Performance Acceptance Certificate

Incident Work Order Number	AZIWO2132
Date/Time of Incident	03/12/2002
Severity Level	2
Initiator	Susan Hayslip
Date of Qwest Resolution	03/22/2002
TAG Concurrence Date	

Description of Incident

In AZIWO2130, CGE&Y presented 111 orders for which the due date recorded in Qwest's adhoc RSOR data did not match the due date provided to the Pseudo-CLEC on the original FOC. Qwest responded that for the majority of orders identified, the due date was entered incorrectly due to manual errors. Based on this response, CGE&Y recalculated the OP-3 PID measures, replacing the RSOR due date (SODD) with the due date provided on the FOC to the Pseudo-CLEC for the 111 orders identified. CGE&Y's recalculation only considered test data from the original phase of the Functionality Test. The results of the recalculation revealed several disparities not previously identified in §2.5 of the Final Functionality Report. These disparities were for dispatched UNE-P, and non-dispatched business, centrex, PBX, and UNE-P. The results of the OP-3 PID calculations for these products are presented below for both the RSOR due date (SODD) and the Pseudo-CLEC captured due date (FOC DD).

OP-3 – Installation Commitments Met (Percent)

Disaggregation	Product	Standard	Pseudo-CLEC Results (SODD)	Pseudo-CLEC Results (FOC DD)	Pseudo-CLEC vs. Standard (SODD)	Pseudo-CLEC vs. Standard (FOC DD)
Y/MA	UNE-P (POTS)	94.45% n: 132133	95.41% n: 109	88.07% n: 109	Parity d=-.022, rd=.003	Disparity d=0.115, r0=.002
N/MA	Business	99.00% n: 30789	100.0% n: 163	96.93% n: 163	Parity d=-.100, rd=.001	Disparity d=0.076, r0=.004
N/MA	Centrex 21	98.58% n: 8443	100.0% n: 34	91.18% n: 34	Indet. -> P d=-.120, rd=.060	Disparity d=0.182, r0=.000
N/MA	PBX	98.68% n: 607	100.0% n: 23	91.30% n: 23	Indet. -> P d=-.115, rd=.108	Disparity d=0.184, r0=.001
N/MA	UNE-P (POTS)	99.78% n: 665589	99.55% n: 222	95.58% n: 226	Parity d=0.020, rd=.006	Disparity d=0.165, r0=.000

Resolution

Qwest Response Summary:

The issue identified in this IWO is the inconsistency of the Service Order Due Date (SODD) and the due date provided on the FOC for these 111 orders. As was reported in Qwest's response to AZ IWO2130, these errors are attributable to human error, including instances where Qwest received requests with less than standard interval and although the due date was determined correctly, was not accurately reported on the FOC. These requests had due dates established by existing standard intervals and outside dispatch availability, as appropriate. These orders were provisioned within those intervals on par with retail orders. The error was in not communicating the appropriately established due date when issuing the FOC.

Qwest recognizes that it is important for the due date to be accurately communicated to the CLEC on the FOC. Qwest has undertaken several steps since these errors occurred early last year. These actions, described in the Qwest response to AZ IWO2130, have reduced the occurrence of human error.

Further, using December and January commercial data, Qwest has analyzed a random 50% sampling comparing the service order due date to the due date on the FOC. The results reflect 97.5% of the requests had FOC due dates matching the SODD for the products specified in this IWO. Qwest process staff has also conducted process reviews looking at a broader set of products for varying weeks between February 18 and March 8. The findings are consistent with the results of the December/January study. These are all indications that Qwest's efforts to increase accuracy have been effective and have reduced occurrences of human error to a reasonable level.

Since the the correct due date was met in these instances and Qwest has minimized occurrences of mis-reporting the due date on the FOC, the original parity analysis in Section 2.5 should still stand. Consequently this TI should be closed.

Resolution Submitted by:	Qwest	Date:	03/22/02

Verification of Resolution

The PID does not specify whether the appropriate due date for measurement calculations is the due date transmitted via the FOC or the due date contained on the service order, therefore, CGE&Y cannot conclude that results published in Qwest's monthly results are not compliant with the PID. However, CGE&Y does recognize that the transmission of an incorrect due date can place CLECs at a disadvantage and could severely impact the CLEC's relation with its end-user customer. CGE&Y's main concern is to ensure that the FOC and the service order reflect the same due date.

In addition to the random 50% analysis described by Qwest in its response, CGE&Y has verified that Qwest has implemented several quality control mechanisms to ensure the due date transmitted via the FOC is identical to that which is entered into the SOP. On a monthly basis, Qwest's quality review team compares 10% of all due dates. In addition, 100% of all due dates are reviewed for a one day period each week. Qwest has also implemented a due date GUI which includes a database containing due dates based on the Service Interval Guide. Service Representatives are personally coached when input errors are discovered.

Although not all of the quality control procedures described above where in place during the retest period, CGE&Y observed significant improvement in the reduction of due date discrepancies. Increased flow through rates would also serve to reduce the opportunity for this type of manual input error. The retest` results seen by CGE&Y support Qwest's claim of greater than 97% agreement between the due provided in the FOC and that contained on the service order. CGE&Y finds that Qwest is reporting accurate results for OP-3 when the due date on the service order matches the due date provided on the FOC. Therefore, CGE&Y closes this IWO and recommends the parties review future commercial performance results to determine if Qwest is providing non-discriminatory service in meeting due dates.

Verification completed by:	Susan Hayslip	Date:	03/26/02

TAG Recommendation ☐ Approved ☐ Return to Qwest

TAG Acceptance by:		Date:	

