EXHIBIT MGW -T7

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

| | |
|---|---|
| In the Matter of the Investigation into U S WEST Communications, Inc.'s Compliance with § 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 | Docket No. UT-003022 |
| In the Matter of U S WEST Communications, Inc.'s Statement of Generally Available Terms Pursuant to Section 252(f) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 | Docket No. UT-003040 |

# SUPPLEMENTAL
# DIRECT TESTIMONY
# OF
# MICHAEL G. WILLIAMS

## ON BEHALF OF QWEST CORPORATION
## RE: MARCH 2001 - FEBRUARY 2002 PERFORMANCE DATA

## APRIL 5, 2002

# I. IDENTIFICATION OF WITNESS

**Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND CURRENT POSITION.**

A. My name is Michael G. Williams. My business address is 250 Bell Plaza, Room 1603-B, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111. I am employed by Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") as Director, Wholesale Markets.

**Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

A. Yes. In these dockets, I submitted direct testimony (Exhibit MGW-T1) regarding Qwest's performance data which was filed with the Commission on November 16, 2001. On November 7, 2001, I also filed comments responding to AT&T's, WorldCom's and Covad's comments and testimony regarding Qwest's performance pleadings. I also appended an affidavit to Qwest's first monthly performance pleading (summarizing July 2000 – June 2001 data) filed on September 7, 2001. I filed supplemental direct testimony concerning the September 2001 metrics for which Qwest failed to meet the ROC determined performance objective on December 5, 2001. Finally, I filed supplemental direct testimony concerning the February 2001- January 2002 metrics for which Qwest failed to meet the ROC determined performance objective on March 8, 2001.[1]

# II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

**Q. DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.**

[1] The Supplemental Testimony filed on March 8, 2001 cover sheet indicated the testimony addressed the October 2001 - January 2002 Performance Data in error. It should have stated that it addressed the February 2001 - January 2002 Performance Data.

A. The purpose of my testimony is as follows:

1. To provide the Commission with a summary of Qwest Corporation (Qwest) commercial performance in the state of Washington from March 2001 through February 2002, attached as Exhibit 1. I have also included as Exhibit 2 the February 2002 regional performance data to establish that Qwest continues to provide those elements of the competitive checklist that have had small or no volume in Washington to CLECs at a high level of quality. The regional data also provides additional support that Qwest provides each aspect of the checklist at an acceptable level of quality.
2. To respond to the Commission's request, in paragraphs 16 and 17 of its Twenty-seventh Supplemental Order, to provide supplemental direct testimony (for each month's data beginning with the September 2001 performance results) identifying "each instance where Qwest failed to meet the parity or benchmark standard...[along with-] a narrative as to why the company failed to meet the measure and identify[ing] the steps being taken to ensure future compliance." The September 2001 testimony responsive to the Commission's Order, was previously filed on December 5, 2001. Supplemental direct testimony concerning the February 2001- January 2002 metrics for which Qwest failed to meet the ROC determined performance objective was filed on March 8, 2001.[2]

[2] See Exhibits 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, Supplemental Direct Testimony of Michael G. Williams in Docket Nos. UT-003022 and UT-003040, filed March 8, 2002.

3. To present to the Commission the Oregon Liberty Data Reconciliation Report so that the Commission may confidently rely on Qwest's performance results in assessing the quality of how it provides CLECs with interconnection, resale and access to UNEs.

4. I will also review the FCC evidentiary standards applied to date to performance standards, in determining when a Regional Bell Operating Company has satisfied the FCC checklist requirements.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE EXHIBITS APPENDED TO THIS DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF YOUR TESTIMONY.**

A. The following exhibits are appended to this document:

- Attached as Exhibit 1 is Qwest's actual performance data for Washington from March 2001 through February 2002 on a checklist-item-by-checklist-item basis.

- Attached as Exhibit 2 is Qwest's actual regional performance data from March 2001 through February 2002 on a checklist-item-by-checklist-item basis.

- Attached as Exhibit 3 is a table correlating the pages of the checklist-item-formatted Washington data reports (Exhibit 1) on a PID-by-PID basis.

- Attached as Exhibit 4 is the "Summary of Notes" on the Qwest Regional Performance Results corresponding to Qwest's March 2001-February 2002 data report. The summary is compiled by Qwest and disclosed on a public web site to document for Commissions, CLECs, and any other interested party, the actions taken by the ROC or internally by Qwest with regard to particular PIDs.

- Attached as Exhibit 5 is a color-coded chart (which Qwest refers to as the Washington "blue chart") visually demonstrating, on a checklist-item-by-checklist-item basis the extent to which Qwest satisfied the applicable benchmark and parity standards between March 2001 and February 2002 in Washington. Qwest uses four months of data to be consistent with how the FCC evaluates ILECs' performance data in its 271 decisions.

- Attached as Exhibit 6 is a color-coded chart (which Qwest refers to as the regional "blue chart") visually demonstrating, on a checklist-item-by-checklist-item basis the extent to which Qwest satisfied the applicable benchmark and parity standards between March 2001 and February 2002 across its region. Qwest uses four months of data to be consistent with how the FCC evaluates ILECs' performance data in its 271 decisions.

- Attached as Exhibit 7 is a copy of the Liberty Data Reconciliation Report for Oregon.

- Attached as Exhibit 8 is a matrix identifying each specific PID where the performance objective was missed in more than one of the last four months in Washington, based on the March 2001 - February 2002 data report.

- Attached as Exhibit 9 is a matrix identifying each specific PID where the performance objective was missed only in November 2001 in Washington, based on the March 2001 - February 2002 data report.

- Attached as Exhibit 10 is a matrix identifying each specific PID where the performance objective was missed only in December 2001 in Washington, based on the March 2001 - February 2002 data report.

- Attached as Exhibit 11 is a matrix identifying each specific PID where the performance objective was missed only in January 2002 in Washington, based on the March 2001 - February 2002 data report.

- Attached as Exhibit 12 is a matrix identifying each specific PID where the performance objective was missed only in February 2002 in Washington, based on the March 2001 - February 2002 data report.

- Attached as Exhibit 13 is Qwest's Response to Observation 3089.

- Attached as Exhibit 14 is the Cap Gemini Ernst and Young report on the Arizona "incident work order" equivalent of Observation 3089.

- Attached as Exhibit 15 is the October 2001 Covad comments on the Liberty Performance Measurement Audit Report.

- Attached as Exhibit 16 is Liberty Consulting's Response to Covad's October comments on the Liberty Performance Measurement Audit Report.

- Attached as Exhibit 17 is a matrix of CLEC electronic flow -through rates.

## III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE APPROACH AGREED UPON AT THE ROC WORKSHOPS TO DEMONSTRATE THE QUALITY OF SERVICE PROVIDED TO CLECS IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHECKLIST ITEMS.**

A. Parties to the ROC workshops negotiated performance measurements (PIDs) and, in virtually every circumstance, the expected level of performance that would provide CLECs with a meaningful opportunity to compete in the marketplace. Under the ROC performance measurements, adequate performance is determined in one of two ways: (1) parity with retail; or, (2) where no retail analog exists, by meeting a performance objective or "benchmark." When a retail analogue exists, the FCC requires that Qwest serve CLECs in "substantially the same and manner" as Qwest provides the analogous service to retail customers. In ROC workshops, parties agreed upon statistical methods to determine when performance is substantially

similar.[3] Thus, if Qwest's retail performance is better than wholesale performance, the Commission must look at the statistical result to determine whether the disparity is statistically significant. If it is not statistically significant, there is no concern. When the PID has an associated performance benchmark, there is no concern when Qwest achieves the benchmark. A detailed review of the data makes it very clear that Qwest continues to provide every element of the competitive checklist to CLECs at a high level of quality.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE WHAT THE FEBRUARY DATA PERFORMANCE RESULTS DEMONSTRATE?**

A. The attached performance results show that Qwest's actual performance over the last four months meets 271 objectives and that Qwest provides interconnection, collocation, access to UNEs, emerging services, number portability, resale, and the remaining checklist items in a manner that is either "substantially the same as" Qwest provides to its retail operations, or in a manner that provides "efficient CLECs with a meaningful opportunity to compete."[4] In particular:

[3] Under the statistical standards the ROC adopted, if the Z score is higher than +1.645, retail performance is better than wholesale performance by a statistically significant margin. The same is true if the parity score is a positive number. The two statistical methods generally work together meaning that when the Z score is higher than 1.645, the parity score usually will be a positive number, indicating that retail performance exceeds wholesale performance by a statistically significant margin. The parity score (rather than the Z score) should be used for evaluating parity when there is a smaller sample size. (See Exhibit 7, at pages 4-5 appended to the "Qwest November 2000-October 2001" performance data filing.)

[4] These are the verbatim standards set by the FCC. Where retail parity exists, Qwest must provide service to CLECs in substantially the same time and manner." This is managed in the PIDs through use of statistical methodology. Where no retail analog exists, Qwest must provide an "efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete." The ROC has set benchmarks in those situations that the ROC collectively determined would give CLECs a meaningful opportunity to compete.

- Interconnection: Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest met an average of 97.51% of its installation commitments to CLECs for interconnection trunks, at parity with retail performance for Qwest's Feature Group D trunks (the agreed upon retail analogue). The average installation interval over these same four months was 17.1 days, also at parity with retail performance for the last four months. The overall trouble rate remained extremely small – 0.02% or less. When troubles did occur, Qwest cleared an average of 95.65% of those few trouble reports within four hours over the last four months, again at parity with retail performance. As always, blockage on CLEC trunks was well below the benchmark of 1%, at 0.08% or less each month for the last four months.
- Collocation: Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest met 100% of its installation commitments for collocation throughout the region irrespective of whether the collocation had an associated 90-day, 120-day, or 150-day interval. Qwest also completed 100% of its feasibility studies on a timely basis and in an average of nine days, easily meeting both ROC benchmarks.
- UNE-P: Between November 2001 through February 2002, Qwest provisioned both reported categories of UNE-P -- UNE-P-POTS and UNE-P-Centrex – at an extremely high level of quality. For UNE-P-POTS, Qwest provisioned an average of 99.4% of the orders on time irrespective of whether the orders required a technician dispatch. For non-dispatched orders, the largest

percentage of orders, Qwest met over 99% of its installation commitments to CLECs each month in an average installation interval of three days or less. Of the UNE-P-POTS circuits in service, less than 1% experienced trouble each month. When trouble did occur, Qwest resolved CLEC out of service troubles on average over 93% of the time within 24 hours, and in a mean time to restore service at parity with restoration of equivalent Qwest service. For UNE-P-Centrex, over these same months Qwest provisioned on average 96.86% of the circuits on time irrespective of whether the orders required a technician dispatch. For dispatched orders, the largest percentage of orders, Qwest met 100% of its installation commitments to CLECs for three out of the last four months in an average interval of less than 5 days. Of the UNE-P-Centrex circuits in service, less than 1% experienced trouble each month. When trouble did occur, Qwest always resolved 100% of CLEC out of service troubles within 24 hours when no technician dispatch was required and an average of 89.8% of such troubles when a dispatch was required. The mean time to restore troubles on UNE-P-Centrex lines was also consistently at parity with restoration of equivalent Qwest service.

- Loops: Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's performance was outstanding in provisioning all types of unbundled loops; however, because analog loops (voice loops) and 2-wire non-loaded loops (DSL loops) account for more than 87% of all CLEC loops in service, Qwest will discuss those here. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest provisioned

an average of 99.03% of analog loops on time (besting the ROC 90% benchmark) in an average interval below the ROC's 6-day benchmark. 2-wire non-loaded loops were provisioned an average of 98.3% on time during these same months in an average interval well below the ROC's 6-day benchmark. For both types of loops, Qwest's installations were always trouble-free more than 97% of the time. For all coordinated cutovers, whether they were analog loops or some other type of loop, Qwest always provisioned in excess of 95% of the cutovers on time, exceeding the ROC benchmark and far exceeding that deemed acceptable by the FCC in New York. Unbundled loop repair was equally impressive as Qwest always cleared more than 98% of out of service troubles experienced on analog and 2-wire non-loaded loops within the 24 hour objective, and in a mean time to restore service usually at parity with restoration of equivalent retail service.

- Number Portability: Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest completed its work in provisioning number portability in excess of 98% of the time irrespective of whether a Qwest loop or CLEC loop was the underlying facility involved. This performance exceeds the 95% benchmarks set in the ROC. Moreover, 99.97% of the 39,771 numbers ported in Washington over the last four months were disconnected on a timely basis.
- Resale: Between November 2001 and February 2002, an extremely high percentage of resale orders were provisioned without a technician dispatch. In such circumstances, Qwest always met over 99% of its CLEC installation

commitments for resold residential customers, and 100% for business, Centrex, PBX and DSL customers. For all five types of resold service, CLECs always experienced a trouble rate less than 1.28% each month. With respect to maintenance and repair, for each class of service discussed, whether dispatches were required or not, Qwest cleared an average of 87.78% of residence out of service troubles within 24 hours and over 95% of business, Centrex, PBX or DSL out of service troubles within 24 hours, and usually at parity with equivalent Qwest retail service.

My testimony will show that in virtually every instance, the performance lapses in November 2001, December 2001, January 2002 and February 2002 were either minor or an aberration when viewed in the context of Qwest's overall performance over several months.

**Q. HOW CAN THE COMMISSION KNOW QWEST'S PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS ARE RELIABLE AND CREDIBLE?**

A. In September 2001, the Liberty Consulting Group concluded its audit of Qwest's performance measurements and concluded that Qwest's performance data "accurately and reliably report actual Qwest performance." The Commission may therefore confidently rely on the performance results in assessing the quality of interconnection, resale and access to UNEs. Nonetheless, to provide the Commission with even greater confidence in Qwest's performance data, the ROC

retained Liberty Consulting to reconcile performance data for all interested CLECs. Three CLECs – AT&T, WorldCom and Covad – asked Liberty to reconcile data on a few of Qwest's performance measurements. These CLECs focused exclusively on unbundled loop, line sharing, and interconnection trunk performance. Given that Liberty had already audited Qwest's performance measurements and found them accurate and reliable, to participate in the reconciliation the ROC required CLECs to come forward with evidence showing that Qwest's performance data was inaccurate.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS UTILIZED BY LIBERTY TO RECONCILE THE DATA PROVIDED BY CLECS.**

A. The reconciliation process began in September and, over the past four months Liberty has issued six data reconciliation reports, each based on a detailed order-by-order review of various records. In total, Liberty has analyzed well over 10,000 orders. These reports describe Liberty's detailed review of performance data from the states of Arizona, Colorado, Nebraska, Oregon and Washington.[5] Liberty has concluded that the reconciliation process is an on-going project. At this point, Liberty has issued one Exception and thirteen Observations to Qwest's performance data, of which the Exception and ten Observations have since been closed. The three remaining Observations, which Qwest expects will be closed soon, concern

[5] Liberty issued two Data Reconciliation Reports from the state of Colorado. Liberty has yet to complete its work in the states of Utah and Minnesota. The CLECs, not Qwest, determined the states, products and PIDs to be reconciled. The Washington, Arizona, Nebraska and Colorado reports were filed with my March 8, 2002 testimony as Exhibits 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. The Oregon report is attached hereto as Exhibit 7.

slight incidents of human error or a programming fix that affected a diagnostic measure. In a recent hearing, Liberty testified that the current state of Qwest's performance data "is quite representative of Qwest's performance in the marketplace today."[6] Liberty also testified that Qwest's performance data "is much more accurate and reliable than would be any of the CLECs to evaluate."[7]

**Q. WHAT ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE DOES QWEST PRESENT WITH RESPECT TO LIBERTY'S DATA RECONCILIATION.**

A. Liberty Consulting has submitted pre-filed testimony and will testify in the state of Washington as it relates to data reconciliation. This will allow the Commission to hear first hand the views of an independent party with respect to the accuracy of Qwest's performance data.

**Q. WHAT DO THE LIBERTY AUDITED AND RECONCILED PERFORMANCE RESULTS DEMONSTRATE?**

A. Qwest's audited and reconciled performance results demonstrate that the Commission can confidently rely on Qwest's performance data to evaluate whether Qwest satisfies section 271 of the Act. This data shows that Qwest is providing interconnection, UNEs, and services to competing carriers in substantially the same time and manner as Qwest provides to itself, and in a manner that allows an

[6] Colorado Data Reconciliation Transcript at page 118.
[7] Colorado Data Reconciliation Transcript at page 120 (Jan. 29, 2002) (testimony of Mr. Bob Stright of Liberty Consulting).

efficient CLEC a meaningful opportunity to compete as required by Section 271.

**Q. WHAT ARE THE EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE SET FORTH BY THE FCC?**

A. The FCC places tremendous emphasis on PIDs negotiated through an open process, such as occurred at the ROC. The FCC concluded that when "[performance] standards are developed through open proceedings with input from both the incumbent and competing carriers, these standards can represent informed and reliable attempts to objectively approximate whether competing carriers are being served by the incumbent in substantially the same time or manner or in a way that provides them a meaningful opportunity to compete."[8] The FCC held:

> Thus, to the extent there is no statistically significant difference between a BOC's provision of service to competing carriers and its own retail customers, the Commission generally need not look any further. Likewise, if a BOC's provision of service to competing carriers satisfies the performance benchmark, the analysis is usually done.[9]

Even when statistically significant differences in performance exist, the Commission may "conclude that such differences have little or no competitive significance in the marketplace."[10] In such cases, "the Commission may conclude that the differences are not meaningful in terms of statutory compliance."[11] A

[8] *Verizon Massachusetts Order* at ¶13.
[9] *Verizon Connecticut Order* at Appendix D-5, ¶8 (October 20, 2001).
[10] *Id.*
[11] *Verizon Connecticut Order* at Appendix D-5, ¶8.

steady improvement in performance over time indicates that problems are being resolved.[12] Moreover, when "there are multiple performance measurements associated with a particular checklist item, the Commission considers the performance demonstrated by all the measurements as a whole. Accordingly, a disparity in performance for one measurement, by itself, does not usually provide a basis for finding noncompliance with the checklist."[13]

Thus, the ultimate issue before this Commission is whether Qwest's overall performance on a checklist-item-by-checklist-item basis is adequate. The FCC has made clear that when performance metrics are negotiated, ILECs such as Qwest need not meet the negotiated standards 100% of the time to satisfy Section 271. This would be a virtual impossibility. The Commission's role is to assess all of the PIDs for each checklist item in totality and decide whether the performance is adequate. Moreover, when evaluating a 271 application, the FCC has always studied the four most recent months of performance data.[14] Qwest, therefore, describes its November 2001 to February 2002 performance data, which demonstrates that its overall performance meets the FCC standard for Section 271. Moreover, given the voluminous nature of Qwest's performance data (see Exhibits 1 and 2), Qwest has created a demonstrative exhibit that mirrors the FCC's standard

[12] *Verizon New York Order* at ¶59.
[13] *Verizon Connecticut Order* at Appendix D-5, ¶9.
[14] *See, e.g., In the Matter of Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region InterLATA Service in the State of New York,* Memorandum, Opinion and Order, CC Docket No. 99-295 ("Bell Atlantic New York Order") at ¶¶69, 156, 219, 221, 223, 224, 284, 300, 301 and 323 (Dec. 1999).

for evaluating performance data. This exhibit, which has become known as Qwest's "Blue Chart," allows the Commission to quickly evaluate Qwest's performance on a checklist-item-by-checklist-item basis consistent with the FCC's approach. In addition, the Blue Chart identifies the specific performance measurements where Qwest has missed its performance objective in more than one of the most recent four months. Qwest's Blue Chart for Washington is attached as Exhibit 5 and the regional Blue Chart is attached as Exhibit 6.

## IV. DETAILED DISCUSSION OF CHECKLIST PERFORMANCE DATA

### 1. Interconnection/Collocation

#### a. Interconnection

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INTERCONNECTION (CHECKLIST ITEM 1) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR MARCH 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Interconnection trunks allow the mutual exchange of traffic between Qwest and CLECs. Qwest has continued to meet the ROC's performance standards for provisioning, maintaining, and repairing interconnection trunks thereby keeping interconnection trunk blockage low.

- Trunk Blockage. Between November 2001 and February 2002, trunk blockage on CLEC interconnection trunks to Qwest tandem offices has been

virtually non-existent, 0.08% or less, far below the ROC's 1% benchmark. Exhibit 1 at 34, NI-1A. Trunk blockage on CLEC interconnection trunks to Qwest end offices was equally insignificant, 0.03% or less, far below the ROC's 1% benchmark. *Id.*, NI-1B.

- Trunk Installation Measurements. In Zone 1 (high density areas), Qwest met an average of 98.28% or more of its interconnection trunk installation commitments to CLECs between November 2001 and February 2002, with an average interval between 12 and 17 days. Both of these measurements were at parity between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 25, OP-3D, OP-4D. In Zone 2 (low density areas), Qwest met an average of 92.16% of its installation commitments to CLECs between November 2001 and February 2002 with an average interval of 21.57 days, both performance measurements were at parity with retail results. *Id.* at 26, OP-3E, OP-4E. Delays incurred installing interconnection trunks between November 2001 and February 2002 continued to be rare; however, when they did occur in either zone, Qwest performance was at parity with comparable delays for retail customers. *Id.* at 25-26, OP-6A-4, OP-6A-5. Overall, trunk installation quality has been excellent as well. Over 97.5% of the newly installed trunks between November 2001 and February 2002 did not experience any trouble within 30 days. *Id.* at 26-27, OP-5, OP-5*.
- Trunk Maintenance and Repair Measurements. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest continued to achieve similar success in

maintaining and repairing interconnection trunks. The trouble rate for interconnection trunks has been extremely low – 0.02% (2 in 10,000 trunks) or less each month. *Id.* at 31, MR-8*. In Zone 1, Qwest cleared an average of 97.26% of CLEC trouble reports within four hours between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 29, MR-5A. In Zone 2, Qwest cleared an average of 89.47% of CLEC trouble reports between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 30, MR-5B. In each instance for both Zone 1 and Zone 2, these wholesale results were at parity with Qwest's retail performance. *Id.* at 29-30, MR-5A, MR-5B. In both Zone 1 and Zone 2, the mean time to restore interconnection service to CLECs has been at parity between November 2001 and February 2002 and less than the 4-hour objective. *Id.*, MR-6D, MR-6E. These results demonstrate that Qwest is providing interconnection trunking to competitors on a nondiscriminatory basis.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INTERCONNECTION (CHECKLIST ITEM 1) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS, BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. Of the sixteen individual PIDs relating to interconnection trunk installation, repair and blocking, only one PID failed to meet the parity standard for more than one

month. *Id.* 25-31 and 34, OP-3D, OP-4D, OP-6A-4, OP-3E, OP-4E, OP-6A-5, OP-5, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E, MR-8, NI-1A, NI-1B. In November and February, Qwest failed to meet the parity standard for the overall trouble rate on interconnection trunks. Exhibit 1 at 31, MR-8, MR-8*. However, as the FCC has repeatedly recognized, statistical significance does not always indicate material or competitive significance.

To explain, MR-8 measures the percentage of troubles that all of the interconnection trunks in service in the entire state of Washington experience in a given month. Qwest compares this measurement for CLECs against data for Feature Group D trunks. This is the retail comparable set by the ROC for this measurement. Thus, Qwest is meeting its performance standard if CLECs and retail customers alike experience a "substantially similar" percentage of troubles. This "retail parity" standard is evaluated using statistical analysis in order to determine whether observed differences are significant or merely explained by the normal variability inherent in the performance. To analyze the statistics, Qwest utilizes two forms of statistical tests, both of which are accepted by the ROC and consistent with those used in 271 applications approved by the FCC. Specifically, these are the modified Z test and the permutation/proportion tests. The modified Z test considers performance at parity if it generates a score equal to critical value, typically 1.645, or less. For convenience, the parity score indicates performance is at parity if it is less than 0.0. Conversely, if the parity score is 0.0 or greater, the

observed difference is considered to be statistically significant. Where sample sizes are relatively small, such as 100 orders or less per month, a permutation test (for measurements reported as intervals) or proportions test (for measurements reported as percentages) more accurately represents the variability of the performance in determining statistical significance. As with the modified Z test, the parity score compares the observed difference with the adjusted critical value and, again, indicates that performance is at parity when the parity score is less than 0.0.

The overall trouble rate on interconnection trunks for CLECs in November was 0.01% before the "no trouble found" repair reports were excluded. *Id.* That means 1 of 10,000 trunks in service experienced trouble. The retail result for feature group D trunks was also 0.01%. This incredibly slight disparity, although technically being statistically significant, requires consideration out to additional decimal places in order to even see the tiny numerical difference. The overall CLEC trouble rate in February was 0.02% (2 in 10,000 trunks). *Id*. Moreover, for every reported month, the CLEC trouble report rate has been 0.03% or less, which clearly constitutes excellent performance. This is a case where the Commission should determine that a CLEC can easily compete with a 0.02% trouble rate; therefore, this does not pose any problems.

Qwest met the parity standard between November 2001 and February 2002 for all remaining six repair PIDs for interconnection trunks. *Id.* at 29-31, MR-5A, MR-

6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest cleared an average of over 95.6% of CLEC troubles in both zones within 4 hours. *Id.* at 29-30, MR-5A, MR-5B. The mean time to restore service for all outages was no more than an average of two hours and forty minutes. *Id.*, MR-6D, MR-6E.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS DURING NOVEMBER 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 WHERE THE COMPANY FAILED TO MEET THE ROC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE FOR INTERCONNECTION (CHECKLIST ITEM 1), FOR ONLY ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS?**

A. No.

**b. Collocation**

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR COLLOCATION (CHECKLIST ITEM 1).**

A. Collocation allows CLECs to place equipment in Qwest central offices or other structures such as remote terminals.[15] In response to two collocation decisions from the FCC, the ROC significantly revised the collocation PIDs it originally developed. The revised PIDs set installation intervals of 90 days when the collocation is forecasted, and 120-150 days when no forecast is provided

[15] The ROC's collocation PIDs focus on central office collocations.

(depending on whether major infrastructure modifications are necessary). The PIDs also set a 10-day benchmark for feasibility studies.

Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's collocation performance has been perfect. In Washington, Qwest has met the 90-, 120-, and 150-day installation benchmarks, with average intervals substantially shorter than the ROC set benchmark. *Id.* at 32, CP-1A, CP-1B, CP-1C. In every instance, Qwest also completed 100% of its installation commitments on time. *Id.* at 32-33, CP-2B, CP-2C.

Collocation has two measurable components: installations and feasibility. Feasibility studies are completed in the first 10 days of the installation interval and require Qwest to inform CLECs whether the requisite central office contains adequate space and power to meet the CLECs request. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest reported that it met the collocation feasibility obligations 100% of the time in Washington. *Id.* at 33, CP-4. This performance far exceeds the ROC's 90% benchmark. Qwest also provided these feasibility studies in ten or less days each month, besting the ROC's 10-day performance benchmark in three out of the last four months. *Id.*, CP-3.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR CHECKLIST 1 ITEMS OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS.**

A. Qwest met its performance objective for 22 of the 23 performance metrics associated with interconnection and collocation between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 26-34, OP-3D, OP-4D, OP-6A, OP-3E, OP-4E, OP-6A-5, OP-5, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E, MR-8, CP-1A, CP-1B, CP-1C, CP-2B, CP-2C, CP-3, CP-4, NI-1A, NI-1B. As set forth above, the isolated performance miss is minor. This is outstanding performance. The Commission should find that Qwest has satisfied checklist one performance requirements.

## 2. Access to Unbundled Network Elements

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CHECKLIST ITEM 2 PERFORMANCE DATA PIDS.**

A. In its prior orders on section 271 applications, the FCC has discussed access to OSS and UNE Combinations under checklist item two. The FCC has also demanded that, in the absence of significant commercial volumes, BOCs must subject their OSS to third party testing – and successfully passed such tests – prior to obtaining section 271 approval. Hewlett-Packard, the Pseudo-CLEC, is currently testing Qwest's OSS, with KPMG Consulting serving as Test Administrator. Qwest will report the results of the third party test when it is completed. A hearing to discuss the OSS Test is currently set for June 4-6, 2002.

### a. OSS

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OSS (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVENBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Qwest's OSS is a combination of the systems, databases, personnel and documentation that are integral to pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing of facilities and services to CLECs. In its first performance data filing, Qwest described each of these aspects of OSS in detail.[16] Here, Qwest will simply describe its last four months of actual performance results.

- Gateway Availability. The gateway availability PIDs measure the percentage of time the systems for interfacing with Qwest's computer network are available to CLECs. The ROC benchmark for all interfaces requires availability 99.25% of the time. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest consistently exceeded the 99.25% benchmark for six of eight gateway systems: IMA-GUI Fetch-n-Staff; IMA-GUI Data Arbiter; IMA-EDI; EB-TA; EXACT; and GUI Repair interfaces. *Id.* at 36-38, GA-1B, GA-1C, GA-3, GA-4, GA-6, GA-7. The other two systems exceeded the 99.25% benchmark in three of four months and were available 98.32% of the time in the single month (November) where the benchmark was missed. *Id.* at 36, GA-1A, GA-2.
- Pre-Order Response Times. The ROC PIDs require Qwest to measure the time

[16] See Qwest July-June Performance Data Filing at pages 20-22.

it takes its computer network to respond to various CLEC requests for information. For the IMA-GUI and EDI interfaces, the PIDs assess the time it takes CLECs to schedule appointments, inquire about service availability times, conduct facility checks, validate addresses, get CSRs, make telephone number ("TN") reservations, and provide loop qualification information. The PIDs separately track the time it takes CLECs to receive the requested screen and the time it takes Qwest to respond after the CLEC submits the request.[17] The PIDs then aggregate those times and apply benchmarks ranging from 10 to 25 seconds.

Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's pre-order response performance has been outstanding. Qwest uniformly met every aggregate pre-order response time benchmark. *Id.* at 40-51, PO-1A-1 Total, PO-1A-2 Total, PO-1A-3 Total, PO-1A-4 Total, PO-1A-5 Total, PO-1A-6 Total, PO-1A-7(b), PO-1A-8(b), PO-1C-1, PO-1B-1 Total, PO-1B-2, PO-1B-3, PO-1B-4, PO-1B-5, PO-1B-6 Total, PO-1B-7, PO-1B-8, PO-1C-2. This excellent performance helps to ensure that CLECs can provide customers with a high quality, initial customer experience.

- Electronic Flow-Through. The flow-through PIDs measure the percentage of time that CLEC Local Service Requests (LSRs) are converted into service orders recognized by Qwest's systems and "flowed-through" to Qwest's back-

[17] In addition, through March 2001 results, there was an "accept" screen for some transactions (Appointment Scheduling and Telephone Number Reservation), for which Qwest also reported the time to produce the screen indicating that Qwest's systems have successfully received the CLEC's request.

end systems without manual intervention. More specifically, the flow-through PIDs measure the overall flow-through rates for all orders (PO-2A) and the flow-through rates for orders that are designed to flow through (PO-2B).

Qwest's flow-through PIDs have been diagnostic, primarily because the FCC does not consider flow-through to be a "conclusive measure of nondiscriminatory access to ordering functions, but as one indicium among many of the performance measures" of Qwest's OSS.[18] The FCC recognizes, and Qwest's data shows, that CLECs impact heavily the flow-through rates that a BOC can achieve. Efficient CLECs achieve high flow-though rates while other, less efficient CLECs have lower flow-through rates.[19] For these reasons, the FCC has focused less on actual flow-through rates than on whether the BOC's OSS are capable of flowing orders through.[20] More recently, the ROC collaborative established benchmarks for PO-2B – LSRs eligible for flow-through – effective January 2002.[21]

Qwest's performance results demonstrate that Qwest has continued to improve its ability to flow through orders for POTs Resale, Unbundled Loops and Local Number Portability ("LNP") and its ability to meet the new ROC benchmarks.

In February, Qwest's flow-through rates for eligible LSRs sent through the

[18] *Verizon Massachusetts Order* at ¶77.
[19] *Id*. at ¶¶78, 80.
[20] *Id*. at ¶¶77, 80.
[21] In establishing the PO-2B benchmarks, the ROC Steering Committee chose to adopt benchmarks that were about six months accelerated over Qwest's proposed schedule of phased benchmark increases. Because Qwest's propose schedule accommodated a planned phase-out of non-fatal LSR rejections, Qwest had not been excluding such LSRs from PO-2 as the PID permits. However, with the accelerated schedule, Qwest has sought and obtained agreement from ROC parties to begin excluding non-fatal LSR rejections from PO-2. Overall, this will result in higher flow through percentages.

IMA-GUI were 92.74% for POTs Resale (*Id.* at 52, PO-2B-1), besting the ROC's 90% benchmark; 75.40% for Unbundled Loops (*Id.* at 53, PO-2B-1), besting the ROC's 70% benchmark; 97.31% for LNP (*Id.* at 54, PO-2B-1), besting the ROC's 90% benchmark; and 78.08% for UNE-P-POTS (*Id.* at 55, PO-2B-1), besting the ROC's 75% benchmark.. 30.6% of all eligible LSRs received in February for Unbundled Loops were received via IMA-GUI. *Id*. at 53, PO-2A-1, PO-2A-2, PO-2B-1, PO-2B-2. 74.2% of all eligible LSRs received in January for UNE-P POTS were received via IMA-GUI. *Id*. at 55, PO-2A-1, PO-2A-2, PO-2B-1, PO-2B-2.

In February, electronic flow-through rates for all eligible LSRs received via IMA-EDI were as follows: 50% for POTS Resale (*Id.* at 52, PO-2B-2); 78.35% for Unbundled Loops (*Id.* at 53, PO-2B-2), besting the ROC's 70% benchmark; 97.92% for LNP (*Id.* at 54, PO-2B-2), besting the ROC's 90% benchmark; and 71.38% for UNE-P-POTS (*Id.* at 55, PO-2B-2). Only two LSRs received in February for POTS Resale were received via IMA-EDI. *Id.* at 52, PO-2A-1, PO-2A-2, PO-2B-1, PO-2B-2. 25.8% of all eligible LSRs received in February for UNE-P POTS were received via IMA-EDI. *Id.* at 55, PO-2A-1, PO-2A-2, PO-2B-1, PO-2B-2.

- LSR Rejections. There are times when CLECs do not adequately complete LSRs, generating an "LSR Rejection." For the IMA-GUI and EDI interfaces, the ROC PIDs require Qwest to track the length of time it takes Qwest to submit

LSR rejection notices to CLECs. The PIDs set benchmarks in hours for manual rejections and in seconds for electronic rejections.

For the IMA-GUI interface, Qwest met the 12-hour (manual) and 18-second (electronic) benchmarks for LSR rejections in each of the last four months. *Id.* at 56, PO-3A-1, PO-3A-2. The same is true for the EDI interface, where Qwest also uniformly met the 12-hour and 18-second benchmarks between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 56-57, PO-3B-1, PO-3B-2. Qwest also uniformly met the 24-hour LSR rejection benchmark for manual and IIS. *Id.* at 57, PO-3C.

- Firm Order Confirmations. Qwest submits and measures the percentage of Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Qwest sends to CLECs on time for various products and services. FOCs identify the due date by which CLECs should expect to receive the requested service. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest submitted over 99% of FOCs on time for POTS Resale orders processed electronically through both the IMA-GUI and EDI interfaces, easily surpassing the 95% benchmark. *Id.* at 59, PO-5A-1(a), PO-5A-2(a). The same is true for orders processed manually, in whole or in part. In every circumstance, Qwest submitted over 94% of these FOCs on time, besting the 90% benchmark. *Id.* at 59-60, PO-5B-1(a), PO-5B-2(a) & PO-5C-(a).

Qwest's performance with respect to orders for unbundled loops was also outstanding. For orders submitted electronically through either interface, for those processed in part manually, and for orders submitted completely on a

manual basis, Qwest always returned over 99% of these orders on time. Thus, Qwest far surpassed the ROC's 90% and 95% benchmarks. *Id.* at 61-62, PO-5A-1(b), PO-5A-2(b), PO-5B-1(b), PO-5B-2(b) & PO-5C-(b).

In each month between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest also met the 90% or 95% ROC benchmarks for FOCs on time for local number portability (LNP). Qwest always processed in excess of 99% of these orders on a timely basis irrespective of whether the LSRs were processed electronically, in part manually, or on a complete manual basis. *Id.* at 63-64, PO-5A-1(c), PO-5A-2(c), PO-5B-1(c), PO-5B-2(c) & PO-5C–(c).

Finally, in three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest timely processed 100% of all FOCs for interconnection trunks. In February, Qwest timely processed 88.3% of interconnection trunk orders, still besting the 85% benchmark. *Id.* at 65, PO-5D. Thus, in each instance Qwest uniformly surpassed the ROC's benchmarks in processing FOCs for CLECs.

- Jeopardy Notifications. When it becomes evident that Qwest might not meet an expected due date for the provision of a product or service, Qwest submits a jeopardy notification. For non-designed services and UNE-P-POTS, between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest submitted jeopardy notices to CLECs, on average 3.25 days before the scheduled delivery date, at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 67 and 70, PO-8A, PO-8D. The percentage of timely jeopardy notices to CLECs for non-designed services and UNE-P-POTS has

also been at parity with retail performance between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.*, PO-9A, PO-9D.

For unbundled loops, the data is much the same. Qwest's wholesale and retail results show performance at parity; the average CLEC jeopardy interval is an average of 4.7 days. *Id.* at 68, PO-8B. The percentage of timely jeopardy notices to CLECs has also been at parity with retail performance between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.*, PO-9B.

Finally, for interconnection trunks there is very little data in Washington. Only five notices have been issued between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 69, PO-8C, PO-9C. Regionally, Qwest submitted jeopardy notices to CLECs at parity with Qwest retail performance for eight of nine months between March 2001 and February 2002. *Exhibit 2* at 70, PO-8C. The percentage of timely jeopardy notices provided to CLECs has consistently been at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, PO-9C.

- Access to Centers. Qwest measures the access that both CLEC and Qwest customers have to Qwest centers. PID OP-2 measures the percentage of calls to Qwest's provisioning center that were answered within 20 seconds. Between November 2001 and February 2002, over 93.45% of all CLEC calls were answered within 20 seconds. *Exhibit 1* at 75, OP-2.

  Similarly, PID MR-2 measures the percentage of calls to Qwest's repair center that were answered within 20 seconds. Over 84.42% of the wholesale calls were answered within 20 seconds. *Id.*, MR-2. The results for both of these

measurements were at parity with retail performance as indicated, in this case, by at least the most recent nine months showing numerically better results for CLECs than for retail.

- Billing. Qwest tracks how timely and completely it bills for services it provides to CLECs. Between November 2001 and February 2002, the billing data is mixed. In each month, Qwest provided CLECs with timely access to usage records. Such records were provided to CLECs in less than 3.26 days, substantially faster than the retail average of more than fourteen days. *Id.* at 76, BI-1A. Qwest also provided switched access usage records to CLECs in a timely manner, over 97.5% of the time each month between November 2001 and February 2002, above the 95% benchmark. *Id.* at 76, BI-1B. Qwest also delivered nearly all bills – over 99.93% – to CLECs within the requisite 10-day period for three of four months, between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 77, BI-2. All of this billing data is extremely positive.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY MONTHS BETWEEN NOVEMBER 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 THAT QWEST MISSED A ROC DETERMINED GATEWAY AVAILABILITY (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE FOR MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS ?**

A. No.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY MONTHS BETWEEN NOVEMBER 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 THAT QWEST MISSED A ROC DETERMINED GATEWAY AVAILABILITY (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE FOR ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS ?**

A. Yes. In November, Qwest missed two gateway availability benchmarks. The gateway availability PIDs measure the percentage of time the systems for interfacing with Qwest's computer network are available to CLECs. The ROC benchmark for all interfaces is 99.25% availability. In November, the IMA-GUI and the IMA-EDI gateways were available 98.32% of the time. November is the only month from September 2001-February 2002 when this metric has not met the ROC benchmark of 99.25%. *Id.* at 36, GA-1A, GA-2. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest has consistently exceeded the 99.25% benchmark for all remaining gateway interfaces. *Id.* at 36-38, GA-1B, GA-1C, GA-3, GA-4, GA-6, GA-7.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ELECTRONIC FLOW-THROUGH (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT?**

A. The flow through PIDs are somewhat unique in that there were no performance objectives associated with them until January 2002. Moreover, the overall flow

through rate (PO-2A) remains diagnostic. Only the flow through eligible PIDs (PO-2B) now have associated performance benchmarks. Thus, of the eight flow through PID measurements that have an associated performance objective, Qwest consistently met the performance objective in January and February 2002 on all but two: eligible LSRs received via the EDI interface for both-POTS resale (PO-2B-2) and UNE-P. These misses were attributable to a low volume of orders. For resale orders submitted via EDI, Qwest flowed-through three of ten (30%) LSRs in January and one of two (50%) LSRs in February. *Id*. at 52, PO-2B-2. This fell short of the ROC's 90% benchmark.[22]

Qwest's flow-through rates for eligible LSRs sent through the IMA-EDI interface were slightly lower, principally because of fewer CLECs using that interface. In Washington, only 50% of POTs resale flowed through (*Id.* at 52, PO-2B-2); however, this was one of two resale orders. Regionally, where this interface is more widely utilized, 91.30% of such orders flowed through (*Exhibit 2* at 53, PO-2B-2), besting the ROC's 90% benchmark.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE BILLING (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC**

[22] In establishing the PO-2B benchmarks, the ROC Steering Committee chose to adopt benchmarks that were about six months accelerated over Qwest's proposed schedule of phased benchmark increases. Because Qwest's propose schedule accommodated a planned phase-out of non-fatal LSR rejections, Qwest had not been excluding such LSRs from PO-2 as the PID permits. However, with the accelerated schedule, Qwest has sought and obtained agreement from ROC parties to begin excluding non-fatal LSR rejections from PO-2. Overall, this will result in higher flow through percentages.

**DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. Of the six individual PID measurements relating to billing, Qwest did not achieve parity on three PIDs for more than one month between November 2001 and February 2002: (1) billing completion notification timeliness (PO-7A,C); (2) billing accuracy (BI-3A); and (3) billing completeness (BI-4A).

The billing completion notification timeliness results found Qwest not at parity in November and December for notices sent via IMA-GUI. *Exhibit 1* at 66, PO-7A,C. In November, 98.1% of CLEC electronic billing completion notifications were made available to CLECs within five business days of posting completion in the service order processor. In December, 84.5% were made available to CLECs within five business days of posting completion in the service order processor. The comparable retail measurement is the percent of retail service orders posted within five business days in the CRIS billing system for the reporting period. In November, 99.03% of the retail orders were posted within five business days and in December, 98.17% were posted within five business days. In January and February, Qwest's service to CLECs was at parity with retail results. *Id.*

The November and December PO-7 misses are related to a Customer Records Management (CRM, a source system for PO-7) system release that took place on

September 29, 2001. An error in the code of the CRM release affected LSRs with multiple service orders associated with the LSR. As a result, only the first service order to complete would receive a billing completion notice. Subsequent service orders would not receive billing completion notifications. This coding error did not impact the provisioning, completion or posting to billing of the service order. It also did not impact the presence of the service order on the Loss and Completion Reports. It only prevented the transmission of the billing completion notification, which is the focus of PO-7. The problem was identified in late November, the CRM code was corrected in early December, and the clean-up to send all appropriate billing completion notifications was completed during the last half of December. Thus, going forward, the problem is corrected, as January and February 2002 results bear out.

It is important to note that no concerns were raised by the CLECs during the eight-week period of the problem. Qwest believes this is true because, as we have learned in recent months, the electronic billing completion notification is used by very few, if any, of the CLECs.

Qwest was also not at parity with retail results in November and December for the billing accuracy measurement (*Id.* at 78, BI-3A). In November, 56.13% of the revenue billed to CLECs was accurate and in December 96.47% of the revenue billed to CLECs was accurate. Qwest retail bills were 98.82% accurate in

November and 99.4% accurate in December. In January and February, CLEC billing over 99.7% accurate, at parity with the retail result, which was over 99.3% accurate. *Id.* The missed metrics in November and December were principally due to ongoing implementation of the cost docket in Washington. The process of implementing the cost docket has been ongoing for sometime both in Washington and throughout Qwest's region. Qwest went through a substantial mapping effort to ensure that all rates charged to CLECs in the state of Washington are accurate. The cost docket requires Qwest to update many thousands of USOCs (billing codes) in Washington alone. Qwest completed this work in mid-January 2002.

The Billing Completeness results found Qwest not at parity for three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 79, BI-4A. In November, Qwest's bills were complete 95.9% of the time, which was well below retail parity. *Id.* This was principally also due to ongoing implementation of the cost docket in Washington. The process of implementing the cost docket has been ongoing for sometime both in Washington and throughout Qwest's region. The cost docket requires Qwest to update many thousands of USOCs (billing codes) in Washington alone. Qwest finally completed this work in mid-January 2002.

Because the implementation has occurred over several months, the more recent results already reflect the improvement. In November, Qwest's bills were complete 95.9% of the time, in December they were complete 95.69% of the time and in

January they were complete 97.29% of the time. *Id.* In February 2002, Qwest's bills were complete 98.61% of the time, at parity with retail performance. *Id.* Qwest anticipates that this upward trend will continue and the data later in 2002 will continue to reflect the completion of this work.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS BETWEEN NOVEMBER 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 WHERE THE COMPANY FAILED TO MEET THE ROC BENCHMARK PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE FOR BILLING (CHECKLIST ITEM 2), FOR ONLY ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS?**

A. Yes. In December, Qwest missed one billing metric: billing completion notification timeliness. *Id.* at 66, PO-7B,C. In December, 90.8% of CLEC electronic billing completion notifications were made available to CLECs within five business days of posting completion in the service order processor. The comparable retail measurement is the percent of retail service orders posted within five business days in the CRIS billing system for the reporting period. In December, 98.17% retail orders were posted. *Id.* This metric was missed for the same reason as the discussed above for PO-7A,C.

**Q. PLEASE REVIEW QWEST'S ACCESS TO OSS (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS, BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. Qwest has met 69 of the 73 OSS performance metrics in at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 36-79, GA-1A, GA-1B, GA-1C, GA-2, GA-3, GA-4, GA-6, GA-7, PO-1A-1 Total, PO-1A-2 Total, PO-1A-3 Total, PO-1A-4 Total, PO-1A-5 Total, PO-1A-6 Total, PO-1A-7(b), PO-1A-8(b), PO-1C-1, PO-1B-1 Total, PO-1B-2, PO-1B-3, PO-1B-4, PO-1B-5, PO-1B-6 Total, PO-1B-7, PO-1B-8, PO-1C-2, PO-2B-1, PO-2B-2, PO-2B-1, PO-2B-2, PO-3A-1, PO-3A-2, PO-3B-1, PO-3B-2, PO-3C, PO-5A-1(a), PO-5A-2(a), PO-5B-1(a), PO-5B-2(a), PO-5C-(a), PO-5A-1(b), PO-5A-2(b), PO-5B-1(b), PO-5B-2(b), PO-5C-(b), PO-5A-1(C), PO-5A-2(c), PO-5B-1(c), PO-5B-2(c), PO-5C-(c), PO-5D, PO-7A,C, PO-7B,C, PO-8A, PO-9A, PO-8B, PO-9B, PO-8C, PO-9C, PO-8D, PO-9D, PO-15, PO-16, OP-2, MR-2, BI-1A, BI-1B, BI-3A, BI-4A. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied checklist item two OSS performance requirements once it completes its review of the OSS test results.

### b. Unbundled Network Element Combinations

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OTHER CHECKLIST ITEM 2 PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS THE COMMISSION SHOULD REVIEW.**

A. The FCC also has discussed UNE Combinations (both UNE-P-POTS and UNE-P-Centrex) and EELs under checklist item two. Qwest is successfully meeting increasing demand for these products by promptly installing and repairing them for CLECs.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE UNE-P (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Installation of UNE-P-POTS. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest installed 84.89% of all UNE-P-POTS lines in Washington without a technician dispatch. *Id.* at 80-82, OP-3A, OP-3B, OP-3C. For UNE-P orders in that category, Qwest timely provisioned an average of 99.7% of its installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002 in an average of 2.86 days. *Id.* at 82, OP-3C, OP-4C. The percentage of installation commitments met were at parity with equivalent retail performance. *Id.*, OP-3C. In the rare circumstance when delays in installations occurred, the delays were brief, and consistently at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, OP-6A-3.

When the provision of UNE-P-POTS required the dispatch of a technician, Qwest also performed well between November 2001 and February 2002. For dispatches within MSAs, Qwest met an average of 97.77% of its CLEC installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 80, OP-3A. The average installation interval was 4.87 days for this same period of time. *Id.*, OP-4A. For dispatches outside MSAs, Qwest met an average of 96.97% of its installation commitments to CLECs between November 2001 and February 2002, with an average installation interval of 6.41 days. *Id.* at 81, OP-3B, OP-4B. Irrespective of the type of technician dispatch, all of these results were at parity with retail

performance between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 80-81, OP-3A, OP-4A, OP-6A-1, OP-6B-1, OP-3B, OP-4B, OP-6A-2.

New installation quality has also been at parity with retail performance in three of the last four months. *Id.* at 83, OP-5, OP-5*. Once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded, Qwest completed over 94% of all UNE-P-POTS installations (dispatched and non-dispatched) without a CLEC filing a trouble report within 30-days in November, December and January.

Repair of UNE-P-POTS. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's repair of UNE-P-POTS circuits has been equally impressive. The overall trouble rate for UNE-P-POTS lines has always been less than 1%, lower than the trouble rate for comparable retail installations. *Id.* at 89, MR-8, MR-8*. When troubles occurred, Qwest resolved them efficiently. When no technician dispatch was required to clear the trouble, Qwest cleared an average of 98.36% of CLEC out of service reports within 24-hours and 99.77% of all CLEC trouble reports within 48-hours between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 88, MR-3C, MR-4C. The mean time to restore UNE-P service was less than five hours when no dispatch was required, also at parity with equivalent retail repairs. *Id.*, MR-6C.

Qwest provided similar outstanding service when repair of UNE-P-POTS lines required a technician dispatch. Whether repairs required a dispatch within an MSA or outside an MSA, Qwest cleared an average of 92.27% of the out of service troubles within 24 hours between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 85-86, MR-3A, MR-3B. The mean time to restore such lines was always seventeen hours, ten minutes or less, and always at parity with equivalent retail service. *Id.* at 85 and 87, MR-6A, MR-6B.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE UNE-P (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS, BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. Of the 27 PIDs relating to UNE-P, Qwest failed to meet the retail parity standard on three measurements for more than one month between November 2001 and February 2002: (1) the average installation interval for UNE-P POTS when no technician dispatch was required (OP-4C); (2) UNE-P-POTS repeat trouble rate when no technician dispatch was required (MR-7C); and (3) UNE-P repair appointments met when no technician dispatch was required (MR-9C).

The February data report indicates that CLECs experienced a longer installation interval in December and January, when no dispatch was required for UNE-P POTS. The CLEC interval in December was 2.83 days and was 3.0 days in

January. The comparable retail interval was 2.64 days in December and 2.7 days in January. *Id*. at 82, OP-4C. Thus, the difference between CLEC and retail intervals was always 0.3 days or less, hardly competitively significant. In the rare instances when delays in installations occurred, the delays were brief, and consistently at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, OP 6A-3. Furthermore, Qwest provisioned over 99.7% of CLEC installation commitments when no technician dispatch was required, at parity with retail performance. *Id*., OP-3C.

The February data report does show that CLECs experienced a higher percentage of repeat troubles for UNE-P-POTS when no technician dispatch was required. CLECs experienced a 12.31% rate in December and an 18.84% rate in January after the "no troubles found" reports were excluded. In February, the "no trouble found" data is not yet available; thus, the overall repeat trouble rate was 19.47%. Qwest's comparable retail customers experienced a 15.85% rate in December, a 13.94% rate in January, and a 12.17% rate in February. *Id*. at 88-89, MR-7, MR-7C*. The November result was at parity with retail performance. *Id*. In December and January, the metric comes into parity when the "no troubles found" are excluded. *Id.*, MR-7C*.

The February data report also indicates that Qwest met fewer CLEC repair appointments met when no technician dispatch was required. *Id*. at 89, MR-9C. In December, Qwest met 107 of 115 (93.04%) of CLEC repair appointments when no

dispatch was required. In contrast, Qwest met 97.3% of the 6,670 retail commitments in December. In February, Qwest met 107 of 113 (94.69%) of CLEC repair appointments when no dispatch was required. In contrast, Qwest met 98.76% of the 6,919 retail commitments in February. *Id*. Qwest met more repair appointments for CLECs than for retail customers when a technician dispatch was required. *Id*. at 86-87, MR-9A, MR-9B. If all repair appointments are aggregated over the last four months, irrespective of whether a technician dispatch is required, Qwest met 93.6% of CLEC appointments and 93.0% of retail repair appointments. *Id*. Thus, overall Qwest is providing comparable repair appointments in Washington.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS BETWEEN NOVEMBER 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 THAT QWEST MISSED THE ROC DETERMINED UNE-P (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR ONLY ONE MONTH?**

A. Yes. Qwest missed one metric in November, one metric in January, and two metrics in February.

**Q. WHICH UNE-P (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE DID QWEST MISS IN NOVEMBER?**

A. The February data report indicates that CLECs experienced a higher percentage of troubles on new service installations in November. *Id.* at 83, OP-5. In November,

Qwest completed 459 (88.17%) of all UNE-P-POTS installations without a CLEC filing a trouble report within 30-days, once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded. This was not at parity with retail performance. However, this is the only month between November 2001 and February 2002 where Qwest's performance was not at parity with retail performance. *Id*. Moreover, the four-month average shows that CLECs obtained better performance in this area than did comparable retail customers. Thus, Qwest views November as an aberration

**Q. WHICH UNE-P (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE DID QWEST MISS IN JANUARY?**

A. In January, Qwest missed the average installation interval when a technician dispatch was required outside of MSAs. *Id.* at 81, OP-4B. The average CLEC installation interval for 32 orders was 8.91 days and the average retail installation interval for 2,211 orders was 4.87 days. *Id.* The miss was caused by two orders delayed due to non-facility reasons, which delays were at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, OP-3B, OP-6A-2. This is the only month in the last twelve months the average installation interval was not at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, OP-4B. Qwest considers this an aberration since all other installation measurements have been at parity with retail performance between November 2001 and February 2002 when a dispatch was required. *Id.* at 80-81, OP-3A, OP-4A, OP-6A-1, OP-6B-1, OP-3B, OP-4B, OP-6A-2.

**Q. WHICH UNE-P (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN FEBRUARY?**

A. In February, Qwest failed to clear all troubles within 48 hours when a technician dispatch was required outside of MSAs (MR-4B), at parity with retail performance. Similarly, CLECs experienced a higher repeat trouble rate when a technician dispatch was required outside of MSAs (MR-7B). On the first measure, Qwest cleared 29 of 32 (90.6%) CLEC trouble reports within 48 hours in February. *Id*. at 86, MR-4B. This is the first month in the last twelve months this metric was not at parity with retail performance. *Id.* As to the latter measure, CLECs experienced a 24.24% repeat trouble rate in February. *Id.* at 87, MR-7B. This performance metric has been at parity with retail performance for four of the last five months, between October 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. Thus, in each instance, these performance misses appear to be anomalous.

A. **PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR UNE-P INSTALLATION AND REPAIR OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS.**

A. In summary, 24 of the 27 UNE-P installation and repair performance metrics have been at parity with retail performance in at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 80-89, OP-3A, OP-4A, OP-6A-1, OP-6B-1, OP-3B, OP-4B, OP-6A-2, OP-3C, OP-4C, OP-6A-3, OP-5, MR-3A, MR-4A, MR-6A, MR-7A, MR-9A, MR-3B, MR-4B, MR-6B, MR-7B, MR-9B, MR-3C, MR-4C, MR-6C, MR-7C, MR-9C, MR-8. As set forth above, the isolated

performance misses are minor and/or an aberration. This performance is also outstanding. The Commission should find that Qwest meets the requirements of Checklist Item 2, as it relates to UNE-P-POTS.

**Q. PLEASE REVIEW QWEST'S UNE-P-CENTREX (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS, BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. *Installation of UNE-P-Centrex.* Qwest met 31 of 32 (96.87%) UNE-P-Centrex installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 91 and 93, OP-3A, OP-3C. The average interval was 4.19 days. *Id*., OP-4A, OP-4C. In the rare circumstance when delays in installations occurred, the delays were brief and at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, OP-6A-1.

*Repair of UNE-P-Centrex*. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's repair of UNE-P-Centrex lines has been very good. When troubles occur, Qwest resolves them efficiently and at parity with equivalent retail service. Irrespective of whether a technician dispatch is required to clear the trouble, Qwest cleared an average of 91.43% of CLEC out of service reports within 24-hours and 99.22% of all CLEC trouble reports within 48 hours, between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 96 and 99, MR-3A, MR-3C, MR-4A, MR-4C. The mean time to restore UNE-P-Centrex service was always less than 11

hours, 15 minutes between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, MR-6A, MR-6C.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY UNE-P-CENTREX (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE METRICS THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT?**

A. Yes. Qwest failed to meet one UNE-P-Centrex performance metric in more than one month between November 2001 and February 2002: (1) the overall UNE-P Centrex trouble rate (MR-8). The overall trouble rate for UNE-P-Centrex is consistently higher than retail. The CLEC trouble rate after "no trouble found" reports were excluded was 0.54% in November, 0.44% in December, and 0.43% in January. The comparable retail trouble rate was 0.24% in November, 0.21% in December and 0.29% in January. *Id*. at 100, MR-8*. The CLEC trouble rate was 0.49% in February while the retail trouble rate was 0.32%. *Id.*, MR-8. However, just as with interconnection trunks, the overall trouble rate that CLECs experience in Washington is still extremely small. Since June 2001, the trouble rate has never exceeded 1.0%. The Commission should view this performance miss in totality and recognize that this very small trouble rate does not impair a CLEC's ability to compete in the marketplace.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS DURING MARCH 2001-FEBRUARY 2001 THAT QWEST MISSED THE ROC DETERMINED UNE-P-CENTREX (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE FOR ONLY ONE MONTH?**

A. Yes. Qwest missed the performance objective for two metrics in December and one metric in January.

**Q. WHICH UNE-P-CENTREX (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN DECEMBER?**

A. Qwest missed the performance objective for two metrics in December: (1) new service installation quality (OP-5); and (2) the repeat trouble rate when no technician dispatch was required (MR-7C). The December data shows that CLECs installed nine UNE-P-Centrex lines in December, of which five experienced trouble. However after the "no trouble found" reports were excluded this metric is at parity with retail results. *Id.* at 94, OP-5*. Therefore Qwest has been at parity with retail results for this metric from September 2001-February 2002.

The February data report also shows that CLECs experienced a higher percentage of repeat troubles for UNE-P-Centrex when no technician dispatch is required. CLECs experienced a 36.36% repeat trouble rate (4 of 11 repairs had repeat troubles reported) in December. *Id*. at 99, MR-7. Qwest's comparable retail customers experienced an 8.24% (7 of 85 repairs had repeat troubles reported)

repeat trouble rate in December. *Id*. While this percentage is relatively high, it is important to note that volumes this low tend to drive strange results. With the exception of December, this metric has been at parity in each of the last six months when "no troubles found" are excluded. *Id*. at 100, MR-7*. Thus, this does not appear to be a systemic problem.

**Q. WHICH UNE-P-CENTREX (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN JANUARY?**

A. The average installation interval for CLECs when a technician dispatch was required within MSAs was 5.12 days in January. *Id*. at 91, OP-4A. The comparable installation interval for retail was 3.14. *Id*. This was the only month over the last five months, when this metric was not at parity with retail performance. *Id*. Again, Qwest views this as anomalous.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR UNE-P CENTREX INSTALLATION AND REPAIR OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS.**

A. In summary, 16 of the 17 UNE-P Centrex installation and repair performance metrics were at parity with retail performance for at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 91-101, OP-3A, OP-4A, OP-6A-1, OP-3C, OP-4C, OP-5, MR-3A, MR-4A, MR-6A, MR-7A, MR-9A, MR-3C, MR-4C, MR-6C, MR-7C, MR-9C, MR-8. As set forth above, the isolated performance misses were minor and/or an aberration. This is again outstanding

performance. The Commission should find that Qwest meets the requirements of Checklist Item 2, as it relates to UNE-P-CENTREX.

**Q. PLEASE REVIEW QWEST EEL (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. Enhanced Extended Loops (EELs) are a relatively new product with, to date, relatively low demand. As a result, the ROC has set a performance objective on only one performance metric (OP-3); specifically, it determined that Qwest should provide 90% of its commitments on time. In November, January, and February, Qwest missed this objective in Zone 1. In November, Qwest met 2 of 4 (50%) installation commitments; in January, Qwest met 2 of 3 (66.67%) installation commitments and in February, Qwest met 4 of 5 (80%) installation commitments in Zone 1. *Id.* at 102, OP-3D.

Qwest also missed this objective in November and February in Zone 2. In each of these months, Qwest missed one installation commitment. *Id.* at 102, OP-3E. Given the low volumes, the only way that Qwest could have achieved the 90% ROC benchmark would be by providing perfect - 100% - performance.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR CHECKLIST 2 ITEMS OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS.**

A. Qwest has met 69 of the 73 OSS performance metrics in at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 36-79, GA-1A, GA-1B, GA-1C, GA-2, GA-3, GA-4, GA-6, GA-7, PO-1A-1 Total, PO-1A-2 Total, PO-1A-3 Total, PO-1A-4 Total, PO-1A-5 Total, PO-1A-6 Total, PO-1A-7(b), PO-1A-8(b), PO-1C-1, PO-1B-1 Total, PO-1B-2, PO-1B-3, PO-1B-4, PO-1B-5, PO-1B-6 Total, PO-1B-7, PO-1B-8, PO-1C-2, PO-2B-1, PO-2B-2, PO-2B-1, PO-2B-2, PO-3A-1, PO-3A-2, PO-3B-1, PO-3B-2, PO-3C, PO-5A-1(a), PO-5A-2(a), PO-5B-1(a), PO-5B-2(a), PO-5C-(a), PO-5A-1(b), PO-5A-2(b), PO-5B-1(b), PO-5B-2(b), PO-5C-(b), PO-5A-1(C), PO-5A-2(c), PO-5B-1(c), PO-5B-2(c), PO-5C-(c), PO-5D, PO-7A,C, PO-7B,C, PO-8A, PO-9A, PO-8B, PO-9B, PO-8C, PO-9C, PO-8D, PO-9D, PO-15, PO-16, OP-2, MR-2, BI-1A, BI-1B, BI-3A, BI-4A. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied checklist item two OSS performance requirements once it completes its review of the OSS test results.

In addition, Qwest has met 40 of the 44 UNE-P (27 related to UNE-P POTS and 17 related to UNE-P Centrex) performance metrics in three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 80-100, OP-3A, OP-4A, OP-6A-1, OP-6B-1, OP-3B, OP-4B, OP-6A-2, OP-3C, OP-4C, OP-6A-3, OP-5, MR-3A, MR-4A, MR-6A, MR-7A, MR-9A, MR-3B, MR-4B, MR-6B, MR-7B, MR-9B, MR-3C, MR-4C, MR-6C, MR-7C, MR-9C, MR-8. Qwest missed 2 EEL performance metrics for more than one month between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*.

at 102, OP-3D, OP-3E. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied checklist item two UNE-P and EEL performance requirements.

### 3. Access to Poles, Ducts, Conduits and Rights of Way

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ACCESS TO POLES, DUCTS, CONDUITS, AND RIGHTS OF WAY (CHECKLIST ITEM 3) PERFORMANCE DATA.**

A. The ROC has not adopted any performance measurements for this checklist item.

### 4. Unbundled Loops

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE UNBUNDLED LOOP (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Qwest has met its performance objectives in at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002 for the installation, repair, cut-over and conditioning of unbundled loops on 99 of the 104 unbundled loop performance metrics. Following are the performance data results for March 2001 through February 2002, for each type of unbundled loop.

### a. Analog Voice Loops

*Installation of Unbundled Analog Loops.* Analog loops account for 74.5% of all unbundled loops installed in Washington. *Id*. at 110, 111, 119, 120, 128, 134, 135, 141, 142, 149, 150, MR-8. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's installation record for unbundled analog loops has been excellent. In Zone 1, Qwest met over 97% of its commitments each month, far exceeding the ROC's 90% benchmark. *Id*. at 110, OP-3D. The results were virtually identical in Zone 2, where Qwest met over 98.17% of its installation commitments over the same period of time. *Id.* at 111, OP-3E.

Qwest has also maintained the average installation interval for CLEC loops below the ROC's 6-day benchmark. Between November 2001 and February 2002, the average interval to install analog loops in Zone 1 has been less than 6 days. *Id.* at 110, OP-4D. In Zone 2, the interval has been less than 6 days in three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 111, OP-4E.

Qwest's installation quality of CLEC analog loops has also been consistently high. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest installed over 97.8% of new loops without a CLEC filing a trouble report. These results are at parity with retail performance in each month. *Id.* at 112, OP-5, OP-5*.

*Repair of Unbundled Analog Loops*. Qwest's repair record between November 2001 and February 2002 shows it provides quick and reliable repairs for CLECs. At the outset, it is important to note that repairs are rarely needed. The trouble rate for analog loops was well below 1% in each of the last four months. In each instance, the trouble rate for CLEC loops was at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 117, MR-8.

Moreover, when repairs are needed, they are performed quickly. In both Zone 1 and Zone 2, Qwest always cleared over 98% of out of service troubles within 24 hours. *Id.* at 115-116, MR-3D, MR-3E. Qwest cleared over 99.5% of all CLEC trouble reports within 48 hours. *Id.*, MR-4D, MR-4E. This performance was always at parity with Qwest's retail service. *Id*. Similarly, the mean time to restore service to CLECs was always less than 3.5 hours in both zones. *Id*. MR-6D, MR-6E. In fact, Qwest provided parity repair service to CLECs for all nine performance metrics addressing unbundled analog loops in each month between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 115-117, MR-3D, MR-4D, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-7D*, MR-3E, MR-4E, MR-6E, MR-7E, MR-7E*, MR-8, MR-8*.

**b. Coordinated cutovers**

Another key component of loop provisioning is how well Qwest performs coordinated cutovers, what some in the industry call "hot cuts." Qwest opened a center in Omaha in late March 2001 to manage all coordinated cutovers (the largest

percentage of loops ordered). The Omaha Center also made a number of process improvements. Since its opening, performance results have been outstanding. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's has timely provisioned coordinated cuts for analog loops over 99.2% of the time, consistently above the ROC's 95% benchmark. *Id*. at 163, OP-13A. For all other loops, Qwest's on time performance between November 2001 and February 2002 is equally impressive with Qwest installing over 95.74% of such loops on time, again surpassing the 95% benchmark. *Id*.

Qwest's coordinated cutover intervals are correspondingly short. For analog loops, the coordinated cut interval – the time the CLEC customer is out of service – is consistently three minutes or less between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 163, OP-7. For other loops, the interval is ten minutes or less. *Id.* Qwest has also improved its coordination with CLECs. Each month, Qwest has initiated less than 0.79% of all coordinated loop cutovers without CLEC approval. *Id*. at 164, OP-13B. In summary, Qwest consistently meets and exceeds the FCC's accepted test for provisioning hot cuts.[23]

[23] *Verizon New York Order* at ¶309.

### c. Non-Loaded (2-Wire) Loops

*Installation of non-loaded (2-wire) loops*. These loops account for 12.9% of all unbundled loops installed in Washington. *Id*. at 110, 111, 119, 120, 128, 134, 135, 141, 142, 149, 150, MR-8. Qwest has a strong record of installing non-loaded (2-wire) loops in a timely manner. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest installed an average of 99.28% of such loops on time in Zone 1 and 97.37% in Zone 2. *Id*. at 119-120, OP-3D, OP-3E. This easily surpasses the ROC's 90% benchmark. Qwest also provisioned these loops in shorter intervals than the 6-day benchmark in each month in both Zone 1 and Zone 2. The intervals averaged 4.66 days in Zone 1 and 4.45 days in Zone 2. *Id.*, OP-4D, OP-4E.

In September, Qwest also began reporting how well it conditioned loops. Loop conditioning is sometimes necessary to create 2-wire non-loaded loops. In Zone 1, Qwest conditioned over 95.67% of its loops as committed in February. *Id*. at 165, OP-3D. Qwest conditioned the loops at an average interval of less than 5 days in each month. *Id*., OP-4D. In Zone 2, Qwest met 94.64% or more of its installation commitments for conditioned loops between November 2001 and February 2002 in an average interval of less than 6 days. *Id*., OP-3E, OP-4E. In both Zones, this performance is consistently better than the 90%, and 16.5-day benchmarks. *Id*. OP-3D, OP-4D, OP-3E, OP-4E.

On the rare occasions when Qwest is late with a CLEC installation, the delays between November 2001 and February 2002 were short and always at parity with equivalent retail delays. This was true regardless of whether the delays were caused by facility or non-facility reasons. *Id*. at 119-120, OP-6A-4, OP-6B-4, OP-6A-5, OP-6B-5. Qwest also provisioned 2-wire non-loaded loops at a level of quality at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 121, OP-5.

*Repair of non-loaded (2-wire) loops*. Between November 2001 and February 2002, the trouble rate for such CLEC loops was always less than 0.25% at parity with that experienced by Qwest's retail customers. *Id*. at 125, MR-8. When repairs are needed, Qwest performs them promptly. Qwest consistently cleared 100% of CLEC of out-of-service reports within 24 hours in both zones. *Id.* at 123-124, MR-3D, MR-3E. Similarly, Qwest always cleared 100% of all trouble reports within 48 hours in both zones. *Id*., MR-4D, MR-4E. In fact, all nine of Qwest's repair metrics for 2-wire non-loaded loops were at parity with Qwest's retail performance in at least three of the last four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 123-125, MR-3D, MR-3E, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-4D, MR-4E, MR-6E, MR-7E, MR-8.

### d. Non-Loaded (4-Wire) Loops

*Installation of Non-Loaded (4-Wire) Unbundled Loops.* Although CLECs have not requested a high number of 4-wire non-loaded loops since June 2001, Qwest always provisioned 100% of such loops on time in both Zone 1 and Zone 2. *Id.* at 127-128, OP-3D, OP-3E. Intervals for these loops averaged between five and eleven days and were always provided at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, OP-4D, OP-4E. Installation quality has been virtually perfect. *Id.* at 129, OP-5. All installation performance metrics were provided to CLECs at parity with retail performance in each of the last four months. *Id.* at 127-129, OP-3E, OP-4E, OP-5.

*Repair of Non-Loaded (4-Wire) Unbundled Loops*. Between November 2001 and February 2002, there have been six trouble reports for 4-wire non-loaded loops. The trouble rate for 4-wire loops provisioned to CLECs was less than 1% each month, and always at parity with that experienced by retail customers. *Id.* at 133, MR-8, MR-8*. There have been no reported troubles in Zone 2 in any of the last four months. *Id.* at 132, MR-5B, MR-6E. When trouble did occur in Zone 1, Qwest repaired CLEC service in a manner at parity with Qwest retail performance between December 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 131, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D.

**e. DS-1 Capable Loops**

*Installation of DS-1 Capable Loops*. These loops account for 4.4% of all unbundled loops installed in Washington. *Id*. at 110, 111, 119, 120, 128, 134, 135, 141, 142, 149, 150, MR-8. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest has continued to provide CLECs with effective installations of DS-1 loops. Qwest has steadily improved its performance over the last four months to where it met 88.61% of such installation commitments in February in Zone 1. *Id*. at 134, OP-3D. In both zones, CLECs experienced a shorter average installation interval for DS-1 loops than did Qwest retail customers. *Id.* at 134-135, OP-4D, OP-4E. Similarly, when delays in provisioning occurred, in both zones the average delay CLECs experienced was consistently at parity with that experienced by retail customers. *Id*., OP-6A-4, OP-6B-4, OP-6A-5, OP-6B-5. Over the past year, Qwest's installations for CLECs have been of a quality at parity with retail performance for two of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 136, OP-5.

*Repair of DS-1 Capable Loops*. The CLEC trouble rate for DS-1 loops was 2.93% or less in each month between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 140, MR-8, MR-8*. An average of 73.84% of CLEC DS-1 repair reports were restored within four hours in Zone 1 and 86.67% in Zone 2 during this same period of time. *Id.* at 138-139, MR-5A, MR-5B. Between November 2001 and February 2002 in both zones, the mean time to restore service has been less than the four-hour restoration objective, except for the February result in Zone 1, which was an

average of 4 hours, 23 minutes. *Id.*, MR-6D, MR-6E. Qwest has performed at parity with retail service for four of the seven repair metrics for DS1 capable loops for at least three of the last four months. Id. at 138-140, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E, MR-8.

### f. ISDN Capable Loops

*Installation of ISDN Capable Loops.* These loops account for 6.3% of all unbundled loops installed in Washington. *Id*. at 110, 111, 119, 120, 128, 134, 135, 141, 142, 149, 150, MR-8. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest met an average of 90.2% of its installation commitments in Zone 1, and 92.3% of its commitments in Zone 2. *Id.* at 141-142, OP-3D, OP-3E. This was always at parity with comparable Qwest retail performance. *Id*. In both zones, the average installation interval for CLEC loops continued to be shorter for CLECs than for retail customers. *Id.*, OP-4D, OP-4E. When installation was delayed past the due date, CLEC customers received ISDN loops at parity with that provided to retail customers, regardless of whether the delay was due to facility or non-facility reasons. *Id*., OP-6A-4, OP-6B-4, OP-6A-5, OP-6B-5. Qwest's installation quality for CLECs has also been at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 143, OP-5 & OP-5*.

*Repair of ISDN Capable Loops*. Qwest has performed quick and reliable repairs of ISDN Capable Loops for CLECs in the rare instances when repairs were needed.

The trouble rate for ISDN loops provisioned to CLECs was less than 0.8% in each of the last four months. This trouble rate was consistently at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 147, MR-8. Moreover, Qwest has consistently cleared a high percentage of troubles on CLEC loops on time. In each of the last four months, Qwest cleared over 100% of out-of-service troubles within 24-hours in both zones. *Id.* at 145-146, MR-3D, MR-3E. Qwest also cleared 100% of all CLEC trouble reports within 48-hours every month in both zones. *Id.*, MR-4D, MR-4E. The mean time to restore CLEC service was five hours, nine minutes or less in each month in both zones. *Id.*, MR-6D, MR-6E.

### g. ADSL Qualified Loops

*Installation of Unbundled ADSL Qualified Loops.* Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's overall installation record for ADSL Qualified Loops has been excellent. In Zone 1 and Zone 2, Qwest met 100% of its CLEC installation commitments every month. *Id.* at 149-150, OP-3D, OP-3E. Qwest also consistently met the 6-day installation interval benchmark in Zone 1, where most of the installation activity occurred. *Id*. at 149, OP-4D. Moreover, in the rare circumstance when delays occur, Qwest cleared them promptly and at parity with equivalent retail service. *Id.* at 149-150, OP-6A-4, OP-6A-5. Finally, installations of such loops for CLECs continued to be of a consistently high quality. 100% of all ADSL loop installations were installed without trouble in three of the last four months. *Id.* at 151, OP-5.

*Repair of Unbundled ADSL Qualified Loops*. Between November 2001 and February 2002, the trouble rate for such CLEC loops was less than 1.15%, which was always at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 154, MR-8. Qwest also cleared these CLEC troubles expeditiously. In both Zone 1 and Zone 2, Qwest cleared 100% of all CLEC troubles on time. *Id.* at 152-153, MR-3D, MR-4D, MR-3E, MR-4E. The mean time to restore service continued to be lower for CLECs, and always averaged 4 hours, 33 minutes or less in Zone 1 and was 2 hours, 50 minutes in Zone 2. *Id.*, MR-6D, MR-6E. All nine repair measurements were at parity with retail performance in each of the last four months. *Id.* at 152-154, MR-3D, MR-4D, MR-3E, MR-4E, MR-6D, MR-6E, MR-7D, MR-7E, MR-8.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE UNBUNDLED LOOP (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE METRICS THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS, BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

**A.** Of the 104 PIDs in Washington relating to the various types of unbundled loop installation, repair, cutovers and conditioning, Qwest missed the ROC determined performance objective on six in more than one month between November 2001-February 2002: (1) installation commitments met for DS1 capable unbundled loops in Zone 2 (OP-3E); (2) new service installation quality for DS1 capable unbundled loops (OP-5); (3) all troubles cleared within four hours for DS1 capable unbundled

loops in Zone 1 (MR-5A); (4) the mean time to restore DS1 capable unbundled loops in Zone 1 (MR-6D); (5) the trouble rate for DS-1 capable unbundled loops (MR-8 and MR-8*); and (6) the average installation interval for ADSL unbundled loops in Zone 2 (OP-4E). Thus, five of the six multiple misses affect DS-1 Capable loops, which constitute a mere 4.4% of the loops in service in Washington. There are no multiple misses for analog, 2-wire non-loaded loops and ISDN capable loops which collectively comprise 93.7% of the loops in service in Washington.[24] Qwest met the ROC determined performance objective for every other installation and repair measurement for every form of an unbundled loop in at least three of four months between November 2001-February 2002.

Qwest met eight of fourteen (57.14%) installation commitments for DS1 capable unbundled loops in Zone 2 in November and five of ten (50%) CLEC installation commitments in January. *Id.* at 135, OP-3E. In stark contrast, the average CLEC installation interval was 12.83 days in November and 10.67 days in January, substantially shorter (3-6 days shorter) than comparable retail results. *Id.*, OP-4E. When orders were delayed due to non-facility reasons in Zone 2, the average delay was 2.29 days in November and 2.25 days in January, both at parity with retail results for each of the last eight months. *Id.*, OP-6A-5. When orders were delayed due to facility reasons in Zone 2, the number of delayed days was 8 days in

[24] See FCC's Penn. 271 decision at para 89-91, which states that multiple performance misses by Verizon for high-capacity loops which constituted a small percentage of the overall loop total did not give cause to deny checklist approval.

November and 5.75 days in January, also at parity with retail results for the last four months. *Id.*, OP-6B-5. Thus, three of the four CLEC installation performance metrics in Zone 2 were at parity with retail results in each the last four months. *Id.* at 135, OP-4E, OP-6A-5, OP-6B-5. The Commission has set an aggressive 5-day interval for the installation of DS-1 Loops. This drives shorter intervals, but a concomitant smaller percentage of commitments met. Qwest utilizes a 9-day interval for parallel retail services. The data bears out the obvious.

The November data also shows CLECs installed 87 DS1 capable unbundled loops and 17 experienced trouble. Thus, 80.46% were installed without trouble. However, once circuits with "no trouble found" were removed, 85.06% were installed without trouble. The January data shows CLECs installed 120 DS1 capable unbundled loops and ten experienced trouble. Thus, 91.67% were installed without trouble. However, once circuits with "no trouble found" are removed, 94.17% were installed without trouble. *Id.* at 136, OP-5. While these results were outside of parity, it is important to note that Qwest cleared troubles on DS-1 capable loops in an average well under four hours. *Id*. at 138-139, MR-6D, MR-6E.

In January, 34 of 50 (68%) CLEC troubles were cleared within four hours for DS1 capable unbundled loops in Zone 1. In February, 14 of 20 (70%) CLEC troubles were cleared within four hours for DS1 capable unbundled loops in Zone 1. *Id.* at 138, MR-5A. The mean time to restore DS1 capable unbundled loops in Zone 1 in

January was three hours, eighteen minutes and in February was four hours, twenty-three minutes. *Id.*, MR-6D. Thus, overall CLECs obtained prompt repair of DS-1 loops in Washington.

The overall trouble rate for DS1 capable unbundled loops is consistently higher than the retail DS1 trouble rate. The CLEC trouble rate after "no trouble found" reports were excluded was 2.93% in November, 1.6% in December and 2.15% in January. *Id*. at 140, MR-8*. The comparable retail trouble rate was 1.01% in November, 0.82% in December, and 0.9% in January. *Id*., MR-8, MR-8*. The CLEC trouble rate in February was 1.05%, at parity with retail performance. *Id*., MR-8. However, just as with interconnection trunks, the overall trouble rate that CLECs experience in Washington is still extremely small. Since August 2001, the trouble rate has never exceeded 3% once "no trouble found" reports are excluded. The difference between wholesale and retail performance is generally different by less than 1%. *Id*. The Commission should view this performance miss in totality and recognize that this very small trouble rate does not impair a CLECs ability to compete in the marketplace.

The average installation interval for ADSL unbundled loops in Zone 2 was 6.8 days in December and 13 days in February. The ROC benchmark is six days. *Id.* at 150, OP-4E. However all of the orders were installed as committed. *Id*., OP-3E. Moreover, there were very small volumes of such loops in those months. It appears

that these orders were impacted by closed Liberty Observation 1032, which tends to inappropriately harm Qwest's performance results. Normally, OP-4 excludes requests for longer than the standard interval; here they were included and harmed Qwest's results given the low volumes. Therefore the Commission should not be concerned about the installation interval.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS DURING MARCH 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 WHERE THE COMPANY FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED UNBUNDLED LOOP DS1 CAPABLE (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR ONLY ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS?**

A. Yes. Qwest missed two DS1 capable unbundled loop performance metrics in November and one DS1 capable unbundled loop performance metric in January.

**Q. WHICH UNBUNDLED LOOP DS1 CAPABLE (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN NOVEMBER?**

A. Qwest missed the ROC determined performance objective on two DS1 capable unbundled loop metrics: (1) the installation commitments met for DS1 capable unbundled loops in Zone 1 (OP-3D); and (2) the repeat trouble rate in Zone 2 (MR-7E).

Qwest met 11 of 20 (55%) installation commitments for DS1 capable unbundled loops in Zone 1 in November. *Id.* at 134, OP-3D. However, the average installation interval was significantly shorter for CLECs, and the number of delayed days for facility or non-facility reasons performance results were at parity with retail performance in November, as they have been for the last twelve months. *Id.* at 134, OP-4D, OP-6A-4, OP-6B-4. As described above for commitments met on DS-1 loops in Zone 2, this is attributable to seeking to mandate shorter committed intervals for CLECs, than Qwest provides on the retail side.

The repeat trouble rate for DS1 capable loops in Zone 2 was 50% in November. *Id.* at 139, MR-7E. CLECs reported fourteen repairs of which seven had repeat troubles. While 50% is high, the low volume needs to be considered When Zone 1 and Zone 2 are aggregated in the month of November, CLECs experienced 15 repeat troubles of the total 73 repairs reported. *Id*. at 138-139, MR-7D, MR-7E. This 20.5% overall repeat trouble rate fairs well with the retail comparable rates of 20.27% in Zone 1 and 20.63% in Zone 2. *Id.* Qwest therefore views this miss as based on low volumes and not performance.

**Q. WHICH UNBUNDLED LOOP DS1 CAPABLE (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE DID QWEST MISS IN JANUARY?**

A. Qwest missed the ROC determined performance objective on one DS1 capable unbundled loops metric in January: the repeat trouble rate in Zone 1 (MR-7D).

CLECs reported that they experienced repeat troubles on 22 of the 50 CLEC repair tickets issued in Zone 1 in January. *Id.* at 138, MR-7D. While this result is higher than Qwest wants to see, this is the first month since July 2001 that this metric was outside of parity with retail performance. *Id.* Thus, this result appears anomalous.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS DURING MARCH 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 WHERE THE COMPANY FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED UNBUNDLED LOOP (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE FOR ANY OTHER TYPES OF LOOP IN ONLY ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS?**

A. Yes. Qwest missed four metrics in November, two metrics in December, two metrics in January, and four metrics in February for only one month between November 2001 and February 2002.

**Q. WHICH UNBUNDLED LOOP (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN NOVEMBER?**

A. In November, Qwest missed the ROC determined performance objective on four metrics: (1) the analog loop repeat trouble rate in Zone 2 (MR-7E); (2) the mean time to restore 2-wire non-loaded loops in Zone 2 (MR-6E); (3) the mean time to restore 4-wire non-loaded loops in Zone 1 (MR-6D); and (4) the mean time to restore ISDN capable unbundled loops in Zone 2 (MR-6E).

*Analog Loops*: Eleven of forty CLEC analog unbundled loops experienced repeat trouble in November. However, once the "no trouble found" reports were removed, only five of twenty-one loops experienced repeat trouble, resulting in parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 117, MR-7E. All analog unbundled loop out-of-service reports were cleared within 24 hours in Zone 2 between November 2001 and February 2002, and all remaining trouble reports were cleared within 48 hours for each of the same four months, at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 116, MR-3E, MR-4E. The mean time to restore service was also at parity with retail results between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*., MR-6E.

*Non-Loaded Two-Wire Loops*: The mean time to restore service on 2-wire non-loaded in Zone 2 was not at parity with retail results in November. Three CLEC repairs took an average of eight hours, eight minutes to restore as compared to the two hours, nine minutes for eighteen such retail troubles. *Id.* at 124, MR-6E. This is the first time this metric has been out of parity since April 2001. *Id.* Moreover, in each month since October 2001, Qwest cleared 100% of out-of-service conditions experienced on two-wire non-loaded loops within the 24-hour objective in both zones. *Id.* at 123-124, MR-3D, MR-3E.

*Non-Loaded Four-Wire Loops*: The mean time to restore service on 4-wire non-loaded unbundled loops in Zone 1 was not at parity with retail results in November.

Three CLEC repair reports took on average a total of seven hours, forty minutes to restore service as compared to two hours, forty-seven minutes on 523 reported retail troubles. *Id.* at 131, MR-6D. This is the only time this metric has not been at parity with retail performance, and the parity score is right on the cusp of non-disparity. *Id.* This result is clearly an aberration and does not reflect Qwest's typical performance, which has been at parity with retail performance for every other repair measurement for every month in which there is CLEC activity. *Id*. at 131 and 133, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-8.

*ISDN Capable Loops*: The mean time to restore service for ISDN capable unbundled loops in Zone 2 in November was five hours, nine minutes. The mean time to restore comparable retail service was two hours, nine minutes. This is the only month since August where Qwest was not at parity with retail results. *Id.* at 146, MR-6E. Moreover, 100% of all out-of-service troubles were cleared within the 24-hour objective and 100% of all remaining repairs were cleared within the 48 hour objective between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 145-146, MR-3D, MR-4D, MR-3E, MR-4E. The number of repeat troubles has also been at parity with retail performance between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 145 and 147, MR-7D, MR-7E.

**Q. WHICH UNBUNDLED LOOP (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN DECEMBER?**

A. In December, Qwest missed the ROC determined performance objective on two metrics: (1) the average installation interval on analog unbundled loops in Zone 2 (OP-4E); and (2) the number of delayed days for non-facility reasons for analog unbundled loops in Zone 2 (OP-6A-5).

*Analog Loops:* The average installation interval on analog unbundled loops in Zone 2 in December was 6.09 days compared to the ROC benchmark of 6 days. However, Qwest met 100% of the CLEC installation commitments in that month. *Id.* at 111, OP-4E, OP-3E. In addition, the average Qwest caused delay for non-facility reasons for analog unbundled loops in Zone 2 was 6.17 days while the retail result was 2.72 days. *Id.* at 112, OP-6A-5. Obviously, the delays for non-facility reasons caused the average installation miss as well. This is the only time either metric has not been within the ROC determined performance objective since August 2001. *Id.* at 111-112, OP-4E, OP-6A-5. Thus, this miss is anomalous.

**Q. WHICH UNBUNDLED LOOP (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN JANUARY?**

A. In January, Qwest missed the ROC determined performance objective on two metrics: (1) the mean time to restore 2-wire non-loaded loops in Zone 1 (MR-6D); and (2) the mean time to restore ISDN capable loops in Zone 1 (MR-6D).

*2-Wire Non-Loaded Loops*: The mean time to restore 2-wire non-loaded loops in Zone 1 was four hours, forty minutes compared to the retail result of one hour, fifty-seven minutes. *Id.* at 123, MR-6D. This is the first time this metric has not been at parity with retail results since April 2001. *Id.* Moreover, Qwest cleared 100% of troubles reported by CLECs within the objective time frames of 24 and 48 hours. *Id*. at 123, MR-3D, MR-4D. This performance is outstanding, irrespective of the statistical disparity.

*ISDN Capable Loops:* The mean time to restore ISDN capable unbundled loops in Zone 1 in January was four hours, four minutes. *Id.*, at 145, MR-6D. The comparable retail performance was one hour, fifty-seven minutes. This is the first time this metric has not been at parity with retail results since October 2001. *Id.* Again, Qwest cleared 100% of CLEC reported troubles within the 24- and 48-hour objectives. *Id*. at 145, MR-3D, MR-4D. Again, this performance is outstanding, irrespective of the statistical disparity.

**Q. WHICH UNBUNDLED LOOP (CHECKLIST ITEM 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN FEBRUARY?**

A. In February, Qwest missed the ROC determined performance objective on four metrics: (1) analog loop installation commitments met when a technician dispatch was required within an MSA (OP-3A); (2) the average installation interval for analog loops when a technician dispatch was required within an MSA (OP-4A); (3)

analog loop delays for facility reasons when a technician dispatch was required within an MSA (OP-6A-1); and (4) new installation quality for ADSL Compatible Loops (OP-5).

*Analog Loops*: All three of these measures relate to the same unbundled loop order. One CLEC experienced an apparent long delay in trying to obtain one analog loop within an MSA in February; this loop had a delay of 52 days for facility reasons. *Id*. at 108, OP-6A-1. When the details of this order are analyzed, it is apparent that Qwest miscoded the order. This order was delayed by the CLEC and therefore would have been excluded from OP-3 and the delay attributable to the CLEC excluded from OP-4. Liberty Consulting has testified that a few instances of human error like this are to be expected. Moreover, Qwest still met over 99% of the installation commitments for 1,896 unbundled analog loops in February and installed all services in less than the six day benchmark, at parity with retail results. *Id*. at 110-111, OP-3D, OP-4D.

*ADSL Compatible Loops*: Of the seventeen performance measurements involving ADSL Compatible Loops, Qwest failed to meet the ROC determined standard for one in February. *Id.* at 151, OP-5. CLECs experienced a higher percentage of new installation troubles than did comparable Qwest retail customers. Qwest installed 22 of 25 such loops (88%) without the CLECs experiencing an installation trouble. *Id*. at 151, OP-5. The three months prior, Qwest has installed between 97% and

100% of such loops without reported trouble. In each of these months the service was provided at parity with retail performance. Moreover, the FCC has stated that installing 95% of loops without trouble is an acceptable level of performance.[25] With the exception of February when volumes were low, Qwest has met or exceeded this 95% threshold each month since September 2001.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR CHECKLIST 4 ITEMS BETWEEN NOVEMBER 2001 AND FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Qwest has met 98 of the 104 performance metrics associated with unbundled loops in at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 108-166, OP-3A, OP-4A, OP-6A-1, OP-3D, OP-4D, OP-6A-4, OP-6B-4, OP-3E, OP-4E, OP-6A-4, OP-6B-4, OP-6A-5, OP-6B-5, OP-5, MR-3D, MR-4D, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-3E, MR-4E, MR-6E, MR-7E, MR-8, OP-13A. As set forth above, the isolated performance misses are minor and/or an aberration. Qwest is performing at an extraordinary level of quality. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied checklist four unbundled loop performance requirements.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE LINE SHARING (CHECKLIST ITEM 2) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

[25] New York 271 at ¶309.

A. Qwest reports twenty-eight monthly data points for the installation and repair of line-sharing. However, unlike other products where Qwest has several years of experience provisioning the product, line-sharing is a comparatively new service. As such, the ROC set performance objectives on only 17 of the 28 measurements. *Id*. at 166-178, OP-3A, OP-4A, OP-3B, OP-4B, OP-3C, OP-4C, OP-5, MR-3A, MR-4A, MR-6A, MR-3B, MR-4B, MR-6B, MR-3C, MR-4C, MR-6C, MR-8. The remaining 11 measurements are diagnostic, or for informational purposes only.

*Installation of Line Shared Loops.* Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest's record for installing line shared loops has been strong. Qwest met an average of 99.83% of its line sharing installations for CLECs in Washington. *Id.* at 168, OP-3C. This performance was well above the ROC 95% benchmark. The same is true for the installation interval, which ranged from 3.01 to 3.22 days, below the ROC's 3.3 day benchmark. *Id.* OP-4C. The new installation quality of line shared loops is also excellent with over 96.92% of such lines installed without trouble. *Id*. at 169, OP-5.

*Repair of Line Shared Loops*. Between November 2001 and February 2002, there have been very few line sharing repairs reported. The overall trouble rate is always less than 1% and has been at parity with equivalent retail service for three of the last four months. *Id*. at 178, MR-8. When troubles do occur, 100% of non-dispatched out-of- service troubles are cleared within 24 hours, and more than 95.56% of all

troubles are cleared within 48 hours over the last four months. *Id*. at 176, MR-3C, MR-4C. The mean time to restore these services is also consistently less than thirteen hours. *Id*., MR-6C.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE LINE-SHARING (CHECKLIST ITEMS 2 and 4) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR MORE THAN ONE MONTH OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. Of the measurements with performance objectives, during March 2001 to February 2002, Qwest failed to meet the ROC determined performance objective in more than one month for one measurement: the mean time to restore reported troubles for repairs that do not require a technician dispatch (MR-6C). Qwest failed to meet this objective in January and February. *Id*. at 176, MR-4C, MR-6C.

Line-sharing is a unique service, as both voice and data are on the same circuit. As such, it is commonplace and expected to receive a higher percentage of trouble reports than for POTS alone, and many of these troubles are for ***other than*** an out-of-service situation. That is exactly what the data bears out. In January, Qwest received 45 CLEC trouble reports for line-shared loops that did not require a technician dispatch. *Id*. at 176, MR-4C. Of those forty-five reports, only ten (22%) were for an out-of-service situation. In February, Qwest received 13 CLEC trouble

reports for line-shared loops that did not require a technician dispatch. *Id*. None of those 13 reports were for an out-of-service situation. For the retail comparable, however, (which is an aggregate of residential and business POTS) 44% of the troubles reported in January and February were out-of-service situations. *Id*. Out-of-service situations, have a higher priority in the repair queue than a non-out-of-service situation. Thus, from the outset a much higher percentage of retail orders have a higher priority. It is not surprising, therefore, that the mean time to restore is shorter for retail than for wholesale. However, it is important to note that Qwest still cleared these CLEC troubles in an average of twelve hours, twenty-seven minutes in January and eleven hours, nineteen minutes in February, better than the 24-hour objective to clear out of service troubles. *Id*., MR-6C.

Similarly, line-shared loop repairs are more complex. For retail POTS, Qwest knows the troubles are its responsibility to fix. For line-sharing loops, however, the CLEC is responsible to make data repairs and Qwest makes voice repairs. Thus, it is more complex to identify and clear troubles on line-shared loops. A better comparable is therefore probably Qwest retail DSL service. There, the retail performance data for MR-4 (troubles cleared in 48 hours) and MR-6 (mean time to restore service) over time look quite similar. *Id*. at 290-292, MR-3D, MR-4D, MR-6D, MR-3E, MR-4E, MR-6E.

Qwest cleared 43 of 45 (95.56%) CLEC trouble reports within 48 hours when there was no dispatch required in January and 13 of 13 (100%) in February. *Id*. at 176, MR-4C. In January, Qwest's cleared 7,289 of 7,327 (99.36%) retail reports within 48 hours when no dispatch was required and 6,890 of 6,919 (99.58%) retail reports in February. *Id*., MR-4C. The mean time to restore service retail service was six hours, three minutes in January and five hours, fifty minutes in February. *Id*., MR-6C. Given the uniqueness of line sharing repair, this is outstanding service.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS DURING NOVEMBER 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 THAT QWEST MISSED THE ROC DETERMINED LINE-SHARING (CHECKLIST ITEMS 2 & 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES?**

A. Yes. Qwest missed two metrics in January.

**Q. WHICH LINE SHARING (CHECKLIST ITEMS 2 & 4) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DID QWEST MISS IN JANUARY?**

A. In January, 95.56% of all CLEC troubles were cleared within 48 hours, when no dispatch was required. Two CLEC reports that did not require a technician dispatch were not cleared within 48 hours. However, these reports were not related to an out-of-service trouble condition. *Id*. at 176, MR-3C, MR-4C. The mean time to restore service for all troubles was less than 12.5 hours. *Id*., MR-6C. As previously

stated, line-shared loops repairs are more complex. The Commission should recognize this as it reviews Qwest performance data for line sharing.

In addition, the CLEC trouble rate for line sharing circuits was 1.76% compared to the retail rate of 1.34%. *Id.* at 178, MR-8. The trouble rate is 0.79% once the "no trouble found" reports are excluded, at parity with retail performance. *Id.*

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR LINE-SHARING (CHECKLIST ITEMS 2 and 4) OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS.**

A. Qwest has met twelve of the thirteen performance metrics associated with line-sharing in at least three of the last four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 168-178, OP-3C, OP-4C, OP-5, MR-3A, MR-4A, MR-6A, MR-3B, MR-4B, MR-6B, MR-3C, MR-4C, MR-6C, MR-8. As set forth above, the isolated performance misses are understandable given the circumstances. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied line-sharing (checklist two and four) performance requirements.

### 5. Unbundled Transport

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE UNBUNDLED TRANSPORT – UDIT (CHECKLIST ITEM 5) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. *DS-1 UDIT Installation*. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest provided unbundled transport to CLECs at a high level of quality. In both Zone 1 and Zone 2, Qwest met 100% of its CLEC installation commitments, with an average interval of about nine days between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 181-182, OP-3D, OP-3E, OP-4D, OP-4E. In the few circumstances when delays occurred, they were always at parity with retail performance. *Id*., OP-6A-4, OP-6A-5. Installation quality for DS-1 UDIT is also outstanding. In every month between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest installed all UDIT facilities without CLECs filing a trouble report. *Id.* at 183, OP-5.

*DS-1 UDIT Repairs*. The overall trouble rate for DS1 UDIT facilities continued to be low – less than 2% in November once "no trouble found" trouble reports are excluded and no troubles were reported in two of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. These results were at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 187, MR-8*. In Zone 1, Qwest had four trouble reports in November and one trouble report in February. *Id*. Three of the four reports filed in November were cleared within four hours. *Id.* at 185, MR-5A. All four reports in November were cleared in an average of three hours, fourteen minutes. *Id*., MR-6D.

In February, two CLEC trouble reports were filed; one report was cleared in one minute and the other in thirteen minutes. *Id*. at 185-186, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-5B, MR-6E. All CLEC DS1 UDIT troubles were cleared in a manner at parity with

retail performance. *Id.* at 185-86, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E.

*DS-3 UDIT Installation*. Qwest achieved similar success installing UDITs above DS-1 levels between November 2001 and February 2002. As to these facilities, Qwest met 100% of its commitments in both Zone 1 and Zone 2 between November 2001 and January 2002, at parity with retail performance. In February, Qwest missed one installation commitment, however, performance was still at parity with retail results. *Id.* at 188-189, OP-3D, OP-3E. These facilities were installed in average intervals that were also at parity with retail performance each month. *Id.*, OP-4D, OP-4E. The quality of new installations was at parity with retail results between November 2001 and February 2002, once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded. *Id*. at 190, OP-5*.

*DS-3 UDIT Repairs*. The CLEC trouble rate for DS-3 UDIT was 1.43% or less between November 2001 and February 2002, once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded. *Id.* at 194, MR-8*. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest had eleven total trouble reports in both zones and cleared ten of the eleven reports within four hours. *Id.* at 192-193, MR-5A, MR-5B. The mean time to restore service was always less than three hours and was always at parity with retail performance. *Id.*, MR-6D, MR-6E. The repeat trouble rate was also at parity with

retail performance between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*., MR-7D, MR-7E.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE UNBUNDLED DEDICATED INTEROFFICE TRANSPORT (CHECKLIST ITEM 5) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS, BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. Of the 24 PIDs relating to the provision and repair of unbundled dedicated interoffice transport (UDIT) in Washington, Qwest missed the ROC determined performance objective on one metric in more than one month: the overall trouble rate for UDITs greater than a DS-1 level (MR-8).

In November, the CLEC trouble rate for DS3 UDIT was 1.01% once the "no trouble found" reports are excluded. *Id.* at 194, MR-8*. The comparable retail trouble rate was 0.16% in November. *Id.* In February, the CLEC trouble rate for DS3 UDIT was 1.25%; the "no trouble found" information is not yet available. When trouble did occur, 100% of the CLEC troubles have been cleared within four hours between December 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 192-193, MR-5A, MR-5B. All but one of the seven repair performance metrics for DS3 UDITs were at parity with retail performance between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*., MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E. Especially given the small volumes of DS3

UDITs in service, this is clearly a case where the Commission should view this performance miss in totality and recognize that this very small trouble rate does not impair a CLEC's ability to compete in the marketplace.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS DURING NOVEMBER 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 THAT QWEST MISSED THE ROC DETERMINED UNBUNDLED DEDICATED INTEROFFICE TRANSPORT (CHECKLIST ITEM 5) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES?**

A. Yes. In November, Qwest missed the new installation service quality performance metric for UDITs greater than a DS-1 level (OP-5). In most instances 100% of the circuits are installed without trouble. In November, one trouble report was received but was later found to test okay, "no trouble found." All of the other installation metrics were at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 181-189, OP-3D, OP-4D, OP-6A-4, OP-3E, OP-4E, OP-6A-5.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR UDIT (CHECKLIST ITEM 5) OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS.**

A. Qwest has met 28 of the 29 performance metrics associated with UDIT products in at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 181-194, OP-3D, OP-4D, OP-6A-4, OP-3E, OP-4E, OP-5, OP-6A-5, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E, MR-8. As set forth above, the isolated performance misses are minor. Qwest's performance is outstanding. The

Commission should find Qwest has satisfied the checklist item five performance requirements.

### 6. Unbundled Switching

**Q. HAS QWEST RECEIVED ANY CLEC REQUESTS TO DATE FOR UNBUNDLED SWITCHING?**

A. To date, CLECs have submitted virtually no requests to Qwest for unbundled local switching on a stand-alone basis. The ROC concluded that no performance measurements were needed for stand-alone unbundled switching because there is virtually no demand for it. CLECs obtain access to unbundled switching as part of UNE-P facilities. Qwest's UNE-P performance establishes that Qwest can provide unbundled switching to CLECs upon request.

### 7. 911/E911/Directory Assistance/Operator Services

#### a. 911/E911

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE 911/E911 (CHECKLIST ITEM 7) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. *E911 Database Updates*. Qwest measures the amount of "Time to Update Databases;" however, this measurement has a "parity by design" standard because

Qwest's E911 database does not distinguish between updates for Qwest or CLECs. *Id*. at 198, DB-1A. In each of the last four months, Qwest's E911 database was updated in four hours, twenty-seven minutes or less. *Id.*

*911/E911 Trunk Installation*. Between November 2001 and February 2002 Qwest installed one E911 trunk. *Id*. at 199, OP-3E. The trunk took seventeen days to install. *Id*. at 200, OP-4E. Qwest's data showed that there was a seven day delay in provisioning this 911 trunk. Upon investigation, Qwest again found that it miscoded this order. The delay was attributable to the CLEC. This order should have been excluded from OP-3, with a 10-day interval in OP-4, and no time in OP-6A. Qwest's performance on this one trunk was perfect.

Throughout the region in Zone 1 and Zone 2, Qwest only provisioned a few 911 trunks. *Exhibit 2* at 207, OP-3. Qwest generally provided these circuits at parity with Qwest retail performance. Installation quality on E911 circuits was excellent. In each of the last four months, the quality of newly installed 911 circuits in the region was identical to retail installation quality. *Id.* at 209, OP-5.

*911/E911 Trunk Repair*. The trouble rate on CLEC E911 trunks in Washington was always less than 0.36%, once "no trouble found" reports are excluded, at parity with retail performance. *Exhibit 1* at 205, MR-8*. Only five total repair reports have been filed between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.* at 203-204, MR-5A,

MR-5B. When repairs were needed, Qwest cleared three of the five troubles within four hours. *Id.* Two reports in November took an average of five hours, twenty-five minutes to restore. *Id*. at 203, MR-6D. Service was always restored at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 203-204, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-5B, MR-6E. No repeat troubles were filed in either zone over the last four months. *Id*. at 203-204, MR-7D, MR-7E.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR E911 (CHECKLIST ITEM 7) OVER THE LAST FOUR MONTHS.**

A. Qwest has met all eight performance metrics associated with E911 over the last four months. *Id*. at 200-205, OP-5, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E, MR-8. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied this portion of the checklist item seven, E911 performance requirements.

### b. Directory Assistance and Operator Services

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE OPERATOR SERVICES (CHECKLIST ITEM 7) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. The “Speed of Answer” PIDs for directory assistance and operator services, DA-1 and OS-1, measure the average time required for Qwest’s operator and directory assistance personnel to answer calls. These PIDs are also "parity by design" measurements because Qwest's directory assistance and operator services systems

do not distinguish between Qwest or CLEC calls and handle all calls on a first come, first served basis. Between November 2001 and February 2002, the speed of answer for directory assistance and operator service calls was, on average, between 4.86 and 9.08 seconds. *Id.* at 206, DA-1, OS-1. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied this aspect of checklist item seven.

## 8. White Pages Directory Listings

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE WHITE PAGES DIRECTORY LISTINGS (CHECKLIST ITEM 8) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBUARY 2002.**

A. The only PIDs for white pages directory listings are "parity by design" because Qwest processes CLEC end user listings with the same or similar systems, databases, methods, procedures, and personnel used by Qwest for its own retail end user listings. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest completed electronically processed updates to the directory listings database in an average of 0.08 seconds or less, with an accuracy rate of over 95.5%. *Id*. at 207, DB-1C-1, DB-2C-1. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied the checklist item eight performance requirements.

## 9. Number Administration

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE NUMBER ADMINISTRATION (CHECKLIST ITEM 9) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Qwest provides nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers for assignment by CLECs to their customers. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest loaded and tested 100% of CLEC NXX codes prior to the LERG effective date. *Id.* at 209, NP-1A. There were no CLEC NXX code activations delayed for facility reasons. *Id.*, NP-1B. Therefore the Commission should find Qwest has satisfied the checklist item nine number administration performance requirements.

## 10. Call-Related Databases and Associated Signaling

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CALL-RELATED DATABASES AND ASSOCIATED SIGNALING (CHECKLIST ITEM 10) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Qwest offers all CLECs access to, and routing over, its call-related databases and associated signaling in the same manner that Qwest accesses those services. Qwest uses a queuing and routing system that treats all carriers alike. The sole performance measurement for this checklist item is DB-1B, which evaluates the time to update the line identification database ("LIDB"). This is also a "parity by design" measurement. The aggregate Qwest and CLEC result under that

measurement has consistently been less than 7.47 seconds. *Id.* at 210, DB-1B. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied the checklist item ten number call-related databases and associated signaling performance requirements.

## 11. Number Portability

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE NUMBER PORTABILITY (CHECKLIST ITEM 11) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Number portability allows customers to change carriers without changing telephone numbers. To provision number portability, Qwest must pre-set "triggers" on a timely basis. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest set over 98.6% of LNP triggers prior to the scheduled start time for coordinated loop cutovers, exceeding the ROC's 95% benchmark. During the same period, Qwest set over 96.5% of LSA triggers prior to the scheduled start time for LNP orders not requiring loop coordination, again exceeding the 95% benchmark. *Id.* at 211, OP-8B, OP-8C. Beginning with the December report, Qwest also began reporting the percentage of ported numbers that are disconnected before the CLEC completes its side of the number porting. The ROC requires that Qwest provide at least 98.25% of all ported numbers without an associated disconnect. The data shows that between November 2001 and February 2002, 99.95% or more of all numbers were ported without an associated disconnect. *Id.*, OP-17. These results show that Qwest is meeting its requirements for local number portability.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (CHECKLIST ITEM 11) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES.**

A. Of the five PIDs relating to local number portability, Qwest provided parity service during November 2001-February 2002 in at least three out of four months on all number portability metrics. *Id*. at 211-212, OP-8B, OP-8C, OP-17, MR-11, MR-12.

**Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER MONTHS DURING MARCH 2001-FEBRUARY 2002 THAT QWEST MISSED THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (CHECKLIST ITEM 11) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES?**

A. Yes. In December, Qwest missed two performance metrics: (1) CLEC LNP trouble reports cleared within 24 hours (MR-11); and (2) the average mean time to restore LNP service (MR-12). Given that Qwest properly disconnected over 99.9% of ported numbers, both of these measurements had incredibly low volumes

In December, two of six CLEC out-of-service trouble reports were not cleared within 24 hours. *Id.* at 211, MR-11. The average mean time to restore service was fourteen hours, ten minutes. *Id*. at 212, MR-12. These LNP metrics are relatively new and the incredibly small volume associated with these metrics is a tribute to Qwest's mechanized process that prevents troubles in the LNP process from occurring. Thus, while these metrics are outside of parity, the larger picture shows that as a practical matter, troubles rarely occur at all. *Id*. at 211, OP-8B, OP-8C,

OP-17. Moreover, these performance measurements were in parity every other month between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id.*

## 12. Local Dialing Parity

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE LOCAL DIALING PARITY (CHECKLIST ITEM 12) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Qwest provides dialing parity to competitors in its region. There are no performance metrics associated with this checklist item. This Commission has already found that Qwest is in full compliance with this checklist item.[26]

## 13. Reciprocal Compensation

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE RECIPROCAL COMPENSATION (CHECKLIST ITEM 13) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Reciprocal compensation is made between carriers for terminating local calls on behalf of the other. Qwest's bills were 100% accurate in January and 99.8% accurate in February. *Id*. at 213, BI-3B. They have also been 100% complete since September 2001 in Washington. *Id*., BI-4B.

[26] See Commission Order in Docket Nos. UT-003022 and UT-003040 Addressing Workshop One Issues: Checklist Item Nos. 7, 9, 10, 12, 13 (June 11, 2001), ¶80 (10).

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE RECIPROCAL COMPENSATION (CHECKLIST ITEM 13) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE BENCHMARK OBJECTIVES FOR MORE THAN ONE MONTH BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT.**

A. Of the two PIDs relating to reciprocal compensation, Qwest failed to meet the 95% accuracy benchmark in November and December, 2001. *Id*., BI-3B. These two months show that Qwest failed to accurately bill CLECs 100% of the time. This occurred because during these two months Qwest spent a substantial amount of time and effort correcting historical payments. In some instances, this required Qwest to pay CLECs money, and in others it required Qwest to bill the CLEC requesting additional money. Either way, the metric showed the bill as "inaccurate." It is important to restate that Qwest completed this work late last year and the metric again showed 100% accuracy in January and 99.8% accuracy in February 2002. *Id*.

## 14. Resale

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE RESALE (CHECKLIST ITEM 14) PERFORMANCE DATA RESULTS FOR NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest provided resold services to CLECs in a nondiscriminatory manner. The PIDs for resale measure performance

for twelve products: residential lines, business lines, Centrex, Centrex 21, PBX, Basic ISDN, Qwest DSL, Primary ISDN, DS0, DS1, DS3 and higher, and Frame Relay. The standard for resale performance is parity with retail service, and Qwest is achieving parity in the vast majority of resale performance measurements in Washington. Given the small volumes for many of these services, Qwest will focus its discussion on residential POTS, business POTS, Centrex and DSL services.[27]

*Installation. No Dispatch Required.* Qwest provisions a vast percentage of all resold orders without requiring a technician dispatch, just like UNE-P and line sharing. The following data concerns the four months of performance between November 2001 and February 2002. For residential POTS, Qwest met an average of 99.86% of its CLEC installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002, in an overall average installation interval of 2.03 days. The installation commitment met results were at parity with retail performance since July 2001. *Id*. at 216, OP-3C, OP-4C. For business POTS, Qwest met 100% of its CLEC installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002, in an average installation interval of 2.2 days or less, at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 227, OP-3C, OP-4C.

[27] Qwest received no orders for Centrex 21, ISDN (Basic or Primary service), DS0, DS3, or Frame Relay service between November 2001 and February 2002, in Washington. 3,373 (89%) of the total resold orders received over these same four months were for residence POTS, 139 (3.7%) were for business POTS, 123 (3.2%) were for Centrex and 122 (3.2%) were for DSL. Twelve (0.3%) PBX orders and ten (0.26%) DS1 orders were received for these same four months.

For Centrex, Qwest met 100% of its CLEC installation commitments each month. *Id*. at 238, OP-3C. The overall average installation interval for resold Centrex was less than 4 days, at parity with retail performance for two of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*., OP-4C. For DSL, Qwest met 100% of its CLEC installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002, in an average of 8.3 days, at parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 285-286, OP-3C, OP-4C.

*Installation. Dispatches within MSAs.* For residential POTS, Qwest met an average of 98.16% of its CLEC installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002, in an average of 3.27 days, at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 214, OP-3A, OP-4A. For business POTS, Qwest met an average of 88.89% of its CLEC installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002, in an average of 5.2 days, at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 225, OP-3A, OP-4A. For Centrex, Qwest met an average of 95.59% or more of its CLEC installation commitments between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 236, OP-3A. The overall average installation interval for Centrex was 4.22 days. *Id*., OP-4A. For DSL, Qwest met one (100%) CLEC installation commitment between November 2001 and February 2002, in ten days, at parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 284, OP-3A, OP-4A.

*Installation. Dispatch outside MSA s.* As to dispatches outside of MSAs, this level of performance continues with Qwest consistently meeting 100% of its commitments for all services in three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 215, 226, 237, OP-3B. In each of the last four months, the average installation interval was also at parity with retail performance. *Id.,* OP-4B.

*Maintenance and Repair*. In three of the last four months, the overall trouble rate for resold CLEC lines has been extremely small once "no trouble found" reports are excluded: less than 1.3% for residential POTS (*Id*. at 223, MR-8*); less than 1% for business POTS (*Id*. at 234, MR-8*); and less than 0.55% for Centrex (*Id*. at 245, MR-8*). No trouble reports were received for CLEC DSL service between November 2001 and February 2002 once the "no trouble found reports" were removed. *Id*. at 292-293, MR-8, MR-8*. For every service except resold Centrex, these results were at parity with retail performance in at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*. at 223, 234, 245, 292-293, MR-8, MR-8*. Although, the Centrex CLEC trouble rate was disparate, it was extremely low (0.54% or less). *Id.* at 245, MR-8*. This is an example when the Commission should look behind the statistics to see the outstanding performance provided to CLECs by Qwest. A less than one percent trouble rate is outstanding in every circumstance.

Repairs of all four primary resold products in Washington are measured by the number of out-of-service troubles cleared in 24-hours and the number of troubles cleared in 48-hours. Qwest also measures the mean time to restore service. All three of these metrics are tracked for trouble that requires dispatches within MSAs, dispatches outside of MSAs, and those not requiring a dispatch. Therefore, there are nine primary repair measurements per type of resold service.

For resold residential POTS service, Qwest cleared an average of 87.78% of all out-of-service situations in 24-hours between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail service. *Id*. at 219-222, MR-3A, MR-3B, MR-3C. An average of 98.81% of all troubles were cleared within 48-hours between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail performance. *Id*., MR-4A, MR-4B, MR-4C. For resold business POTS service in October, Qwest cleared an average of 95.65% of all out-of-service situations in 24-hours between November 2001 and February 2002, generally at parity with retail service. *Id*. at 230, 231, 233, MR-3A, MR-3B, MR-3C. An average of 97.95% of all troubles were cleared within 48-hours between November 2001 and February 2002, generally at parity with retail performance. *Id*., MR-4A, MR-4B, MR-4C. For resold Centrex service in October, Qwest cleared an average of 96.26% of all out-of-service situations in 24 hours between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail service. *Id*. at 241, 242, 244, MR-3A, MR-3B, MR-3C. An average of 97.52% of all troubles were cleared within 48-hours between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity

with retail performance. *Id*., MR-4A, MR-4B, MR-4C. Finally, Qwest had only one trouble report for resold DSL service between November 2001 and February 2002, which was cleared in two minutes, at parity with retail service. *Id*. at 290, MR-3D, MR-6D.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE RESALE (CHECKLIST ITEM 14) PERFORMANCE DATA THAT FAILED TO MEET THE ROC DETERMINED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT?**

A. For obvious reasons, all resale performance is measured against the retail parity standard. Of the 164 PIDs relating to resale installation and repair in Washington during March 2001 to February 2002, Qwest met the parity standard on all but eight metrics in at least three of four months. The exceptions: (1) average installation interval for resold residence service when no dispatch was required (OP-4C); (2) new service installation quality for resold business service (OP-5); (3) average installation interval for resold Centrex service when orders required a technician dispatch within a MSA (OP-4A); (4) average installation interval for resold Centrex service when orders did not require a technician dispatch (OP-4C); (5) repair repeat report rate for resold Centrex service when troubles required a technician dispatch within a MSA (MR-7A); (6) Centrex trouble rate (MR-8); (7) new service

installation quality for resold DS-1 service (OP-5); and (8) DS1 trouble rate (MR-8).

*Residence Resale PID.* Of the 26 installation and repair measurements surrounding residence resale, Qwest met the parity standard on all but one metric: the average installation interval for resold residence service when no dispatch was required (OP-4C). In December, the average interval was 2.81 days and in January it was 2.86 days. The comparable retail interval was 2.66 days in December and 2.72 days in January. *Id.* at 216, OP-4C. This is a 0.2 day difference or smaller. Moreover, 100% of the installation commitments were met in December and only four of 493 orders were delayed in January. *Id.*, OP-3C. The January delays were for non-facility reasons and the average days delayed was 2.5 days, at parity with retail performance. *Id*., OP-6A-3. Qwest is clearly performing well here.

*Business Resale PIDs*. Of the 26 installation and repair measurements surrounding business resale, Qwest met the parity standard on all but one metric: new service installation quality. In November 75% of new installations were installed without trouble, in December and January 50% of new installations were installed without trouble. *Id*. at 228, OP-5. Once the "no trouble found" reports are excluded, however, November results are at parity with retail performance, the December result improves to 57.69% and the January result to 66.67%. *Id*., OP-5*. In February, 52.27% of new business installations were installed without trouble.

Between June and October 2001, Qwest installed resold business lines without subsequent trouble, consistently at parity with retail results. *Id*., OP-5 & OP-5*. Then, the numbers declined as referenced above. Qwest has not experienced this issue in many other states. Upon investigation, this issue appears to be caused by DMS10 switches, which are more prevalent in Washington. Qwest will complete its installation of a programming fix in these switches as of April 6, 2002; Qwest expects this fix will cure this issue going forward.

It is also important to note that Qwest cleared an average of 95.65% of all business POTS out-of-service reports within 24-hours between November 2001 and February 2002, at parity with retail service. *Id*. at 230, 231, 233, MR-3A, MR-3B, MR-3C. An average of 97.95% of all troubles were cleared within 48-hours between November 2001 and February 2002, generally parity with retail performance. *Id*., MR-4A, MR-4B, MR-4C.

*Centrex Resale PIDs.* Of the 26 installation and repair measurements surrounding Centrex resale, Qwest met the parity standard on all but four metrics: (1) average installation interval when a technician dispatch was required within an MSA (OP-4A); (2) average installation interval when no technician dispatch was required (OP-4C); (3) repair trouble rate when troubles required a technician dispatch within a MSA (MR-7A); and (4) trouble rate (MR-8).

As to the installation interval, in December, this metric showed that CLECs obtained resold Centrex service in an average of 4.11 days, while comparable Qwest retail residential customers received the service in an average of 3.23 days. In January, the CLEC interval was 4.79 days, while comparable Qwest retail residential customers received the service in an average of 3.14 days. *Id*. at 236, OP-4A. When a technician dispatch is required to provision an order, a standard interval is not used. Instead "Appointment Scheduler" sets appointment times and dates on a nondiscriminatory basis, as both CLECs and retail service representatives access the same scheduler on a first-come, first-served basis. CLECs may request a longer, but not shorter, interval than those offered by the scheduler. Because Qwest does not have the capability to exclude longer-than-standard intervals for dispatched orders (as explained in the PID), wholesale results may be longer than retail, for reasons not caused by Qwest's performance, to the extent CLECs request longer intervals proportionally more than retail customers. This data, therefore, needs to be interpreted along side the percentage of installations that Qwest met on time. Between November 2001 and February 2002, Qwest met an average of 96.4% of these orders on time; specifically, during this two months Qwest provisioned 69 of the 72 (95.8%) Centrex resale orders on time. *Id*. at 225-227, OP-3A, OP-3B, OP-3C. The delays in December and January were due to non-facility reasons and were related to one order each month. *Id*. at 225, OP-6A-1. The order delayed in December, was completed in seven days, at parity with retail performance. *Id*. The order delayed in January was completed in twenty-seven

days, outside of retail parity. *Id*. The Commission should clearly take this into consideration when evaluating Qwest's overall resale performance.

In December and January, the average installation interval when no technician dispatch was required was outside of parity (OP-4C). The average installation interval for CLECs in December was 3.55 days and 3.62 days in January. The average installation interval for retail customers was 1.50 days in December and 2.17 days in January. *Id*. at 238, OP-4C. However, in each of these months Qwest installed 100% of the CLEC orders by the committed installation date. *Id.*, OP-3C. Furthermore, the CLEC interval has been at parity with retail performance since July 2001 and was at parity with retail performance again in February. *Id.*, OP-4C.

In January and February, the repeat trouble rate when a technician dispatch was required within an MSA was not a parity with retail performance. *Id.* at 241-242, MR-7A, MR-7A*. In January, once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded, five CLEC repeat troubles were filed. The "no trouble found" information is not yet available for February results. While this performance is outside of parity, this measure usually comes into parity when the "no troubles found" are excluded. Qwest does note that the February 2002 "no trouble found" data is not yet available; therefore, Qwest cannot yet determine whether the measure will be at parity in February when these orders are excluded.

Finally, the Centrex resale trouble rate also showed consistent disparity. In November the trouble rate was 0.54%, and in December and January the trouble rate was 0.39%, once "no trouble reports" were excluded. *Id*. at 245, MR-8*. The Centrex resale trouble rate was 0.39% in February, at parity with retail performance. *Id*., MR-8. Each month, the retail trouble rate was smaller. *Id*., MR-8, MR-8*. Moreover, a trouble rate of less than 1% is extremely small, and constitutes outstanding performance. The Centrex resale trouble rate has never exceeded 0.6% once "no trouble found" reports are excluded. *Id*. The Commission should view this performance miss in totality and recognize that this very small trouble rate does not impair a CLECs ability to compete in the marketplace.

*DS1 Resale PIDs.* Of the 13 installation and repair measurements surrounding resale of DS1 circuits, Qwest provided parity service on all but two metrics: (1) new service installation quality (OP-5); and, (2) the trouble rate (MR-8). Between November 2001 and February 2002, there were eighteen CLEC orders installed and six trouble tickets filed within 30 days of installation. *Id*. at 315, OP-5*. The OP-5 measurement has known limitations. This limitation is heightened with a DS-1 circuit, which constitutes 24 DS0 channels, each of which is a candidate for new service trouble. This has an additional multiplying effect on trouble reports in the numerator, in comparison to orders in the denominator (which, for DS1, not only may have multiple lines per order, but each DS1 line has 24 circuits). To illustrate, in October, the trouble experienced on the DS1 line was on one of the 24 DS0

circuits that "ride" on the DS1, which trouble was promptly fixed. Thus, when installing circuits of this type, it is not surprising that the numerator for OP-5 reported for DS1 to be inflated, as multiplied by both the number of lines per order in the denominator, but also the 24 circuits per DS1 line. Moreover, when troubles did occur in November, twenty-three of twenty-seven reports were cleared within four hours and in January all reports were cleared within four hours. *Id.* at 317-318, MR-5A, MR-5B. The mean time to restore service in November was also less than two hours, thirty minutes. *Id*., MR-6D, MR-6E.

The CLEC DS1 trouble rate was 4.72% in December and 5.26% in January once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded. *Id*. at 319, MR-8* Seven trouble reports were filed in December, six of which were cleared within four hours. *Id.* at 317 and 319, MR-5A, MR-8. Fourteen reports were filed in January and were cleared within four hours. *Id.* The trouble rate was 4.92% in February. *Id*. Six reports were filed in February and were cleared within four hours. *Id.*

**Q. DID QWEST MISS ANY OTHER OF THE ROC DETERMINED RESALE (CHECKLIST ITEM 14) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN NOVEMBER?**

A. Yes. In November, Qwest missed six resale performance metrics: two for resold residence service, two for resold PBX service, one for resold DSO service, and one for resold DS1 service.

*Residence Resale PIDs.* Of the 26 installation and repair measurements surrounding residential resale, two metrics were not a parity with retail performance in November: (1) mean time to restore service when no technician dispatch was required (MR-6C); and (2) repeat trouble rate when no technician dispatch was required (MR-7C). The CLEC mean time to restore CLEC service when no dispatch was required was an average of ten hours, thirty-nine minutes in November; the comparable retail equivalent was seven hours, eleven minutes. *Id.* at 222, MR-6C. This is the only time since July 2001 that this metric has been outside of parity; thus, it is an aberration. Similarly, the CLEC repeat trouble rate when no technician dispatch was required was at parity with retail results once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded. *Id.* at 223, MR-7C*. Qwest has also provided parity service for this repair metric every other month for the last twelve months, therefore November results were clearly an aberration. *Id.*

*PBX Resale PIDs.* Of the 27 installation and repair measurements surrounding PBX resale, two metrics were not at parity with retail performance in November: (1) the percentage of installation commitments met in Zone 2 (OP-3E); and, (2) the average installation interval in Zone 2 (OP-4E). In November, Qwest met three of five (60%) CLEC PBX resale installation commitments in Zone 2. *Id.* at 262, OP-3E. One of the two orders were delayed 89 days. *Id.* at 263, OP-6B-5. This order caused Qwest to also miss the average installation interval metric in Zone 2 as well. *Id.* at 262, OP-4E. The average installation interval was 36.14 days in November in

Zone 2. *Id.* Qwest views this as a disparity caused by a single order. The Commission should not attempt to draw negative inferences from individual orders.

*DS0 Resale PID.* Of the 13 installation and repair measurements surrounding resale of DS0 circuits, Qwest missed only one in November: the average installation interval in Zone 1 (OP-4D). The only CLEC order in that month was delayed thirty-seven days, which caused a miss of the average installation interval. *Id*. at 306, OP-4D. Again, the Commission should not attempt to draw negative inferences from individual orders.

*DS1 Resale PID.* Of the 13 installation and repair measurements surrounding resale of DS1 circuits, Qwest missed only one in November: the repeat trouble rate in Zone 1. *Id.* at 317, MR-7D. Five of ten repairs in November had repeat troubles, once the no trouble found reports were excluded. *Id*., MR-7D*. This is the only month since June 2001 where Qwest failed to provide parity service on this performance metric. *Id.* The mean time to restore service in November was less than two hours. *Id*. at 317, MR-6D.

**Q. DID QWEST MISS ANY OTHER OF THE ROC DETERMINED RESALE (CHECKLIST ITEM 14) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN DECEMBER?**

A. Yes. In December, Qwest missed four resale performance metrics: one for resold Centrex service, two for resold PBX service and one for resold DS0 service.

*Centrex Resale PIDs*. Of the 26 installation and repair measurements surrounding Centrex resale, one metric was not at parity with retail performance in December: the number of delayed days for facility reasons when a technician dispatch within an MSA was required (OP-6B-1). In December, one Centrex resale order was delayed ten days due to facility reasons. *Id.* at 236, OP-6B-1. This compared to fourteen retail orders delayed for facility reasons an average of 2.93 days. This was the only order delayed for facility reasons in any month since April 2001. *Id.* Given that no delayed orders is the objective, Qwest is clearly performing well in this area.

*PBX Resale PID.* Two PBX resale metrics were missed in December: (1) installation commitments met when no technician dispatch was required (OP-3C); and, (2) average installation interval when no technician dispatch was required (OP-4C). Here, one order with eight CLEC lines was not installed on time. *Id*. at 260, OP-3C. These eight lines were all associated with one order, which order was delayed because an associated order was delayed. Again, the Commission should not attempt to draw negative inferences from individual orders.

*DS0 Resale PID.* Of the 13 installation and repair measurements surrounding resale of DS0 circuits, Qwest missed one metric in December; specifically, Qwest missed its only installation commitment objective in Zone 1. *Id.* at 305, OP-3D. This one order was delayed due to non-facility reasons and was completed in fifteen days.

*Id*. at 306, OP-4D. This was the first time this metric was outside of parity. *Id.* at 305, OP-3D.

**Q. DID QWEST MISS ANY OTHER OF THE ROC DETERMINED RESALE (CHECKLIST ITEM 14) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN JANUARY?**

A. Yes. Qwest missed three resold business metrics and two Primary ISDN metrics in January.

*Business Resale PID.* Of the 26 installation and repair measurements surrounding business resale, three metrics was not at parity with retail performance in January: (1) delayed days for non-facility reasons when a technician dispatch was required within an MSA; (2) all troubles cleared within 48 hours when a technician dispatch was required within an MSA (MR-4A); and (3) out-of-service troubles cleared within 24 hours when no technician dispatch was required (MR-3C).

In January, one CLEC order was delayed twenty-seven days due to non-facility reasons. *Id.* at 225, OP-6A1. This one delay caused the disparity. This measure has had either no delays (the best possible performance) or delays at parity with retail performance in every other month since June 2001. Thus, this one delay is anomalous.

Qwest cleared eight of ten trouble reports within the 48-hour objective when a technician dispatch was required within MSAs. *Id.* at 230, MR-4A. Moreover, the mean time to restore these troubles was 15 hours, 38 minutes, at parity with retail. *Id*., MR-6A. This is the only time in twelve months that Qwest has not been at parity on this measure. *Id.*, MR-4A. Thus, this miss is clearly an aberration.

Qwest cleared thirteen of fifteen out-of-service trouble reports within the 24-hour objective when a technician dispatch was not required. *Id.* at 233, MR-3C. The two missed commitments were cleared within 48-hours and the mean time to restore all troubles was three hours, thirty-two minutes, at parity with retail. *Id*., MR-4C, MR-6C. This is the only time in twelve months that Qwest has not been at parity on this measure. *Id.*, MR-3C.

*Primary ISDN resale PID.* Of the seven installation and repair measurements surrounding Primary ISDN resale, two metrics were not at parity with retail performance in January: (1) new service installation quality (OP-5); and, (2) trouble rate (MR-8). One CLEC experience trouble, which trouble was cleared within four hours. *Id.* at 298 and 300, OP-5, MR-5A. In addition, no trouble was found when Qwest investigated this report, bringing the OP-5 metric into parity with retail performance. *Id*. at 298, OP-5*. This same report also caused Qwest to miss the trouble report metric, which now shows parity when the "no trouble found" report is removed. *Id*. at 302, MR-8.

**Q. DID QWEST MISS ANY OTHER OF THE ROC DETERMINED RESALE (CHECKLIST ITEM 14) PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN FEBRUARY?**

A. Yes. Qwest missed two business metrics in February.

*Business Resale PID.* Of the 26 installation and repair measurements surrounding business resale, two metrics was not at parity with retail performance in February: (1) the repeat trouble rate when no technician dispatch was required (MR-7C); and, (2) trouble rate (MR-8). Twelve repeat CLEC reports were received in February. *Id.*, at 233, MR-7C. All twelve reports were cleared within 24-hours and the mean time to restore service was less than two hours. *Id.*, MR-3C, MR-6C. This is the first time since June 2001 that Qwest has missed this metric. *Id*., MR-7C* Thus, this performance miss is clearly anomalous.

The business trouble rate was 0.96% in February compared to the retail rate of 0.6%. *Id*. at 234, MR-8. A trouble rate of less than 1% is very low and constitutes outstanding performance in every circumstance.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE QWEST PERFORMANCE FOR RESALE (CHECKLIST ITEM 14) BETWEEN NOVEMBER 2001 AND FEBRUARY 2002.**

A. Qwest has met 156 of the 164 performance metrics associated with resold CLEC services in at least three of four months between November 2001 and February 2002 in Washington. *Id.* at 214-333, OP-3A, OP-4A, OP-6A-1, OP-6B-1, OP-3B, OP-4B, OP-6A-2, OP-6B-2, OP-3C, OP-4C, OP-6A-3, OP-6B-3, OP-5, MR-3A, MR-4A, MR-6A, MR-7A, MR-9A, MR-3B, MR-4B, MR-6B, MR-7B, MR-9B, MR-3C, MR-4C, MR-6C, MR-7C, MR-9C, MR-8, OP-6A-4, OP-6B-4, OP-3E, OP-4E, OP-6A-5, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-7D, MR-5B, MR-6E, MR-7E, OP-3D, OP-4D, OP-6B-5. Qwest's performance in this measurement prone checklist item is outstanding. The Commission should find Qwest has satisfied its checklist item fourteen performance requirements.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF ROC DETERMINED BENCHMARK OR PARITY STANDARDS THAT QWEST MISSED FROM NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002 IN WASHINGTON FOR MORE THAN A SINGLE MONTH.**

A. Qwest missed only a few performance standards in Washington for more than one month from November 2001 through February 2002. Based on the data depicted in the March 2001 – February 2002 data report (the "February data report"), Qwest missed the standards for only twenty-eight individual metrics, which equates to 4.3% of the approximately 656 individual performance sub-measurements tracked in total each month.[28] See *Exhibit 8*. One of the twenty-eight individual

[28] Qwest actually tracks data on 786 separate measurements (not 656) each month and, for 109 of those, it offers two views of the data (bringing the total number of tracking graphs to 895). However, 130 of the 786 sub-measurements relate to measures which are either simply diagnostic (i.e., neither evaluated under a

performance metric misses, one metric actually was provisioned in accord with performance objectives for three of the last four months, if not longer. This metric previously included trouble reports when no trouble was found and the CLEC service tested okay. The metric is: UNE-P - Repeat Report Rate - No Dispatches *Id.* at 89, MR-7C*.

Qwest reports trouble rates using two methods: (a) all CLEC reported troubles; and, (b) by excluding CLEC reported troubles where Qwest found no trouble in the Qwest network. The latter category is designated after the metric with a "*". Thus, new service installation troubles (OP-5), repeat report rate troubles (MR-7), and the overall trouble rate (MR-8) have all been reported under both methods since August 2001. The "no trouble found" data (those metrics designated with "*") are always reported one month in arrears. Thus, the Commission must evaluate the subsequent month performance report to see whether excluding no trouble situations brings a metric into parity. One of these trouble rate PIDs came into parity by excluding the no trouble situations.

Thus, in Washington CLECs experienced only 27 metric misses out of the 656 sub-measurements with performance objectives (4.1%) for more than one month during

---

parity or benchmark standard and for informational purposes only) or offer merely extraneous information (e.g. sub-measurements that offer only historical data relating to outdated methods of tracking data). For the sake of a fair comparison of the "total" number of sub-measurements showing parity/benchmark problems, I have excluded these 130 from the total number of submeasurements tracked as a whole (bringing the total down to 656) and, later in my testimony, from the "total" number of submeasurements relating to individual services.

the last four months. This is outstanding performance under any objective standard. Attached hereto as *Exhibit 8* and incorporated herein by this reference is a matrix isolating those 27 misses.[29]

**Q. WOULD YOU SUMMARIZE THE PIDS WHERE THE COMPANY FAILED TO MEET THE PARITY OR BENCHMARK STANDARD FOR MORE THAN ONE OF THE LAST FOUR MONTHS BASED ON THE FEBRUARY DATA REPORT?**

A. Yes. At the outset and in summary, the 28 multiple month PID misses detailed at *Exhibit 8* can be grouped into the following 10 categories:

1. LIS Trunks: 1 of the 28 PID misses is related to LIS trunks (MR-8).

2. Electronic Flow Through: 1 of the 28 PID misses is related to electronic flow-through for all eligible LSRs received via EDI for POTS resale (PO-2B-2).

3. Billing: 3 of the 28 PID misses are related to billing (PO-7A,C, BI-3A, BI-4A).

4. UNE-P: 4 of the 28 PID misses are related to UNE-P/UNE-P Centrex. One of the three PID misses (MR-7C) is compliant once the "no trouble found" trouble reports are removed (OP-4C, MR-7C, MR-9C, MR-8).

5. EELs: 2 of the 28 PID misses are related to EELs (OP-3D, OP3E).

6. Unbundled Loops: 6 of the 28 PID misses are related to DS1 unbundled loops (OP-3E, OP-4E, OP-5, MR-5A, MR-6D, MR-8).

7. Line Sharing: 1 of the 28 PID misses is related to shared loops (MR-6C).

[29] Exhibit 13 also includes the one PID that demonstrates it has satisfied the performance objective once the "no trouble found" reports are excluded.

8. UDIT: 1 of the 28 PID misses is related to above DS1 capable transport (MR-8).

9. Reciprocal Compensation: 1 of 28 PID misses is related to reciprocal compensation (BI-3B).

10. Resale: 8 of the 28 PID misses are related to resale (OP-5, OP-4A, OP-4C, MR-7A, MR-8).

**Q. DID QWEST MISS MEETING ANY OTHER ROC DETERMINED BENCHMARK OR PARITY STANDARDS DURING THIS SAME PERIOD OF TIME IN WASHINGTON?**

A. Yes. In each month from November 2001 through February 2002, Qwest missed other ROC determined benchmark or parity standards in **only** one month. In other words, these same metrics were met in three of the last four months. Based on the data depicted in the February data report, Qwest missed seventeen additional metrics in November 2001, two of which were found to be in compliance once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded. See *Exhibit 9*.

Eleven additional metrics were missed in December 2001, one of which was found to be in compliance once the 'no trouble found" reports were excluded. See *Exhibit 10*. Twelve additional metrics were missed in January 2002; three of which are found to be in compliance once the "no trouble found" reports were excluded. See *Exhibit 11*. Finally, eight additional metrics were missed in February; however, since the “no troubles found” metric is populated one month in arrears, this total number is likely to drop once the February performance report is issued. See

*Exhibit 12*. I discussed each of these metrics within their appropriate checklist item section above.

**Q. SINCE QWEST MISSED SOME OF THE BENCHMARK OR PARITY STANDARDS DURING NOVEMBER 2001 THROUGH FEBRUARY 2002, DOES THAT MEAN THE WASHINGTON COMMISSION SHOULD DECLINE TO SUPPORT QWEST'S 271 APPLICATION?**

A. Absolutely not. In my November 7, 2001 comments in these dockets, I quoted two paragraphs from the FCC's recent Pennsylvania Order, which succinctly set forth the legal standard for evaluating a BOC's performance data. In that order, the FCC makes clear that perfect performance is not necessary and that a BOC's miss on one measurement, by itself, does not necessarily provide a basis for finding noncompliance with the corresponding checklist item. For the ease of Commission review, I will re-insert those paragraphs here as well.

> 8. The Commission has explained in prior orders that parity and benchmark standards established by state commissions do not represent absolute maximum or minimum levels of performance necessary to satisfy the competitive checklist. Rather, where these standards are developed through open proceedings with input from both the incumbent and competing carriers, these standards can represent informed and reliable attempts to objectively approximate whether competing carriers are being served by the incumbent in substantially the same time and manner, or in a way that provides them a meaningful opportunity to compete. Thus, to the extent there is no statistically significant difference between a BOC's provision of service to competing carriers and its own retail customers, the Commission generally need not look any further. Likewise, if a BOC's provision of service to competing carriers satisfies the performance benchmark, the analysis is usually done. Otherwise, the Commission will examine the evidence further to make a determination whether the statutory nondiscrimination requirements are met. Thus, the Commission will examine the

explanations that a BOC and others provide about whether these data accurately depict the quality of the BOC's performance. The Commission also may examine how many months a variation in performance has existed and what the recent trend has been. The Commission may find that statistically significant differences exist, but conclude that such differences have little or no competitive significance in the marketplace. In such cases, the Commission may conclude that the differences are not meaningful in terms of statutory compliance. Ultimately, the determination of whether a BOC's performance meets the statutory requirements necessarily is a contextual decision based on the totality of the circumstances and information before the Commission.

9. Where there are multiple performance measures associated with a particular checklist item, the Commission would consider the performance demonstrated by all the measurements as a whole. Accordingly, a disparity in performance for one measure, by itself, may not provide a basis for finding noncompliance with the checklist. The Commission may also find that the reported performance data is affected by factors beyond a BOC's control, a finding that would make it less likely to hold the BOC wholly accountable for the disparity. This is not to say, however, that performance discrepancies on a single performance metric are unimportant. Indeed, under certain circumstances, disparity with respect to one performance measurement may support a finding of statutory noncompliance, particularly if the disparity is substantial or has endured for a long time, or if it is accompanied by other evidence of discriminatory conduct or evidence that competing carriers have been denied a meaningful opportunity to compete.[30]

[30] *In the Matter of Application of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc., Verizon Long Distance, Verizon Enterprise Solutions, Verizon Global Networks Inc., and Verizon Select Services Inc. for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Pennsylvania,* CC Docket No. 01-138 App. C, ¶¶8-9 (Sept. 19, 2001) (footnotes omitted).

**Q. THE COMMISSION'S 21st SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER REQUESTS AN EXPLANATION OF SINGULAR PERFORMANCE MISSES FOR EACH MONTH SINCE SEPTEMBER. IS THIS HOW THE FCC EVALUATES PERFORMANCE?**

A. No. As described in my December 5, 2001 testimony, in each 271 application that the FCC has approved, the FCC focused on four months of performance data.[31] It is for this reason that Qwest submitted a demonstrative exhibit to my November 7, 2001 comments [September Blue Chart] that graphically depicts each aspect of Qwest's of performance over a four month span. That Exhibit and this testimony concern the exact same performance data metrics. The principle difference between this testimony and my earlier Exhibit is that the Exhibit presents the data in the manner that the FCC evaluates it, while this document only presents a partial picture. Attached hereto as *Exhibit 5* and incorporated herein by this reference is an updated "blue chart" based on the February data report.

It is important to note that a miss for one month out of the last four month period of performance data is not viewed by the FCC as a basis for finding noncompliance with the checklist. As previously stated, the FCC's has found that when "there are multiple performance measurements associated with a particular checklist item, the Commission considers the performance demonstrated by all the measurements as a

[31] *See, e.g., In the Matter of Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region InterLATA Service in the State of New York,* Memorandum, Opinion and Order, CC Docket No. 99-295 ("Bell Atlantic New York Order") at ¶¶69, 156, 219, 221, 223, 224, 284, 300, 301 and 323 (Dec. 1999).

whole. Accordingly, a disparity in performance for one measurement, by itself, may not provide a basis for finding noncompliance with the checklist."[32]

Thus, the ultimate issue before this Commission is whether Qwest's overall performance on a checklist item by checklist item basis is adequate. The FCC has made clear that when performance metrics are negotiated, ILECs such as Qwest need not meet the negotiated standards 100% of the time to satisfy 271. This would be a virtual impossibility. The Commission's role is to assess all of the PIDs for each checklist item in totality and decide whether the performance is adequate. Moreover, when evaluating a 271 application, the FCC has always studied the four most recent months of performance data.[33]

## V. REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

**Q. WHAT PARTIES FILED TESTIMONY IN RESPONSE TO YOUR MARCH 8, 2002 TESTIMONY?**

A. Both AT&T and Covad Communications filed responsive comments. It is not clear whether the material is testimony as no individual verified the comments therein. I will respond to the principal allegations raised by each intervenor. Mr. Robert

[32] *Verizon Connecticut Order* at Appendix D-5, ¶ 9.
[33] *See, e.g., In the Matter of Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region InterLATA Service in the State of New York*, Memorandum, Opinion and Order, CC Docket No. 99-295 ("Bell Atlantic New York Order") at ¶¶ 69, 156, 219, 221, 223, 224, 284, 300, 301 and 323 (Dec. 1999).

Stright of Liberty Consulting also filed testimony. I will not respond to that testimony.

**Q. AT&T RECOMMENDS THAT THE COMMISSION DEFER JUDGMENT ON QWEST'S COMMERCIAL PERFORMANCE DATA UNTIL THE ROC OSS TEST IS COMPLETE. DO YOU AGREE?**

A. No, I do not. The Commission should analyze Qwest's commercial performance data, and render an opinion about whether Qwest is fully compliant with the 271 Checklist, "subject to successful completion of the OSS Test."

The essence of AT&T's argument is that Liberty's data reconciliation effort is a work in process; therefore, final judgment should await completion of the Liberty effort. Waiting until completion of the Liberty effort is simply not necessary. As of the date of this rebuttal testimony, Liberty has also completed its data reconciliation work in the state of Oregon. A copy of Liberty's Oregon Report is attached as Exhibit 7. In the Oregon Report, Liberty closed Observation 1036, and opened Observations 1037 and 1038. In testimony in South Dakota, Mr. Robert Stright testified that "it appears [these new Observations] were limited to a specific time interval during the first half of 2001." Thus, these new issues do not affect the performance data before this Commission, which the Commission must evaluate to determine whether Qwest meets the requirements of Section 271 in Washington.

Given that Liberty has completed its work in Oregon, all that remains is minimal reconciliation work in the states of Utah and Minnesota. In Utah, Liberty's charge is to analyze various aspects of performance surrounding interconnection trunks on behalf of AT&T. In Minnesota, this charge is expanded to include the analysis of Covad's orders for line sharing and 2-wire non-loaded loops. In the past, Liberty has testified that its Covad work in Minnesota was essentially complete, with no new findings to date. In Utah, Qwest and AT&T have agreed on all but one issue affecting six orders, and in Minnesota, Qwest and AT&T have agreed on the treatment on all interconnection trunk orders. Thus, I anticipate that Liberty will have completed its data reconciliation effort by the time Mr. Stright of Liberty Consulting testifies in Washington.

AT&T also asserts that the Commission should also await conclusion of the OSS Test before it evaluates Washington performance data. AT&T states that the "KPMG reconciliation effort will be much broader in scope" than that performed by Liberty Consulting.[34] This argument is similar to previous arguments made before this Commission and should be rejected. AT&T previously argued that the OSS test should not begin until Qwest's performance measurements were audited to ensure that Qwest's data was accurate and reliable. Liberty subsequently issued its Performance Measurement Audit, and found Qwest results to be "accurate and reliable." AT&T then complained that Qwest's commercial data should not be

[34] AT&T Comments at page 4.

relied upon until Qwest's input data was analyzed for accuracy. Liberty Consulting subsequently agreed to its data reconciliation effort. AT&T then agreed on the scope of the Liberty data reconciliation effort to evaluate the very input data that any CLEC challenged as inaccurate. Now that this effort is almost complete, AT&T calls Liberty's reconciliation "somewhat limited" and asks the Commission to wait to conclude anything about Qwest's commercial performance until the KPMG test is complete. It is clear that AT&T 's approach is based on its desire to draw out the schedule established by this Commission to complete this proceeding.

The Regional Oversight Committee ("ROC") has retained Liberty Consulting to perform various tasks on its behalf for well over two years now, and Liberty Consulting continually opines that Qwest's reported performance data is accurate and reliable. Moreover, to the extent that KPMG reaches any different conclusions about the data, the parties may address such conclusions in testimony to be filed May 31, 2002 and at the June 4-6, 2002 hearing on the results of the OSS Test. A conclusion by this Commission that Qwest is fully compliant with the 271 Checklist "subject to successful completion of the OSS Test" is appropriate at this time. Moreover, such a conclusion would be fully consistent with decisions reached by numerous commissions around the country and within Qwest's region.

**Q. AT&T MENTIONS TWO KPMG OBSERVATIONS AS REFLECTIVE OF WHY THE COMISSION SHOULD WAIT TO RENDER A DECISION ON COMMERCIAL DATA PERFORMANCE. HOW DO YOU RESPOND?**

A. AT&T specifically mentions Observations 3089 and 3099 and raises concerns over the accuracy of Qwest's performance data. Their assertion is overstated. Observation 3089 (contained in Exhibit 13) concerns the field from which Qwest must measure whether it meets its performance commitments for CLECs. Specifically, whether or not Qwest should track its performance based on an extended commitment date, firm order confirmation ("FOC") date, or whether it should base its performance on a standard interval. In over 95% of all relevant orders, the FOC date and recorded due date are identical. However, on rare occasions, Qwest is more conservative, establishes a later due date, and tracks performance against the earlier due date, which results in reporting more missed commitments than actually occur. Qwest informed KPMG of such; the notification is provided in the Qwest responses in Exhibit 13 (p. 7). The issue before KPMG, therefore, is whether this more conservative method is appropriate and acceptable. Cap Gemini Ernst and Young, the company running the OSS Test for the state of Arizona, has already evaluated this very issue, found Qwest's methodology appropriate, and closed the "incident work order" (the Arizona equivalent of an observation, IWO 2100). See *Exhibit 14*.

Observation 3099 concerns the inclusion/exclusion of orders involving customer requests for longer-than-standard intervals for unbundled loops in the installation interval measurement, OP-4. The PID calls for excluding orders with longer-than-standard intervals, but KPMG had observed instances in which some were apparently included. For those instances, the result was to reflect worse performance than Qwest was actually providing. Qwest provided explanations for all but three orders that involved human error in coding data fields that affect their inclusion in OP-4. This observation has been closed by KPMG, with a few final issues that were moved to Exception 3120 to be closed upon review of Qwest's latest results, which is now under way and which Qwest asserts will demonstrate the matter is resolved.

Thus, the two Observations identified by AT&T as creating purported data inaccuracies simply do not stand for that proposition. Moreover, as I set forth above, the time for evaluating OSS test incidents issued by KPMG in Washington is set for June 4-6, 2002.

**Q. COVAD ALSO COMPLAINS ABOUT LIBERTY CONSULTING'S DATA RECONCILIATION EFFORT. HOW DO YOU RESPOND?**

A. Covad spends a vast percentage of its comments critiquing the methodology used by Liberty Consulting for completing the data reconciliation effort. Qwest does not agree with Covad 's assertions and believes that the author of the Covad comments

has limited, if any, knowledge about how Liberty Consulting tracked Qwest's performance or how the Liberty Consulting reconciliation effort has proceeded to date.

For example, Covad claims that Qwest's performance data is unreliable because Liberty found some issues. While Liberty did find some issues, the issues about which Covad complains have been rectified and the current Washington performance data is free of those issues. Thus, the data is accurate and reliable.

Covad also asserts that "Liberty never took the time to determine whether [a] code fix would actually do what Qwest opined it would do. . . ."[35] and that "Liberty never confirmed whether [Qwest] training took place or whether it was efficacious."[36] These comments are simply inaccurate. When an Observation was based on a problem with computer code, Liberty reviewed the code and additional data showing the issue had been corrected. AT&T itself admits this with respect to Observations 1026 and 1027, two of the Observations about which Covad complains. When an Observation was based on human error, Liberty evaluated Qwest's training materials, interviewed Qwest personnel about that training, and made an independent professional judgement about the likely success of the training effort. To claim, as Covad does, that Liberty simply closed Observations without

[35] Covad Comments at page 21.
[36] Covad Comments at page 22.

substantial thought and scrutiny is completely lacking in foundation.

Finally, Covad's comments completely ignore the fact that before the data reconciliation effort, Liberty Consulting spent over one year auditing Qwest's performance data, and found Qwest's measurements to generate accurate and reliable results. This substantial effort and familiarity with Qwest's performance measurements is highly relevant and important to focus on when evaluating Liberty's conclusions.

**Q. DO YOU KNOW IF COVAD COMUNICATIONS MAY HAVE SOME PERCIEVED DIFFERENCES WITH LIBERTY CONSULTING?**

A. That is unclear. I believe a review of prior events demonstrates that Liberty Consulting has attempted to address similar if not the same allegations previously made by Covad. For example, in October 2001, two weeks after Liberty issued its final Performance Measurement Audit Report, Covad complained about the contents of the report for the first time. See *Exhibit 15*. These comments were filed months late, and Liberty so stated. Nonetheless, Liberty responded to each and every allegation of Covad, establishing the lack of foundation for each allegation made therein. See *Exhibit 16*. Then in Arizona, Covad again failed to provide Liberty with the requisite information on time to complete the data reconciliation effort. On the day that Liberty released the Arizona report, Covad finally disclosed the underlying detail from about thirty-five line sharing orders, when it was

supposed to provide source material on hundreds of line sharing and loop orders weeks earlier. While Liberty has since evaluated the thirty-five orders in question, at the Arizona hearing, Mr. Stright was clear that Covad's material was late, and that Qwest provided the necessary material on time. Finally, Liberty has stated on several occasions that the Covad performance data is unreliable and bereft with errors. For example, Mr. Stright testified to orders for incorrect products, incorrect states, and even the wrong Bell Operating Company. Whether or not these inherent Covad data problems has led it to the point of personal attack on Liberty, however, is unclear.

**Q. WHAT ADDITIONAL COMMENTS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THE DATA RECONCILIATION EFFORT?**

A. On all remaining aspects of the data reconciliation effort, Qwest will defer to the testimony of Mr. Robert Stright. As the third party reconciling Qwest's performance data to that of AT&T, WorldCom and Covad, Liberty is in the best position to advise the Commission about the accuracy of Qwest's results.

**Q. AT&T AND COVAD COMPLAIN ABOUT THE RESULTS OF INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE METRICS. DOES THE FCC EVALUATE PERFORMANCE BY INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE METRIC?**

A. No, it does not. The Commission should evaluate Qwest's performance in the same fashion as the FCC; which is based on a checklist item in its entirety, not on a

PID-by-PID basis. Qwest's most recent performance report for Washington, which covers the period from March 2001 through February 2002, is submitted herewith as Exhibit 1. That report includes 333 pages of performance results, with almost 900 charts showing results under the negotiated PIDs. In its comments, AT&T addressed only eight or so of those charts and Covad addresses about nine of those charts. Moreover, both AT&T and Covad discussed those charts in isolation, and utterly failed to consider Qwest's performance as a whole under each checklist item. This approach contravenes the FCC's well-established standards for evaluating performance in a section 271 proceeding.

In the *New York 271 Order*, the FCC stated, "[W]e consider the overall picture presented by the record, rather than focusing on any one aspect of performance." [37] The FCC concluded,

> The determination of whether a BOC's performance meets the statutory requirements necessarily is a contextual decision based on the totality of the circumstances and information before us. There may be multiple performance measures associated with a particular checklist item, and an apparent disparity in performance for one measure, by itself, may not provide a basis for finding noncompliance with the checklist. Other measures may tell a different story, and provide us with a more complete picture of the quality of service being provided. [38]

The FCC has followed this approach in all subsequent 271 Orders. For example, in the *Kansas/Oklahoma 271 Order*, the FCC said, "We emphasize, however, that we

[37] *Bell Atlantic New York 271 Order* at ¶ 5 (Dec. 22, 1999). *See also id.* at ¶ 46 ("We look at each application on a case-by-case basis and consider the totality of the circumstances. . . .").
[38] *Id*. at ¶ 60.

do not view each particular metric as wholly dispositive of checklist compliance. . . . Ultimately, the determination of whether a BOC's performance is consistent with the statutory requirements is a contextual decision based on the totality of the circumstances." [39] Most recently, in the *Rhode Island 271 Order*, the FCC noted, "Where there are multiple performance measures associated with a particular checklist item, the Commission would consider the performance demonstrated by all the measurements as a whole. Accordingly, a disparity in performance for one measure, by itself, may not provide a basis for finding noncompliance with the checklist." [40]

AT&T's and Covad's comments, which focus on performance under a few PIDs in isolation, are inappropriate and do not warrant a finding of noncompliance with any checklist items. The specific issues raised by AT&T and Covad must be analyzed in the context of Qwest's overall performance under each checklist item.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO AT&T'S ALLEGATION THAT QWEST'S FLOW THROUGH PERFORMANCE IS INADEQUATE.**

A. The flow-through PIDs measure the percentage of time that CLEC Local Service Requests ("LSRs") are converted into service orders recognized by Qwest's systems and "flowed-through" to Qwest's back-end systems without human intervention.

---

[39] *SBC Kansas/Oklahoma 271 Order* at ¶ 31 (Jan. 22, 2001).

[40] *Verizon Rhode Island 271 Order*, App. D, at ¶ 9 (Feb. 22, 2002).

The flow-through PIDs measure the overall flow-through rates (PO-2A) and the flow-through rates for orders that are designed to flow-through (PO-2B). AT&T's testimony focused entirely on PO-2A, the overall flow-through rate. This is curious, given that those measurements remain diagnostic, or for information purposes only, by all parties' agreement. On the other hand, the flow-through rates for those PIDs designed to flow-through, received performance objectives for the first time in January 2002.

Qwest's overall flow-through PIDs (PO-2A) are diagnostic, primarily because the FCC does not consider flow-through to be a "conclusive measure of nondiscriminatory access to ordering functions, but as one indicium among many of the performance" of Qwest's OSS.[41] The FCC recognizes, and Qwest's data shows, that CLECs impact heavily the flow-through rates that a BOC can achieve. Efficient CLECs achieve high flow-though rates while other, less efficient CLECs have lower flow-through rates.[42] Qwest's data show that some CLEC s obtain very high flow through rates, and others very low flow through rates. See *Exhibit 17*. For these reasons, the FCC has focused less on actual flow-through rates than on whether the BOC's OSS are *capable* of flowing orders through.[43]

Thus, the key flow-through PID is PO-2B; the flow-through rate for those orders

[41] *Verizon Massachusetts Order* at ¶ 77.
[42] *Id*. at ¶¶ 78, 80.
[43] *Id*. at ¶¶ 77, 80.

designed to flow-through. Given that Qwest's flow-through performance continues to improve, Qwest notes its February 2002 flow-through rates. Qwest's flow-through rates for eligible LSRs sent through the IMA-GUI interface were 92.74% for POTs resale (*Exhibit 1* at 52, PO-2B-1), besting the ROC's 90% benchmark; 75.40% for unbundled loops (*Id*. at 53, PO-2B-1) besting the ROC's 70% benchmark; 97.31% for LNP (*Id*. at 54, PO-2B-1) besting the ROC's 90% benchmark; and 78.08% for UNE-P-POTS (*Id*. at 55, PO-2B-1), besting the ROC's 75% benchmark. Qwest's flow-through rates for eligible LSRs sent through the IMA-EDI interface were slightly lower, principally because of fewer CLECs using that interface. In Washington, only 50% of POTs resale flowed through (*Id.* at 52, PO-2B-2); however, this was one of two resale orders. Regionally, where this interface is more widely utilized, 91.30% of such orders flowed through (*Exhibit 2* at 53, PO-2B-2), besting the ROC's 90% benchmark. The remaining services, however, have enough volume in Washington to analyze. Qwest flowed through 78.35% for unbundled loops (*Exhibit 1* at 53, PO-2B-1) besting the ROC's 70% benchmark; 97.92% for LNP (*Id*. at 54, PO-2B-1) besting the ROC's 90% benchmark; and 71.38% for UNE-P-POTS (*Id*. at 55, PO-2B-1), just missing the ROC's 75% benchmark. Thus, for the key flow-through performance measurement – the measurement the FCC focuses on – Qwest routinely and consistently flows through orders at higher rates than expected.

However, the overall flow-through rates are much better than that depicted by AT&T. AT&T focuses on the IMA-EDI interface which represents only 1.2% of all LSRs submitted between November 2001 and February 2002 for resale. The other 99% are submitted via IMA-GUI. *Id.* at 52, PO-2A-1, PO-2A-2.

For unbundled loops AT&T also claims that Qwest never exceeded a 35% flow-through rate for orders submitted via the IMA-GUI interface. However, the GUI interface represents 47.8% of all LSRs submitted between November 2001 and February 2002 for unbundled loops; the flow-through rate for the EDI interface has exceeded 50% between January and February 2002. *Id*. at 53, PO-2A-1 & PO-2A-2. The GUI interface also shows steady improvement over the last seven months. The FCC has specifically held that it focuses on the "recent trend" where one exists.[44] There is clearly an upward trend for this flow-through rate PID. *Id.*

For LNP, AT&T complains that Qwest does not flow-through more than 59% of such orders. In reality, the February data shows that Qwest flowed through over 64% of orders for the EDI interface. *Id*. at 54, PO-2A-2. More importantly, there are some types of LNP Orders – managed cuts and coordinated cuts – which are designed to *not* flow-through. This ensures that a number is not ported until the CLEC is ready and is heavily utilized for medium to large business accounts. It is

[44] Pennsylvania 271 Decision at App. C, ¶8.

unfair to make a complaint that certain orders do not flow-through when the CLEC has effectively asked that they not flow-through.

All in all Qwest's flow-through rates at this point is very solid and, where a performance objective exists, Qwest is usually meeting and exceeding that standard as previously discussed.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO AT&T'S ALLEGATIONS THAT QWEST'S WHOLESALE BILLS ARE INACCURATE AND INCOMPLETE.**

A. As AT&T recognized, the FCC has found that "a BOC must demonstrate that it provides competing carriers with wholesale bills in a manner that gives competing carriers a meaningful opportunity to compete." AT&T then complains about historic data about billing accuracy and completeness, without mentioning that Qwest has recently completed a "mapping exercise" ensuring that its billed rates match those approved by the Commission in its pending cost docket proceeding. This mapping exercise dropped the billing accuracy measurement down to 56.13% in November 2001 and its completeness measurement down to 24% in July 2001. *Id*. at 78-79, BI-3A, BI-4A. However, over the past several months, those percentages have steadily increased until Qwest met the parity standard with over 99% of bills accurate in January and February 2002. Similarly, the billing completeness measurement met the parity standard in February with bills being 98.61% complete. Now that the mapping exercise is finished, Qwest expects its

wholesale bills to continue to be accurate and complete. This is another instance where the performance trend belies AT&T's allegations.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO AT&T'S ALLEGATION THAT QWEST'S DAILY USAGE FEED (DUF) INFORMATION IS INADEQUATE.**

A. It is curious that AT&T raises this issue here, in a pleading on commercial performance. As AT&T itself recognizes, the Daily Usage Feed (DUF) is not relegated to a particular performance measurement. As a result, this issue is currently being addressed in the ROC OSS Test. As AT&T itself recognizes, KPMG's current analysis is due on April 5, 2002; thus, I cannot mention Qwest's current performance here. Given that this issue is receiving such scrutiny in the test and there is no current measurement to track this performance, Qwest respectfully recommends that this issue be discussed and addressed in the Commission's June 4-6, 2002 hearing on OSS Testing. At that point in time, the Commission can ask the parties and KPMG for their thoughts on this issue.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO AT&T'S ALLEGATION THAT QWEST'S BILLING COMPLETION NOTICES ARE BELOW THE RETAIL PARITY STANDARD**.

A. This is another issue where AT&T is not identifying all known facts, and thereby improperly suggests that Qwest's performance is poor. Measurement PO-7 tracks the timeliness with which electronic billing notifications are made available to

CLECs." Here, AT&T recognizes that a 95% rate in PID PO-7 would be acceptable and meets the FCC's requirements.[45] Qwest has exceeded this percentage in every month except December. *Id.* at 66, PO-7A, C, PO-7B, C. Late last year, Qwest discovered that a CRM system release contained an error in its code that affected LSRs with multiple associated service orders. As a result, only the first service order to complete would receive a billing completion notice. When corrected and the missing notices were sent, PO-7 captured them as misses (i.e. late), affecting December 2001 results. Qwest corrected this problem as the data from January and February 2002 establishes. Not only is the January and February data above AT&T's 95% threshold, but it is also at parity with retail. *Id*. AT&T's concern is misplaced.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO AT&T'S ALLEGATION THAT QWEST CHANGES AN INORDINATE PERCENTAGE OF CLEC ORDERS.**

A. Some clarification here is important to ensure the Commission is tracking with AT&T's allegation. AT&T complains that 7% of CLEC orders have changed due dates, whereas only 3% of Qwest retail orders have changed due dates. This, AT&T argues, shows that Qwest is not taking sufficient time to determine whether or not the assigned due date is achievable. As an initial matter, the performance measurement that tracks this data is PO-15, not OP-15 as AT&T alleges. The Washington data can be found on page 72 of *Exhibit 1*. This measurement is

[45] AT&T Comments at page 14.

diagnostic, meaning for informational purposes only, for a reason. This measurement accumulates all orders for all services – POTS, loops and interconnection trunks – and tracks the due date changes on a collective basis. For this measurement to have any meaning, the mix of services ordered by Qwest retail customers and CLECs would have to be the same. Today, Qwest still receives a disproportionate share of the simple, non-design POTS orders. CLECs on the other hand are focusing much of their attention on unbundled loops, a much more complex service to provision. It is not surprising therefore that there are more due date changes for CLECs. This does not, as AT&T claims, suggest anything nefarious. To the contrary, the data supports Qwest's claim that it is performing extremely well. Only 7% of orders need a due date change. That means 93% of orders do not. Meeting 93% of due dates for all services combined, no matter how complex, is extremely strong. *Id*. This is especially due to the fact that some extremely complex orders may have multiple due date changes and count more than once in PO-15. The benchmark for unbundled analog and 2-wire non-loaded loops is 90% commitments met. Qwest is performing exceedingly well here.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO AT&T'S ALLEGATION THAT QWEST'S AVERAGE INSTALLATION INTERVAL FOR UNE-P-POTS CIRCUITS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A TECHNICIAN DISPATCH IS OUTSIDE OF PARITY.**

A. As previously stated, of the 27 PIDs relating to UNE-P, Qwest filed to meet the parity standard on three measurements for more than one month between November 2001 and February 2002. The February data report indicates that CLECs experienced a longer installation interval in December and January, when no dispatch was required for UNE-P POTS. The CLEC interval in December was 2.83 days and was 3.0 days in January. The comparable retail interval was 2.64 days in December and 2.7 days in January. *Id*. at 82, OP-4C. Thus, the difference between Qwest retail and CLEC intervals was less than 0.3 days, hardly competitively significant. Moreover, in the rare instances when delays in installations occurred, the delays were brief, and consistently at parity with retail performance between November 2001 and February 2002. *Id*., OP 6A-3. Furthermore, Qwest met over 99.7% of the CLEC installation commitments in December and January, when no dispatch was required, at parity with retail performance. *Id*., OP-3C.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO AT&T'S ALLEGATION THAT NEW INSTALLATION QUALITY FOR CLEC'S UNE-P-POTS ORDERS ARE WORSE FOR CLECS THAN FOR EQUIVALENT RETAIL CUSTOMERS.**

A. This is another instance where AT&T's data is simply outdated. OP-5 tracks the percentage of newly installed orders that receive a reported trouble within 30 days of installation. *Id*. at 83, OP-5. AT&T claimed that two of the last four months had issues. This allegation is incorrect, both based on current data and historical data. The current data shows that Qwest has installed over 93% of all such lines trouble

free in each of the last three months at parity with retail performance. *Id*. However, Qwest also tracks the percentage of CLEC reported troubles that do not yield a Qwest problem within 30 days of the issuance of the trouble report. These "no troubles found" tickets are reported in OP-5*. *Id*. Excluding these "no trouble" tickets has brought the measurement into parity in each month except one. Thus, in the last four months, Qwest has provided the CLECs with better overall service than it has provided its retail customers for this measurement.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO AT&T'S ALLEGATION THAT CLEC'S EXPERIENCE A DISPORTIONATE PERCENTAGE OF REPEAT TROUBLES ON UNE-P-POTS LINES.**

A. This is another instance where AT&T's allegation does not carry water. Repeat troubles (MR-7), just like new service installation quality (OP-5), is tracked using two methods. The first PID reports all troubles irrespective of whether the CLEC's trouble report was justified. On the other hand, Qwest also tracks repeat troubles and excludes trouble tickets where no troubles were found. *Id*. at 88-89, MR-7, MR-7*. AT&T cites to the repeat trouble data without the "no troubles" excluded. That measurement shows disparity in five of the last six months. When "no troubles found" are excluded, however, the inverse occurs and retail parity exists in five of the last six months. AT&T's complaint on this measurement is without basis.

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR THOUGHTS ON AT&T'S ALLEGATIONS AROUND COMMERCIAL PERFORMANCE.**

A. The aforementioned testimony shows that AT&T's claim that Qwest is not meeting its performance objectives is consistently without basis. First, AT&T complains about isolated instances of performance, when the FCC has made plain that the Commission should analyze performance holistically on a checklist-item-by-checklist-item basis. However, even when the individual performance metrics are evaluated, AT&T's claims continue to be without merit.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO COVAD' ALLEGATIONS THAT QWEST'S PROVISIONING PERFORMANCE FOR LINE SHARING IS UNSATISFACTORY?**

A. Covad claims that Qwest is not meeting its performance objectives for provisioning of line shared loops.[46] This is simply untrue. Since July 2001, each month Qwest has provisioned over 99% of such shared loops in Washington on time. *Id*. at 166 and 168, OP-3A, OP-3C. Similarly, the average installation interval has been at or below the 3.3 day benchmark in each month as well. *Id*. at 168, OP-4C. The only other line sharing provisioning measurement that has a performance objective is new installation quality. *Id*. at 169, OP-5. For new installation quality, Qwest consistently provides CLECs with over 98% of line shared loops without trouble; this far exceeds comparable retail performance. Thus, the basis for Covad's

[46] Covad Comments at page 19.

allegations are less than clear. Qwest is performing exceedingly well on provisioning line shared loops.

**Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO COVAD' ALLEGATIONS THAT QWEST'S REPAIR PERFORMANCE FOR LINE SHARING IS UNSATISFACTORY?**

A. Of the line sharing repair measurements with performance objectives, during March 2001 through February 2002, Qwest failed to meet the ROC determined performance objective for one measurement: the mean time to restore reported troubles for repairs that do not require a technician dispatch (MR-6C). Qwest failed to meet this objective in January and February. *Id*. at 176, MR-4C, MR-6C.

Line-sharing is a unique service, as both voice and data are on the same circuit. As such, it is commonplace and expected to receive a higher percentage of trouble reports than for POTS alone, and many of these troubles are for ***other than*** an out-of-service situation. That is exactly what the data bears out. In January, Qwest received 45 CLEC trouble reports for line-shared loops that did not require a technician dispatch. *Id*. at 176, MR-4C. Of those forty-five reports, only ten (22%) were for an out-of-service situation. In February, Qwest received 13 CLEC trouble reports for line-shared loops that did not require a technician dispatch. *Id*. None of those 13 reports were for an out-of-service situation. For the retail comparable, however, (which is an aggregate of residential and business POTS) 44% of the troubles reported in January and February were out-of-service situations. *Id*. Out-

of-service situations, have a higher priority in the repair queue than a non-out-of-service situation. Thus, from the outset a much higher percentage of retail orders have a higher priority. It is not surprising, therefore, that the mean time to restore is shorter for retail than for wholesale. However, it is important to note that Qwest still cleared these CLEC troubles in an average of twelve hours, twenty-seven minutes in January and eleven hours, nineteen minutes in February, better than the 24-hour objective to clear out of service troubles. *Id*., MR-6C.

Similarly, line-shared loop repairs are more complex. For retail POTS, Qwest knows the troubles are its responsibility to fix. For line-sharing loops, however, the CLEC is responsible to make data repairs, and Qwest is responsible for voice repairs. Thus, it is more complex to identify and clear troubles on line-shared loops. Qwest cleared 43 of 45 (95.56%) CLEC trouble reports within 48 hours when there was no dispatch required in January and 13 of 13 (100%) in February. *Id*. at 176, MR-4C. This performance is exceedingly strong by any objective measure.

## VI. CONCLUSION

**Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.**

A. The attached performance data shows that over the last four months, Qwest has consistently provided CLECs with outstanding performance across all checklist

items. Qwest is offering CLECs a meaningful opportunity to compete in the marketplace in Washington today. In the very near term, Qwest expects to ask the Commission to formally recommend 271 approval to the FCC.

**Q. DOES THAT CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

A. Yes, it does.