A. EDI and TAG Resale Functional Evaluation (PO&P11)

1.0 Description

The objective of the Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) and Telecommunications Access Gateway (TAG) Resale Functional Evaluation (PO&P11) was to evaluate the BellSouth Operational Support Systems (OSS) and processes associated with pre-ordering and ordering of Resale services by Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs). This test assessed the functionality of BellSouth's pre-ordering and ordering systems in processing pre-order queries and Local Service Requests (LSRs).

2.0 Methodology

This section summarizes the test methodology.

2.1 Business Process Description

See Section IV, "Pre-Ordering, Ordering & Provisioning Overview" for a description of the BellSouth ordering process via TAG and EDI.

2.2 Scenarios

KCI generated and transmitted LSRs based on the Resale scenarios outlined in the BellSouth – Georgia OSS *Supplemental Test Plan* (*STP*). The EDI and TAG Resale Functional Evaluation (PO&P11) scenarios covered the following Resale activity types:

Table IV-1.1: Resale Test Scenarios

Activity	Res. POTS	Bus. POTS	Res. ISDN-BRI	Bus. ISDN-BRI	PBX	Syn-chronet
Migration from BLS "as is"	X	X	X	X	X	
Feature changes to existing customer	X	X				
Migration from BLS "as specified"	X	X	X	X		
New customer	X	X			X	X[1]
Telephone number change	X	X				
Directory change	X	X				
Add lines/trunks/ circuits	X	X			X	
Suspend/restore service	X	X				

---

[1] BellSouth supports electronic orders for new Synchronet® service at speeds of 2.4, 4.8, and 9.6Kbps.

KPMG Consulting

Disconnect (full and partial)	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
Moves (inside and outside)	**X**	**X**				

Pre-Order activity was limited to the submission of requests for information required to complete the Resale orders.

2.3   Test Targets & Measures

The test target was the pre-ordering and ordering processes and sub-processes for Resale via the TAG and EDI interfaces.   Processes, sub-processes, and evaluation measures are summarized in the following table. The last column, "Test Cross-Reference," indicates where the particular measures are addresses in Section 3.1 "Results & Analysis."

Table IV-1.2: Test Target Cross-Reference: EDI and TAG Resale Functional Evaluation

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
Submit a Pre-Order	Send a pre-order	Presence of Functionality	PO&P-11-2-2
	Retrieve required information for submission of Resale order	Accuracy of Response	PO&P-11-4-1 PO&P-11-4-2
Submit an Order	Send order in LSR format	Presence of Functionality	PO&P-11-2-1 PO&P-11-2-3
	Receive acknowledgment	Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-1a PO&P-11-3-1b
	Receive FOC/error/reject notification	Accuracy of Response	PO&P-11-4-3 PO&P-11-4-4 PO&P-11-4-5
		Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-4-3
		Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-2a PO&P-11-3-2b PO&P-11-3-3a PO&P-11-3-3b PO&P-11-3-4a PO&P-11-3-4b PO&P-11-3-5a PO&P-11-3-5b
	Send expedited order transaction	Presence of Functionality	PO&P-11-2-1 PO&P-11-2-3
Submit a Supplement	Send supplement	Presence of Functionality	PO&P-11-2-1 PO&P-11-2-3

KPMG Consulting

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
	Receive acknowledgment	Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-1a PO&P-11-3-1b
	Receive FOC/error/reject notification	Accuracy of Response	PO&P-11-4-3 PO&P-11-4-4 PO&P-11-4-5
		Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-4-3 PO&P-11-4-4
		Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-2a PO&P-11-3-2b PO&P-11-3-3a PO&P-11-3-3b PO&P-11-3-4a PO&P-11-3-4b PO&P-11-3-5a PO&P-11-3-5b
	Correct error(s)	Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-4-4
	Re-send supplement	Presence of Functionality	PO&P-11-2-1 PO&P-11-2-3
	Receive FOC	Accuracy of Response	PO&P-11-4-3
		Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-4-3
		Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-4a PO&P-11-3-4b PO&P-11-3-5a PO&P-11-3-5b
Receive Completion Notice (CN)	Receive CN transaction	Accuracy of Response	PO&P-11-4-6
		Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-4-6
		Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-6a PO&P-11-3-6b
Receive Jeopardy Notification	Receive Jeopardy notification/Missed Appointment transaction	Accuracy of Response	PO&P-11-3-5 PO&P-11-3-6
		Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-3-5 PO&P-11-3-6
		Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-7 PO&P-11-3-8
Submit an Error	Send error in LSR format	Presence of Functionality	PO&P-11-2-1 PO&P-11-2-3
	Receive acknowledgement	Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-1a PO&P-11-3-1b
	Receive planned error/reject notification	Accuracy of Response	PO&P-11-4-4
		Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-4-4

Process	Sub-Process	Evaluation Measure	Test Cross-Reference
		Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-2a PO&P-11-3-2b PO&P-11-3-3a PO&P-11-3-3b
	Correct error(s)	Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-4-4
	Re-send order	Presence of Functionality	PO&P-11-2-1 PO&P-11-2-3
	Receive FOC	Accuracy of Response	PO&P-11-4-3
		Clarity of Information	PO&P-11-4-3
		Timeliness of Response	PO&P-11-3-4a PO&P-11-3-4b PO&P-11-3-5a PO&P-11-3-5b

2.4   Data Sources

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

Table IV-1.3: Data Sources for EDI and TAG Functional Evaluation

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Local Exchange Ordering (LEO) Implementation Guide, Volume 1. Issues 7L, 7M, 7N, 7O and 7P were utilized.	No Electronic Copy	PO&P–11-A-25	BLS
LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 2. Issue 6B, July 99	No Electronic Copy	PO&P-11-A-26	BLS
LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 3. Issue 3A, August 98	No Electronic Copy	PO&P-11-A-27	BLS
LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 4. Issue 7F October 99	No Electronic Copy	PO&P-11-A-28	BLS
Product and Services Interval Guide	No Electronic Copy	PO&P-11-A-29	BLS
Local Service Request Error Messages (Version TCIF 7)	POP11_errors.pdf	PO&P-11-A-4	BLS
CLEC Service Order Tracking System (CSOTS) *Users Guide*	POP11_csots.pdf	PO&P-11-A-1	BLS
KCI Company Codes and Billing Account Numbers	POP11_OCN.xls	PO&P-11-A-6	BLS
Initial State Customer Service Records (CSRs)	POP11_PreCSR.mdb	PO&P-11-A-10	BLS

Document	File Name	Location in Work Papers	Source
Post-Order Activity CSRs	POP11_PostCSR.mdb	PO&P-11-A-11	BLS
Pending Order Status Job Aid	POP11_Pendingstat.pdf	PO&P-11-A-13	BLS
Additional Test Bed Addresses	POP11_newad.doc	PO&P-11-A-14	BLS
Resale Test Case Master	POP11_Testcasemaster.xls	PO&P-11-A-17	KCI
Order Transaction Submission Schedule	POP11_editagsced.xls	PO&P-11-A-18	KCI
KCI Help Desk Log	POP11_HelpDesklog.xls	PO&P-11-A-19	KCI
KCI Issues Log	POP11_TestIssues.xls	PO&P-11-A-20	KCI
EDI System Availability Logs	POP11_EDIsystem.mdb	PO&P-11-A-22	HP
Expected Results Analysis - EDI	POP11_EDIExpected	PO&P-11-A-25	KCI
TAG System Availability Logs	POP11_TAGsystem.mdb	PO&P-11-A-26	HP
Expected Results Analysis – TAG	POP11_TAGExpected.mdb	PO&P-11-A-27	KCI

2.4.1 Data Generation/Volumes

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

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

2.5 Evaluation Methods

To allow for service request submission, BellSouth provided KCI with test bed accounts that were provisioned according to KCI's specification[2]. Test cases and instances, equivalent to Local Service Requests (LSRs), were developed using test bed accounts, pre-order data and BellSouth ordering documentation, which included the *Local Exchange Ordering Guide (LEO), Volume 1.*

KCI submitted order transactions according to a pre-defined schedule. Pre-order queries were submitted for requests for information required to complete the Resale orders. KCI evaluated transaction responses to determine if BellSouth systems and representatives provided the pre-order and order functionality described in BellSouth documentation.   Transaction responses were evaluated for consistency with the BellSouth pre-order and order Business Rules.   In addition, KCI evaluated the timeliness, accuracy, and completeness of transaction responses.

---

[2] See Section IV, "Pre-Ordering, Ordering & Provisioning Overview" for a detailed description of the Ordering and Provisioning test bed.

![KPMG Consulting]

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-5*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

2.6 Analysis Methods

The EDI and TAG Functional Evaluation included a checklist of evaluation measures developed by KCI during the preparation of test activities for the BellSouth - GA OSS Evaluation. The evaluation criteria provided the framework of norms, standards, and guidelines for the EDI and TAG Functional Evaluation.

The Georgia Public Service Commission (GPSC) voted on June 6, 2000 to approve a set of Service Quality Measurement- (SQM-) related measures and standards to be used for purposes of this evaluation[3]. Where applicable, results for this evaluation that map to an SQM were calculated based on Hewlett Packard/KCI time stamps, which may differ significantly from the time measurement points reported in the SQMs[4]. For those evaluation criteria that do not map to the GPSC-approved measures, or where BellSouth does not specify and publish a standard business interval for a given procedure, KCI applied its own standard, based on our professional judgment.

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

3.0 Results Summary

This section identifies the evaluation criteria and test results.

3.1 Results & Analysis

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

Table IV-1.4: Evaluation Criteria and Results

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
Interface Availability			
PO&P-11-1-1	TAG and EDI order transaction capability is consistently	Satisfied	The GPSC approved standard is 99.5% system availability during scheduled hours of operation[5].

---

[3] On October 30, 2000, the GPSC issued an order requiring BellSouth to report for business purposes a set of measures that differs in some cases from the requirements of the June 6, 2000 test standards.

[4] For example, for an LSR, BellSouth records the time received and the time a corresponding FOC or ERR is sent. HP/KCI measures the time an LSR is sent, and the time a corresponding FOC or ERR is received. In most cases, we would expect these times to correspond roughly, allowing for factors such as queuing and transmission time. In some cases, these times may differ significantly as a result of system downtime, network congestion, etc.

[5] Regular scheduled hours of availability for the TAG interface are published on the Interconnection Web site (www.interconnection.bellsouth.com/oss/oss_hour.html). Notices of specific scheduled system downtime (e.g.,

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-6*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	available during scheduled hours of operation.		During the course of this test, Hewlett Packard attempted to maintain a constant connection to BLS's EDI and TAG interfaces by implementing regular system 'pinging'.
			Based on an analysis of HP's EDI system availability logs between 2/7/00 and 7/27/00[6], KCI observed that the EDI interface was available during 98.6% of scheduled hours of availability[7].
			Based on an analysis of HP's TAG system availability logs between 2/15/00 and 7/27/00[8], KCI observed that the TAG interface was available during 99.5% of scheduled hours of availability.
System Functionality			
PO&P-11-2-1	The TAG and EDI interface provides expected system responses.	Satisfied	The KCI standard is 99% of expected system and representative response received.
			Of the 644[9] order transactions submitted during the Functional Evaluation, 99.7% received responses (functional acknowledgements, subsequent errors or confirmations, and expected completion notifications) from BLS[10].

---

for a new system release or fix) are communicated through Carrier Notifications posted on the BellSouth Web site.

[6] HP maintained detailed logs of EDI system availability beginning on 2/7/00. Comprehensive system availability data for the test period prior to this date is unavailable.

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

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

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

[10] Responses (FOCs) for two electronically-submitted LSRs were received via Fax. Of these, one LSR subsequently received an electronic FOC.

![KPMG Consulting]

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-7*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PO&P-11-2-2	BLS systems and representatives provide required Pre-order functionality for Resale-specific inquiries.[11]	Satisfied	BLS systems and representatives provided appropriate functionality to process Resale-related pre-order transaction types evaluated during the course of this test.
PO&P-11-2-3	BLS systems and representatives provide required Resale order functionality.	Satisfied	BLS systems and representatives provided appropriate functionality to process electronically-orderable Synchronet, PBX, ISDN, and OS/DA transaction types.
			The following deficiencies in Resale ordering functionality were observed:
			Some Universal Service Order Code (USOC) changes were not communicated to the CLEC in an adequate or timely manner. When attempting to assign USOCs NXMCR and ESXDC, KCI discovered that they had been replaced with USOC N1ACR[12]. KCI was unable to find any documentation related to this change at the time the order was placed. See Exception 49 for additional information on this issue. In response to this exception, BLS developed a policy of providing monthly advanced carrier notification of new and obsolete USOCs. Based on testing of this procedural change, KCI has recommended closure of Exception 49 to the GPSC. Exception 49 is closed.
			On 10 occasions, BLS ordering representatives modified the TNs requested on an LSR[13]. BLS returned the newly assigned/replacement TNs

---

[11] KCI performed a number of pre-order transaction types in order to validate customer information or to obtain data needed to process subsequent orders. Complete results of pre-order testing are presented in PRE-1: Pre-Order Functional Evaluation. Functionality associated with those pre-order transaction types containing Resale-specific indicators (CSRQ, CDD, and SAQ) were evaluated in this POP-11 report.

[12] USOC NXMCR is Caller ID Name and Number with Anonymous Call Rejection (ACR). ESXDC is Call Waiting Deluxe with conferencing. N1ACR is Enhanced Caller ID with Call Management, with ACR.

[13] KCI selected these TNs through electronic pre-order queries. BellSouth determined these TNs to be unavailable or invalid at the time of service request receipt (KCI's reservations had 'expired').

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-8*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			on the FOC response. BLS documentation does not outline this procedure.
			The deficiencies noted are not significant enough to affect the overall evaluation.
Timeliness of Response [14]			
PO&P-11-3-1a	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs)[15].	Satisfied	The KCI standard is 95% of FAs received within 30 minutes.
			LSRs submitted via EDI during initial testing received FAs within the following timeframes:
			• 58% of 359 FAs were received in less than 30 minutes.
			• An additional 25% were received within 60 minutes and 9% more within 90 minutes.
			• The remaining 8% were received in greater than 90 minutes.
			KCI initiated a re-test of FA Timeliness on January 19, 2001. This re-test was designed to evaluate BLS's recent EDI infrastructure changes[16]. LSRs submitted during re-testing received FAs within the following timeframes:
			• 99% of 230 FAs were received within 30 minutes.
			See Exception 60 for additional

---

[14] During the course of this evaluation, KCI conducted a re-test to address BellSouth performance relative to select 'response timeliness' criteria. The re-test commenced on January 19, 2001, following BellSouth EDI infrastructure changes. A description of the BellSouth EDI infrastructure modifications can be found in BellSouth's Carrier Notification SN91082007. BellSouth also implemented an EDI change *during the course of* the re-test. On February 2, 2001, BellSouth modified the time intervals for the process consolidating EDI transactions into a single file for pickup by the LEO system. The process was modified to run every 5 minutes (between 6AM-8PM CST) and every 10 minutes (after 8PM and before 6AM); previously, this process ran every 15 minutes. While KCI's evaluation result is determined based on total results for the latest related re-test, data on BellSouth performance after implementation of a mid-test fix is provided for information purposes.

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

[16] A description of the BellSouth EDI infrastructure modifications can be found in BellSouth's Carrier Notification SN91082007.

![KPMG Consulting]

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 60 to the GPSC.
PO&P-11-3-1b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Functional Acknowledgements (FAs)[17].	Satisfied	The KCI standard is 95% of FAs received within 30 minutes.
			LSRs submitted via TAG received FAs within the following timeframes:
			• 99% of 285 FAs were received in less than 30 minutes.
			• 100% of 285 FAs were received in less than one hour.
PO&P-11-3-2a	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Fully Mechanized (FM) order errors (Fatal Rejects and Auto Clarifications).	Not Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for fully mechanized (FM) errors is 97% received within one hour[18].
			LSRs submitted during initial EDI functional testing received FM errors within the following time frames (See Table IV-1.5):
			• 9% of FM errors were received in less than one hour.
			• An additional 61% were received within 2 hours.
			KCI initiated a re-test of FM error timeliness on January 19, 2001. LSRs submitted during re-testing received FM errors via EDI within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.6):
			• 85% of FM errors were received in less than 1 hour. An additional 8% were received within 2 hours.[19]
			See Exception 77 for additional information on this issue. As no subsequent re-testing activities are planned, KCI has recommended closure of Exception 77 to the GPSC.

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

[18] Results are based on the actual Flow-Through status of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that an error was fully mechanized (FM) or partially/non-mechanized (PM) by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PO&P-11-3-2b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Fully Mechanized (FM) order errors (Fatal Rejects and Auto Clarifications).	Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for fully mechanized (FM) errors is 97% received within one hour[18]. LSRs submitted for TAG functional testing received FM errors within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.5): ▪ 100% of FM errors were received in less than one hour.
PO&P-11-3-3a	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Partially Mechanized (PM) order clarifications (CLRs).	Satisfied[20]	The GPSC-approved standard for partially mechanized (PM) CLRs is 85% received within 24 hours[18]. LSRs submitted for EDI functional testing received PM CLRs within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.5): ▪ 83% of PM CLRs were received in less than 24 hours. ▪ An additional 16% were received within 48 hours.
PO&P-11-3-3b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Partially Mechanized (PM) order clarifications (CLRs).	Not Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for partially mechanized (PM) CLRs is 85% received within 24 hours[18]. LSRs submitted for TAG functional testing received PM CLRs within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.5): ▪ 72% of PM CLRs were received in less than 24 hours. ▪ An additional 22% were received

Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FM/PM classification.

[19] BellSouth implemented a modification to its EDI systems on 2/2/01 (see Footnote 14 for additional information). 84% of FM errors received via EDI following this fix were delivered within 1 hour.

[20] Although the test percentage is below the benchmark of 85%, the statistical evidence is NOT strong enough to conclude that the performance is below the benchmark with 95% confidence. In other words, the inherent variation in the process is large enough to have produced the substandard result, even with a process that is operating above the benchmark standard. The p-value, which indicates the chance of observing this result when the benchmark is being met, is 0. 1339, above the .0500 cutoff for a statistical conclusion of failure.

[21] KCI did not perform a re-test of Resale PM CLR timeliness. KCI did submit transactions for UNE service to re-test error timeliness. See O&P-1-3-2b and O&P-2-3-2b for additional information and results of UNE re-test activities.

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-11*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			within 48 hours.
			See Exception 98 for additional information on this issue[21]. As no subsequent re-testing activities are planned, KCI has recommended closure of Exception 98 to the GPSC.
PO&P-11-3-4a	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Flow-Through (FT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).	Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for Flow- Through (FT) FOCs is 95% received within three hours[22].
			LSRs submitted during initial EDI functional testing received FT FOCs within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.7):
			▪ 76% of FOCs were received in less than 3 hours.
			▪ An additional 11% were received within 4 hours.
			KCI initiated a re-test of FT FOC timeliness on January 15, 2001. LSRs submitted during retesting received FT FOCs via EDI within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.8):
			▪ 95% of FOCs were received in less than 3 hours.[23]
			See Exception 78 for additional information on this issue. The issues in Exception 78 that relate to this criterion are resolved.

---

[22] Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow-Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FT/NFT classification.

[23] BellSouth implemented a modification to its EDI systems on 2/2/01 (see Footnote 14 for additional information). 93% of FT FOCs received via EDI following this fix were delivered within 3 hours.

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-12*

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

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PO&P-11-3-4b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Flow-Through (FT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).	Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for Flow- Through (FT) FOCs is 95% received within three hours[22]. LSRs submitted for TAG functional testing received FOCs within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.7): ▪ 99% of FOCs were received in less than three hours for FT LSRs.
PO&P-11-3-5a	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Non-Flow-Through (NFT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).	Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for Non-Flow-Through (NFT) FOCs is 85% received within 36 hours[22]. LSRs submitted for EDI functional testing received NFT FOCs within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.7): ▪ 88% of FOCs were received in less than 36 hours for NFT LSRs. ▪ An additional 9% were received within 48 hours.
PO&P-11-3-5b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Non-Flow-Through (NFT) Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).	Satisfied	The GPSC-approved standard for Non-Flow-Through (NFT) FOCs is 85% received within 36 hours[22]. LSRs submitted for TAG functional testing received NFT FOCs within the following timeframes (See Table IV-1.7): ▪ 91% of FOCs were received in less than 36 hours for NFT LSRs. ▪ An additional 7% were received within 48 hours.
PO&P-11-3-6a	BLS's EDI interface provides timely Completion	No Result Determination Made[24]	BLS delivers CNs upon the conclusion of "field provisioning" [25] activities as well as all subsequent downstream

---

[24] KCI is unable to provide a result for this criterion and provides the test results as diagnostic information. Although the GPSC Service Quality Measurement (SQM), 'Average Completion Notice Interval' is related to CN delivery and has an associated standard of "Parity with Retail," KCI is unable to accurately compare its functional transaction results to this SQM within a reasonable degree of accuracy. BellSouth calculates this metric using the following data points: 1) Completion date and time (as entered by a BellSouth field technician for dispatched orders or 5pm on the due date for non-dispatched orders); and 2) Date and time of conclusion of all downstream (listing, billing, and - for LNP orders - TN porting) activities. Within the CN response file delivered

KPMG Consulting

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	Notifications (CNs).		(listing and billing) provisioning activities. Within the CN, BLS provides the field provisioning completion date (located in the 'DD' field). BLS does not offer a guideline for the standard interval between field and billing completion activities. LSRs submitted for functional testing received CNs within the following timeframes (See Tables IV-1.9)[26]: • 98% of CNs delivered via EDI were received within one business day after the field provisioning completion date. • 1% was received within three to five business days. • The remaining 2% were received within six or more days following field provisioning completion.
PO&P-11-3-6b	BLS's TAG interface provides timely Completion Notifications (CNs).	No Result Determination Made[24]	BLS delivers CNs upon the conclusion of "field provisioning"[27] activities as well as all subsequent downstream (listing and billing) provisioning activities. Within the CN, BLS provides the field provisioning completion date (located in the 'DD' field). BLS does not offer a guideline for the standard interval between field and billing completion activities. LSRs submitted for functional testing received CNs within the following timeframes (See Tables IV-1.9): • 89% of CNs delivered via TAG

to CLECs, BellSouth provides the work completion date (but not the time); BellSouth does not provide a date/time stamp associated with downstream provisioning completion. While the CN Timeliness results calculated using CLEC data measurement points (and presented in the comment section of this criterion) provide a reasonable representation of the time between receipt of a CN and completion of field provisioning activities, the differences between KCI and BLS calculation points is large enough to prevent an accurate assignment of a Satisfied/Not Satisfied result relative to the SQM standard.

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

[26] Totals do not equal 100% due to rounding.

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

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-14*

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

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			were received one business day after the field provisioning completion date. ■ 3% were received within 2 business days after field provisioning completion. ■ 4% were received within three-to-five business days following field provisioning completion. ■ The remaining 3% were received in six or more business days following field provisioning completion.
PO&P-11-3-7	BLS's TAG and EDI interface provides timely Jeopardy Notifications.	No Result Determination Made[28]	The GPSC-approved standard is 95% of Jeopardy Notifications received at least 48 hours before the confirmed Due Date (DD). KCI received one Jeopardy Notification during the course of this Resale test. The Jeopardy was delivered one month after the Due Date provided on BLS's confirmation response.
PO&P-11-3-8	BLS's TAG and EDI interface provides Missed Appointment (MA) notifications within agreed upon standard intervals.	No Result Determination Made [28]	The KCI standard is 95% of MA notifications received within one business day after the latest confirmed Due Date (DD). The two MA notices received during the course of this test were returned within one business day after the DD.
Accuracy of Response			
PO&P-11-4-1	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete pre-order responses.	Satisfied	A sample of pre-order responses was examined for clarity, completeness, and accuracy relative to the BLS Business Rules. Pre-order responses were complete with respect to BLS Business Rule requirements in most cases. CDD query responses were missing the value in the INQNUM data element, a

---

[28] Result not provided due to statistically insignificant sample size.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			value initially required according to the Pre-Order Business Rules. BLS updated its Business Rules on 10/9/00 to remove this field from the CDD response list. See Exception 66 for additional information on this issue. Exception 66 is closed.
			KCI also encountered discrepancies between service due date intervals obtained via CDD queries and those presented in BLS documentation for the same order type. See Exception 71 for additional information on this issue. BLS performed several activities to correct these discrepancies:
			▪ A change was implemented on July 21, 2000 to update internal tables used to generate CDD response intervals.
			▪ BLS introduced modifications in TAG Version 2.2.11 to correct errors in generating CDD intervals for Resale requests.
			▪ BLS updated its Product and Services Interval Guide to include standard intervals for Directory Listing requests (REQ TYPE J).
			KCI performed a re-test to evaluate BLS changes in TAG 2.2.0.11. CDD queries covering the range of electronically-available Resale order types were submitted, and the CDD interval responses were compared to the intervals provided in BLS documentation. Following this re-test, KCI observed a continued interval discrepancy on line feature addition service requests. While the CDD pre-order provides intervals in line with BLS documentation for standard order types, the CDD query does not allow data inputs to sufficiently identify a

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			more detailed service request type variation. For example, the service interval for a feature change differs based on whether the change requires a technician dispatch or not. No field within the CDD pre-order allows the CLEC to provide the level of detail needed to differentiate between a non-dispatch and a dispatch service request.
			The deficiency noted is not significant enough to affect the overall evaluation.
			See Exception 71 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 71 to the GPSC.
PO&P-11-4-2	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Pre-Order error messages.	Satisfied	A sample of pre-order errors was examined for clarity, completeness, and accuracy relative to the BLS Business Rules.
			Error messages were received only in response to invalid pre-order requests.
			Pre-order error responses were complete with respect to BLS Business Rule requirements.
			Additionally, error remarks provided an adequate level of information to determine the cause of error.
PO&P-11-4-3	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs).	Not Satisfied	A sample of FOCs received via TAG and EDI was examined for clarity, accuracy, and completeness relative to the BLS business rules (*Local Exchange Ordering [LEO] Implementation Guide*, Volume 1).
			In some cases, the FOCs analyzed were received in response to invalid LSRs. During initial functional testing, a number of FOCs were received in response to invalid service requests for Directory Listing changes. BLS should have delivered error messages in these instances.

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-17*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			In response to this issue, BLS submitted an internal change request for prioritization into a future software release. This system edit is designed to clarify an order when the only activity is a listing change and the REQTYP is other than J.
			During KCI's functional re-test, additional occurrences of inaccurate Resale FOCs were noted.[29] LSRs submitted with incorrect information in required data fields received FOCs.
			See Exception 95 for additional information.
			During KCI's initial review of FOC completeness, the *LEO Guide* (Issue 7S) did not adequately define usage requirements, by specific order types, for some response fields[30]. On 1/31/01, BLS issued a modified *LEO Guide* (Issue 7U) that included additional usage information for response transactions. Based on this updated documentation, KCI validated that all expected data fields were populated on FOC responses.
			See Exception 68 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 68 to the GPSC.
PO&P-11-4-4	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate and complete order errors and clarifications (CLRs).	Not Satisfied	A sample of error messages received via TAG and EDI was examined for clarity, accuracy, and completeness relative to the BLS business rules.
			During initial testing, KCI observed a number of inaccurate CLRs received for valid transactions. Of the CLRs reviewed, 97% were confirmed as accurate (i.e., received for transactions

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

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

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-18*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			containing errors). For the remaining 3%, BLS informed KCI that the ordering representatives had incorrectly issued clarifications. KCI was able to receive FOCs on supplemental service requests submitted to these instances.
			During the functional re-test, however, KCI noted additional inaccurate CLRs on EDI orders.[31] The majority of these CLRs contained an error message stating that KCI had invalid data in its RTR (Response Type Requested) data element. KCI's RTR entry of "C" conformed to BLS business rules requirements[32]. BLS has indicated that these invalid CLRs resulted from ordering representative errors. On 2/9/01, BLS provided training for its representatives on appropriate RTR entries.[33] See Exception 132 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 132 to the GPSC.
			During KCI's initial review of error completeness, the *LEO Guide* (Issue 7S) did not adequately define usage requirements, by specific order types, for some response fields[34]. On 1/31/01, BLS issued a modified *LEO Guide* (Issue 7U) that included additional usage information for response transactions. Based on this updated documentation, KCI validated that all expected data fields

---

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

[32] Prior to transmission to BellSouth, this RTR value of "C" gets translated into "AT" in conformance with EDI technical specifications.

[33] BellSouth representatives were viewing KCI RTR entries as "AT", the EDI field value, and sending Clarifications because the value did not match "C", the Business Rule requirement. BellSouth training on 2/9/01 covered representatives on valid EDI entries for this field. KCI did not have a large enough sample size of transactions submitted following 2/9/01 to evaluate the effects of BellSouth representative training.

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

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-19*

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

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			were populated on error responses.
			See Exception 68 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 68 to the GPSC.
			This criterion has been assigned a Not Satisfied as a result of the inaccurate CLRs noted above.
PO&P-11-4-5	Service order provisioning due dates identified within BLS's order confirmation (FOC DDs[35]) delivered through TAG and EDI are consistent with the CLEC's valid due date (LSR DDD[36]) request (e.g., a due date selected in accordance with the product's standard interval or acquired from a Calculate Due Date [CDD] pre-order query.)	No Result Determination Made[37]	KCI obtained valid DDD information for population on an LSR from one of two sources: BLS *Product and Services Interval Guide.* A combination of pre-order queries. KCI performed a Calculate Due Date (CDD) query to determine the earliest possible due date for an order type. An Appointment Availability Query (AAQ) was then run to confirm that the appointment time was available in the necessary Central Office[38]. For EDI LSRs populated with a DDD obtained from BLS documentation[39]: ▪ 88% of DDs were equal to the LSR DDD; ▪ 7% of DDs were earlier than the LSR DDD; ▪ 5% of DDs were later than the

---

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

[36] LSR Desired Due Date (LSR DDD) is defined as the due date requested in a customer's LSR. KCI calculated this date using BellSouth' *Product and Services Interval Guide.*

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

[38] See PO&P-11-4-1 and Exception 71 for additional information on discrepancies uncovered between CDD pre-order responses and standard interval documentation. BellSouth implemented system enhancements in TAG Version 2.2.11 to address the service intervals returned in response to a CDD query for Resale services. Due Date accuracy results for those LSRs using pre-order responses as input for the DDD are likely affected by these discrepancies.

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

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-20*

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

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			LSR DDD.
			For EDI LSRs populated with a DDD obtained from electronic pre-order queries:
			▪ 83% of DDs were equal to the LSR DDD;
			▪ 17% of DDs were later than the LSR DDD.
			For TAG LSRs populated with a DDD obtained from BLS documentation:
			▪ 82% of DDs were equal to the LSR DDD;
			▪ 15% of DDs were earlier than the LSR DDD;
			▪ 3% of DDs were later than the LSR DDD.
			For TAG LSRs populated with a DDD obtained from electronic pre-order queries:
			▪ 77% of DDs were equal to the LSR DDD;
			▪ 23% of DDs were later than the LSR DDD.
			See Exception 38 and Table V-1.10 for additional detail on due date accuracy. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 38 to the GPSC.
PO&P-11-4-6	BLS systems and representatives provide clear, accurate, and complete Completion Notifications (CNs).	Satisfied	A sample of CNs received via TAG and EDI was examined for clarity, accuracy, and completeness relative to the BLS Business Rules.
			CNs received were accurate response types relative to the LSR (i.e., received in response to a completed order).
			During KCI's initial review of CN completeness, the *BellSouth Business Rules* (Issue 7S) did not adequately

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-21*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			define usage requirements, by specific order types, for some response fields[40]. On 1/31/01, BLS issued a modified *LEO Guide* (Issue 7U) that included additional usage information for response transactions. Based on this updated documentation, KCI validated that all expected data fields were populated on CN responses. See Exception 68 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 68 to the GPSC.

---

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

Test Cross-Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PO&P-11-4-7	BLS service orders tracking systems (CSOTS) provide accurate LSR status.	Satisfied	KCI compared a sample of order status queries in CSOTS to the order status reflected in KCI's Order Management Tool (i.e., the most recent response file message received by KCI). Based on this sampling, CSOTS queries (Confirmed, Pending, or Completed) matched the responses received by KCI in most cases. On two orders, KCI received completion dates that did not match the completion date identified in CSOTS. On an additional three orders, CSOTS showed a complete status although KCI did not receive electronic completion notification. The deficiencies noted are not enough to affect the overall evaluation. In response to this issue, BLS opened a feature change request to populate the CN completion date with the date on which the last BLS service order completes. A target date for implementation of this feature has not yet been established. See Exception 125 for additional information on this issue. KCI has recommended closure of Exception 125 to the GPSC.

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-23*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table IV-1.5 Part 1: Error/Clarification Timeliness, Summary View – Initial Test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail – EDI Aggregate							
Fully Mechanized							
	<1 hr	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FM	4	27	10	3	0	0	0	0
% FM	9%	61%	23%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Partially Mechanized							
				<24hrs	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
PM				88	16	1	1	0
% PM				83%	15%	1%	1%	0%

Clarification Timeliness Detail – TAG Aggregate							
Fully Mechanized							
	<1 hr	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FM	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% FM	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Partially Mechanized							
				<24hrs	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
PM				72	11	11	2	4
% PM				72%	11%	11%	2%	4%

Table IV-1.5 Part 2: Clarification Timeliness, Disaggregated View – Initial Test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail – EDI Disaggregated View								
Fully Mechanized								
Service Type	**<1 hr**	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Bus. POTS circuits <10	2	15	4	1	0	0	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits <10	9%	68%	18%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Res. POTS circuits <10	2	11	6	2	0	0	0	0
% Res. POTS circuits <10	10%	52%	29%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Res. ISDN	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Res. ISDN	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	**4**	**27**	**10**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	9%	**61%**	**23%**	**7%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Partially Mechanized								
Service Type					**< 24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Bus. POTS circuits <10					41	8	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits <10					84%	16%	0%	0%
Bus. POTS circuits >= 10					1	1	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits >= 10					50%	50%	0%	0%
Bus. ISDN					6	1	0	0
% Bus. ISDN					86%	14%	0%	0%
Bus. PBX >= 10					2	0	0	0
% Bus. PBX >= 10					100%	0%	0%	0%
Res. POTS circuits < 10					29	5	1	2
% Res. POTS circuits < 10					78%	14%	3%	5%
Res. ISDN					8	2	0	1
% Res. ISDN					73%	18%	0%	9%
TOTALS					**87**	**17**	**1**	**3**
					81%	**16%**	**1%**	**3%**
Clarification Timeliness Detail – TAG Disaggregated View								
Fully Mechanized								
Service Type	**<1 hr**	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Bus. POTS circuits <10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits <10	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Bus. ISDN circuits <10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Clarification Timeliness Detail – EDI Disaggregated View								
% Bus. ISDN circuits <10	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Res. POTS circuits <10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Res. POTS circuits <10	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Res. POTS circuits < 10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%Res. POTS circuits < 10	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	**32**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	100%	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Partially Mechanized								
Service Type					**< 24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Bus. POTS circuits <10					39	9	1	1
% Bus. POTS circuits <10					78%	18%	2%	2%
Bus. ISDN circuits < 10					3	1	0	1
% Bus. ISDN circuits < 10					60%	20%	0%	20%
Bus. PBX circuits < 10					0	1	0	0
% Bus. PBX circuits < 10					0%	100%	0%	0%
Bus. PBX circuits >= 10					1	1	1	0
% Bus. PBX circuits >= 10					33%	33%	33%	0%
Res. POTS circuits < 10					20	2	0	3
% Res. POTS circuits < 10					80%	8%	0%	12%
Res. ISDN					7	4	0	1
% Res. ISDN					58%	33%	0%	8%
TOTALS					**70**	**18**	**2**	**6**
					73%	**19%**	**2%**	**6%**

Notes:
(Notes apply to Table IV-1.5, Parts 1 and 2)

1. A fully mechanized (FM) response occurs when an electronically submitted LSR receives a clarification generated by BellSouth systems with no manual intervention. FM responses include Fatal Rejects and Auto Clarifications.
2. A partially mechanized (PM) response occurs when an electronically submitted LSR falls out for manual handling and receives a clarification generated by a BellSouth representative. PM responses include LCSC-issued Clarifications.
3. Results are based on the actual performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a clarification was fully mechanized or partially/non-mechanized by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FM/PM classification.
4. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).

![KPMG Consulting]

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-26*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

5. The disaggregated breakdown of Clarification timeliness reflects the GPSC's disaggregation levels outlined in the June 6, 2000 – test-specific Service Quality Measurements.

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

Table IV-1.6 Part 1: Error/Clarification Timeliness, Summary View – Re-test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail – EDI Aggregate							
Fully Mechanized							
	<1 hr	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**>48 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FM	61	6	1	4	0	0	0	0
% FM	85%	8%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table IV-1.6 Part 2: Clarification Timeliness, Disaggregated View – Re-test Data

Clarification Timeliness Detail -- Disaggregated View								
Fully Mechanized								
Service Type	**<1 hr**	**1-2 hrs**	**2-4 hrs**	**4-12 hrs**	**12-24 hrs**	**24-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Business POTS <10 Circuits	29	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
% Business POTS <10 Circuits	85%	9%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Residence POTS <10 Circuits	32	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
% Residence POTS <10 Circuits	84%	8%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	61	6	1	4	0	0	0	0
	85%	8%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Notes:
(Notes apply to Table IV-1.6, Parts 1 and 2)

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

![KPMG Consulting]

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-28*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table IV-1.7 Part 1: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Summary View – Initial Test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – EDI Aggregate						
Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FT	62	20	0	0	0	0
% FT	76%	24%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Non-Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
NFT	17	42	20	6	2	0
% NFT	20%	48%	23%	7%	2%	0%
Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – TAG Aggregate						
Flow Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
FT	69	1	0	0	0	0
% FT	99%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Non-Flow-Through						
	<3 hrs	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
NFT	18	43	11	7	1	2
% NFT	22%	52%	13%	9%	1%	2%

Table IV-1.7, Part Two: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Disaggregated View – Initial Test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – EDI Disaggregated View						
Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Bus. POTS circuits < 10	23	5	0	0	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits < 10	82%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Res. POTS circuits < 10	39	15	0	0	0	0
% Res. POTS circuits < 10	72%	28%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	**62**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	76%	**24%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Non-Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Bus. POTS circuits < 10	8	22	8	0	2	0
% Bus. POTS circuits < 10	20%	55%	20%	0%	5%	0%
Bus. POTS circuits >= 10	0	4	2	0	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits >= 10	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Bus. ISDN circuits < 10	0	3	3	0	0	0
% Bus. ISDN circuits < 10	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Bus. PBX circuits >= 10	0	1	0	0	0	0
% Bus. PBX circuits >= 10	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Res. POTS circuits < 10	8	8	5	6	0	0
% Res. POTS circuits < 10	30%	30%	19%	22%	0%	0%
Res. ISDN circuits < 10	1	4	2	0	0	0
% Res. ISDN circuits < 10	14%	57%	29%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	**17**	**42**	**20**	**6**	**2**	**0**
	20%	**48%**	**23%**	**7%**	**2%**	**0%**
Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – TAG Disaggregated View						
Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Bus. POTS circuits < 10	36	0	0	0	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits < 10	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Res. POTS circuits < 10	33	1	0	0	0	0
% Res. POTS circuits < 10	97%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	**69**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – EDI Disaggregated View						
	99%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – EDI Disaggregated View						
Non-Flow-Through						
Service Type	**<3 hrs**	**3-24 hrs**	**24-36 hrs**	**36-48 hrs**	**48-72 hrs**	**>72 hrs**
Bus. POTS circuits < 10	9	21	4	2	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits < 10	25%	58%	11%	6%	0%	0%
Bus. POTS circuits >= 10	0	5	0	1	0	0
% Bus. POTS circuits >= 10	0%	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Bus. ISDN circuits < 10	3	2	1	3	0	0
% Bus. ISDN circuits < 10	33%	22%	11%	33%	0%	0%
Bus. PBX circuits < 10	1	0	0	0	0	0
%Bus. PBX circuits < 10	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Bus. PBX circuits >= 10	0	0	1	0	1	0
% Bus. PBX circuits >= 10	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
Res. POTS circuits < 10	5	8	1	0	0	1
% Res. POTS circuits < 10	33%	53%	7%	0%	0%	7%
Res. ISDN circuits < 10	0	6	3	1	0	0
% Res. ISDN circuits < 10	0%	60%	30%	10%	0%	0%
TOTALS	**18**	**42**	**10**	**7**	**1**	**1**
	23%	**53%**	**13%**	**9%**	**1%**	**1%**

Notes:

(Notes apply to Table IV-1.7, Parts 1 and 2)

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

![KPMG Consulting]

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-32*
Published by KPMG Consulting, Inc. Confidential. For BellSouth, KCI, and Georgia Public Service Commission use.

Table IV-1.8 Part 1: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Summary View – Re-test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail – EDI Aggregate					
Flow-Through					
	<3 hrs	3-24 hrs	24-36 hrs	36-48 hrs	48-72 hrs	>72 hrs
FT	79	4	0	0	0	0
% FT	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table IV-1.8 Part 2: Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness, Disaggregated View – Re-test Data

Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness Detail -- Disaggregated View						
Flow-Through						
Service Type	<3 hrs	3-24 hrs	24-36 hrs	36-48 hrs	48-72 hrs	>72 hrs
Business POTS <10 circuits	39	2	0	0	0	0
% Business POTS <10 circuits	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Residence POTS <10 circuits	40	2	0	0	0	0
% Residence POTS <10 circuits	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTALS	79	4	0	0	0	0
	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Notes:

(Notes apply to Table IV-1.8, Parts 1 and 2)

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

KPMG Consulting

March 20, 2001   *IV-A-33*

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

Table IV-1.9 Part 1, EDI: Completion Notice Due Date (CN DD) vs. Completion Notification Delivery Date

	TOTAL		Flow-Through					
	CNs Received	% of Total CN	Flow -Through[1]	% Flow-Through[2]	% of Total Flow -Through[3]	Non- Flow- Through[4]	% Non-Flow- Through[5]	% of Total Non- Flow -Through[6]
CN Date Received = CN DD	112	92%	56	50%	98%	56	50%	86%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 1 day	7	6%	1	14%	2%	6	86%	9%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 2 days	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 3-5 days	1	1%	0	0%	0%	1	100%	2%
CN Date Received = CN DD + >=6 days	2	2%	0	0%	0%	2	100%	3%
TOTAL	**122**	**100%**	**57**		**100%**	**65**		**100%**

Notes:

1. Flow-Through = The number of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Flow-Through LSRs.
2. % Flow-Through = The percentage of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Flow-Through LSRs.
3. % of Total Flow-Through = The percentage of total Flow-Through LSRs that received CNs within the specified timeframe.
4. Non-Flow-Through = The number of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Non-Flow-Through LSRs.
5. % Non-Flow-Through = The percentage of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Non-Flow-Through LSRs.
6. % of Total Non-Flow-Through = The percentage of total Non-Flow-Through LSRs that received CNs within the specified timeframe.
7. Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow-Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. Using an algorithm, KCI determined whether an LSR actually flowed through BellSouth systems or fell out for manual processing. BellSouth has not validated the algorithm used by KCI.
8. Calculations are based on business days (i.e. weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
9. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

![KPMG Consulting logo]

Table IV-1.9 Part 2, TAG: Completion Notice Due Date (CN DD) vs. Completion Notification Delivery Date

	TOTAL		Flow -Through					
	CNs Received	% of Total CN	Flow -Through[1]	% Flow - Through[2]	% of Total Flow -Through[3]	Non- Flow - Through[4]	% Non-Flow- Through[5]	% of Total Non- Flow -Through[6]
CN Date Received = CN DD	98	80%	44	45%	81%	52	53%	79%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 1 day	11	9%	4	36%	7%	7	64%	11%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 2 days	4	3%	0	0%	0%	4	100%	6%
CN Date Received = CN DD + 3-5 days	5	4%	2	40%	4%	3	60%	5%
CN Date Received = CN DD + >=6 days	4	3%	4	100%	7%	0	0%	0%
TOTAL	**122**	**100%**	**54**		**100%**	**66**		**100%**

Notes:

1. Flow-Through = The number of CNs received on within the specified timeframe that were Flow-Through LSRs.
2. % Flow-Through = The percentage of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Flow-Through LSRs.
3. % of Total Flow-Through = The percentage of total Flow-Through LSRs that received CNs within the specified timeframe.
4. Non-Flow-Through = The number of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Non-Flow-Through LSRs.
5. % Non-Flow-Through = The percentage of CNs received within the specified timeframe that were Non-Flow-Through LSRs.
6. % of Total Non-Flow-Through = The percentage of total Non-Flow-Through LSRs that received CNs within the specified timeframe.
7. Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow-Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team. Using an algorithm, KCI determined whether an LSR actually flowed through BellSouth systems or fell out for manual processing. BellSouth has not validated the algorithm used by KCI.
8. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).
9. Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

![KPMG Consulting]

Table IV-1.10 Part 1, EDI: Desired Due Date from KCI's Local Service Request (LSR DDD) vs. Committed Due Date from BellSouth's Firm Order Confirmation (FOC DD)

	Total		Flow-Through Analysis			
	Number	Percent	FT	% FT	NFT	%NFT
LSR DDD = FOC DD	121	88%	54	86%	67	89%
LSR DDD not = FOC DD	17	12%	9	14%	8	11%
Total	**138**	**100%**	**63**	**100%**	**75**	**100%**
DD = DDD - 1 day	3	33%	1	33%	2	33%
DD = DDD - 2 days	2	22%	0	0%	2	33%
DD = DDD - 3-5 days	4	44%	2	67%	2	33%
DD = DDD - >=6 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Earlier (DD before DDD)	**9**	**7%**	**3**	**5%**	**6**	**8%**
DD = DDD + 1 day	5	63%	3	50%	2	100%
DD = DDD + 2 days	3	38%	3	50%	0	0%
DD = DDD + 3-5 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD + >=6 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Later (DD after DDD)	**8**	**6%**	**6**	**50%**	**2**	**3%**

Notes:

1. LSRs on which KCI's Desired Due Date was earlier than the standard interval for the order type (as documented in BellSouth's *Product and Services Interval Guide*) were excluded from this report.

2. The table above represents Due Date accuracy results from LSRs submitted using standard intervals documentation and pre-order queries to obtain a DDD.

3. Calculations are based on business days (i.e., weekends and BellSouth holidays are not counted).

4. Results are based on actual Flow-Through (FT) and Non-Flow Through (NFT) performance of LSRs submitted by KCI. KCI determined that a FOC was FT or NFT by analyzing BellSouth back-end system data provided to KCI's Flow-Through Evaluation team KCI also created an algorithm, based on BellSouth Flow-Through definitions, used to obtain actual performance data on KCI-issued service requests. KCI validated the BellSouth-provided data against the KCI-obtained data for consistency in FT/NFT classification.

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

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

Table IV-1.10 Part 2, TAG: Desired Due Date from KCI's Local Service Request (LSR DDD) vs. Committed Due Date from BellSouth's Firm Order Confirmation (FOC DD)

	Total		Flow-Through Analysis			
	Number	Percent	FT	% FT	NFT	%NFT
LSR DDD = FOC DD	100	83%	46	96%	54	74%
LSR DDD not = FOC DD	21	17%	2	4%	19	26%
Total	**121**	**100.0%**	**48**	**100.0%**	**73**	**100.0%**
DD = DDD - 1 day	4	27%	1	100%	3	21%
DD = DDD - 2 days	6	40%	0	0%	6	43%
DD = DDD - 3-5 days	5	33%	0	0%	5	36%
DD = DDD - >=6 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Earlier (DD before DDD)	**15**	**12%**	**1**	**2%**	**14**	**19%**
DD = DDD + 1 day	5	83%	1	100%	4	80%
DD = DDD + 2 days	1	17%	0	0%	1	20%
DD = DDD + 3-5 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
DD = DDD + >=6 days	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Later (DD after DDD)	**6**	**5%**	**1**	**2%**	**5**	**7%**

Notes:

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