

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of Qwest Corporation to Initiate a Mass-Market Switching and Dedicated Transport Case Pursuant to the Triennial Review Order

Docket No. UT-033044

QWEST'S BATCH HOT CUT PROPOSAL

Pursuant to the Commission's November 3, 2003 Notice of Endorsement of Proposed Regional Batch Hot Cut Forum, Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") respectfully submits this proposal for a region-wide batch loop conversion process. Qwest proposes a single, centrally coordinated ordering and conversion process that would be used in all fourteen of its states whenever a CLEC has the requisite number of qualified lines to convert from Qwest's circuit switch (both Qwest retail and CLEC UNE-P lines) to the CLEC's circuit switch. The same process could also be used to convert lines from one CLEC's circuit switch to another's to the extent that sufficient volumes existed to justify use of the batch process.

Qwest's proposal builds on, and makes improvements to, a process for provisioning unbundled loops that already operates at a demonstrably high level of performance. As discussed below, Qwest's current process does not suffer from many of the cost and operational problems that the *Triennial Review Order*¹ identified; Qwest does not have problems with excessive provisioning

¹ Report and Order, *Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*, CC Dkt. No. 01-338, FCC 03-36 (rel. Aug. 21, 2003) ("*Triennial Review Order*" or "*TRO*").

1 delays or service outages;² and, Qwest does not levy huge non-recurring charges to perform a hot
2 cut.³ Moreover, unlike some other incumbent LECs,⁴ Qwest actually does have substantial
3 experience migrating large batches of CLEC lines — including thousands in 2003 for one CLEC
4 alone — from UNE-P to stand-alone unbundled loops on a project-managed basis. These batch
5 conversions *are* reflected in Qwest’s current performance data, and establish that Qwest has
6 continued to provide these loops to the CLEC at an extraordinarily high level of quality.

7 Even with this strong performance, in the two and a half months since the *Triennial Review*
8 *Order*’s release, Qwest has worked hard to improve this process even further. Qwest has re-
9 examined every step of its current loop-conversion process to find the efficiencies that become
10 available when a CLEC works with Qwest to convert twenty-five lines or more in a single batch.
11 Qwest has also used its experience performing large-scale project-managed conversions to identify
12 the steps that can be streamlined or eliminated when the carriers are migrating batches of in-service
13 loops. Qwest’s work has paid off: The batch conversion process that Qwest proposes reduces
14 substantially the work times associated with some of the steps within the process, the number of
15 times Qwest has to contact the CLEC, and the process of clearing the order once the work has been
16 completed. While Qwest has not yet completed its detailed cost studies, it appears that in virtually
17 every instance these efficiencies will reduce Qwest’s cost of performing a batch hot cut.

18 Qwest first provides a brief background summarizing the FCC’s instructions to the state
19 commissions concerning adoption of a new batch conversion process, as well as the loop-conversion
20 process that Qwest is currently using. Qwest then presents its proposal for a new batch process.

21 **I. BACKGROUND**

22 **A. The Triennial Review Order and the FCC’s Implementing Rules**

23 In the *Triennial Review Order*, the FCC determined that “in the large majority of locations”

24 _____
25 ² Compare *TRO* ¶ 466 with *infra* at section I(B) (discussion of Qwest provisioning and outage data).

26 ³ Compare *TRO* ¶ 470 with *infra* at section II(D) (discussion of Qwest’s current NRCs).

⁴ See *TRO* ¶ 474 & n.1466 (finding that Verizon’s procedures for performing project-managed migrations “not sufficiently developed” and noting Verizon’s failure to provide any performance data reflecting these project-managed cuts).

1 (though not all),⁵ the incumbent LECs’ existing processes for migrating in-service loops one at a time
2 from their own switches to their competitors’ would “serve as barriers to competitive entry in the
3 absence of unbundled switching” for mass-market customers.⁶ The FCC found that the incumbents’
4 current one-at-a-time conversions, as a general matter, imposed non-trivial one-time costs and
5 service disruption risks on CLECs, and it questioned whether these processes would be able “to
6 handle the necessary volume of migrations” if mass-market switching is taken off the unbundling list.⁷
7 The FCC did note that some incumbents had begun to perform larger numbers of loop migrations on
8 a project-managed basis, and that “[t]he record evidence strongly suggests” that managing and
9 performing cut-overs on a batch basis in this manner could yield significant improvements. But based
10 on the specific record before it, the FCC concluded that these project-managed processes were not
11 yet “sufficiently developed or widespread enough to adequately address the impairment created by
12 the loop cut over process.”⁸

13 The FCC acknowledged that the evidence before it was “not sufficiently detailed” to permit
14 it to evaluate whether these general observations held true for any carrier’s particular hot cut process
15 in any individual market,⁹ and that states might well find in some markets that “existing hot cut
16 practices would be adequate even in the absence of unbundled local circuit switching.”¹⁰ But for all
17 other markets, the FCC directed the states to “approve, within nine months of the effective date of
18 this Order, a batch cut migration process . . . that will address the costs and timeliness of the hot cut
19 process.”¹¹ The FCC’s formal rules implementing the *Triennial Review Order* define a “batch cut
20 process” as “a process by which the incumbent LEC simultaneously migrates two or more loops
21 from one carrier’s local circuit switch to another carrier’s local circuit switch, giving rise to

22 ⁵ TRO ¶ 473.

23 ⁶ TRO ¶ 460.

24 ⁷ TRO ¶ 459.

25 ⁸ TRO ¶ 474.

26 ⁹ TRO ¶ 473.

¹⁰ TRO ¶ 490.

¹¹ TRO ¶ 488.

1 operational and economic efficiencies not available when migrating loops . . . on a line-by-line
2 basis.”¹² The FCC held that the efficiencies that become available when migrating loops in batches
3 rather than singly would mitigate the economic and operational burdens on which the FCC’s
4 presumptive national finding of impairment for mass-market switching was based: “We conclude
5 that the loop access barriers contained in the record may be mitigated through the creation of a batch
6 cut process by spreading loop migration costs over a large number of lines, decreasing per-line cut
7 over costs.”¹³

8 The FCC rules implementing the *Order* direct state commissions to make four
9 determinations with respect to the new batch conversion process (beyond determining whether any
10 new process is required in a given market at all¹⁴):

11 (1) A state commission shall first determine the appropriate
12 volume of loops that should be included in the “batch.”

13 (2) A state commission shall adopt specific processes to be
14 employed when performing a batch cut, taking into account the
15 incumbent LEC’s particular network design and cut over practices.

16 (3) A state commission shall evaluate whether the incumbent
17 LEC is capable of migrating multiple lines served using unbundled
18 local circuit switching to switches operated by a carrier other than
19 the incumbent LEC for any requesting telecommunications carrier in
20 a timely manner, and may require that incumbent LECs comply with
21 an average completion interval metric for provision of high volumes
22 of loops.

23 (4) A state commission shall adopt rates for the batch cut
24 activities it approves in accordance with the Commission’s pricing
25 rules for unbundled network elements. These rates shall reflect the
26 efficiencies associated with batched migration of loops to a
requesting telecommunications carrier’s switch, either through a
reduced per-line rate or through volume discounts as appropriate.¹⁵

The paragraphs of the *Order* giving state commissions specific instructions for the nine-month cases

12 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(2)(ii).

13 *TRO* ¶ 487.

14 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(2)(B) provides, “If a state commission concludes that the absence of a batch cut migration process is not impairing requesting telecommunications carriers’ ability to serve end users using DS0 loops in the mass market without access to local circuit switching on an unbundled basis, that conclusion will render the creation of such a process unnecessary.” The rule specifies the findings that a state must make if it chooses not to require adoption of a new batch process. *See also TRO* ¶ 490.

15 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(ii)(A)(1)-(4).

1 contain these same directives.¹⁶

2 **B. Qwest's Current Hot Cut Process**

3 As just noted, in considering any new batch conversion process, a state commission must
4 “tak[e] into account the incumbent LEC’s particular network design and cut over practices.”¹⁷

5 Qwest has already spent considerable time and effort to develop a seamless process for provisioning
6 large quantities of unbundled loops for CLECs at an extremely high level of quality, and to develop
7 TELRIC-compliant rates for that process. The state commissions and the FCC examined Qwest’s
8 existing hot cut process at length in the section 271 proceedings and found it adequate. Rather than
9 redescribing the entire process in this document, Qwest attaches the affidavit of William M.
10 Campbell, filed before the FCC in the recent Arizona section 271 docket, which outlines Qwest’s
11 current hot cut process. **See Exhibit 1.** To highlight:

- 12 • Qwest uses, and must continue to use, the same hot cut process in all fourteen of its
13 states.
- 14 • Qwest has a dedicated center in Omaha, Nebraska – the QCCC – that oversees the
15 provision of each and every hot cut throughout the Qwest region.
- 16 • Qwest has a detailed procedure that defines the hot cut process. **See Exhibit 2.**
- 17 • Qwest has trained its technicians on the hot cut process.
- 18 • Qwest has provisioned unbundled loops for CLECs using this process at an
19 extremely high level of quality. Qwest’s audited and reconciled performance data
20 shows that it is routinely provisioning over 98% of its hot cut commitments across the
21 region on time. **See Exhibit 3.** This percentage varies in individual states, but in
22 general remains within the 95-98% performance level. **See Exhibit 4.** Moreover,
23 only a small fraction of migrated loops experience any trouble in the 30 days
24 following cut-over. Regionally, for example 97.5%-99.99% of loops do not
25 experience installation troubles. **See Exhibits 3-4.**

26 Qwest uses its current process to provision approximately 1,000 hot cuts per day on average, and
27 has processed up to 1,350 hot cuts in a single day. Importantly, these numbers reflect CLECs’
28 actual order levels, not the maximum number of hot cuts Qwest could perform in a single day.

29 Qwest has experience working with CLECs to transition very large batches of UNE-P lines

30 ¹⁶ See TRO ¶ 489.

31 ¹⁷ 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(ii)(A)(2).

1 to stand-alone unbundled loops simultaneously. Qwest has already worked with one CLEC to
2 migrate thousands of UNE-P lines to the CLEC's own switching using its current form of "batch
3 processing." These numbers continue to mount. Unlike some other LECs whom the FCC
4 specifically considered in the *Triennial Review Order*,¹⁸ Qwest includes the results of this large-
5 scale batch conversion process in its performance data. Thus, the extremely good performance
6 results noted above reflect Qwest's ability to perform hot cuts for its CLEC customers in larger
7 quantities. **See Exhibits 3-4.** The batch conversion process that Qwest proposes in this forum
8 reflects Qwest's actual experience with these types of large-scale cuts and the lessons it has learned
9 regarding what does and does not work.

10 **II. QWEST'S BATCH LOOP CONVERSION PROPOSAL**

11 Qwest presents its proposal for a new batch hot-cut process in terms of the four
12 determinations the FCC instructed state commissions to make.

13 **A. The Minimum "Batch" That Qualifies for the Batch Conversion Process (47** 14 **C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(ii)(A)(1)**

15 As noted above, the very point of adopting a *batch* hot cut process is to capture the
16 operational and economic efficiencies that come from migrating many in-service loops simultaneously
17 rather than singly. The FCC directed the states to consider batch conversions specifically because it
18 "expect[ed] these processes to result in efficiencies associated with performing tasks once for
19 multiple lines that would otherwise have been performed on a line-by-line basis,"¹⁹ and it is the ability
20 to "spread loop migration costs over a large number of lines, decreasing per-line cut over costs" that
21 enables "the loop access barriers contained in the record [to] be mitigated."²⁰ But these per-loop
22 costs drop only if the CLEC converting a high enough quantity of loops to give rise to economies and
23 justify the slightly greater up-front coordination that batch conversions require. The CLEC must also

24 _____
25 ¹⁸ The FCC noted that Verizon's project-managed large-batch hot cuts were not offered at set rates, were not
subject to any performance intervals, and, as a result, were not tracked by Verizon's performance metrics. *See*
TRO ¶ 474 & n.1466.

26 ¹⁹ *TRO* ¶ 489.

²⁰ *TRO* ¶ 487.

1 be seeking to convert loops of a kind that actually permit conversion tasks to be consolidated;
2 otherwise, there are no efficiencies to pass through.

3 For these reasons, the first task the FCC assigned the states was to determine what minimum
4 “batch” of loops a CLEC must be converting in order to qualify for “batch” conversion. *See* 47
5 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(ii)(A)(1); *TRO* ¶ 489. (This is a separate question from the maximum volumes
6 of loops the batch conversion process must be prepared to handle, which is discussed in part C
7 below). Qwest’s preliminary determination is that the necessary economies and efficiencies may be
8 realized when a CLEC is converting twenty-five (25) voice grade lines at a single time in a single
9 central office. The reason why CLECs need at least twenty-five (25) lines *individually* is that some
10 of the significant efficiencies — for example the ability to reduce the number of separate calls
11 between Qwest and the CLEC, and the ability to perform multiple pre-wirings in the same physical
12 locations on the frame — come from performing multiple conversions *for the same CLEC*, not just
13 from doing multiple conversions *per se*.²¹

14 In addition, batched loops must all be capable of conversion on a consolidated basis. The
15 FCC adopted its batch conversion requirement to assist CLECs in serving the “mass market,” which
16 the FCC defined as “consumers of analog ‘plain old telephone service’ or ‘POTS’ that purchase
17 only a limited number of POTS lines and can only economically be served via analog DS0 loops.”²²
18 A batch conversion process is possible for these analog DS0 loops, which constitute the vast
19 majority of Qwest’s outside plant. But it is not feasible to gain these efficiencies when the underlying
20 facility uses integrated digital loop carrier systems (“IDLC”). The *Triennial Review Order* itself
21 recognizes²³ that IDLC is not unbundled via the same, uniform cut-over process as other loop plant:
22 Each IDLC loop must be examined individually to determine which of the several unbundling

23 _____
²¹ *Cf.* *TRO* ¶ 489 (FCC expects efficiencies to come from consolidating pre-wiring and reducing number of
24 communications between ILEC and CLEC).

²² *TRO* ¶ 459.

25 ²³ *See TRO* ¶ 297 (noting that unbundling IDLC loops “may require incumbent LECs to implement policies,
26 practices, and procedures different from those used” to unbundle other kinds of loops); *id.* n.855 (describing a
number of different ways that IDLC loops might be unbundled).

1 methods used for such loops (such as finding a metallic pair alternative, hair-pinning, reconnecting the
2 loop to a universal DLC system at the remote terminal, or installing a new central-office terminal) is
3 available or appropriate for that loop. Qwest emphasizes that it will continue to unbundle IDLC lines
4 at a very high level of quality; however, such loops (which form the small percentage of Qwest's
5 plant in any event) must be migrated individually using the existing hot cut process.²⁴ *See Exhibit 5.*

6 Likewise, the FCC expressly defined its batch-cut requirements in terms of developing a
7 process to migrate loops "from one carrier's local circuit switch to another carrier's *local circuit*
8 *switch.*"²⁵ The FCC's definition of a "batch cut process" thus does not include conversions
9 including loop-splitting arrangements that also connect an unbundled loop to a third carrier's *packet*
10 *switch.* As the Arizona Corporation Commission has properly recognized,²⁶ the FCC directed
11 carriers to pursue line-splitting implementation, not as part of the nine-month switching cases or the
12 development of a batch conversion process, but rather as part of the pre-existing change
13 management process.²⁷ The FCC's decision *not* to include loop splits as part of the batch
14 conversion process makes sense: conversions from UNE-P directly to loop-splitting arrangements
15 cannot be consolidated into a batch because each loop must be individually checked to ensure it is
16 capable of carrying DSL signals and, if not, conditioned. Just as contemplated by the *Triennial*
17 *Review Order*, the voice CLEC in a potential line-splitting arrangement will be able to use Qwest's
18 *current* processes to migrate individual lines to stand-alone unbundled loops connected to that
19 CLEC's circuit switch.²⁸

20 ²⁴ See TRO ¶¶ 251-252

21 ²⁵ 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(ii) (defining "batch cut process") (emphasis added). See also 47 C.F.R. §
22 51.319(d)(ii)(A) (directing state commissions to establish process "for use in migrating lines served by one
23 carrier's local circuit switch to lines served by another carrier's *local circuit switch*) (emphasis added).

24 ²⁶ See Arizona Corporation Commission, Procedural Order, *ILEC Unbundling Obligations As a Result of the*
25 *Federal Triennial Review Order*, Dkt. No. T-00000A-03-0369 (Nov. 6, 2003) at 5-6 ("[T]he FCC's Triennial Review
26 Order did not require line splitting to be addressed in the nine-month docket and . . . no party could point to
another state commission that is addressing line splitting in its triennial review proceedings."); *id.* at 7 ("IT IS
FURTHER ORDERED that line splitting will not be addressed in this docket.").

²⁷ See TRO ¶ 252 ("[W]e encourage incumbent LECs and competitors to use existing state commission
collaboratives and change management processes to address OSS modifications that are necessary to support
line splitting.").

²⁸ TRO ¶¶ 251-252.

1 **B. The Process Employed (47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(2)(ii)(A)(2))**

2 The FCC’s second instruction to the states is to “adopt specific processes to be employed
3 when performing a batch cut, taking into account the incumbent LEC’s particular network design and
4 cut over practices.”²⁹ Compared to the loop conversion process that Qwest uses today, the new
5 batch hot cut process eliminates many of the repetitive dial tone testing steps, much of the telephonic
6 contact between the two companies, and the need for duplicative entries into Qwest systems in order
7 to update records. The new process also has new business rules associated with it on both Qwest’s
8 and the CLEC’s part. Each is intended to make the work steps within the new process more
9 efficient and workable for both parties.

10 **1. Process flow**

11 **Exhibit 6** is a process diagram describing the recommended tasks for the new batch hot cut
12 process. As illustrated in this diagram, a CLEC will perform pre-order functions including an initial
13 batch coordination meeting with Qwest. CLEC must submit to Qwest a Local Service Request
14 (“LSR”) with a Purchase Order Number (“PON”) and a three-letter unique identifier *e.g.*, (“BHC”)
15 to designate it as a batch hot cut candidate in order to begin the batch conversion. Once a complete
16 and accurate LSR is received, a service order will be generated resulting in a firm order confirmation
17 (“FOC”) back to the CLEC. Once the service order is issued, a Qwest project manager, residing in
18 the QCCC, will begin compiling the batch orders on a Central Office (“CO”) by CO basis.

19 Approximately two days prior to due date for the batch, a spreadsheet containing all loops in
20 the batch will be forwarded to both the CLEC and the central office where the work will take place.
21 This batch spreadsheet will contain order related information such as the CLEC Purchase Order
22 Number PON with a three-letter unique identifier BHC describing it as a batch hot cut candidate; the
23 Qwest order number; a Qwest project ID number; and CLEC contact information.

24 On the due date, the Central Office Technician (“COT”) will perform both the pre-wiring
25 and lift and lay activity associated with the conversion order. Prior to performing the lift and lay,

26

²⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(2)(ii)(A)(2). *See also TRO ¶ 489.*

1 however, the COT will perform a dial tone test on both the Qwest switch port and the CLEC's
2 facility to verify the existence of dial tone on each facility, and that each facility has the correct
3 number working on it. These tasks will occur before any conversion is conducted. If the COT does
4 not have dial tone on the CLEC's facility on the due date, the QCCC will contact the CLEC via a
5 phone call asking the CLEC to resolve the issue. If CLEC dial tone is present, the COT will monitor
6 the line to ensure an idle state prior to disconnecting the Qwest circuit switch and then reconnecting it
7 to the CLEC's switch. Upon completion of the orders identified on the batch spreadsheet, Qwest
8 will notify the CLEC via e-mail that it has completed the conversions. It remains the responsibility of
9 the CLEC to ensure that each line is triggered for number porting upon completion of the order.

10 **2. Batch Hot Cut Requirements**

11 **Exhibit 7** contains a list of the draft requirements that both Qwest and the CLECs must
12 follow in order to make the conversion process as seamless and efficient as possible. A summary of
13 the most significant of these requirements is as follows:

14 a) **General requirements**

15 The batch hot cut process is applicable to basic installations that will re-use existing facilities;
16 this will avoid the need to dispatch a Qwest technician to the field to change outside plant facilities.
17 Other installation options will remain available during normal business hours to provision other types
18 of unbundled loops. For example, UNE-P loops working on Integrated Digital Loop Carrier
19 systems, or line splitting arrangements will be converted during normal business hours using existing
20 processes because a field dispatch may be required to complete the conversion.

21 b) **Qwest-specific requirements**

22 Qwest will produce and distribute via e-mail a batch spreadsheet for the CLEC documenting
23 all order activity within a given central office, and use this batch spreadsheet to communicate with the
24 CLEC on order status and completion. Unlike the QCCC's current process, to maximize efficiency
25 Qwest will conduct pre-wire work on the due date, not two days earlier, to minimize the number of
26 instances technicians must work on each order.

c) **CLEC-specific requirements**

1 The CLEC must provide both email and live contact information on the LSR when it is
2 submitted. The CLEC must provide accurate end-user service address information. The CLEC dial
3 tone must be on their designated CFA termination prior to the due date. The CLEC must make
4 resources readily available to clear all loops identified on the batch spreadsheet in a timely manner
5 between the hours of 3:00PM CST and 11:00PM CST. This will ensure that the CLEC and Qwest
6 can promptly resolve any issues the COT may encounter (*i.e.*, bad CFA or no dial tone).

7 **C. The Capacity and Timeliness of the Batch Process (47 C.F.R.**
8 **§ 51.319(d)(2)(ii)(A)(3)**

9 The FCC’s third instruction to state commissions is to “evaluate whether the incumbent LEC
10 is capable of migrating multiple lines served using unbundled local circuit switching to switches
11 operated by a carrier other than the incumbent LEC for any requesting telecommunications carrier in
12 a timely manner”³⁰ This requires state commissions to make predictive judgments regarding the
13 volumes of conversions the batch cut process must be able to handle and whether Qwest can
14 continue to provision loops at an acceptable level of quality at those volumes.

15 The expected volume of conversions turns on five factors: (1) current volumes of stand-alone
16 unbundled loop provisioning, (2) current volumes of new UNE-P orders, (3) the size of the
17 embedded UNE-P base, (4) the fraction of that base and new UNE-P orders that will convert to
18 stand-alone unbundled loops, and (5) the *Triennial Review Order*’s schedule for transitioning the
19 embedded UNE-P base to other arrangements. Qwest addresses each factor in turn. The volumes
20 of UNE-P and UNE-L lines CLECs submit monthly are well established in Qwest’s performance
21 data. The only unknown is the percentage of UNE-P lines (new and existing) that will convert once
22 switching is no longer available as a UNE.

23 The FCC set a transition schedule for moving the embedded base of UNE-P lines to
24 unbundled loops. CLECs must submit 1/3 of their embedded UNE-P lines for conversion 13
25 months after the state commission decision; 1/3 of their UNE-P lines 20 months after the state

26 ³⁰ 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(2)(ii)(A)(3). *See also TRO* ¶ 489.

1 commission decision; and the last 1/3 of their UNE-P lines 27 months after the state commission
2 decision.³¹ Assuming a July 2, 2004 decision from the state commission, that means 1/3 of the
3 embedded base will convert between August 2005 and February 2006; 1/3 of the embedded base
4 will convert between March 2006 and September 2006, and the remainder will convert before April
5 2007.³² The FCC also stated that state commission decisions eliminating unbundled switching as a
6 UNE will become effective on December 2, 2004.³³

7 Thus, to calculate the expected monthly volumes in each state, the state commissions should
8 apply the following formulas based on the volumes of UNE-P lines and UNE-L lines in each
9 individual state:

- 10 • December 2004 – July 2005: [Inward unbundled loop volume (growth) eligible for
11 the batch hot cut process * percent of UNE-P lines in markets where Qwest is
12 challenging the impairment finding]
- 13 • August 2005 – April 2007: [Inward unbundled loop volume (growth) eligible for the
14 batch hot cut process * percent of UNE-P lines in markets where Qwest is
15 challenging the impairment finding] + [Embedded UNE-P base amortized over 21
16 months * percent of UNE-P lines in markets where Qwest is challenging the
17 impairment finding]

15 These formulas will provide the expected volumes of unbundled loops that Qwest's must be
16 prepared to provision in each state on a monthly basis.

17 **D. Batch Cut Rates (47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(2)(ii)(A)(4))**

18 The FCC's last directive to each state commission is to "adopt rates for the batch cut
19 activities it approves in accordance with the Commission's pricing rules for unbundled network
20 elements," which should "reflect the efficiencies associated with batched migration" ³⁴ The final
21 rate will obviously depend on the precise procedure adopted in this forum.

22 As an initial matter, Qwest notes it is starting from a better position than many other
23 incumbent LECs in this regard. The FCC found in the *Triennial Review Order* that currently hot

24 _____
³¹ 47 C.F.R. §51.319(d)(4)(A).

25 ³² *TRO* ¶ 532.

26 ³³ 47 C.F.R. §51.319(d)(4).

³⁴ 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(d)(2)(ii)(A)(4). *See also TRO* ¶ 489.

1 cuts are “often priced at rates that prohibit facilities based competition for the mass market,”³⁵ citing
2 ILEC non-recurring charges exceeding \$100 and as high as \$185.³⁶ But Qwest’s hot cut charges
3 across its region are not nearly this high. In virtually every state Qwest’s current non-recurring
4 charges for a basic hot cut range between \$29.10 and \$65.00.³⁷

5 The batch conversion process that Qwest proposes above will yield significant additional
6 efficiencies and in most states the CLEC community can expect to experience a significantly reduced
7 rate.

8 **III. CONCLUSION**

9 Qwest hereby presents a viable batch hot cut proposal that will allow CLECs to convert
10 large volumes of DS0 lines to unbundled analog loops, while still ensuring that CLEC end-user
11 customers have minimal service interruption, and minimal installation service problems. In most
12 states, the process will also significantly reduce the non-recurring rate associated with provisioning an
13 individual unbundled loop. Qwest has already demonstrated that the CLEC community can use its
14 existing hot cut process to reach mass-market customers at a high level of quality. This simplified
15 process should do nothing but improve an already strong process. Qwest asks the Commission to
16 approve its proposed process.

17 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this _____ day of November, 2003.

18 QWEST

19
20 _____
21 Lisa Anderl, WSBA # 13236
22 Adam Sherr, WSBA # 25291
23 Qwest
24 1600 7th Avenue, Room 3206
25 Seattle, WA 98191

25 ³⁵ TRO ¶ 465 (emphasis added).

26 ³⁶ TRO ¶ 470.

³⁷ In two states, Idaho and Minnesota, the nonrecurring rates associated with hot cuts are substantially below this range. In these states, these costs are well below the cost of providing the service even with the new batch hot cut process. As such, Qwest does not set forth these rates as an example.

Phone: (206) 398-2500
Attorneys for Qwest

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26