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Percent Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Activity.
O&P-7-12-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Total Service Order Cycle Time.
O&P-7-12-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Total Service Order Cycle Time.
O&P-7-12-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data -Total Service Order Cycle Time.
O&P-7-13-1	BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete - Service Order Accuracy.
O&P-7-13-2	KCI-calculated SQM values agree with BLS-reported SQM values - Service Order Accuracy.
Evaluation Criteria – Not Complete	
O&P-7-1-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data - Percent Rejected Service Requests.
O&P-7-2-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data – Reject Interval.
O&P-7-3-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data - Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness.
O&P-7-6-3	Test data collected by KCI agrees with BLS raw data - Average Jeopardy Notice Interval and Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices.

8.0 O&P-8: EDI Documentation Evaluation

This section provides a summary of the O&P-8: EDI Documentation Evaluation.

8.1 Objective

The objective of this test was to assess whether the documentation provided by BellSouth adequately assists CLECs in understanding how to implement and use all of the EDI ordering and provisioning functions available to them.

8.2 Evaluation Methods

The EDI Documentation Evaluation 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 test.

8.3 Analysis Methods

The data collected from the EDI Documentation Evaluation were analyzed, and the results were assessed employing test specific evaluation criteria.

8.4 Summary Results

The following tables present the summary results for the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

Table III-B.8: O&P-8: EDI Documentation Evaluation – Summary Results

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-8-1-1	BLS documentation is readily available via the BellSouth Web site or in hardcopy.
O&P-8-1-2	BLS makes updates to documents readily available to the CLECs.
O&P-8-1-3	Training is available for use of documentation.
O&P-8-1-4	Responsibilities and procedures for developing, updating, and correcting documentation are clearly defined.
O&P-8-1-5	Responsibilities and procedures for distributing documentation are clearly defined.
O&P-8-2-1	Document version is indicated clearly within and throughout each document.
O&P-8-2-2	BLS document organization is consistent with its intended use.
O&P-8-2-3	BLS documents contain information that is relevant to its intended audience.
O&P-8-2-4	BLS documents contain table of contents.
O&P-8-2-5	BLS documents are logically organized with clear page numbering and section labeling.
O&P-8-2-6	BLS Documents contain contact/help desk numbers.
O&P-8-2-7	BLS documents clearly indicate purpose and scope.
O&P-8-2-8	Cross-references are clearly stated directing readers to relevant sources of additional information.
O&P-8-2-9	BLS documents clearly instruct users how to notify BellSouth of document errors and omissions.
O&P-8-3-1	BLS documents provide description of all error messages and potential steps for resolution.
O&P-8-3-2	BLS documents clearly identify inputs/outputs of the specific processes.
O&P-8-3-3	BLS documents include expected results of process and cycle times.
O&P-8-4-1	BLS documents correctly define all data fields.
O&P-8-4-2	BLS documents accurately define acceptable formats for all data fields.
O&P-8-4-3	BLS documents clearly identify required and optional fields.
O&P-8-4-4	BLS documents clearly describe expected system responses/outputs.
O&P-8-4-5	BLS documents contain methods and procedures to correctly execute processes.

9.0 O&P-9: TAG Documentation Evaluation

Interface development, and the documentation supporting this process, was not part of the evaluation scope outlined by the GPSC in its May 20, 1999 *Order*. Therefore, no such evaluation was conducted.

10.0 O&P-10: EDI/TAG Production Volume Performance Test

This section provides a summary of the O&P-10: EDI/TAG Production Volume Performance Test.

10.1 Objective

The objective of the EDI/TAG Production Volume Performance Test was to measure the performance of the EDI and TAG interfaces under current production capacity at YE01 projected transaction mix.

10.2 Evaluation Methods

The EDI/TAG Production Volume Performance Test (O&P-10) tested BellSouth's interfaces under current production capacity at YE01 projected transaction mix in BellSouth's production environment for one eight-hour period. This test was executed by submitting Resale and UNE orders in addition to associated pre-orders against BellSouth test-bed accounts.

The order transaction loads were distributed geographically across multiple Central Offices in the state of Georgia. BellSouth established and configured customer test accounts prior to initiation of the test.

10.3 Analysis Method

The data collected from EDI/TAG Production Volume Performance Test were analyzed, and the results were assessed employing test specific evaluation criteria.

10.4 Summary Results

The following tables present the summary results for the evaluation criteria. Definitions of evaluation criteria and possible results (Satisfied, Not Complete, or Not Satisfied) are provided in Section II.

Table III-B.10: O&P-10: EDI/TAG Production Volume Test – Summary Results

Evaluation Criteria – Satisfied	
O&P-10-1-1	EDI order transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation.
O&P-10-1-2	TAG order transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation.
O&P-10-2-1	The EDI interface provides expected system responses.
O&P-10-2-2	The TAG interface provides expected system responses.

O&P-10-2-3	The TAG interface provides expected pre-order system responses.
O&P-10-3-1	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs).
O&P-10-3-2	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs).
O&P-10-3-3	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-10-3-4	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-10-3-5	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses from BLS's Regional Street Access Guide-Telephone Number (RSAG-TN) back end system.
O&P-10-3-6	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses from BLS's RSAG-Address back end system.
O&P-10-3-7	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses from BLS's Direct Order Entry Support Application Program (DSAP) back end system.
O&P-10-3-8	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses from BLS's Application for Telephone Number Load Administration and Selection (ATLAS) back end system.
O&P-10-3-9	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses from BLS's CRSECSR back end system.
O&P-10-3-10	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses from BLS's ATLAS-MLH back-end system.
O&P-10-3-11	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses from BLS's ATLAS-DID back-end system.
O&P-10-3-12	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses from BLS's OASIS back-end system.
O&P-10-3-13	The TAG interface provides timely pre-order responses to Calculate Due Date (CDD) inquiries.
O&P-10-4-1	BLS systems provide accurate pre-order success responses.
O&P-10-4-2	BLS systems provide clear, accurate, and complete Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).
O&P-10-4-3	BLS systems provide accurate order errors (ERRs)/clarifications (CLRs).