B.   Test Results: Metrics Definition Documentation and Implementation Verification and Validation Review (PMR2)

1.0   Description

The objective of the Metrics Definition Documentation and Implementation Verification and Validation Review (PMR-2) was to evaluate the definitions of the Service Quality Measurements (SQMs) and the associated descriptions of the calculations in the October 22, 1999 version of BellSouth's Georgia SQM documentation.

The Metrics Definition Documentation and Implementation Verification and Validation Review evaluated the completeness and logic of the stated definitions and calculations, as well as their mutual consistency. The test then compared the descriptions of the calculations and exclusions in the SQM documentation to the computation instructions in BellSouth's *PMAP Raw Data Users Manual*,[1] unless the SQM was a "manual SQM" (i.e., an SQM that is wholly or primarily calculated outside of PMAP), in which case KCI compared the descriptions of the calculations and exclusions to the computation instructions provided by BellSouth subject matter experts.

BellSouth applies exclusions, either in the process of creating the raw data or when the SQMs are calculated. KCI examined exclusions of the former type in this evaluation, by investigating whether BellSouth actually implemented them. KCI examined the implementation of the other exclusions as part of the PMR5 Calculation Validation test.

2.0   Methodology

This section summarizes the test methodology.

2.1   Business Process Description

BellSouth updates SQM documentation on a quarterly basis, subject to approval by the Georgia Public Services Commission (GPSC). For each SQM, this document contains the definition, the exclusions, the business rules, the levels of disaggregation, and the calculation description, along with other information pertaining to report structure, data retention, and evaluation standards. This document is the official reference for all SQMs reported by BellSouth.

---

[1] PMAP is the acronym for BellSouth's Performance Measurement Analysis Platform.

2.2   Scenarios

Scenarios were not applicable to this test.

2.3   Test Targets & Measures

The test target was the set of definitions, calculation descriptions, and associated information in the October 1999 SQM documentation. Processes, sub-processes, and evaluation measures are presented in the following table. The last column "Test Cross-Reference" indicates where the particular measures are addressed in Section 3.1 "Results & Analysis."

Table VIII-2.1: Test Target Cross-Reference

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
Pre-Ordering	Average OSS Response Time and Response Interval	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-1-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-1-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-1-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-1-4
	OSS Interface Availability	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-2-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-2-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-2-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-2-4
Ordering	Percent Rejected Service Requests	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-3-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-3-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-3-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-3-4
	Reject Interval	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-4-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-4-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-4-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-4-4
	Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-5-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-5-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-5-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-5-4
	Speed of Answer in Ordering Center	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-6-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-6-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-6-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-6-4
Provisioning	Mean Held Order Interval & Distribution Intervals	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-7-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-7-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-7-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-7-4
	Average Jeopardy Notice Interval & Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-8-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-8-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-8-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-8-4
	Percent Missed Installation Appointments	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-9-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-9-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-9-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-9-4
	Average Completion Interval Order Completion Interval Distribution	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-10-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-10-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-10-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-10-4
	Average Completion Notice Interval	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-11-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-11-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-11-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-11-4
	Coordinated Customer Conversions	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-12-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-12-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-12-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-12-4
	Percent Provisioning Troubles Within 30 Days	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-13-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-13-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-13-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-13-4
	Total Service Order Cycle Time	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-14-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-14-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-14-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-14-4
	Service Order Accuracy	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-15-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-15-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-15-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-15-4
Maintenance & Repair	Missed Repair Appointments	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-16-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-16-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-16-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-16-4
	Customer Trouble Report Rate	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-17-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-17-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-17-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-17-4
	Maintenance Average Duration	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-18-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-18-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-18-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-18-4
	Percent Repeat Troubles Within 30 Days	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-19-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-19-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-19-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-19-4
	Out of Service > 24 hours	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-20-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-20-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-20-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-20-4
	OSS Interface Availability	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-21-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-21-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-21-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-21-4
	OSS Response Interval and Percentages	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-22-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-22-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-22-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-22-4
	Average Answer Time – Repair Centers	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-23-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-23-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-23-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-23-4
Billing	Invoice Accuracy	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-24-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-24-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-24-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-24-4
	Mean Time to Deliver Invoices	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-25-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-25-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-25-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-25-4
	Usage Data Delivery Accuracy	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-26-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-26-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-26-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-26-4
	Usage Data Delivery Completeness	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-27-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-27-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-27-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-27-4
	Usage Data Delivery Timeliness	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-28-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-28-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-28-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-28-4
	Mean Time to Deliver Usage	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-29-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-29-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-29-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-29-4
Operator Services (Toll) and Directory Assistance	Average Speed to Answer (Toll)	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-30-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-30-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-30-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-30-4
	Percent Answered within "X" Seconds (Toll)	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-31-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-31-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-31-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-31-4
	Average Speed to Answer (DA)	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-32-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-32-2

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-32-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-32-4
	Percent Answered within "X" Seconds (DA)	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-33-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-33-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-33-3
		Consistency between he stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-33-4
E911	Timeliness	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-34-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-34-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-34-3

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-34-4
	Accuracy	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-35-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-35-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-35-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-35-4
	Mean Interval	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-36-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-36-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-36-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-36-4

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
Trunk Group Performance	Trunk Group Service Report	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-37-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-37-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-37-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-37-4
	Trunk Group Service Detail	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-38-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-38-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-38-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-38-4

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
	Trunk Group Performance-Aggregate[2]	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-39-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-39-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-39-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-39-4
	Trunk Group Performance-CLEC Specific[3]	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-40-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-40-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-40-3

[2] This SQM was documented only in the 2/24/00 version of the SQM documentation and did not exist in the 10/22/99 version. Therefore, the PMR2 test for this SQM was performed solely based on the 2/24/00 version.

[3] This SQM was documented only in the 2/24/00 version of the SQM documentation and did not exist in the 10/22/99 version. Therefore, the PMR2 test for this SQM was performed solely based on the 2/24/00 version.

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-40-4
Collocation	Average Response Time	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-41-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-41-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-41-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-41-4
	Average Arrangement Time	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-42-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-42-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-42-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-42-4

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
	Percent Due Dates Missed	Adequacy and completeness of the SQM definition	PMR2-43-1
		Adequacy, completeness, and logic of the SQM calculation description	PMR2-43-2
		Consistency between (a) the SQM calculation description and exclusions, and (b) computation instructions provided by BLS	PMR2-43-3
		Consistency between the stated exclusions and their implementation in the raw data creation process	PMR2-43-4

2.4   Data Sources

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

Table VIII-2.2: Data Sources for Metrics Definition Documentation and Implementation Verification and Validation Review

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Pre-Ordering OSS Response Interval Interview Report of the January 21, 2000 interview.	PMR4_000121_IntRptWong_PreOrderOSSIntvl.doc	PMR-2-A-1	KCI
Pre-Ordering OSS Response Interval summarized raw data for November, 1999.	Response Data For November 1999.xls	PMR-2-A-1	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Pre-Ordering OSS Response Interval raw data for November 19, 1999.	tag_preorder.flat.file.20000119	PMR-2-A-1	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Response Interval summarized raw data for November 19, 1999.	TAG Data Test Case (Summary).xls	PMR-2-A-1	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Response Interval response regarding the 't.resp_time' field used in the raw data.	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-A-1	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Response Interval report, November 1999.	OSS_Response_Time_Interval. XLS	PMR-2-A-1	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Interface Availability raw data.	KPMG2.XLS	PMR-2-A-2	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Interface Availability calculating instructions.	AUDITK~1.DOC	PMR-2-A-2	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Interface Availability information regarding the retention of schedules.	KPMGSC~1.DOC	PMR-2-A-2	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Pre-Ordering OSS Interface Availability website used to communicate schedules to the CLECs.	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-A-2	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Interface Availbility response to Interview Guide.	OSSINTER.DOC	PMR-2-A-2	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Interface Availbility description of the extraction of data from REM.	REM Availability Calculations.doc	PMR-2-A-2	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Pre-Ordering OSS Interface Availability Interview Report of the February 18, 2000 interview.	PMR4_000218IntReportAvailabilityWong.doc	PMR-2-A-2	KCI
Pre-Ordering OSS Interface Availability report, November 1999	OSS Interface Availability SQM.xls	PMR-2-A-2	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering PMAP response to questions regarding raw data	RAWDATA.XLS	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering PMAP clarifications to RAWDATA.XLS regarding raw data	Q&AKPMG.XLS	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Ordering PMAP methodology on how some raw data fields were derived	ORFILE2.DOC	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering PMAP response to request regarding the derivation of raw data fields	ORFILE.DOC	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering PMAP response to questions regarding specific raw data fields	20000113.DOC	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering PMAP response to questions regarding raw data variables in LEO and LON	DATARE~1.DOC	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering PMAP Interview Report for the March 13, 2000 interview	PMR2_000313_IntReportMoulin_OrdPMAP.doc	PMR-2-A-3	KCI
Ordering PMAP information regarding a table used for the FOC Timeliness metric	FOCTIM~1.DOC	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering PMAP information regarding a table used for the FOC Timeliness metric	NOE3D1~1.DOC	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Ordering PMAP information regarding a table used for the Percent Rejeted Servie Requests metric	NOE0E6~1.DOC	PMR-2-A-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering PMAP reports for all metrics, November 1999	Many electronic files.	PMR-2-A-3	BLS (Performance Measurement Analysis Platform "PMAP" Web site)
Ordering PMAP raw data for all metrics, November 1999	order_servorder_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt order_rejintand%rejbyint_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt order_foctimeliness_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt order_foctimeliness(trunks)_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt order_fatalreject_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt	PMR-2-A-3	BLS (PMAP Web site)
Ordering Speed of Answer – Business information on how fields are calculated	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-A-4	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering Speed of Answer – Business response to various questions	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-A-4	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering Speed of Answer – Business report, November 1999	Speed of Answer in Ordering Center SQM.xls	PMR-2-A-4	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Ordering Speed of Answer – Business Interview Report for the February 3, 2000 interview	PMR4_000203IntReportASABusinessWong.doc	PMR-2-A-4	KCI
Ordering Speed of Answer – Residence information on a raw data field	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-A-5	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering Speed of Answer – Residence report, November 1999	Speed of Answer in Ordering Center SQM.xls	PMR-2-A-5	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering Speed of Answer – Residence Interview Report for the March 23, 2000 interview	PMR2_000323_IntReportMoulin_ASA-Residence.doc	PMR-2-A-5	KCI
Ordering Speed of Answer – Residence Interview Report for the February 3, 2000 interview	PMR4_000203IntReportASAResidenceWong.doc	PMR-2-A-5	KCI
Ordering Speed of Answer – Residence raw data sample, November 1999	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-A-5	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering Speed of Answer – LCSC response to KCI's question regarding the raw data file	BDY.RTF	PMR-2-A-6	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering Speed of Answer – LCSC explanation of raw data fields	Explain ASA and Tot calls.doc	PMR-2-A-6	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Ordering Speed of Answer – LCSC report, November 1999	Speed of Answer in Ordering Center SQM.xls	PMR-2-A-6	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Ordering Speed of Answer – LCSC Interview Report of the February 3, 2000 interview	PMR4_000203IntReportASAL CSCWong.doc	PMR-2-A-6	KCI
Ordering Speed of Answer – LCSC raw data sample, November 1999	dec_3rd week_LCSC Birm.txt	PMR-2-A-6	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP responses to questions about raw data fields	KPMGANS.XLS	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP information on missed appointment codes	MISSEDAP.DOC	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP location of raw data fields and information on how they are derived	KPMDOC01.DOC	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP response to KCI's interview guide regarding raw data fields, submitted by Mike Nason of BLS	1AINTE~1.DOC	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Provisioning PMAP response to KCI's interview guide regarding raw data fields, submitted by Terri Ferrara of BLS	BHAM-K~1.DOC	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP Interview Report of March 13, 2000 interview	PMR2_000313_IntReportMoulin_ProvPMAP.doc	PMR-2-B-7	KCI
Provisioning PMAP list of Missed Appointment Codes	MISSED~1.DOC	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP list of field names and values for a raw data table used for the TSOCT metric	MARCH1~1.DOC	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP response to KCI's questions regarding raw data tables	KPMGRD1.DOC	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP information regarding Missed Appointment Codes	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP information regarding a table used for Percent Missed Installation Appointments	NODS_V~3.DOC	PMR-2-B-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning PMAP reports for all metrics, November 1999	Many electronic files.	PMR-2-B-7	BLS (PMAP Web site)

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Provisioning PMAP raw data all metrics, November 1999	prov_ordercompintdist_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt prov_ordercompintdist(trunk)_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt prov_jeopnotint_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt prov_heldorders_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt prov_avecompnotint_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt prov_%missinstalapp_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt prov_%missinstalapp(trunk)_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt	PMR-2-B-7	BLS (PMAP Web site)
Provisioning CCC procedures for manual collection of data	CCCREP~1.DOC	PMR-2-B-8	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning CCC raw data, October 1999	GAOCTCCC.XLS	PMR-2-B-8	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning CCC screen shot from the CCSS system	COORDINATED	PMR-2-B-8	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning CCC Interview Report of the March 9, 2000 interview	PMR2_000309_IntReportMoulin_CCC.doc	PMR-2-B-8	KCI
Provisioning CCC Interview Report of the February 16, 2000 interview	PMR4_000216IntReportCCCWong.doc	PMR-2-B-8	KCI

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Provisioning CCC report, November 1999	Coordinated_Customer_Conversions_111999.xls	PMR-2-B-8	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning SOA calculation procedures	SOA Procedures.doc	PMR-2-B-9	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning SOA report, November 1999	SOA_11~1.XLS	PMR-2-B-9	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning SOA Interview Report of the February 22, 2000	PMR5022200IntRptFreundlich.doc	PMR-2-B-9	KCI
Provisioning SOA response to Interview Summary	RE.DOC	PMR-2-B-9	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning SOA description of the sampling procedures	SAMPLE.DOC	PMR-2-B-9	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning SOA sample run documentation	SAMPLE~1.DOC	PMR-2-B-9	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Provisioning SOA Interview Report of the March 10, 2000 interview	PMR2_000310_IntReport_SOA.doc	PMR-2-B-9	KCI

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Provisioning SOA Interview Report of the February 28, 2000 interview	PMR4_000228IntReportSOAM angla.doc	PMR-2-B-9	KCI
Provisioning SOA sample of raw data, November 1999	Mech GA Business under 10.xls	PMR-2-B-9	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R PMAP response with descriptions of possible values for selected fields	MRAUD~1.XLS	PMR-2-B-10	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R PMAP Interview Report of the March 13, 2000 interview	PMR2_000313_IntReportMoulin_M&R_PMAP.doc	PMR-2-B-10	KCI
M&R PMAP response to KCI's questions regarding raw data field values	CAUSE_~1.XLS	PMR-2-B-10	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R PMAP reports for all metrics, November 1999	Many electronic files.	PMR-2-B-10	BLS (PMAP Web site)
M&R PMAP raw data files for all metrics, November 1999	maint_oos24_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt

maint_missrepapp_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt

maint_linesinserv_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt

maint_custroubreprate_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt

maint_avedur_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt

maint_%reptroubwithin30_KPMG_november_rawdata.txt | PMR-2-B-10 | BLS (PMAP Web site) |

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
M&R OSS Response Interval calulation procedures	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-C-11	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R OSS Response Interval Interview Report for the March 21, 2000 interview	PMR2_000321_IntReportMoulin_M&R_OSSRespIntvl.doc	PMR-2-C-11	KCI
M&R OSS Response Interval Interview Report for the February 23, 2000 interview	PMR4_000223IntReportMROSSResponseIntervalWong.doc	PMR-2-C-11	KCI
M&R OSS Response Interval reports, November 1999	OSS Response Interval SQM (M&R) BST Total.xls OSS Response Interval SQM (M&R).xls	PMR-2-C-11	BLS (PMAP Web site)
M&R OSS Response Interval raw data file, November 1999	1199CLEC.xls	PMR-2-C-11	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – Business information on fields and procedures	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-C-12	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – Business Interview Report for the February 14, 2000 interview	PMR4_000214IntReportAvgDelayBusinessWong.doc	PMR-2-C-12	KCI
M&R Average Answer Time – Business report, November 1999	Answer Time - Repair Center SQM.xls	PMR-2-C-12	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
M&R Average Answer Time – Business sample of raw data, October 1999	ASAOCT.XLS	PMR-2-C-12	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – UNE calculating formulas	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-C-13	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – UNE report, November 1999	Answer Time - Repair Center SQM.xls	PMR-2-C-13	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – UNE raw data, October 1999	une.unl	PMR-2-C-13	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – UNE column names	columns.txt	PMR-2-C-13	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – BRMC calculating formulas	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-C-14	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – BRMC responses to KCI's Interview Guide	INTERV~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-14	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
M&R Average Answer Time – BRMC Interview Report for the March 15, 2000 interview	PMR4_000215IntReportAvgDelayResidenceWong.doc	PMR-2-C-14	KCI
M&R Average Answer Time – BRMC report, November 1999	Answer Time – Repair Center SQM.xls	PMR-2-C-14	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – BRMC raw data, November 1999	brmc.unl	PMR-2-C-14	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
M&R Average Answer Time – BRMC column names	columns.txt	PMR-2-C-14	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Invoice documentation regarding handling of data for Mean Time to Deliver Invoices metric	PURPOSE1.DOC PROCED~1.DOC PROCED~2.DOC PROCED~3.DOC	PMR-2-C-15	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Invoice phrase code list for CABS	ADJPC1~1.XLS	PMR-2-C-15	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Invoice Interview Report of the February 9, 2000 interview	PMR5_000209IntRptFreundlich.doc	PMR-2-C-15	KCI
Billing Invoice definitions of columns in raw data files	RESPON~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-15	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Billing Invoice response with general calculation information	0217IN~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-15	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Invoice Documentation for calculating BST Aggregate Adjustment data (CRIS) & total BST revenue	CLECDO~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-15	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Invoice flowchart of raw data files used for PMAP	DOCUME~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-15	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Invoice Interview Report for the February 17, 2000 interview	PMR4_000217IntReportBilling Wong.doc	PMR-2-C-15	KCI
Billing Invoice reports, November 1999	Invoice Accuracy CLEC (region).txt Invoice Accuracy SQM (Region).xls Mean Time to Deliver Invoice CLEC (Reg).txt Mean Time to Deliver Invoices SQM (Reg).xls	PMR-2-C-15	BLS (PMAP Web site)
Billing Usage responses to questions regarding the DAYS_DELAYED field	BILLLIN~4.DOC	PMR-2-C-16	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Usage document describing the requirements for ADUF, ODUF, and CMDS	REQUIR~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-16	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Billing Usage response to KCI's Interview Guide, submitted by Andy Plummer of BLS	BONNER.DOC	PMR-2-C-16	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Usage document describing how to manually calculate the ODUF Message Delay Report	KPMGMS~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-16	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Usage responses to KCI's Interview Summary, submitted by Andy Plummer of BLS	PACKKPMG.DOC	PMR-2-C-16	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Usage responses to KCI's Interview Summary and Interview Guide, submitted by Janet Landefeld of BLS	REPLUS~1.DOC REPLUS~2.DOC	PMR-2-C-16	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Usage describing the criteria for computing Usage metrics	USAGET~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-16	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Usage Interview Report of the March 7, 2000 interview	PMR2_000307_IntReportMoulin_BillingUsage.doc	PMR-2-C-16	KCI
Billing Usage flowchart of raw data files used for PMAP	DOCUME~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-16	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Billing Usage of the February 23, 2000 interview	PMR4_000223IntReportBillingWong.doc	PMR-2-C-16	KCI

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Billing Usage reports, November 1999	Usage Data Delivery Accuracy CLEC.txt Usage Data Delivery Accuracy SQM.xls Usage Timeliness & Completeness CLEC.txt Usage Timeliness & Completeness SQM.xls	PMR-2-C-16	BLS (PMAP Web site)
OS/DA instructions for calculating metrics	KPMGIN~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-17	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
OS/DA raw data for DA and Toll	NOV_DA.XLS NOV_TOLL.XLS	PMR-2-C-17	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
OS/DA response to KCI's question about OS measurements	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-C-17	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
OS/DA Interview Report of the February 1, 2000 interview	PMR4,1 and5_000201IntRptWong.doc	PMR-2-C-17	KCI
OS/DA Interview Report of the March 7, 2000 interview	PMR1_000307_IntReportAlfor dQMIS.doc	PMR-2-C-17	KCI
OS/DA response to KCI's request for information	KPMG327.DOC	PMR-2-C-17	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
OS/DA reports, November 1999	Speed to Answer Performance OS Toll SQM.txt Speed to Answer Performance OS DA SQM.txt	PMR-2-C-17	BLS (PMAP Web site)

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
E911 raw data, October 1999	fsoi1099	PMR-2-C-18	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
E911 calculation instructions	E911_I~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-18	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
E911 descriptions of fields in raw data file	SCCSPEC2.DOC	PMR-2-C-18	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
E911 revised calculation instructions	E911_I~3.DOC	PMR-2-C-18	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
E911 response to KCI's Interview Summary	PMR4_0~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-18	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
E911 Interview Report of February 17, 2000 interview	PMR4_000217IntReportE911Wong.doc	PMR-2-C-18	KCI
E911 reports, November 1999	E911 Tmlns & Accrcy SQM (BST & CLEC Resale).xls E911 Mean Intvl SQM (BST & CLEC Resale).xls	PMR-2-C-18	BLS (PMAP Web site)
Trunk Group Performance – Old reports, September 1999	CLECAL9.DOC CLECGT9.DOC LOCAL9.DOC	PMR-2-C-19	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Trunk Group Performance – Old reports, September 1999	ALL2.DOC SUJANCTT.PRN	PMR-2-C-19	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Trunk Group Performance – Old reports, September 1999	LOCGT9.DOC SUJANLOC.PRN CLECAL9.DOC	PMR-2-C-19	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Trunk Group Performance – Old Interview Report of March 2, 2000 interview	PMR4_000302IntReportTrunk Mangla.doc	PMR-2-C-19	KCI
Trunk Group Performance – New calculation instructions	Instructions for producing the Bell South reports for September 1999.doc	PMR-2-C-20	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Trunk Group Performance – New calculations and description of processes	data processing document for KPMG.doc	PMR-2-C-20	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Trunk Group Performance – New report	Trunk_Group_Blocking_022000.xls	PMR-2-C-20	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Trunk Group Performance – New sample raw data file	testga.txt blk099ga.dct	PMR-2-C-20	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Collocation raw data, October, 1999	GA1099RS.XLS	PMR-2-C-21	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Collocation Interview Report of the January 19, 2000 interview	PMR5_000119IntRptFreundlich.doc	PMR-2-C-21	KCI
Collocation alias list	GAAL1099.XLS	PMR-2-C-21	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Collocation instructions	1099IN~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-21	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Collocation report, October, 1999	AGGGA.XLS	PMR-2-C-21	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Collocation Interview Report of the February 28, 2000 interview	PMR2_000228_IntRptMoulinCollocation.doc	PMR-2-C-21	KCI
Collocation report, November, 1999	Collocation_111999.xls	PMR-2-C-21	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
PMAP Ordering Interview Report of the March 13, 2000 interview	PMR2_000313_IntRptMoulinPMAPOrd.doc	PMR2-C-22	KCI
PMAP M&R Interview Report of the March 13, 2000 interview	PMR2_000313_IntRptMoulinPMAPMR.doc	PMR2-C-22	KCI

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
PMAP Provisioning Interview Report of the March 13, 2000 interview	PMR2_000313_IntRptMoulinPMAPProv.doc	PMR2-C-22	KCI
Summary of information regarding NODS fields	NODS fields.xls	PMR2-C-23	KCI
Information regarding the source data for the Average Speed of Answer reports, M&R OSS Response Intervals and both OSS Interface Availability Reports	ASA.DOC MR_RESP.DOC OSS_IA.DOC	PMR-2-C-24	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Corrected information regarding the source data for Average Speed of Answer Reports	ASA.DOC	PMR-2-C-24	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Data dictionary for raw data tables and fields	DATADIC2.XLS	PMR-2-C-25	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Responses with information regarding NODS fields	OP7_000306DataReqKanaujia.doc SQMANS~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-26	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Information on calculating all Billing metrics.	FW: BILLIN~1.DOC	PMR-2-C-27	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Code used in calculating Pre-Ordering OSS Response Interval	getresponse master script.docsql source.docmassage_perl.docresponse_production_table.docdb load command files.doc load_data source.doc yesterday source.doc OSS Response Report Source.doc OSS Response Reporting Process.vsd OSS Response Data Process.vsd Cover Letter.doc	PMR-2-P-1	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Code used in calculating Provisioning CCC	CCC.4GL	PMR-2-P-2	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Code used in calculating Billing metrics	REPMEA~1.DOC DOCBST~1.DOC REPLIN~1.DOC SQLQUE~1.DOC REPLY0~1.DOC	PMR-2-P-3	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Code used in calculating Trunk Group Performance metrics	TRUNKG~1.DOC TRUNKG~2.DOC	PMR-2-P-4	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Code used in calculating Trunk Group Performance metrics	TRKGRPDT.DOC TRKGRPSM.DOC	PMR-2-P-4	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Code used in calculating Trunk Group Performance metrics	ALL2.SQL SUJANCTT.SQL CLEC.SQL RSTEWART.SQL LOCAL.SQL SUJANLOC.SQL	PMR-2-P-4	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
SOCS User Guide	No Electronic Copy	PMR-2-P-5	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Raw data used in calculating Billing metrics, October, 1999	EYOCT~1.XLS	PMR-2-P-6	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements
Raw data used in the Average Completion Notice Interval, Jeopardy Interval and Total Service Order Cycle Time metrics	ACNIJE~1.XLS ACNIJE~1.DOC	PMR-2-P-7	BLS – Interconnection Operations – CLEC Performance Measurements

2.4.1 Data Generation/Volumes

This test relied on document reviews and interviews with BellSouth personnel.

2.5   Evaluation Methods

In the first stage of the Metrics Definition Documentation and Implementation Verification and Validation Review, KCI examined in detail the Definition, Calculation, and Business Rules sections for each SQM in the October 22, 1999 version of the SQM documentation. KCI also took into consideration changes published in the February 24, 2000 version of the SQM documentation. KCI examined the content of and the consistency among the statements related to each SQM.

In the second stage of this evaluation, KCI compared the statements in the Calculation and Exclusions sections for each SQM to the corresponding computation instructions published by BellSouth in the *PMAP Raw Data Users*

KPMG Consulting

Manual[4]*,* or to the data provided by BellSouth SMEs in response to KCI requests. Whenever a disagreement was found, KCI attempted to determine which description coincided with the actual computations.

KCI added a third stage to this evaluation whenever the second stage revealed that some or all of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation did not appear in the computation instructions. In that case, KCI reviewed the associated raw data creation process to determine if the exclusions in question were applied there instead.

2.6   Analysis Methods

The Metrics Definition Documentation and Implementation Verification and Validation Review test included a checklist of evaluation measures developed by KCI during the preparation of test activities for the BellSouth-Georgia OSS Evaluation. These evaluation measures provided the framework of norms, standards and guidelines for Metrics Definition Documentation and Implementation Verification and Validation Review.

3.0   Results Summary

This section identifies the discrete 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 VIII-2.3: Evaluation Criteria and Results

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
Pre-Ordering - Average OSS Response Time and Response Interval			
PMR2-1-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average. An additional set of measures is also defined: the percentage of occurrences within specific intervals (less than 2.3 seconds and more than 6 seconds).

---

[4] Whenever the *PMAP Raw Data Users Manual* provided a different but otherwise identical set of instructions for Trunks data and Non-Trunks data, this test was restricted to evaluating the instructions for Non-Trunks data due to the higher availability of Non-Trunks data.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-1-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average (i.e., sum of the measurements divided by the number of measurements). The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure OSS response time. The documented calculation incorrectly states that the average response time should be multiplied by 100. However, this does not impede understanding of the definition of the SQM.
PMR2-1-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions prescribe the calculation of an average, as specified by the stated calculation. The numerator aggregates daily OSS response times over the reporting period. These daily OSS response times are automatically calculated within Navigator, a commercial system for which internal processes and programs are proprietary to third parties and were, therefore, not tested. The denominator aggregates daily accesses to the Pre-Ordering systems over the reporting period, as specified by the stated calculation. The instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation.
PMR2-1-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation does not list any exclusion for this SQM.
Pre-Ordering – OSS Interface Availability			
PMR2-2-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an availability measurement. OSS availability is defined as hours actually available as a percentage of hours scheduled for availability.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-2-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the stated calculation of the SQM was incomplete, as it did not detail the calculations of functional availability and scheduled availability. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93.
			BLS changed the July SQM to provide additional detail on the calculation of functional availability and scheduled availability. KCI's re-test of the changes found the additional detail adequate.
			See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.
PMR2-2-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Not Complete	The computation instructions call for the calculation of actual interface availability as a percentage of scheduled availability, as specified by the stated calculation.
			The instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation. However, the SQM documentation requires that all unscheduled full outages be reflected in the SQM calculation, as a reduction in reported availability. BLS's stated definition of full outages is fairly broad, and includes outages that affect access by the customers, regardless of the cause. However, BLS's change control Web site lists outages (for the LENS system in particular, for October through December 2000) that are unscheduled and meet the stated definition of full outages, which are not reflected in the availability calculation. (BLS reported 100% availability for the LENS system in all three months.)
			BLS stated that it is instituting a process by which all relevant outages (including those listed on its change control Web site) will be taken into consideration when calculating the SQM values. Further, BLS will update the SQM

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			documentation to clarify its position on the definition of full outages. See Exception 133 for additional information on this issue.
PMR2-2-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Not Complete	The SQM documentation does not explicitly list any exclusion for this SQM. However, as indicated in PMR2-2-3 above, BLS has incorrectly excluded a number of unscheduled, full outages listed on the change control Web site, from its calculation of this SQM for October through December 2000.
			BLS has stated that it is instituting a process by which all relevant outages (including those listed on its change control Web site) will be taken into consideration when calculating the SQM values. Further, BLS will update the SQM documentation to clarify its position on the definition of full outages. See Exception 133 for additional information on this issue.
Ordering – Percent Rejected Service Requests			
PMR2-3-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percentage.
			The 10/22/99 version of the Georgia SQM documentation contained an inappropriate definition of validity of LSRs relevant only to electronically submitted LSRs. This was corrected in the 2/24/00 version.
PMR2-3-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage.
			The numerator, number of rejected service requests, is a subset of the denominator, total service requests received, which is logical.
PMR2-3-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The calculations in the computation instructions are consistent with the calculations in the stated calculation.
			The exclusion listed in the SQM documentation, Service Requests

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			cancelled by the CLEC prior to being rejected/clarified, is not addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-3-4 and Exception 87 for additional information. Exception 87 is closed.
PMR2-3-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the exclusion referred to in the PMR2-3-3 comments was not addressed in the raw data creation process. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS determined that the exclusion in question had been performed during BLS's staging process, but was changed during system modifications. A programming change was made to make the process consistent with BLS's computational instructions. KCI's subsequent review found the modified process consistent with the computational instructions. See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is now closed.
Ordering – Reject Interval			
PMR2-4-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration. The 10/22/99 version of the SQM documentation contains an inappropriate reference to validity of LSRs, relevant only to electronically- submitted LSRs. This was not corrected in the 2/24/00 version, however this reference has been eliminated in subsequent versions of the SQM documentation.
PMR2-4-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Not Complete	The calculation is properly stated as an average. However, the stated calculation does not clearly state which time stamps BLS uses to measure reject duration. See Exception 122 for additional information on this issue.
PMR2-4-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in	Not Complete	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that fatal rejects were not included when computing this SQM for the fully

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	the SQM documentation.		mechanized category. Since fatal rejects are instantaneous, the numerator would be the same. However, the denominator would be increased by the number of fatal rejects. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87.
			The May SQM was modified to remove the reference to the inclusion of fatal rejects. KCI's re-test of the change to the SQM found it adequate since the method employed is more conservative.
			See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed.
			Additionally, the stated calculation does not clearly state which time stamps BLS uses to measure reject duration. Further, based upon KCI's understanding of the stated calculation, BLS is not using appropriate time stamps in its calculation of reject durations. See Exception 122 for additional information on these issues.
			The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-4-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Ordering – Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness			
PMR2-5-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-5-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Not Complete	The calculation is properly stated as an average. However, the stated calculation does not clearly state which time stamps BLS uses to measure FOC duration. See Exception 122 for additional information on this issue.
PMR2-5-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with	Not Complete	The calculations in the computation instructions are not consistent with the

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.		calculations in the stated calculation. The stated calculation does not clearly state which time stamps BLS uses to measure FOC duration. Further, based upon KCI's understanding of the stated calculation, BLS may not be using appropriate time stamps in its calculation of FOC durations. See Exception 122 for additional information on these issues. The exclusion listed in the SQM documentation, Partially Mechanized or Non-Mechanized LSRs received and or FOCd outside of normal business hours, was not addressed in the initial computation instructions reviewed. However, this information is not essential to the SQM report generation process, because the exclusion is applied during the creation of the raw data. Additionally, this information is provided in subsequent versions of the computation instructions. See PMR2-5-4 and Exception 87 for additional information. Exception 87 is closed.
PMR2-5-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the exclusion referred to in PMR2-5-3 was not addressed in the raw data creation process either. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS modified the May and July SQMs to include the exclusion and reflect current LCSC business hours. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate. See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed.
Ordering – Speed of Answer in Ordering Center			
PMR2-6-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-6-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the stated calculation of the SQM incorrectly included calls abandoned in the

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	definition.		denominator. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93.
			BLS changed the July SQM to exclude abandoned calls. KCI's re-test of the changes were found adequate.
			See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.
PMR2-6-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions properly call for the calculation of Speed of answer as the aggregation of daily Delay To Handle (DTH) divided by daily Number of Calls Handled (NCH), where DTH is calculated as daily Average Speed to Answer (ASA) multiplied by NCH.
			Both ASA and NCH are automatically calculated within a commercial system, for which internal processes and programs are proprietary to third parties and were not tested.
			The instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation.
PMR2-6-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation does not list any exclusion for this SQM.
Provisioning – Mean Held Order Interval & Distribution Intervals			
PMR2-7-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation as a whole provides a reasonable definition of the SQM, but the Definition section itself does not provide a complete definition.
PMR2-7-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The stated calculation of Mean Held Order Interval only accounts for delayed orders still pending at the end of the reporting month, and does not account for held orders during the reporting month that were closed before the end of the reporting month. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93. BLS modified the July SQM

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			to clarify the definition and calculation of this metric. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate.
			See Exception 93 for additional information on these issues. KCI is preparing a closure statement for Exception 93.
			In the stated calculation of Held Order Distribution Interval, the numerator should refer to held orders not completed to be consistent with the denominator. Nevertheless, KCI believes that the stated calculation is substantially complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.
PMR2-7-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation found that the computation instructions called for held order interval to start with the earliest commitment date, which is inconsistent with the stated calculation of this interval.
			KCI found exclusions listed in the computation instructions that are inconsistent with the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS modified the May computational instructions and July SQM to resolve inconsistencies between the computational instructions and the SQM. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate.
			See Exceptions 87 and 105 for additional information on these issues. Exceptions 87 and 105 are closed.
			The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-7-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Provisioning – Average Jeopardy Notice Interval & Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices			
PMR2-8-1	The definition is	Satisfied	The SQM documentation as a whole

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.		provides a reasonable definition of the SQM, but the Definition section itself does not provide a complete definition. Because the necessary information is provided within the SQM documentation, KCI considers the definition provided complete.
PMR2-8-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation of Average Jeopardy Notice Interval is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure duration of jeopardy notice. The calculation of Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, orders given jeopardy notice, is a subset of the denominator, number of orders committed, which is logical.
PMR2-8-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure duration between date/time of jeopardy notice and commitment date/time. None of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation is addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-8-4 and Exception 87 for additional information. Exception 87 is closed.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-8-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the exclusions referred to in PMR2-8-3 were not addressed in the raw data creation process either. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS modified the May and July SQMs to reflect the inclusion of BLS caused statuses for jeopardy notices rather than list individual CLEC caused statuses for exclusion. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate. See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed.
Provisioning –Percent Missed Installation Appointments			
PMR2-9-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation as a whole provides a reasonable definition of the SQM, but the Definition section itself does not provide a complete definition.
PMR2-9-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the stated calculation was expressed as a percentage of orders completed, but should be expressed as a percentage of orders processed (for which a commitment date has been issued). As a result, KCI issued Exception 93. BLS changed the July SQM was to include all orders with a past due completion date. KCI's re-test found the change adequate. See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.
PMR2-9-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-9-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Provisioning – Average Completion Interval Order Completion Interval Distribution			
PMR2-10-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	Both sub-metrics for this SQM are properly defined, respectively, as an average of a duration and a percentage of occurrences falling within specific intervals.
PMR2-10-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation of the first sub-metric is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure completion duration. The calculation of the second sub-metric is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator (service orders completed in "X" days) is a subset of the denominator (total service orders completed), which is logical.
PMR2-10-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions called for converting null completion duration to 0.33 days, inconsistent with SQM documentation. As a result, KCI issued Exception 84. The July SQM was updated to include the conversion of the null completion duration. KCI's re-test of the change found it adequate. See Exception 84 for additional information on this issue. Exception 84 is closed. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-10-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	instructions.		
Provisioning – Average Completion Notice Interval			
PMR2-11-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-11-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that, for this average duration measurement, the numerator was based on orders notified and the denominator was based on orders completed in the reporting period. This resulted in an incorrect calculation. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93. BLS changed the July SQM to reflect that the denominator is based on orders notified. KCI's re-test found the change adequate. See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.
PMR2-11-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions called for orders to be limited to those completed before the end of the reporting period. However, there were no instructions to exclude orders completed before the beginning of the reporting period. The computation instructions incorrectly called for exclusions that are not listed in the SQM documentation. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS modified the May computational instructions and July SQM to make them consistent. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate. See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed.
PMR2-11-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the program code for raw data creation limited orders to those completed before the end of the report period, but did not

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	instructions.		limit orders to those completed on or after the beginning of the report period. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87.

BLS changed the May computational instructions to limit orders to those completed on or after the beginning of the report period. KCI's re-test of the change found it adequate.

See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed. |
| *Provisioning – Coordinated Customer Conversions (CCC)* | | | |
| PMR2-12-1 | The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM. | Satisfied | The SQM is properly defined as an average duration. However, the title of the SQM does not clearly label it as a duration. Nevertheless, KCI considers the definition provided through the entire SQM documentation (Calculation, Business Rules, etc.) for this SQM complete, and does not believe that this omission interferes with the understanding of the SQM. |
| PMR2-12-2 | The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition. | Satisfied | The calculation is properly stated as an average.

The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure CCC completion duration. |
| PMR2-12-3 | BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation. | Satisfied | The computation instructions properly call for aggregating CCC duration for each cross-connected item and dividing this by the sum of all items cross-connected.

The computation instructions properly call for CCC duration for each cross-connected item to be calculated as the difference between cross-connection time and disconnection time. |
| PMR2-12-4 | Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions. | Satisfied | The three exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are applied to raw data creation during manual transcription of data from the WFA-C system into an Excel spreadsheet in a manner consistent with |

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			the SQM documentation.
			The first exclusion, orders cancelled by the CLEC, is accomplished by not transcribing records that have no date entered in the Due Date Complete field.
			The second exclusion, delays due to CLEC following disconnection of the unbundled loop, is accomplished by not transcribing records documented in the WFA-C data as including CLEC delays.
			Records that meet the criteria for the third exclusion, unbundled loops where there is no existing subscriber loop, are not included in the data used to prepare the raw data file.
Provisioning – Percent Provisioning Troubles Within 30 Days			
PMR2-13-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percentage. However, the SQM name initially referred to service order activity rather than service order completion. BLS has subsequently updated the name of this SQM to "Percent Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Completion."
PMR2-13-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, service orders experiencing troubles within 30 days of provisioning, is a subset of the denominator, total service orders completed, which is logical.
			Initially, the documentation of the denominator was imprecise and not clearly stated as service orders completed in the month preceding the reporting period. BLS addressed this issue in subsequent versions of the documentation.
PMR2-13-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that exclusions listed in the computation instructions were inconsistent with the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			BLS changed the May computational instructions and July SQM to make them consistent. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate.
			See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed.
			The calculations in the computation instructions are consistent with the calculations in the stated calculation.
			The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-13-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Provisioning – Total Service Order Cycle Time			
PMR2-14-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-14-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average.
PMR2-14-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions called for converting null completion duration to 0.33 days, inconsistent with SQM documentation. As a result, KCI issued Exception 84.
			The July SQM was updated to include the conversion of the null completion duration. KCI's re-test of the change found it adequate.
			See Exception 84 for additional information on this issue. Exception 84 is closed.
			The exclusion listed in the SQM documentation, L appointment coded

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			orders, is not addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-14-4 and Exception 87 for additional information. Exception 87 is closed.
PMR2-14-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the exclusion referred to in PMR2-14-3 was not addressed in the raw data creation process either. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. The July SQM was updated to include the conversion of the null completion duration. KCI's re-test of the change found it adequate. See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed.
Provisioning – Service Order Accuracy			
PMR2-15-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The process to be performed to measure the accuracy of provision of service orders is properly defined as a comparison of items ordered and items completed.
PMR2-15-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a comparison of accurately fulfilled orders out of all orders completed. However, the sampling methodology is not adequately documented. Nevertheless, KCI considers the stated calculation complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.
PMR2-15-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions incorrectly prescribed that, for large sample sizes, items for which the service request and the service order cannot be compared should not be counted as an error but still included in the denominator. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS changed the July SQM to indicate that a service order that cannot be matched to a service request is not counted in either numerator or denominator. KCI's re-test of the change found it adequate.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed.
			None of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-15-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	All three exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are applied to raw data generation.
			The first exclusion, Cancelled Service Orders, is accomplished by matching records selected against records from the SOCS system that are for completed orders only.
			The second exclusion, order activities of BLS associated with internal or administrative use of local services, and the third exclusion, D & F orders, are accomplished by selecting records that have specific field values, which are documented in BLS's document entitled "Service Order Accuracy Sampling Process," dated 2/28/2000.
Maintenance & Repair – Missed Repair Appointments			
PMR2-16-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percentage and the definition is complete.
PMR2-16-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, troubles cleared past committed date and time, is a subset of the denominator, total troubles closed, which is logical.
PMR2-16-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions prescribe the calculation of a percentage, as specified by the stated calculation.
			The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-16-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	in BLS's computation instructions.		
Maintenance & Repair – Customer Trouble Report Rate			
PMR2-17-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined.
PMR2-17-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a ratio of occurrences of troubles per 100 lines.
PMR2-17-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions incorrectly called for including troubles reported and closed in the numerator while the stated calculation describes it as troubles reported (i.e., including pending trouble reports). As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS changed the July SQM to include initial and repeated troubles in both the numerator and denominator. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate. See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-17-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Maintenance & Repair – Maintenance Average Duration			
PMR2-18-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-18-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure maintenance duration.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-18-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation indicated that the computation instructions called for counting all closed trouble tickets *received within the reporting period* in the denominator, while the stated calculation describes it as the count of trouble tickets *closed during the reporting period* (some of which might have been *received* prior to the reporting period). As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS's response to Exception 87 clarified the apparent inconsistency between the computational instructions and the stated calculation. KCI's re-test found this response to be adequate. See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is now closed. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-18-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Maintenance & Repair – Percent Repeat Troubles Within 30 Days			
PMR2-19-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percentage.
PMR2-19-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the stated calculation is expressed as a percentage of troubles closed but should be expressed as a percentage of troubles reported. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93. BLS changed the July SQM to reflect that the calculation is a percentage of troubles reported. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate. See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.
PMR2-19-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions incorrectly called for counting the number of <u>closed</u> trouble tickets reported during the reporting month and identified as repeat troubles. As a result, KCI issued Exception 87. BLS changed the July SQM to include repeat trouble tickets completed in the reporting month. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate. See Exception 87 for additional information on this issue. Exception 87 is closed. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-19-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Maintenance & Repair – Out of Service > 24 Hours			
PMR2-20-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percentage.
PMR2-20-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, troubles out of service for more than 24 hours, is a subset of the denominator, which is logical. The documentation of the denominator is imprecise and should clearly indicate that it refers to troubles closed. However, KCI considers the stated calculation as complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.
PMR2-20-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions prescribe the calculation of a percentage, as specified by the stated calculation.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-20-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Maintenance & Repair – OSS Interface Availability			
PMR2-21-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an availability measurement. OSS availability is defined as hours actually available as a percentage of hours scheduled for availability.
PMR2-21-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the stated calculation of the SQM was incomplete, as it did not detail the calculations of functional availability and scheduled availability. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93. BLS changed the July SQM to include the additional details of the calculation. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate. See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.
PMR2-21-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Not Complete	The computation instructions call for the calculation of actual interface availability as a percentage of scheduled availability, as specified by the stated calculation. The instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation. However, the SQM documentation requires that all unscheduled full outages be reflected in the SQM calculation, as a reduction in the reported availability. BLS's stated definition of full outages is fairly broad, and includes outages that affect access by the customers, regardless of the cause.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			Given the current processes and definitions, systems could be inaccessible to CLECs, representing an unscheduled full outage, without there being a corresponding reduction in the availability SQM value.
			BLS has stated that it is instituting a process by which all relevant outages (including those listed on its change control Web site) will be taken into consideration when calculating the SQM values. Further, BLS will update the SQM documentation to clarify its position on the definition of full outages. See Exception 133 for additional information on this issue.
PMR2-21-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Not Complete	The SQM documentation does not explicitly list any exclusion for this SQM. However, as indicated in PMR2-21-3 above, BLS could be incorrectly excluding unscheduled, full outages from its calculation of this SQM.
			BLS has stated that it is instituting a process by which all relevant outages (including those listed on its change control Web site) will be taken into consideration when calculating the SQM values. Further, BLS will update the SQM documentation to clarify its position on the definition of full outages. See Exception 133 for additional information on this issue.
Maintenance & Repair – OSS Response Interval and Percentages			
PMR2-22-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined. However, the reference to "OSS Response Interval" in the name incorrectly implies that response interval is reported, while only the number and percentages of request falling within specific interval categories are reported.
PMR2-22-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the calculation of the SQM, which measures percentage of requests falling within specific interval categories, was not

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			properly stated. It did not describe <u>counting</u> the number of queries for which response time falls within a specific category. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93. BLS changed the name of the metric to ***OSS Response Percent within Interval*** in the July SQM. KCI's re-test of the change found it adequate. See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.
PMR2-22-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions properly call for counting the number of accesses and calculating the percentage of accesses falling within each category. The exclusion listed in the 10/22/99 SQM documentation, Queries received during scheduled system maintenance time, is not addressed in the computation instructions. This exclusion was removed, effective with the 2/24/00 version of the documentation. See PMR2-22-4 for additional information.
PMR2-22-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The 10/22/99 SQM documentation lists one exclusion: records for queries received during scheduled system maintenance time. Queries cannot be submitted while the system is down for maintenance, so no records that meet the exclusion criteria will ever be created. The 2/24/00 version has been revised to remove this exclusion.
Maintenance & Repair – Average Answer Time – Repair Centers			
PMR2-23-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-23-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure answer time. Although the denominator is imprecise (it

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *VIII-B-69*

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

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			should clearly indicate that it refers to calls handled and does not include abandoned calls), KCI considers the stated calculation complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.
PMR2-23-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions properly call for the calculation of answer time as the aggregation of daily Delay To Handle (DTH) divided by daily Number of Calls Handled (NCH), where DTH is calculated as daily Average Speed to Answer (ASA) multiplied by NCH. Both ASA and NCH are automatically calculated within a commercial system, for which internal processes and programs are proprietary to third parties and were not tested. The computation instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation.
PMR2-23-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation does not list any exclusion for this SQM.
Billing – Invoice Accuracy			
PMR2-24-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined, measuring invoice accuracy as a percentage.
PMR2-24-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the subcomponents of this percentage measurement were different and unrelated sets, resulting in an incorrect calculation. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93. BLS changed to July SQM to reflect that the metric addresses both current charges and adjustments to prior periods. KCI's re-test found the changes adequate. See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			the GPSC.
			The stated calculation should specify that the <u>absolute value</u> of billing related adjustments is used in the numerator.
PMR2-24-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions call for the calculation of a percentage, as specified by the stated calculation.
			None of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation is addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-24-4 and Exception 83 for additional information. Exception 83 is closed.
PMR2-24-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the listed exclusion was applied in the creation of raw data for CLEC records, but not for BLS records. As a result, KCI issued Exception 83.
			The exclusion listed was applied prior to receipt of the BLS data from its originating system and were outside the computations reflected in the reviewed instructions. BLS changed the documentation to make it consistent. KCI's re-test of the changes found them adequate.
			See Exception 83 for additional information on this issue. Exception 83 is closed.
			BLS has said it will introduce a mechanized process that will apply the exclusion to both CLEC and BLS records in the same manner.
Billing – Mean Time to Deliver Invoices			
PMR2-25-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
			However, the definition section does not provide a complete definition of the SQM. Specifically, it fails to define the SQM as an average duration to <u>deliver</u> invoices. Nevertheless, KCI considers the definition complete, and does not believe that this omission interferes with the

KPMG Consulting

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			understanding of the SQM.
PMR2-25-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure average duration to deliver invoices.
PMR2-25-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions properly call for the calculation of an average, as specified by the stated calculation. The numerator aggregates invoice delivery duration. The denominator counts the total number of invoices delivered. Each invoice delivery duration is automatically computed during creation of raw data. Although the description of this computation is consistent with the SQM documentation (difference between invoice transmission date and end of the billing cycle), the programming code was not tested. None of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation is addressed in the computation instructions.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-25-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the listed exclusions are not applied in the creation of raw data. As a result, KCI issued Exception 83. The exclusion is performed prior to the computations described in the computational instructions. BLS changed the July SQM document to make it consistent. KCI's re-test found the change adequate. See Exception 83 for additional information on this issue. Exception 83 is closed. The listed exclusion does not call for the exclusion of records or data, but instead clarifies the definition of the SQM. BLS has said it will revise the SQM documentation.
Billing – Usage Data Delivery Accuracy			
PMR2-26-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percentage of data delivered accurately.
PMR2-26-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	Since all retransmissions of usage data packs are performed the same day, subtracting usage data packs re-transmitted from usage data packs sent in the numerator results in usage data packs sent error-free, which is logical.
PMR2-26-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions properly call for a percentage measurement and subtracting pack failures from packs sent to obtain packs sent error-free in the numerator. Pack failures are manually tracked and aggregated as they occur. The total number of packs sent is automatically calculated in BLS systems. The programming code was not tested. Instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-26-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation does not list any exclusion for this SQM.
Billing – Usage Data Delivery Completeness			
PMR2-27-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as measuring data delivery completeness.
PMR2-27-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the stated calculation of the SQM only measures timeliness of usage data delivery and not completeness. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93. The definition of the metric is consistent with the national standard for the metric. KCI's re-test resulted in the closure of the issue in this exception. See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.
PMR2-27-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The calculations in the computation instructions are consistent with the calculations in the stated calculation. Instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation.
PMR2-27-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation does not list any exclusion for this SQM.
Billing – Usage Data Delivery Timeliness			
PMR2-28-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as measuring data delivery timeliness.
PMR2-28-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator (number of usage data delivered within six days) is a subset of

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			the denominator (total number of usage data delivered), which is logical. Initially, the stated calculation did not specify that the measurement is based on usage data from the current reporting month. BLS addressed this issue in subsequent versions of the SQM documentation.
PMR2-28-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The calculations in the computation instructions are consistent with the stated calculation. Instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation.
PMR2-28-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation does not list any exclusion for this SQM.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
Billing – *Mean Time to Deliver Usage*			
PMR2-29-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-29-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the numerator of the SQM is calculated based on estimated, instead of actual, number of days to deliver. As a result, KCI issued Exception 93.

The estimation identified in the exception is solely related to messages received in less than a day. Since the metric is measured in days and is consistent with the industry standard, KCI closed the exception for this issue.

See Exception 93 for additional information on this issue. KCI recommended closure of Exception 93 to the GPSC.

The documentation of the denominator is imprecise and should be clearly stated as records delivered/sent during the reporting period. KCI identified this issue to BLS. |
| PMR2-29-3 | BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation. | Satisfied | KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions prescribed that delivery duration for all usage records taking more than 30 days to deliver be estimated as 31.5 days, which is inconsistent with the SQM documentation.   As a result, KCI issued Exception 84.

KCI reviewed BLS's calculations of the number of usage records taking more than 30 days over a seven-month period and determined that the number was so small as to not affect the overall metric in a material way. The SQM was updated with a note indicating the rule being applied to usage records taking more than 30 days. KCI's re-test of the change found it adequate.

See Exception 84 for additional |

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			information on this issue. Exception 84 is closed.
			Instructions do not call for exclusion of records, which is consistent with the SQM documentation.
PMR2-29-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation does not list any exclusion for this SQM.
Operator Services (Toll) and Directory Assistance – Average Speed to Answer (Toll)			
PMR2-30-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-30-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure speed of answer. Initially, KCI found a reference irrelevant to this SQM in the Definition section of the SQM documentation. BLS removed this reference in subsequent versions of the SQM documentation.
PMR2-30-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions incorrectly called for including the time abandoned calls stay on hold in the numerator. As a result, KCI issued Exception 84. BLS modified the calculation to exclude time-abandoned calls and modified the SQM accordingly. KCI's re-test found the modifications adequate. See Exception 84 for additional information on this issue. Exception 84 is closed.
PMR2-30-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The exclusion listed in the stated calculation documents the handling of abandoned calls in the system that tracks calls in the queue and in the conversion tables used to determine the percent answered in "X" seconds, but does not

KPMG Consulting

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			require any exclusion of calls in the creation of raw data or calculation of the SQM.
Operator Services (Toll) and Directory Assistance – Percent Answered within "X" seconds (Toll)			
PMR2-31-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percent of calls answered within a specific interval.
PMR2-31-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as involving the use of conversion tables that generate the percent of calls answered within a specific interval.
PMR2-31-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions properly call for the use of a third-party conversion system. This system's internal processes and programs are proprietary and were not tested.
PMR2-31-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The exclusion listed in the stated calculation documents the handling of abandoned calls in the system that tracks calls in the queue, and in the conversion tables used to determine the percent answered in "X" seconds, but does not require any exclusion of calls in the creation of raw data or calculation of the SQM.
Operator Services (Toll) and Directory Assistance – Average Speed to Answer (DA)			
PMR2-32-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-32-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure speed of answer. Initially, KCI found a reference irrelevant to this SQM in the Definition section of the SQM documentation. BLS removed this reference in subsequent versions of the SQM documentation.
PMR2-32-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions incorrectly called for including the time abandoned

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *VIII-B-78*

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

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	the SQM documentation.		calls stay on hold in the numerator. As a result, KCI issued Exception 84. BLS modified the calculation to exclude time-abandoned calls and modified the SQM accordingly. KCI's re-test found the modifications adequate. See Exception 84 for additional information on this issue. Exception 84 is closed.
PMR2-32-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The exclusion listed in the stated calculation documents the handling of abandoned calls in the system that tracks calls in the queue and in the conversion tables used to determine the percent answered in "X" seconds, but does not require any exclusion of calls in the creation of raw data or calculation of the SQM.
Operator Services (Toll) and Directory Assistance – Percent Answered within "X" seconds (DA)			
PMR2-33-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percent of calls answered within a specific interval.
PMR2-33-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as involving the use of conversion tables that generate the percent of calls answered within a specific interval.
PMR2-33-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions properly call for the use of a third-party conversion system. This system's internal processes and programs are proprietary and were not tested.
PMR2-33-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The exclusion listed in the stated calculation documents the handling of abandoned calls in the system that tracks calls in the queue and in the conversion tables used to determine the percent answered in "X" seconds, but does not require any exclusion of calls in the creation of raw data or calculation of the SQM.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
E911 – Timeliness			
PMR2-34-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percentage measuring E911 data processed in a timely fashion.
PMR2-34-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, E911 data processed in a timely fashion, is a subset of the denominator, total E911 data processed, which is logical.
PMR2-34-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The calculations in the computation instructions are consistent with the calculations in the stated calculation. None of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-34-4 for additional information.
PMR2-34-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation refer to handling of E911 calls in the third party (SCC Communications) system that handles E911 calls, but do not require any exclusion of calls in the creation of raw data or calculation of the SQM. This system's internal processes and programs are proprietary and were not tested.
E911 – Accuracy			
PMR2-35-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as measuring E911 data processed without errors. Initially, the definition was not expressed as a percentage. BLS addressed this issue in subsequent versions of the SQM documentation.
PMR2-35-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, E911 data processed without errors, is a subset of the denominator, total E911 data processed, which is logical.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-35-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The calculations in the computation instructions are consistent with the stated calculation. None of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation is addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-35-4 for additional information.
PMR2-35-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation refer to handling of E911 calls in the third party (SCC Communications) system that handles E911 calls, but do not require any exclusion of calls in the creation of raw data or calculation of the SQM. This system's internal processes and programs are proprietary and were not tested.
E911 – Mean Interval			
PMR2-36-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-36-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure processing duration.
PMR2-36-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The calculations in the computation instructions are consistent with the calculations in the stated calculation. None of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation is addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-36-4 for additional information.
PMR2-36-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation refer to handling of E911 calls in the third party (SCC Communications) system that handles E911 calls, but do not require any exclusion of calls in the creation of raw data or calculation of the SQM. This system's internal processes and programs are proprietary and were not tested.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
Trunk Group Performance – Trunk Group Service Report			
PMR2-37-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as measuring performance failure.
PMR2-37-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, number of blocked calls, is a subset of the denominator, number of attempted calls, which is logical.
PMR2-37-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions call for the calculation of a percentage, as specified by the stated calculation. However, none of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation is addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-37-4 for additional information.
PMR2-37-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The listed exclusions are applied in the creation of the raw data files.
Trunk Group Performance – Trunk Group Service Detail			
PMR2-38-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as measuring performance failure.
PMR2-38-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, number of blocked calls, is a subset of the denominator, number of attempted calls, which is logical.
PMR2-38-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions call for the calculation of a percentage, as specified by the stated calculation. None of the exclusions listed in the SQM documentation is addressed in the computation instructions. See PMR2-38-4 for additional information.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-38-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The listed exclusions are applied in the creation of the raw data files.
Trunk Group Performance – Trunk Group Performance – Aggregate			
PMR2-39-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as reporting aggregate blocking information on trunk groups. However, the Definition section does not provide a detailed definition of the SQM. Nevertheless, KCI considers the definition provided through the entire SQM documentation (Calculation, Business Rules, etc.) for this SQM complete, and does not believe that this omission interferes with the understanding of the SQM.
PMR2-39-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a weighted average.
PMR2-39-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions call for the calculation of a weighted average, as specified by the stated calculation. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-39-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Trunk Group Performance – Trunk Group Performance – CLEC Specific			
PMR2-40-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as reporting blocking information on CLEC specific trunk groups. However, the Definition section does not provide a detailed definition of the SQM. Nevertheless, KCI considers the definition provided through the entire SQM documentation (Calculation, Business Rules, etc.) for this SQM complete, and does not believe that

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			this omission interferes with the understanding of the SQM.
PMR2-40-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a weighted average.
PMR2-40-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions call for the calculation of a weighted average, as specified by the stated calculation. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-40-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	Exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are included in BLS's computation instructions.
Collocation – Average Response Time			
PMR2-41-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-41-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure response duration.
PMR2-41-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions call for the calculation of an average duration, as specified by the stated calculation. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions.
PMR2-41-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation prescribes exclusion of records for requests to augment previously completed arrangements. A field used to implement this exclusion is populated manually during raw data creation based on a review of existing applications.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
Collocation – Average Arrangement Time			
PMR2-42-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as an average duration.
PMR2-42-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as an average. The numerator uses appropriate time stamps to measure arrangement duration.
PMR2-42-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	KCI's initial evaluation revealed that the computation instructions called for the calculation of average arrangement duration in calendar days, inconsistent with SQM documentation. As a result, KCI issued Exception 84. The July SQM was changed to state that are based on calendar days calculations. KCI's re-test of the change found it adequate. See Exception 84 for additional information on this issue. Exception 84 is closed. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions except for "Time required for BLS to obtain permits." See PMR2-42-4 for additional information.
PMR2-42-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation prescribes the exclusion of the time required for BLS to obtain permits from this SQM. The implementation of this exclusion is performed manually during raw data creation by subtracting the number of days stored in the "Number of Permit Days" field from the calculated arrangement time.
Collocation – Percent of Due Dates Missed			
PMR2-43-1	The definition is complete and agrees with the name of the SQM.	Satisfied	The SQM is properly defined as a percentage.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR2-43-2	The stated calculation is complete, logical, and consistent with the definition.	Satisfied	The calculation is properly stated as a percentage. The numerator, number of orders completed passed the committed date, is a subset of the denominator, total orders completed, which is logical.
PMR2-43-3	BLS's computation instructions agree with the stated calculation in the SQM documentation.	Satisfied	The computation instructions call for the calculation of a percentage, as specified by the stated calculation. The exclusions listed in the SQM documentation are all addressed in the computation instructions except for "Time required for BLS to obtain permits." See PMR2-43-4 for additional information.
PMR2-43-4	Listed exclusions are applied to raw data creation if not included in BLS's computation instructions.	Satisfied	The SQM documentation prescribes the exclusion of the time required for BLS to obtain permits from this SQM. The implementation of this exclusion is performed manually during raw data creation by subtracting the number of days stored in the "Number of Permit Days" field from the calculated arrangement time.