Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Joint Application by SBC Communications	)	
Inc., Illinois Bell Telephone Company,	)	WC Docket No. 03 - 167
Indiana Bell Telephone Company	)	
Incorporated, the Ohio Bell Telephone	)	
Company, Wisconsin Bell, Inc., and	)	
Southwestern Bell Communications Services,	)	
Inc. for Authorization To Provide In-Region,	)	
InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio,	)	
and Wisconsin	)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Adopted: October 14, 2003 **Released: October 15, 2003**

By the Commission: Commissioners Copps, Martin and Adelstein issuing separate statements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On July 17, 2003, SBC Communications Inc., and its subsidiaries, Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Indiana Bell Telephone Company Incorporated, the Ohio Bell Telephone Company, Wisconsin Bell, Inc., and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. (collectively, SBC or applicant) jointly filed this multi-state application pursuant to section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended,[1] for authority to provide in-region, interLATA services originating in the states of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin.[2] We grant SBC's application in this Order based on our conclusion that SBC has taken the statutorily required

[1] We refer to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and other statutes, as the Communications Act or the Act. *See* 47 U.S.C. §§ 151 *et seq*. We refer to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as the 1996 Act. *See* Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).

[2] *See Application of SBC, Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin,*, WC Docket No. 03-167 (filed July 17, 2003) (SBC Application).

steps to open its local exchange markets in these states to competition.

2. We note that the outstanding work of the state commissions in conjunction with SBC's extensive efforts to open its local exchange markets has resulted in competitive entry in each of these states. As of May 2003, SBC estimates competitive local exchange carriers (LECs) were serving at least 2.3 million access lines in Illinois, or 29% of all access lines in Illinois;[3] at least 393,000 access lines in Indiana, or 15% of all access lines in Indiana;[4] at least 885,000 access lines in Ohio, or 20% of all access lines in Ohio;[5] and at least 633,000 access lines in Wisconsin, or 25% of all access lines in Wisconsin.[6] These figures include approximately 319,000 UNE loops and 779,000 UNE-platform lines in Illinois,[7] 53,000 UNE loops and 157,000 UNE platform lines in Indiana,[8] 125,000 UNE loops and 547,000 UNE-platform lines in Ohio,[9] and 229,000 UNE loops and 146,000 UNE-platform lines in Wisconsin.[10]

3. We wish to acknowledge the Illinois Commerce Commission (Illinois Commission), the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (Indiana Commission), the Public Utility Commission of Ohio (Ohio Commission), and the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin (Wisconsin Commission) for their considerable effort and dedication in overseeing SBC's implementation of the requirements of section 271 of the Act. By diligently and actively conducting proceedings to set UNE prices, to implement performance measures, to develop Performance Remedy Plans (PRPs), and to evaluate SBC's compliance with section 271, these state commissions laid the necessary foundation for our review of this application.

II. BACKGROUND

4. In the 1996 amendments to the Communications Act, Congress required that the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) demonstrate compliance with certain market-opening requirements contained in section 271 of the Act before providing in-region, interLATA long

---

[3] SBC Application App. A, Vol. 9, Tab 24, Affidavit of Deborah O. Heritage Regarding Illinois (SBC Heritage Illinois Aff.) at para. 4.

[4] SBC Application App. A, Vol. 9, Tab 25, Affidavit of Deborah O. Heritage Regarding Indiana (SBC Heritage Indiana Aff.) at para. 4.

[5] SBC Application App. A, Vol. 9, Tab 26, Affidavit of Deborah O. Heritage Regarding Ohio (SBC Heritage Ohio Aff.) at para. 4.

[6] SBC Application App. A, Vol. 9, Tab 27, Affidavit of Deborah O. Heritage Regarding Wisconsin (SBC Heritage Wisconsin Aff.) at para. 4.

[7] SBC Heritage Illinois Aff. at para. 6.

[8] SBC Heritage Indiana Aff. at para. 6.

[9] SBC Heritage Ohio Aff. at para. 6.

[10] SBC Heritage Wisconsin Aff. at para. 6.

distance service.[11] Congress provided for Commission review of BOC applications to provide such service in consultation with the relevant state commissions and the U.S. Attorney General.[12] In our examination of this application, we rely heavily on the work completed by the state commissions. We summarize the individual state proceedings below.

5. *Illinois.* On October 24, 2001, the Illinois Commission issued an order initiating a proceeding to investigate the status of SBC's compliance with section 271 of the Act, to hold hearings, and to develop a comprehensive factual record for purposes of its anticipated consultation with this Commission.[13] The Illinois Commission conducted a number of workshops open to all participants that identified and refined relevant issues including those related to Track A, the 14-point checklist, and the public interest.[14] On May 13, 2003, the Illinois Commission issued a final order finding that SBC's application was in the public interest and that SBC met the 14-point checklist and the Track A requirements in Illinois.[15]

6. *Indiana.* On February 2, 2000, SBC formally requested that the Indiana Commission commence a process to review its application to provide long distance services in Indiana.[16] SBC requested that the Indiana Commission review checklist compliance separate from overseeing the testing of the operational support system (OSS) and performance measures.

---

[11] *See* 47 U.S.C. § 271.

[12] 47 U.S.C. §§ 271(d)(2)(A), (B). The Commission has summarized the relevant statutory framework in prior orders. *See, e.g.*, *Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Tel. Co., and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Kansas and Oklahoma*, CC Docket No. 00-217, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 6237, 6241-42, paras. 7-10 (2001) (*SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*), *aff'd in part, remanded in part sub nom. Sprint Communications Co. v. FCC*, 274 F.3d 549 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (*Sprint v. FCC*); *Application by SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Tel. Co. and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Texas*, CC Docket No. 00-65, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 15 FCC Rcd 18354, 18359-61, paras. 8-11 (2000) (*SWBT Texas Order*).

[13] *Illinois Commerce Commission On its Own Motion, Investigation Concerning Illinois Bell Telephone Company's Compliance with Section 271of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* ICC Docket No. 01-0662, Order Initiating Investigation (Illinois Commission October 24, 2001) (*Illinois Section 271 Proceeding Initiating Order*).

[14] SBC Application at 3-6; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 11, Tab 29, Affidavit of Rhonda J. Johnson (SBC Johnson Aff.) at paras. 12-23. As we discuss below, we find that SBC has satisfied the requirements of Track A. *See* para. 13, *infra*.

[15] *Illinois Commerce Commission On its Own Motion, Investigation Concerning Illinois Bell Telephone Company's Compliance with Section 271of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* ICC Docket No. 01-0662, Order on Investigation (Illinois Commission May 13, 2003) (*Illinois Section 271 Order*).

[16] *Petition of Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Incorporated, D/B/A Ameritech Indiana or SBC Indiana Pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-61 for a Three Phase Process for Commission Review of Various Submissions of SBC Indiana to Show Compliance with Section 271(c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* Cause No. 41657, Petition (filed with Indiana Commission February 2, 2000) (*SBC Indiana Petition*).

On March 19, 2001, the Indiana Commission issued an order authorizing the OSS test.[17] The Indiana Commission ensured the process was open to participation by all interested parties and held numerous and lengthy workshops between SBC and the competitive LECs to discuss, among other things, OSS enhancements, performance measures, and checklist items.[18] On July 2, 2003, the Indiana Commission issued an order indicating that it would support SBC's application, subject to the filing of compliance plans developed in Michigan and subsequently filed in Illinois.[19] On August 6, 2003, the Indiana Commission filed comments in this proceeding, which concluded that SBC is largely in compliance with the section 271 requirements. The Indiana Commission did, however, defer to this Commission the ultimate determination of whether local markets have been fully and irreversibly open to competition, and whether SBC has demonstrated sufficient accuracy of its systems data and wholesale billing reliability.[20]

7. *Ohio.* On June 1, 2000, the Ohio Commission initiated a proceeding to review SBC's section 271 application for Ohio.[21] The Ohio Commission held numerous and detailed collaborative workshops between SBC and the competitive LECs focused on OSS enhancements, development and supervision of OSS tests, performance measurements, and checklist items including UNE combinations.[22] On June 26, 2003, the Ohio Commission issued an order concluding that SBC has opened the local markets in Ohio to competition and has satisfied all the requirements for section 271 approval.[23]

8. *Wisconsin.* On September 14, 2001, the Wisconsin Commission issued a notice

---

[17] *Petition of Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Incorporated, D/B/A Ameritech Indiana or SBC Indiana Pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-61 for a Three Phase Process for Commission Review of Various Submissions of SBC Indiana to Show Compliance with Section 271(c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Cause No. 41657, Order (Indiana Commission March 19, 2001) (*Indiana OSS Order*).

[18] SBC Application at 6-7; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 1, Tab 8, Affidavit of Jolynn B. Butler (SBC Butler Aff.) at paras. 9-24.

[19] *Petition of Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Incorporated, D/B/A Ameritech Indiana or SBC Indiana Pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-61 for a Three Phase Process for Commission Review of Various Submissions of SBC Indiana to Show Compliance with Section 271(c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* Cause No. 41657, Compliance Order (Indiana Commission July 2, 2003) (*Indiana Compliance Order*).

[20] Indiana Commission Comments at 1-2.

[21] *Investigation into SBC Ohio's Entry into In-Region InterLATA Service Under Section 271 of the Telecommunication Act of 1996*, Case No. 00-942-TP-COL, Order (Ohio Commission June 1, 2000).

[22] SBC Application at 7-11; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 11, Tab 32, Affidavit of Daniel R. McKenzie (SBC McKenzie Aff.) at paras. 9-20.

[23] *Investigation into SBC Ohio's Entry into In-Region InterLATA Service Under Section 271 of the Telecommunication Act of 1996*, Case No. 00-942-TP-COL, Order (Ohio Commission June 26, 2003) (*Ohio Commission 271 Order*).

opening the section 271 docket in Wisconsin.[24] Interested parties conducted technical hearings and participated in a number of collaborative workshops to resolve some of the outstanding issues.[25] The Wisconsin Commission issued two separate orders. On July 1, 2003, it issued a "Phase I" order concluding that SBC had satisfied Track A and each of the fourteen checklist items in Wisconsin subject to its determinations in its "Phase II" proceeding.[26] On July 7, 2003, it issued a "Phase II" order concluding that SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to OSS in Wisconsin and that it provides unbundled network elements (UNEs) at TELRIC-based rates in Wisconsin.[27]

9. On July 17, 2003, SBC filed the instant application. Comments were filed with the Commission on August 6, 2003 and reply comments were filed on August 29, 2003. The Department of Justice filed an evaluation on August 26, 2003, expressing concerns about SBC's wholesale billing, manual handling of orders, line splitting, pricing, and data reliability.[28] According to the Department of Justice, billing accuracy problems continue to persist that were noted in the Michigan proceeding.[29] Regarding manual handling of orders, the Department of Justice notes that, because of software problems, competitive LECs often must rely on manual processes instead of SBC's normal mechanized interfaces to handle orders. It questions the adequacy of SBC's pre-release testing and defect resolution processes.[30] Moreover, the Department of Justice still questions, as it did in the Michigan proceeding, whether SBC's current processes provide nondiscriminatory access to line splitting and UNE-platform services.[31] The Department of Justice also questions whether SBC may be implementing state commission-ordered TELRIC rates in a way that violates our rules and the Act.[32] Finally, the Department of Justice notes that "the Commission should ensure that the current performance metrics are reliable, and that a stable and reliable reporting system will be in place to help ensure

---

[24] *Petition of Wisconsin Bell, Inc. for a Section 271 Checklist Proceeding*, 6720-TI-170, Notice of Proceeding and Investigation and Assessment of Costs and Technical Hearing (Wisconsin Commission September 14, 2001).

[25] SBC Application at 11-12; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 11, Tab 40, Affidavit of Scott T. Vandersanden (SBC Vandersanden Aff.) at paras. 13-23.

[26] *Petition of Wisconsin Bell, Inc. for a Section 271 Checklist Proceeding*, 6720-TI-170, Determination Phase I (Wisconsin Commission July 1, 2003) (*Wisconsin Commission Phase I Order*).

[27] *Petition of Wisconsin Bell, Inc. for a Section 271 Checklist Proceeding*, 6720-TI-170, Determination Phase II (Wisconsin Commission July 7, 2003) (*Wisconsin Commission Phase II Order*).

[28] Department of Justice Evaluation at 2.

[29] *Id*. at 9.

[30] *Id*. at 15-16.

[31] *Id.* at 16.

[32] *Id*. at 17.

that these local markets remain open after SBC's application is ultimately granted."[33] As a result, the Department of Justice states that it "is not in a position to support this application based on the current record," but states that the Commission may "be able to satisfy itself regarding these [issues] prior to the conclusion of its review."[34]

A. Compliance With Unbundling Rules

10. One part of the required showing, as explained in more detail below, is that the applicant satisfies the Commission's rules governing UNEs.[35] In the *UNE Remand* and *Line Sharing Orders*, the Commission established a list of UNEs that incumbent LECs were obliged to provide: (1) local loops and subloops; (2) network interface devices; (3) switching capability; (4) interoffice transmission facilities; (5) signaling networks and call-related databases; (6) OSS; and (7) the high frequency portion of the loop.[36] The D.C. Circuit vacated these orders and instructed the Commission to reevaluate the network elements subject to the unbundling requirement.[37] The court's mandate was stayed first until January 3, 2003, and then until February 20, 2003. On February 20, 2003, we adopted new unbundling rules as part of our *Triennial Review* proceeding, which became effective on October 2, 2003.[38]

11. Although the former unbundling rules were not in force at the time SBC filed its application in this proceeding, SBC states that it continues to provide nondiscriminatory access

---

[33] *Id*. at 19.

[34] *Id.* at 20.

[35] In order to comply with the requirements or checklist item 2, a BOC must show that it is offering "[n]ondiscriminatory access to network elements in accordance with the requirements of section 251(c)(3)." 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ii).

[36] *See* 47 C.F.R. § 51.319*; Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, CC Docket No. 96-98, Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 15 FCC Rcd 3696 (1999) (*UNE Remand Order*); *Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability; Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* CC Docket Nos. 98-147, 96-98, Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 98-147 and Fourth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98, 14 FCC Rcd 20912 (1999) (*Line Sharing Order*).

[37] *See United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC*, 290 F.3d 415 (D.C. Cir. 2002), *cert. denied sub nom. WorldCom, Inc. v. United States Telecom Ass'n*, 123 S.Ct. 1571 (2003 Mem.).

[38] *See FCC Adopts New Rules For Network Unbundling Obligations Of Incumbent Local Phone Carriers*, News Release (rel. Feb. 20, 2003) (announcing adoption of an Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 01-338, *Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*) (*Triennial Review News Release*); *Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability*, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, 98-147, Report and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 03-36 (rel. Aug. 21, 2003) (*Triennial Review Order*); *Effective Date for New Rules and Comment and Reply Comment Dates*, Public Notice, DA 03-2778 (WCB rel. Sept. 2, 2003) (*Triennial Review Public Notice*).

to these network elements.[39] As the Commission found in the *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, we believe that using the network elements identified in the former unbundling rules as a standard in evaluating SBC's application, filed during the interim period between the time the rules were vacated by the D.C. Circuit and the effective date of the new rules, is a reasonable way to ensure that the application complies with the checklist requirements.[40] We find it significant that no commenter disputes that SBC should be required to demonstrate that it provides these network elements in a nondiscriminatory way. Accordingly, for the purposes of this application, we will evaluate whether SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to the network elements identified under the former unbundling rules. We emphasize that, on an ongoing basis, SBC must comply with all of the Commission's rules implementing the requirements of sections 251 and 252 upon the dates specified by those rules.[41]

III. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 271(C)(1)(A)

12. In order for the Commission to approve a BOC's application to provide in-region, interLATA services, a BOC must first demonstrate that it satisfies the requirements of either section 271(c)(1)(A) (Track A) or 271(c)(1)(B) (Track B).[42] To meet the requirements of Track A, a BOC must have interconnection agreements with one or more competing providers of "telephone exchange service . . . to residential and business subscribers."[43] The Act states that "such telephone service may be offered . . . either exclusively over [the competitor's] own telephone exchange service facilities or predominantly over [the competitor's] own telephone exchange facilities in combination with the resale of the telecommunications services of another carrier."[44] The Commission has further held that a BOC must show that at least one "competing

---

[39] *See* SBC Application at 39, 42-43, 92-93, 95. Consistent with the *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, we will not require SBC to demonstrate compliance with rules that were not in effect at the time the application was filed. *See 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*, CC Docket No. 99-295, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 15 FCC Rcd 3953, 3967, para. 31 (1999) (*Bell Atlantic New York Order*), *aff'd*, *AT&T Corp v. FCC*, 220 F.3d 607 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

[40] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3966-67, para. 30. A similar procedural situation was presented in the *Bell Atlantic New York* proceeding. Bell Atlantic filed its application for section 271 authorization in New York after the unbundling rules had been vacated but before the *UNE Remand Order* had taken effect and, thus, at a time when no binding unbundling rules were in effect. Bell Atlantic suggested, and the Commission agreed, that it would be reasonable for the Commission to use the original seven network elements identified in the former unbundling rules in evaluating compliance with checklist item 2 for the application. *See id.* at 3966-67, paras. 29-31.

[41] *See SWBT Texas Order,* 15 FCC Rcd at 18368, para. 29; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3967, para. 31.

[42] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(A).

[43] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(1)(A).

[44] *Id.*

provider" constitutes "an actual commercial alternative to the BOC,"[45] which a BOC can do by demonstrating that the provider serves "more than a *de minimis* number" of subscribers.[46]

13. We conclude that SBC satisfies the requirements of Track A in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin. No party challenges SBC's compliance with section 271(c)(1)(A) for any of the four states in the instant application. The Illinois Commission concluded that SBC satisfies Track A for Illinois[47] and reports a growing competitive LEC market share in Illinois and expects this competitive LEC market share to increase in the future.[48] The Indiana Commission concluded that SBC satisfies Track A for Indiana while expressing some legal concerns.[49] The Ohio Commission concluded that SBC satisfies Track A requirements in Ohio[50] and the Wisconsin Commission concluded that SBC satisfies Track A for Wisconsin.[51]

14. In Illinois, SBC relies on interconnection agreements with AT&T, Focal Communications, McLeodUSA and MCI.[52] Specifically, the record demonstrates that AT&T, Focal Communications, McLeodUSA and MCI each provides service to more than a *de minimis* number of residential and business customers over their own facilities, or through the use of UNEs.[53] Each of these carriers represents an "actual facilities-based competitive alternative" to

---

[45] *Application by Qwest Communications International Inc., for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Minnesota*, WC Docket No. 03-90, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 13323, 13355, para. 60 (2003) (*Qwest Minnesota Order)*; *Application by SBC Communications Inc., Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Oklahoma*, CC Docket No. 97-121, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 12 FCC Rcd 8685, 8695, para. 14 (1997) (*SWBT Oklahoma Order*).

[46] *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6357, para. 42; *see also Application of Ameritech Michigan Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Michigan,* CC Docket No. 97-137, Memorandum Opinion and Order*,* 12 FCC Rcd 20543, 20585, para. 78 (1997) (*Ameritech Michigan Order*).

[47] Illinois Commission Comments at 25.

[48] *Annual Report on Telecommunications Markets in Illinois*, Illinois Commerce Commission, May 28, 2003. SBC Heritage Illinois Aff., Attach. I at 34-5. The Illinois Commission reports a total of 45 competitive LECs constitute approximately 19.5% of Illinois retail POTS service as of year-end 2002. *Id.* at 12.

[49] Indiana Commission Comments at 3-4. Referring to certain pending court challenges in Indiana, the Indiana Commission modified its determination that SBC satisfied Track A requirements "to the extent the FCC determines that the uncertainty caused by SBC's challenges to our legal authority to order it to file a UNE tariff does not constitute or cause a lack of 'concrete and specific obligation [by SBC] to furnish the item upon request pursuant to state-approved interconnection agreements that set forth prices and other terms and conditions for each checklist item.'" Such legal challenges are addressed in the Pricing section. See para. 49 *infra*.

[50] Ohio Commission Comments, Attach. at 23.

[51] Wisconsin Commission Comments at 1; SBC Application, App. C-WI, Vol. 12, Tab 66 at 21-22.

[52] SBC Heritage Illinois Aff. at para. 5-13.

SBC in Illinois.

15. In Indiana, SBC relies on interconnection agreements with AT&T, Choice One Communications, McLeodUSA, SIGECOM LLC, and MCI.[54] Specifically, the record demonstrates that AT&T, Choice One Communications, McLeodUSA, SIGECOM LLC, and MCI each provides service to more than a *de minimis* number of residential and business customers over their own facilities, or through the use of UNEs.[55] Each of these carriers represents an "actual facilities-based competitive alternative" to SBC in Indiana.

16. In Ohio, SBC relies on interconnection agreements with AT&T, Choice One Communications, CoreComm, and MCI.[56] Specifically, the record demonstrates that AT&T, Choice One Communications, CoreComm, and MCI each provides service to more than a *de minimis* number of residential and business customers over their own facilities, or through the use of UNEs.[57] Each of these carriers represents an "actual facilities-based competitive alternative" to SBC in Ohio.

17. In Wisconsin, SBC relies on interconnection agreements with AT&T, Choice One Communications, McLeodUSA, TDS Metrocom, and MCI.[58] Specifically, the record demonstrates that AT&T, Choice One Communications, McLeodUSA, TDS Metrocom, and MCI each provides service to more than a *de minimis* number of residential and business customers over their own facilities, or through the use of UNEs.[59] Each of these carriers represents an "actual facilities-based competitive alternative" to SBC in Wisconsin.

IV. PRIMARY ISSUES IN DISPUTE

18. As in recent section 271 orders, we will not repeat here the analytical framework and particular legal showing required to establish compliance with every checklist item. Rather,

(Continued from previous page)

[53] SBC Heritage Illinois Aff., Attach. E (citing confidential portion). SBC estimates that competitive LECs provide between 29% and 30% of total access lines in Illinois. *Id*. at para. 4.

[54] SBC Heritage Indiana Aff. at para. 5-15.

[55] SBC Heritage Indiana Aff., Attach. E (citing confidential portion). SBC estimates competitive LECs provide between 15% and 21% of access lines in Indiana. *Id*. at para. 4.

[56] SBC Heritage Ohio Aff. at para. 5-14.

[57] SBC Heritage Ohio Aff., Attach. E (citing confidential portion). SBC estimates that competitive LECs provide between 20 % and 29% of local services access lines in Ohio. *Id.* at para. 4.

[58] SBC Heritage Wisconsin Aff. at para. 5-14.

[59] *Id*., Attach. E (citing confidential portion). SBC estimates that competitive LEC market share is approximately 25% as of May 2003. *Id*. at para. 2.

we rely upon the legal and analytical precedent established in prior section 271 orders,[60] and we attach comprehensive appendices containing performance data and the statutory framework for approving section 271 applications.[61] Our conclusions in this Order are based on performance data as reported in carrier-to-carrier reports reflecting service in the period from March 2003 through July 2003.

19. We focus here on the issues in controversy in the record. Accordingly, we begin by addressing SBC's compliance with checklist item one, which analyzes SBC's provision of interconnection at just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory prices, and checklist item two, which addresses both the accuracy and reliability of SBC's performance data and access to unbundled network elements at just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms and prices. We also extensively address issues regarding checklist item four, which evaluates access to unbundled local loops. Next, we address the following checklist items: checklist item seven (911 and E911 services), checklist item ten (signaling) and checklist item thirteen (reciprocal compensation). The remaining checklist requirements are discussed briefly, as they received little or no attention from commenting parties, and our own review of the record leads us to conclude that SBC has satisfied these requirements. Finally, we discuss section 272 and the public interest requirements, which include issues regarding SBC's performance remedy plans in the four states.

A. Checklist Item 1 – Interconnection

20. Checklist item one requires a BOC to provide "interconnection in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(2) and 252(d)(1)."[62] Section 251(c)(2) requires incumbent LECs to provide interconnection "at any technically feasible point within the carrier's network . . . on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory."[63] Section 252(d)(1) requires state determinations regarding the rates, terms, and conditions of interconnection to be based on cost and to be nondiscriminatory, and allows the rates to include a reasonable profit.[64]

---

[60] *Application by SBC Communications Inc., Michigan Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Michigan*, WC Docket No. 03-138, FCC 03-228, Memorandum Opinion and Order (rel. Sept. 17, 2003) (*SBC Michigan II Order*); *Qwest Minnesota Order,* 18 FCC Rcd at 13328, para. 10; *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6241-42, paras. 7-10; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18359-61, paras. 8-11; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3961-63, paras. 17-20; *see also* App. F (Statutory Requirements).

[61] *See generally* Appendices B (Illinois Performance Data), C (Indiana Performance Data), D (Ohio Performance Data), E (Wisconsin Performance Data), and F (Statutory Requirements).

[62] 47 U.S.C. § 252(c)(2)(B)(i).

[63] *Id.* § 251(c)(2).

[64] *Id.* § 252(d)(1).

21. Based upon the evidence in the record, we find that SBC offers interconnection in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin to other telecommunications carriers at just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory rates in compliance with checklist item one.

22. *Background.* Commenters contend that in Indiana and Ohio,[65] SBC improperly charges for the number of amps fused, rather than the number of amps actually requested and used by competitive LECs.[66] AT&T argues that SBC's power collocation charges are based wrongfully on the full amount of potential (fused and non-fused) power that can be delivered.[67] AT&T argues that SBC's method of billing for power results in overcharging and bears no relation to the actual power provided to competitive LECs or to the costs incurred by SBC in providing power.[68] Although AT&T does not contest the underlying state-approved power consumption rates charged by SBC, AT&T argues that SBC's power collocation pricing structure and billing practices violate TELRIC's cost causation requirements.[69] While AT&T's analysis of SBC's collocation power charges is limited to Ohio, where AT&T and other competitive LECs raised this issue before the Ohio Commission during the section 271 proceeding, AT&T asserts that SBC's collocation power charges are in violation of TELRIC principles in Indiana as well.[70]

23. NuVox maintains that SBC's assessment of collocation power recurring charges in Indiana and Ohio violate the interconnection agreement between the two companies.[71] NuVox argues that SBC charges NuVox for the total amount of fused power that could be delivered over all feeds, regardless of whether NuVox uses this much power.[72] NuVox explains that collocators

---

[65] No party raises this issue with respect to Illinois, where the Illinois Commission has required SBC to meter power usage. We discuss commenters' claims regarding Wisconsin below.

[66] *See* AT&T Comments at 49-51; AT&T Reply at 44-46; NuVox Comments at 3-4. SBC's charges for power in Illinois are not being contested. *See* NuVox Comments at 3 n.6 (explaining that the Illinois Commission requires SBC to bill for power on a usage basis).

[67] AT&T Comments at 49-51.

[68] AT&T Comments at 49-50; AT&T Reply at 44-45.

[69] AT&T Reply at 44. AT&T, in its comments, focused primarily on SBC's recurring power charges for collocation spaces in Ohio, where AT&T raised this issue before the Ohio Commission. *See* AT&T Comments at 49.

[70] AT&T Comments at 49. *See generally*, AT&T Comments, Declaration of Danial Noorani (setting out AT&T's more detailed argument against SBC's recurring collocation power charges in Ohio and analogizing SBC's policy to that of a residential power company charging a residential customer for the amount of power the customer would draw if the customer ran every appliance in the home 24 hours a day and then doubling that amount to account for backup power).

[71] NuVox Comments at 2-3. NuVox does not challenge the state commission-approved collocation power recurring rates, but rather SBC's application of the charges. NuVox Comments at 4.

[72] NuVox Comments at 4-8.

order dual feeds, a primary "A" feed and a secondary "B" feed, to provide redundancy for the continuous flow of power to the collocation arrangement should one feed fail.[73] Both feeds must be capable of carrying the entire amount of power required to operate the collocation arrangement, i.e., each feed must be fused at a higher number of amps than it would normally carry if both feeds were functional. NuVox alleges that SBC wrongfully assesses monthly recurring power consumption charges for the total number of fused amps capable of being carried on both the primary and secondary feeds.[74] NuVox also claims that SBC wrongfully assesses monthly recurring power consumption charges for the total potential amount of fused capacity of feeds that are installed for future growth but which presently are not fused and over which no power currently flows.[75] NuVox asserts, as an example of the wrongful charging, at one collocation arrangement it is charged by SBC on a monthly basis for the consumption of a total 600 amps of fused power at a cost of approximately $3,600 per month, even though NuVox's actual peak usage is on average in the 5 to 15 amp range per such collocation arrangement, with the highest power demand for any single collocation at 21 amps.[76] NuVox argues that SBC has no justification for applying a monthly recurring power consumption charge to more than 50 percent of the sum of the fused amps, and that there should be no recurring charge at all for power leads that are not fused.[77] NuVox asserts that SBC effectively is unilaterally amending the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement, and billing procedures agreed upon by the parties in their interconnection agreements between the parties in Indiana and Ohio, and SBC therefore fails to provide interconnection to NuVox on a just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory basis, in accordance with the agreement between the companies.[78] NuVox currently is engaged in dispute resolution discussions with SBC before both the Indiana and Ohio Commissions regarding SBC's charges for collocation power.[79]

---

[73] NuVox Comments at 4.

[74] NuVox Comments at 4-6.

[75] NuVox Comments at 4-6.

[76] NuVox Comments at 6.

[77] *See* NuVox Comments at 11-13 (setting out NuVox's claim that it is limited to using 50 percent of the fused capacity of individual power feeds); Letter from Ross A. Buntrock, Legal Counsel for NuVox, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167, Attach. Koker Testimony at 16 (filed Aug. 29, 2003) (NuVox August 29 *Ex Parte* Letter) (wherein a NuVox vice president specifically recommends, as an alternative fair price, that the SBC power consumption charge be applied to 50 percent of the total fused amps); Letter from Ross A. Buntrock, Legal Counsel for NuVox, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 at 2-6 (filed Sept. 23, 2003) (NuVox September 23 *Ex Parte* Letter) (providing additional analysis as to industry practices regarding the purposes of redundant power leads and an explanation as to why there is a 50 percent limitation on the maximum load of total amps associated with dual power leads, and arguing the lack of justification for recurring charges being applied against non-fused leads).

[78] NuVox Comments at 9.

[79] *Id.* at 6. AT&T has petitioned to intervene in both the Ohio and Indiana proceedings.

24. SBC states that it charges competitive LEC collocators on a recurring monthly basis for power based on capacity ordered rather than for power actually consumed, even though competitive LECs may ultimately use less than the full amperage ordered.[80] SBC justifies this practice by arguing that it must recover costs associated with sizing and maintaining its DC power plant at the level necessary to provide the total power capacity (fused and non-fused) competitive LECs have ordered.[81] SBC argues that its monthly recurring power charge is intended to recover collocators' proportional cost of the DC power plant and AC power requirements, along with associated heating, ventilation and air conditioning charges.[82] SBC also states, however, that the cost studies underlying the rates at issue do not include costs associated with the power plant (for rectifiers, batteries, and back-up generation).[83] SBC argues that, if it were unable to provide the full power capacity ordered by a collocator upon demand, it would be subject to potential claims of breach of the obligations it must meet pursuant to its interconnection agreements and/or tariffs.[84] SBC maintains that the delivery of power from a DC power plant is not analogous to a commercial AC power delivery system that services residential customers. SBC argues that a DC power delivery system does not have the advantage of projecting rates based on historical and industry capacity data as do AC power utility systems. Instead, SBC asserts that a DC power system must be designed to provide the load requirements specifically set out in the collocation orders arranged with SBC.[85] SBC also argues that to permit competitive LECs to order as much power as they wish but pay only for power consumed could result in SBC incurring power plant expenses that could not be recovered unless rates and underlying rate cost studies are revised to address such changes.[86] Ultimately, SBC argues that the dispute between it and the competitive LECs is fact-intensive and not properly before the Commission because this is a matter of intercarrier disputes regarding billing that are pending before both the Indiana and Ohio Commissions.[87]

---

[80] SBC Reply at 45. *See generally* SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 1a, Tab 1, Reply Affidavit of Scott Alexander (SBC Alexander Reply Aff.) at paras. 1-37.

[81] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 10; *see also* at paras. 34-37 (regarding SBC billing for non-fused power lines).

[82] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 20.

[83] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 22.

[84] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 10.

[85] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at paras. 11-12.

[86] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at paras. 11-12.

[87] SBC Reply at 46 (citing *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, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 17419, 17478, para. 108 (2001) (*Verizon Pennsylvania Order*), and *Application of Verizon New England Inc., Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc. (d/b/a Verizon Long Distance), NYNEX Long Distance Company (d/b/a Verizon Enterprise Solutions) And Verizon Global Networks Inc., For Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA* (continued….)

25. During the pendency of this section 271 application, SBC has made available to competitive LECs in Indiana and Ohio revised collocation power recurring rates pursuant to an Accessible Letter offering an interconnection agreement amendment.[88] Specifically, if a competitive LEC in Indiana or Ohio warrants that it will not draw more than 50 percent of the combined ordered capacity of the leads that are fused for a collocation arrangement, SBC will bill the competitive LEC for DC collocation power at a monthly recurring rate of $9.68 applied to 50 percent of the ordered amps.[89] This rate is based on the recurring power rate in Michigan, reduced to account for certain charges that are recovered through non-recurring charges (NRCs) in Indiana and Ohio.[90] SBC also notified competitive LECs that, as of April 1, 2003, SBC has applied an engineering policy of fusing competitive LEC DC power feeds at 125 percent of the capacity requested by the competitive LEC.[91]

26. *Complete-As-Filed Waiver.* We waive the complete-as-filed requirement on our own motion pursuant to section 1.3 of the Commission's rules to the limited extent necessary to consider SBC's revised collocation power rates and practices.[92] The Commission maintains certain procedural requirements governing section 271 applications.[93] In particular, the "complete-as-filed" requirement provides that when an applicant files new information after the comment date, the Commission reserves the right to start the 90-day review period again or to accord such information no weight in determining section 271 compliance.[94] We maintain this requirement to afford interested parties a fair opportunity to comment on the BOC's application, to ensure that the Attorney General and the state commission can fulfill their statutory

(Continued from previous page)
Services in Massachusetts, CC Docket No. 01-9, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 8988, 9100-9102, paras. 200-203 (2001) (*Verizon Massachusetts Order*). SBC notes that the Ohio Commission has confirmed the validity of SBC's collocation power billing practice. *See* Ohio Commission Comments at 48 (wherein the Ohio Commission notes its reaffirmation of a two-rate element for power including a nonrecurring charge for power delivery per power lead and a recurring charge for power consumption per fuse amp).

88 Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg, Legal Counsel for SBC, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 (Sept. 29, 2003) (SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter).

89 SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter at 1.

90 SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter at 1.

91 SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2, Attach. B.

92 47 C.F.R. § 1.3.

93 *Updated Filing Requirements for Bell Operating Company Applications Under Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, 16 FCC Rcd 6923 (Com. Car. Bur. 2001) (*Updated 271 Filing Requirements Public Notice*).

94 *Application by Verizon New England Inc., Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc. (d/b/a Verizon Long Distance), NYNEX Long Distance Company (d/b/a Verizon Enterprise Solutions), Verizon Global Networks Inc., and Verizon Select Services Inc., for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Rhode Island*, CC Docket No. 01-324, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 3300, 3306-06, para. 7 (2002) (*Verizon Rhode Island Order*); *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6247, para. 21.

consultative roles, and to afford the Commission adequate time to evaluate the record.[95] The Commission can waive its procedural rules, however, "if special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule and such deviation will serve the public interest."[96]

27. We find that a waiver is appropriate in these circumstances. SBC's offering of revised collocation power recurring charges and a revised method of applying those charges constitutes a change in its rates subsequent to the filing of its application.[97] In prior cases the Commission has found cause to grant a waiver of the complete-as-filed rule where the rate changes are responsive to criticisms on the record, as compared to new information that "consists of additional arguments or information" concerning current pricing.[98] The revisions made by SBC in this case satisfy this standard. The changes were responsive to arguments raised in the record of this proceeding, and the revisions provide a pro-competitive response to commenters' stated concerns.[99] The newly-available collocation power recurring charge is based on the rate approved by the Michigan Commission, which in turn was derived from AT&T's cost model.[100] SBC has agreed to apply the rate in a manner consistent with commenters' suggestions in this proceeding, i.e., to 50 percent of the combined ordered capacity of the leads that are fused for a collocation arrangement.[101] We find that it is fully consistent with our precedent under section 271 to consider the type of responsive information without requiring the BOC to make a new filing.

28. Another major concern that we have identified in prior cases where rates have changed during a proceeding is that interested parties be afforded a sufficient opportunity to

---

95 *Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3306, para. 7; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20572-73, paras. 52-54.

96 *Northeast Cellular Telephone Co. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d 1164, 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990); *WAIT Radio v. FCC*, 418 F.2d 1153 (D.C. Cir. 1969). *See also* 47 U.S.C. § 154(j); 47 C.F.R. § 1.3.

97 *See* SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter at 1-2 (describing the Accessible Letters sent to competitive LECs information them of SBC's offer to make available revised collocation power rates and its policy of fusing feeds at 125 percent of the ordered capacity).

98 *Verizon Rhode Island Order* 17 FCC Rcd at 3308-09, para. 12; *Application by Qwest Communications International , Inc. for Authorization to Provided In-Region, Inter-LATA Services in the States of Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming*, WC Docket No. 02-314, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 26303, 26409-10, para. 180 (2002) (*Qwest Nine State Order*).

99 *See* AT&T Comments at 49-51; NuVox Comments at 4-14.

100 *See* Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg, Counsel for SBC, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167, Attach. E Ex. 4 (confidential) (filed Sept. 22, 2003) (SBC Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter).

101 *See* NuVox Comments at 11-13 (arguing that SBC engineers its DC power distribution systems on the expectation that collocators will limit the power demand to 50 percent of the capacity of each feed in a dual feed pair).

review the new rates, and that the analytical burden of doing so is not too great in light of the time constraints inherent in the section 271 application process.[102] Although SBC did not provide notice of this rate change until day 74 of the 90-day statutory period, in prior cases we have considered rate reductions made later in the 90-day application cycle.[103] We also find no undue burden associated with analyzing the new rates. Parties were given notice of this filing and an opportunity to comment on it.[104] Additionally, the new offering is not based on a novel cost theory, as aspects of it are consistent with principles commenters argued should be applied to the rates at issue. Therefore, we find it appropriate to waive the complete-as-filed rule in this instance and consider SBC's revised collocation power submissions.

29. *Discussion.* Commenters in this proceeding argue that SBC's collocation power rates in Indiana and Ohio were developed on a consumption basis (i.e., the cost study underlying the rates was based on the costs incurred per amp consumed), but SBC improperly is applying the rates on a capacity basis (i.e., the rates are applied to the total potential power that could be drawn over all feeds). To comply with the just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory requirements of checklist item one, an applicant must apply its rates consistent with the manner in which the rates were developed. We note that the commenters have raised legitimate questions with respect to SBC's prior application of its collocation power recurring rates; however, we need not decide these issues in light of the revised collocation power rates and terms filed by SBC in its two Accessible Letters.

30. SBC provided notice to the competitive LECs in Indiana and Ohio through two Accessible Letters that a revised recurring collocation power rate and a 125 percent fusing factor are available.[105] The revised rate is based on the Michigan recurring collocation power rate, reduced to account for costs that are recovered through NRCs in Indiana and Ohio.[106] Although the rate of $9.68 is nominally higher than the current rates in Indiana ($6.09) and Ohio ($6.76),[107] SBC will apply the $9.68 rate on 50 percent of the combined ordered capacity of the leads that are fused for a collocation arrangement. Therefore, collocators that opt to amend their interconnection agreements to take this rate will not be assessed recurring charges for backup power or ordered feeds that are not fused. In addition, SBC has clarified that it now provides a

---

[102] *Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3308, paras. 10-11.

[103] *See, e.g., Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3306-10, paras. 8-17 (considering changes in rates filed on day 80 of the application).

[104] *Comments Requested in Connection with SBC's Pending Section 271 Applications*, Public Notice, DA 03-3003 (WCB rel. Sept. 30, 2003).

[105] SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter.

[106] SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter at 1.

[107] *See* SBC Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter at Attach. E, Ex. 1 at 1, and Ex. 2 at 1. SBC asserts that the $6.09 rate in Indiana is found in the NuVox interconnection agreement.

fusing factor of 125 percent above the capacity requested by a competitive LEC.[108] This allows competitive LECs ordering power on or after April 1, 2003 to reduce the amount of power requested by 20 percent.[109] Additionally, parties that ordered power under SBC's prior practice of requiring competitive LECs to order power at the fused level are able to revise these ordered amps to account for this fusing factor.[110] In response to SBC's filing of the Accessible Letters, NuVox states that it is in the process of resolving its collocation power billing disputes with SBC and NuVox withdraws its oppositions to SBC's section 271 applications in Indiana and Ohio.[111]

31. AT&T, Allegiance, and LDMI argue that the collocation power changes in SBC's Accessible Letters still do not demonstrate SBC's compliance with checklist item one. AT&T asserts that SBC has not demonstrated that its new Ohio recurring rates are TELRIC-compliant because use of the Michigan rate may cause double-recovery of some costs.[112] SBC explained, however, that it had reduced the Michigan recurring rate to be applied in Ohio to account for costs that are recovered in non-recurring charges in Ohio.[113] AT&T also argues that, under its prior power charging practice, SBC required collocators using 40 amps of power to order 100 fused amp feeds.[114] AT&T questions whether SBC will impose unreasonable NRCs for removing power cables if collocators attempt to reduce their power capacity from 100 fused amps to a smaller amperage pursuant to SBC's new collocation power policies.[115] SBC responds

[108] SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter at Attach. B.

[109] For example, if a collocator requires 40 amps of power for its equipment in a collocation arrangement, it would have ordered two feeds fused at 50 amps each to allow for power surges and redundancy. Under the prior rate structure, SBC would have assessed the recurring charge on 100 amps for the collocation arrangement. Pursuant to the interconnection agreement amendments in the Accessible Letters, a collocator can now order two feeds fused at 40 amps, and SBC will automatically fuse the feeds at 50 amps. SBC will bill the collocator for a total of 40 amps (50 percent of the combined ordered capacity of the leads that are fused). Twenty percent of the reduction (from 100 amps to 80 amps) is attributable to the 125 percent fusing factor.

[110] Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg, Legal Counsel for SBC, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 (Oct. 1, 2003) (SBC Oct. 1 *Ex Parte* Letter).

[111] NuVox Supplemental Comments at 2.

[112] AT&T Supplemental Comments at 1-2.

[113] SBC Sept. 29 *Ex Parte* Letter at 1.

[114] AT&T Supplemental Comments at 3 and n.2. AT&T asserts that, prior to April 1, 2003, SBC required collocators to fuse at 150 percent of their required amps, therefore a collocator using 40 amps of power would need to fuse the feed at 60 amps. AT&T Supplemental Comments at 3 n.2. According to AT&T, however, SBC offered fuse sizes of only 20 amps, 50 amps, and 100 amps, so a collocator using 40 amps fused at 150 percent was forced to order a feed fused at 100 amps. AT&T Supplemental Comments at 3 n.2.

[115] AT&T Supplemental Comments at 3-4. *See also* Letter from Harisha J. Bastiampillai, Legal Counsel for LDMI, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 (Oct. 8, 2003) (expressing concern about potential NRCs for modifying collocation arrangements in response to SBC's revised collocation power practices).

that it did not require collocators to order 100 fused amp feeds to power 40 amps of equipment, and, in fact, notes that AT&T does not have any 100 fused amp feeds in Ohio or Indiana but primarily has 60 fused amp feeds.[116] SBC explains that, while it may be necessary to remove cabling when reducing power from a 100 fused amp feed to a feed fused at a smaller amount,[117] thereby incurring sizeable NRCs, reducing from a 60 fused amp feed to a 50 fused amp feed would not likely require removal of cable.[118] Therefore, it is unlikely that AT&T's power reductions will require cable removal in Indiana and Ohio. Allegiance and LDMI complain that the recurring charge has gone from $6.76 to $9.68 per amp, but they do not allege that the $9.68 Michigan-based rate is not TELRIC-compliant, nor do they refute SBC's claim that the $6.76 Ohio rate did not take into account certain costs that SBC incurs in providing DC power.[119]

32. We find that the availability of the terms referenced in the Accessible Letters filed in this proceeding by SBC on September 29, 2003 demonstrate that SBC provides collocation on a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory basis in compliance with checklist item one in Indiana and Ohio. Furthermore, we note that the issue of SBC's prior practice of applying its rate to 100 percent of the fused capacity of the feeds is currently before both the Indiana and Ohio Commissions.[120] We believe the state commissions will adequately examine this issue in the pending proceedings.

33. AT&T and TDS Metrocom argue that SBC's collocation power pricing is also an issue in Wisconsin.[121] It appears, however, that SBC's rate for collocation power in Wisconsin was stipulated to in a settlement agreement as TELRIC-compliant by AT&T and other

---

[116] Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg, Legal Counsel for SBC, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 at 2 (Oct. 9, 2003) (SBC Oct. 9 *Ex Parte* Letter). SBC states that it did not require collocators to fuse their feeds at 150 percent. SBC Oct. 9 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2. Furthermore, SBC asserts that, although the standard fused feeds listed in its tariffs and collocation applications are 20 amps, 50 amps, and 100 amps, collocators have always had the option to order feeds fused at other sizes. SBC Oct. 9 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2.

[117] This is because, depending on the cabling in each individual central office, 100 fused amp feeds generally go to different places in the central office than do feeds fused for smaller amounts due to safety and fire hazard concerns. SBC Oct. 9 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2 n.3.

[118] SBC Oct. 9 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2.

[119] Allegiance/LDMI Supplemental Comments at 2. LDMI also argues that SBC should offer the Accessible Letters' collocation power pricing options in Michigan. LDMI Supplemental Comments at 1-2. This proceeding deals with SBC's section 271 application for Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin, therefore this is not the proper venue for LDMI to raise a complaint regarding SBC's collocation power practices in Michigan.

[120] Complaint of NuVox Communications of Indiana, Inc. Against SBC Indiana Regarding Its Unlawful Billing Practices for Collocation Power Charges, Cause No. 42398 (filed with Indiana Commission Mar. 25, 2003); Complaint of NuVox Communications of Ohio, Inc. v. SBC Ohio, Case No. 03-802-TP-CSS (filed with Ohio Commission Mar. 24, 2003).

[121] *See* AT&T Comments at 49; AT&T Reply at 46; TDS Metrocom Supplemental Comments at 2-3.

competitive LECs.[122] Given that commenters do not contest the rate, our concern is whether the application of the rate is consistent with the underlying rate development methodology. In light of the fact that this rate is a stipulated rate, we have no information about the rate development in Wisconsin. To the extent the parties dispute SBC's billing practices in Wisconsin or the stipulated rate, the Wisconsin Commission is the proper forum to initiate a resolution of such questions, and this issue is pending before the Wisconsin Commission.[123]

B. Checklist Item 2—Unbundled Network Elements

1. Pricing of Unbundled Network Elements

34. Checklist item two of section 271 states that a BOC must provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to network elements in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1)" of the Act.[124] Section 251(c)(3) requires incumbent LECs to provide "nondiscriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory."[125] Section 252(d)(1) provides that a state commission's determination of the just and reasonable rates for network elements must be nondiscriminatory, must be based on the cost of providing the network elements, and may include a reasonable profit.[126] Pursuant to this statutory mandate, the Commission has determined that prices for UNEs must be based on the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of providing those elements.[127]

35. In applying the Commission's TELRIC pricing principles in this application, we do not conduct a *de novo* review of a state's pricing determinations.[128] We will, however, reject

---

[122] *See* SBC Reply at 48; TDS Metrocom Supplemental Comments at 2.

[123] TDS Metrocom Supplemental Comments at 3, Attach.

[124] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ii).

[125] 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(3).

[126] 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(1).

[127] *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* CC Docket No. 96-98, First Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 15499, 15844-47, paras. 674-79 (1996) (*Local Competition First Report and Order*) (subsequent history omitted); 47 C.F.R. §§ 51.501-51.515. Last year the Supreme Court upheld the Commission's forward-looking cost methodology in determining the rates for UNEs. *Verizon Communications, Inc. v. FCC*, 535 U.S. 467, 523 (2002). The Commission recently has initiated a proceeding to review its TELRIC rules. *Review of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Pricing of Unbundled Network Elements and the Resale of Service by Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*, WC Docket No. 03-173, FCC 03-224 (Sept. 15, 2003).

[128] *Verizon Pennsylvania Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 17453, para. 55 (citations omitted). *See also Sprint v. FCC*, 274 F.3d at 556 ("When the Commission adjudicates § 271 applications, it does not – and cannot – conduct *de novo* review of state rate-setting determinations. Instead, it makes a general assessment of compliance with TELRIC principles.").

an application if "basic TELRIC principles are violated or the state commission makes clear errors in factual findings on matters so substantial that the end result falls outside the range that the reasonable application of TELRIC principles would produce."[129] We note that different states may reach different results that are each within the range of what a reasonable application of TELRIC principles would produce. Accordingly, an input rejected elsewhere might be reasonable under the specific circumstances here.

36. The analytical framework we employ to review section 271 applications in these situations is well established. As the Commission's previous decisions make clear, a BOC may submit as part of its *prima facie* case a valid pricing determination from a state commission. In such cases, we will conclude that the BOC meets the TELRIC pricing requirements of section 271 unless we find that the determination violates basic TELRIC principles or contains clear errors of fact on matters so substantial that the end result falls outside the range that a reasonable application of TELRIC principles would produce.[130] Once the BOC makes a *prima facie* case of compliance, the objecting party must proffer evidence that persuasively rebuts the BOC's *prima facie* showing. The burden then shifts to the BOC to demonstrate the validity of its evidence or the state commission's approval of the disputed rate or charge.[131] When a party raises a challenge related to a pricing issue for the first time in the Commission's section 271 proceedings without showing why it was not possible to raise it before the state commission, we may exercise our discretion to give this challenge little weight. In such cases, we will not find that the objecting party persuasively rebuts the *prima facie* showing of TELRIC compliance if the BOC provides a reasonable explanation concerning the issue raised by the objecting party.

37. With these principles in mind and after thoroughly reviewing the record in this application, we find that SBC's UNE rates in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory, and satisfy checklist item two. Below we first summarize the individual state proceedings and discuss our analysis of state-specific issues that were raised by commenting parties. Following the state-specific analysis, we discuss commenter arguments and our conclusions regarding pricing issues that concern two or more states.

---

[129] *Verizon Pennsylvania Order,* 16 FCC Rcd at 17453, para. 55 (citations omitted).

[130] *See, e.g., Application by Verizon New Jersey, Inc., Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc. (d/b/a Verizon Long Distance), NYNEX Long Distance Company (d/b/a Verizon Enterprise Solutions), Verizon Global Networks Inc., and Verizon Select Services Inc., for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in New Jersey*, CC Docket No. 02-67, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 12275, 12305, para. 68 (2002) (*Verizon New Jersey Order*).

[131] *Application of BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Louisiana*, CC Docket No. 98-121, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 13 FCC Rcd 20599, 20635-39, paras. 51-59 (1998) (*Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*).

a. Illinois

(i) Background

38. In a series of proceedings beginning in 1996, the Illinois Commission investigated SBC's cost submissions and established rates for the provision of UNEs, interconnection, and local transport and termination.[132] In the course of its evaluation and findings, the Illinois Commission consistently demonstrated its commitment to TELRIC principles.[133] The Illinois Commission required SBC to make numerous modifications to its proposed cost study assumptions based on the evidence submitted by competitive LECs and commission staff.[134] The Illinois Commission ordered the use of a 9.52 percent cost of capital and FCC-prescribed depreciation lives, and made other determinations with respect to fill factors, shared and common cost factors, switching, non-recurring charges, and collocation.[135] Subsequent to the *Illinois TELRIC Order*, the Illinois Commission required SBC to make further changes to its rate structures and prices for non-recurring charges (NRCs) and UNE combinations.[136] In response to the Commission's *UNE Remand Order*,[137] *Line Sharing Order*,[138] and *SBC/Ameritech Merger Order*,[139] the Illinois Commission examined SBC's provision of additional UNEs, including line

---

[132] *Investigation into Forward Looking Cost Studies and Rates of Ameritech Illinois for Interconnection, Network Elements, Transport and Termination of Traffic; Illinois Bell Telephone Company Proposed Rates, Terms and Conditions for Unbundled Network Elements*, ICC Docket Nos. 96-0486/0569 Consol., Second Interim Order (Illinois Commission Feb. 17, 1998) (*Illinois TELRIC Order*). The *Illinois TELRIC Order* was amended from an interim order to a final order by the Illinois Commission on April 6, 1998. *Investigation into Forward Looking Cost Studies and Rates of Ameritech Illinois for Interconnection, Network Elements, Transport and Termination of Traffic; Illinois Bell Telephone Company Proposed Rates, Terms and Conditions for Unbundled Network Elements*, ICC Docket Nos. 96-0486/0569 Consol., Amendatory Order (Illinois Commission Apr. 6, 1998). *See also Investigation into the Compliance of Illinois Bell Telephone Company with the Order in Docket 96-0486/0569 Consolidated Regarding the Filing of Tariffs and the Accompanying Cost Studies for Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements and Local Transport and Termination Regarding End to End Bundling Issues*, ICC Docket No. 98-0396, Order (Illinois Commission Oct. 16, 2001) (*Illinois TELRIC Compliance Order*); *Investigation into the Compliance of Illinois Bell Telephone Company with the Order in Docket 96-0486/0569 Consolidated Regarding the Filing of Tariffs and the Accompanying Cost Studies for Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements and Local Transport and Termination Regarding End to End Bundling Issues*, ICC Docket No. 98-0396, Order on Reopening (Illinois Commission Apr. 30, 2002) (*Illinois TELRIC Compliance Order on Reopening*).

[133] *Illinois TELRIC Order* at 5.

[134] SBC Application App. A Vol. 11, Tab 35, Affidavit of Barbara A. Smith Regarding Illinois (SBC Smith Illinois Aff.) at para. 11. *See also, generally, Illinois TELRIC Order*.

[135] *Illinois TELRIC Order* at 8, 11-12, 28-29, 32-35, 47-54, 58-59, 88-90, 95-98.

[136] *Illinois TELRIC Compliance Order* at 95-97; *Illinois TELRIC Compliance Order on Reopening* at 11, 33-34.

[137] *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd 3696.

[138] *Line Sharing Order*, 14 FCC Rcd 20912.

sharing,[140] and shared transport.[141]

39. On October 24, 2001, the Illinois Commission initiated a proceeding to review Illinois Bell's compliance with section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.[142] The Illinois Commission served a copy of the *Illinois Section 271 Proceeding Initiating Order* on every competitive LEC licensed to provide basic local exchange service in SBC's Illinois service area.[143] All parties were afforded the opportunity to file testimony, comments, and reply comments throughout the proceeding.[144] Phase I of the proceeding examined SBC's compliance with the section 271 competitive checklist, and Phase II addressed SBC's performance results on checklist items, OSS issues, performance measures and the performance remedy plan.[145] In Phase I of the proceeding, the Illinois Commission required SBC to make several demonstrations regarding UNEs.[146] Specifically, the Illinois Commission required SBC to demonstrate that: competitors can opt into UNE offerings in tariffs or interconnection agreements without unnecessary restrictions; UNE rates are clearly defined; interim rates and rates not yet reviewed by the commission fall within a TELRIC zone of reasonableness; combination rates for UNE-P and enhanced extended links (EELs) are clearly defined; and UNE-P and EEL combination rates

(Continued from previous page)

[139] *Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Corporations Holding Commission Licenses and Lines Pursuant to Sections 214 and 310(d) of the Communications Act and Parts 5, 22, 24, 25, 63, 90, 95 and 101 of the Commission's Rules*, CC Docket No. 98-141, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 14 FCC Rcd 14712 (1999) (*SBC/Ameritech Merger Order*), *vacated in part*, *Ass'n of Communications Enterprises v. FCC*, 235 F.3d 662 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

[140] *Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Proposed Implementation of High Frequency Portion of Loop (HFPL)/Line Sharing Service (Tariffs Filed April 21, 2000)*, ICC Docket No. 00-0393, Order (Illinois Commission Mar. 14, 2001); *Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Proposed Implementation of High Frequency Portion of Loop (HFPL)/Line Sharing Service (Tariffs Filed April 21, 2000)*, ICC Docket No. 00-0393, Amendatory Order (Illinois Commission May 1, 2001); *Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Proposed Implementation of High Frequency Portion of Loop (HFPL)/Line Sharing Service (Tariffs Filed April 21, 2000)*, ICC Docket No. 00-0393, Order on Rehearing (Illinois Commission Sept. 26, 2001); *Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Proposed Implementation of High Frequency Portion of Loop (HFPL)/Line Sharing Service (Tariffs Filed April 21, 2000)*, ICC Docket No. 00-0393, Amendatory Order (Illinois Commission Oct. 16, 2001); *Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Proposed Implementation of High Frequency Portion of Loop (HFPL)/Line Sharing Service (Tariffs Filed April 21, 2000)*, ICC Docket No. 00-0393, Order on Second Rehearing (Illinois Commission Mar. 28, 2002).

[141] *Illinois Commerce Commission on Its Own Motion, Investigation into Tariff Providing Unbundled Local Switching with Shared Transport*, ICC Docket No. 00-0700, Order (Illinois Commission July 10, 2002).

[142] *See Illinois Section 271 Proceeding Initiating Order*.

[143] SBC Johnson Aff. at para. 13.

[144] SBC Johnson Aff. at para. 15.

[145] SBC Johnson Aff. at para. 40, citing *Illinois Section 271 Proceeding Initiating Order* at 3-4.

[146] *Illinois Commerce Commission on Its Own Motion, Investigation Concerning Illinois Bell Telephone Company's Compliance with Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, ICC Docket No. 01-0662, Phase I Interim Order on Investigation, 174-75 (Illinois Commission Feb. 6, 2003) (*Illinois Section 271 Phase I Order*).

have been found to be TELRIC-based by the commission, or are within a TELRIC zone of reasonableness.[147] The Illinois Commission also required SBC to provide in its tariffs true-ups for interim rates to February 6, 2003, the effective date of the *Illinois Section 271 Phase I Order*, and to initiate a proceeding to investigate the interim rates for dark fiber, subloops, and CNAM database queries.[148] In its May 13, 2003 order in this docket, the Illinois Commission conditioned its endorsement of SBC's section 271 application for Illinois on SBC's commitment to remedy these issues.[149] In its comments on SBC's section 271 application the Illinois Commission includes an attachment demonstrating that SBC has completed its commitments regarding UNE rates.[150]

40. On May 9, 2003, the Illinois General Assembly passed and the governor signed into law Illinois Public Act 93-005, which created sections 13-408 and 13-409 of the Illinois Public Utilities Act.[151] These statutory provisions direct the Illinois Commission to calculate UNE loop rates using current actual fill factors,[152] and depreciation rates based on the economic lives reflected in the incumbent LEC's books of account.[153] The legislation directed the Illinois Commission to make the required rate adjustments within 30 days of the effective date of the legislation.[154] The Illinois Commission issued an order on June 9, 2003 enacting the legislation and adopting increased UNE loop rates.[155] Also on June 9, 2003, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, enjoined SBC from implementing the legislation.[156] SBC has appealed the district court's decision and this appeal is pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.[157]

---

147 *See Illinois Section 271 Phase I Order* at 174-75.

148 *Illinois Section 271 Phase I Order* at 170, 177.

149 *Illinois Section 271 Order* at 916.

150 Illinois Commission Comments, Attach. A at 1-3.

151 220 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/13-408, 13-409.

152 A "fill factor" is the estimate of the proportion of the facility that will be used.

153 "Depreciation rates" represent the amount of time over which an asset will be depreciated for accounting purposes.

154 22 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/13-408(c).

155 *Petition to Determine Adjustments to UNE Loop Rates Pursuant to Section 13-408of the Illinois Public Utilities Act*, ICC Docket No. 03-0323, Order (Illinois Commission June 9, 2003). This order increased the rates for 2-wire loops from $2.59 to $5.12 in the Metro rate zone, from $7.07 to $12.83 in the Suburban rate zone, and from $11.40 to $19.29 in the Rural rate zone.

156 *Voices for Choices v. Illinois Bell Tel. Co.*, Case No. 03-C-3290, 22 (N.D. Ill. June 9, 2003) (granting preliminary injunction) (*Voices for Choices*).

157 *Voices for Choices v. Illinois Bell Tel. Co.*, Case Nos. 03-2735 and 03-2766 (7th Cir. July 3, 2003).

(ii) Discussion

41. *Illinois Legislation.* The ACN Group argues that sections 13-408 and 13-409 of the Illinois Public Utilities Act preclude a finding that SBC satisfies the requirements of checklist item two in Illinois.[158] Specifically, the ACN Group argues that the loop rates promulgated by the Illinois Commission in response to the legislation are not TELRIC-compliant.[159] Although SBC has been enjoined from implementing the legislation, the ACN Group argues that the existence of the legislation and the pending court proceedings surrounding it result in rate uncertainty for competitive LECs.[160] To reduce uncertainty associated with the pending litigation of the legislation-based rates, SBC voluntarily has committed that, should it prevail in its challenge to the legislation injunction, it will not seek to true-up loop rates any higher than rates that would pass a benchmark comparison to loop rates in Texas that the Commission reviewed and approved in the *SWBT Texas Order* for the period from June 9, 2003 to the date we grant SBC's section 271 application in Illinois.[161]

42. The existence of pending litigation concerning SBC's loop rates in Illinois does not lead us to conclude that SBC's current Illinois loop rates fail to meet the requirements of checklist item two. As we have repeatedly held, we perform our section 271 analysis on the rates before us.[162] If we find these rates to be TELRIC-compliant, then SBC has met its obligation to price UNEs in compliance with checklist item two. If, in the future, SBC were to raise those rates above the range that a reasonable application of TELRIC principles would produce, those rates could be challenged in district court or pursuant to section 271.[163] Section 271 provides a mechanism, section 271(d)(6)(B), to challenge any UNE rates as not being TELRIC-based.[164] Under section 271(d)(6)(A), the Commission has the authority to review any future SBC rate increases and, upon determining that such increases are not TELRIC-based in compliance with checklist item two, the Commission may suspend or revoke SBC's section 271

---

158 ACN Group Comments at 32-35.

159 ACN Group Comments at 32.

160 ACN Group Comments at 34.

161 SBC Reply at 54-55. *See SWBT TexasOrder*, 15 FCC Rcd 18354.

162 *See Joint Application* by *BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth Long Distance, Inc. for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Georgia and Louisiana,* CC Docket No. 02-35, Memorandum Opinion and Order*,* 17 FCC Rcd 9018, 9066-67, para. 97 (*BellSouth Georgia/Louisiana Order)*(citing *Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3317, para. 31).

163 We note that SBC has stated, however, that in the event that it is permitted to raise its Illinois rates in the future, it will not do so above a level that would pass a benchmark comparison with the Texas UNE rates that the Commission reviewed and approved in the *SWBT Texas Order* for the period covering the 90-day 271 review period for Illinois. SBC Reply at 54-55.

164 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(6)(B).

authority or impose other penalties.[165]

43. With respect to the ACN Group's claim of rate confusion, we note that competitors have more rate certainty in this instance than in the case of a pending state commission review of rates. In this case, the Illinois Commission already has completed its proceeding to establish loop rates in compliance with the legislation and competitors know what those rates will be. As noted above, if these loop rates ultimately are reinstated by a court and SBC seeks to true-up rates as of the day after grant of its section 271 authorization in Illinois, parties may challenge the rates pursuant to section 271(d)(6)(B).[166]

44. *Interim Rates.* The ACN Group also argues that SBC does not demonstrate compliance with checklist item two in Illinois due to the existence of interim rates for dark fiber, subloops, and CNAM database queries.[167] In its section 271 proceeding, the Illinois Commission identified these rates as ones that it had not yet investigated, and set interim rates for these elements.[168] These interim rates are subject to true-up.[169] The Commission has held that:

> the mere presence of interim rates will not generally threaten a section 271 application so long as an interim solution to a particular rate dispute is reasonable under the circumstances, the state commission has demonstrated its commitment to our pricing rules, and provision is made for refunds or true-ups once permanent rates are set.[170]

We find that the interim rates identified by the ACN Group in Illinois meet this test. The Illinois Commission examined the interim rates and found them to be reasonable on an interim basis.[171] The Illinois Commission has demonstrated a strong commitment to setting TELRIC-based rates in its many rate proceedings.[172] These interim rates are subject to true-up, and the Illinois

---

[165] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(6)(A).

[166] *See BellSouth Georgia/Louisiana Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 9067-68, para. 98 ("Moreover, as we have pointed out in past section 271 proceedings, if 'prices are not set in accordance with our rules and the Act, we retain the ability going forward to take appropriate enforcement action, including action pursuant to section 271(d)(6)'"(citing *Verizon Massachusetts Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 9003, para. 30)).

[167] ACN Group Comments at 35-36. "CNAM" stands for caller ID with name.

[168] *Illinois Section 271 Phase I Order* at 177; *Illinois Section 271 Order* at 215.

[169] *Illinois Section 271 Phase I Order* at 177.

[170] *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18394, para. 88.

[171] *Illinois Section 271 Order* at 215. Unlike the interim rates for EEL NRCs found by the Illinois Commission to be reasonable discussed in paras. 69-71, *infra*, we do not have specific concerns with the analysis used by the Illinois Commission to determine that these interim rates are reasonable.

[172] *See* para. 5, *supra*.

Commission is reviewing the rates in a pending proceeding.[173] The existence of these interim rates does not, therefore, cause SBC to fail to demonstrate compliance with checklist item two in Illinois.

b. Indiana

(i) Background

45. SBC's current permanent Indiana rates for interconnection, UNEs and transport and termination of traffic are the result of multiple proceedings conducted by the Indiana Commission over a period of several years.[174] On December 18, 1996, pursuant to a request filed by Sprint, the Indiana Commission initiated an investigation and generic proceeding to review SBC's Indiana cost studies for its provision of interconnection, UNEs and transport and termination of traffic pursuant to sections 251 and 252 of the Act.[175] The generic proceeding consisted of three separate, but coordinated, dockets:[176] Cause No. 40611, in which the Indiana Commission mandated the application of TELRIC methodology in determining UNE pricing;[177] Cause No. 40611-S1 Phase I, in which the Indiana Commission considered issues that were not finalized in the *Indiana TELRIC Order*;[178] and Cause 40611-S1 Phase II, in which additional

---

[173] *Illinois Commerce Commission On Its Own Motion vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Investigation of Dark Fiber, Subloops, and CNAM Database Query Rates of Illinois Bell Telephone Company*, ICC Docket No. 03-0231, Order (Illinois Commission Apr. 9, 2003). We also note that the rates that are interim are not UNE-P rates. *See Joint Application of SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Arkansas and Missouri*, CC Docket No. 01-194, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 20719, 20750, para. 64 (2001) (*SBC Arkansas/Missouri Order*).

[174] *See* SBC Application at 49; SBC Butler Aff. at para. 7; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 11, Tab 31, Affidavit of Thomas J. Makarewicz (SBC Makarewicz Aff.) at paras. 10-30.

[175] *Petition of Sprint Communications Company, L.P. for a Generic Proceeding on Ameritech's Rates for Interconnection, Unbundled Elements, Transport and Termination, and Resale*, Cause No. 40611 (Indiana Commission December 18, 1996).

[176] SBC Butler Aff. at paras. 67-69.

[177] *Commission Investigation and Generic Proceeding on Ameritech Indiana's Rates for Interconnection, Service, Unbundled Elements, and Transport and Termination under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Related Indiana Statues*, Cause No. 40611 (Indiana Commission June 30, 1998) (*Indiana TELRIC Order*).

[178] *Commission Investigation and Generic Proceeding on Ameritech Indiana's Rates for Interconnection, Service, Unbundled Elements, and Transport and Termination under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Related Indiana Statues*, Cause No. 40611-S1 (Indiana Commission March 28, 2002) (*Indiana Phase 1 Order*). This docket addressed the rate for unbundled local switching (ULS), including the port and usage costs, if any, the shared transport component of ULS and recurring and nonrecurring charges for all UNE combinations, including new installations when facilities are present but dial tone is not present, and migrations. *See Indiana Phase I Order at* 1-2.

unresolved pricing issues were considered.[179] Over the course of the generic proceeding, the Indiana Commission established SBC's wholesale prices based on either Indiana-specific TELRIC costs proposed by SBC as adjusted by the Indiana Commission, or proposals submitted by competitive LECs that were ordered for use in Indiana by the Indiana Commission.[180] Numerous competitive LECs and other parties participated in the generic proceeding.[181] Subsequent to issuance of the *Indiana TELRIC Order*, SBC filed, on August 30, 1998, amended cost studies in compliance with that order.[182] The rates required by the Indiana Commission in those proceedings are reflected in SBC's UNE and interconnection tariffs, and the rates are available for all new interconnection agreements.[183] Those rates also are made available for existing interconnection agreements if the language of the agreement provides for such adjustments.[184]

46. On February 2, 2000, SBC sought review of its section 271 application by the Indiana Commission.[185] SBC requested and was approved to use a three-phase docket approach in evaluating its application.[186] Phase 2 of the proceeding involved pricing issues and was initiated on September 26, 2002, when SBC submitted its Checklist Informational Filing to the Indiana Commission. On October 31, 2002, however, the Indiana Commission issued a detailed process order that defined the minimum requirements for the Phase 2 investigation, including

---

[179] *Commission Investigation and Generic Proceeding on Ameritech Indiana's Rates for Interconnection, Service, Unbundled Elements, and Transport and Termination under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Related Indiana Statues*, Cause No. 40611-S1 (Indiana Commission February 17, 2003) (*Indiana Phase II Order*). All of the remaining generic cost issues that had not been addressed in the *Indiana TELRIC Order* or *Indiana Phase I Order* were addressed in this docket. These included primary cost study assumptions for annual charge factors (ACFs), fill factors, and shared and common cost markup; access to the CNAM database; operator services/directory assistance (OS/DA) branding; subloop branding; DS-3 loops; loop conditioning; loop qualification; line sharing; line splitting; unbundling Project Pronto; 911 access; and dark fiber prices. *See* SBC Application App. D-IN, Vol. 2a, Tab 10, *Commission Investigation and Generic Proceeding on Ameritech Indiana's Rates for Interconnection, Service, Unbundled Elements, and Transport and Termination under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Related Indiana Statues*, Cause No. 40611-S1 (Indiana Commission July 3, 2001) (listing the cost issues to be reviewed under Cause 40611-S1).

[180] *See* SBC Makarewicz Aff. at paras. 10-25.

[181] Participants included AT&T, Sprint, MCI/WorldCom, Time Warner Communications of Indiana, the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor and numerous others. *See* SBC Makarewicz Aff. at para. 10.

[182] SBC Makarewicz Aff. at para. 14.

[183] SBC Butler Aff. at para. 74.

[184] *Id.*

[185] *See SBC Indiana Petition; see also Indiana Compliance Order* at 1.

[186] *Id.*

information submissions.[187] Consistent with that order, on November 18, 2002, SBC supplemented its Checklist Informational Filing by submitting a comprehensive report reflecting arbitration agreements and tariffs that it intended to use in support of its section 271 application and to demonstrate compliance with applicable statutes, and this Commission and Indiana Commission orders and rules.[188] Parties were given an opportunity to comment on SBC's Checklist Informational Filing and to discuss the checklist filings during workshops held April 2 and 3, 2003.[189]

47. The price lists filed with the Indiana Commission by SBC in the section 271 docket reflect the approved rates set in the TELRIC proceedings.[190] After examining all of the filings in the docket, the Indiana Commission issued an order on July 2, 2003, indicating that it was prepared to support SBC's application, subject to the filing and implementation of the most recent versions of the same compliance plans that SBC had already agreed to implement in Michigan and Illinois.[191] Based upon SBC's August 1, 2003, revised filing, the Indiana Commission concluded that SBC has complied with the *Indiana Compliance Order* and, therefore, conditionally supports SBC's section 271 application.[192]

(ii) Discussion

48. *Rate Uncertainty*. The Indiana Commission expresses concern regarding SBC's ongoing challenges to its authority to require the filing of a UNE tariff.[193] Thus, the Indiana Commission qualifies its finding of SBC's compliance with section 271 upon a further

---

[187] *See Petition of Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Incorporated, D/B/A Ameritech Indiana or SBC Indiana Pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-61 For A Three-Phase Process For Commission Review of Various Submissions of SBC Indiana To Show Compliance With Section 271(C) of The Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Cause No. 41657 Process Order (Oct. 31, 2002) (*Indiana Process Order*).

[188] *Indiana Compliance Order* at 2.

[189] SBC Butler Aff. at para. 46.

[190] *Petition of Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Incorporated, D/B/A Ameritech Indiana or SBC Indiana Pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-61 For A Three-Phase Process For Commission Review of Various Submissions of SBC Indiana To Show Compliance With Section 271(C) of The Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Cause No. 41657, "Section 271" Report and Recommendation of the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission to the Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 (Indiana Commission August 6, 2003) (*Indiana Section 271 Report and Recommendation*) at 194. *See Indiana Section 271 Report and Recommendation* at Attach. 3 for SBC's actual price lists submitted in support of its section 271 application.

[191] *See Indiana Compliance Order* at Attach. One at 1.

[192] Indiana Commission Comments at 3-5. We discuss the Indiana Commission's qualification in the discussion section below.

[193] Indiana Commission Comments at 3 and 4. Presently, SBC's lawsuit in Indiana, *Indiana Bell Tel Co. v. IURC,* Case No. IP01-0219-C-Y/S (S.D. Indiana filed Feb. 16, 2003), is pending before the court.

determination by the Commission that such legal challenges do not result in uncertainty.[194] Similarly, the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor (IUCC) opposes SBC's section 271 application because SBC is appealing all of the Indiana Commission's UNE pricing orders, thereby constituting "continued uncertainty" for UNE rates in SBC's Indiana service territory.[195] Thus, even though the Indiana Commission has reviewed and set TELRIC-compliant rates for SBC, commenters express concern regarding the uncertainty of future rates that SBC might impose on competitive LECs if SBC prevails in its various court appeals.

49. In response to the comments, SBC argues that its challenges of the Indiana Commission's tariff and pricing orders should not preclude a determination that it is in compliance with section 271.[196] SBC characterizes its appeals as intended to preserve the viability of the legal obligations contained in its interconnection agreements.[197] SBC has committed that, if it is successful in its appeals, it will not initiate any action seeking retroactive application or payments from competitive LECs for interconnection services or UNEs.[198] SBC also notes that the IUCC, while complaining of possible rate uncertainty, does not challenge the correctness of current rates, nor of SBC's compliance with the Indiana Commission's pricing orders. SBC also has expressed its intent, during the pendency of the appeals, to continue complying with the Indiana Commission's tariff and pricing orders absent a stay, modification, or reversal.[199]

---

[194] *Id.* Here the Indiana Commission states: "SBC Indiana satisfies Section 271(c)(1)(A) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, to the extent the FCC determines that the uncertainty caused by SBC's challenges to our legal authority to order it to file a UNE tariff does not constitute or cause a lack of a 'concrete and specific legal obligation [by SBC] to furnish the item upon request pursuant to state-approved interconnection agreements that set forth prices and other terms and conditions for each checklist item' for certain UNEs and rate elements."

[195] IUCC Comments at 15-16. In addition to challenging the Indiana Commission's authority to require a tariff, SBC has several pending appeals challenging the validity of the pricing methodology. These include: *Indiana Bell Tel. Co. v. McCarty*, Case No. IP02-C-0656-B/S (S.D. Indiana filed April 29, 2002) challenging the methodology set for NRCs and UNE combinations and other rates; and *Indiana Bell Tel. Co. v. McCarty*, Case Nos. 03-1122, 03-1123 & 03-1124 (7th Cir. Filed Jan. 16, 2003), on issues concerning the obligation to offer new UNE combinations, and OS/DA and dark fiber as a UNE. *See* SBC Butler Aff. at paras. 61-62.

[196] SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 2a, Tab 4, Reply Affidavit of Jolynn B. Butler (SBC Butler Reply Aff.) at para. 3-4.

[197] SBC Reply at 63-64. Here SBC characterizes the Indiana Commission's tariff requirement as being intended to provide competitive LECs the option of purchasing UNEs and interconnection terms "off-the-shelf" rather than through an interconnection agreement; an option that SBC apparently opposes.

[198] SBC September 9 *Ex Parte* Letter at Attach. J. To reduce uncertainty associated with its pending appeals, SBC committed that, subsequent to a favorable court decision, it will not initiate retroactive application of the decision in its favor. Should another party initiate retroactive application of the elements of the decision in that party's favor, however, SBC reserves its rights to seek retroactive application of the portions of the decision in SBC's favor. *Id.*, Attach. J at 2.

[199] *See* SBC Application App. C Vol. 9, Tab 62, *SBC Indiana's Response to April 28, 2003 Comments* at 17.

50. In prior section 271 decisions, we determined that future rate uncertainty due to a pending appeal, without more, should not affect our review of the currently effective rates submitted with a section 271 application.[200] In the *Qwest Minnesota Order*, we rejected AT&T's argument that a section 271 application should be denied solely because an applicant is appealing TELRIC-compliant UNE rates, while at the same time basing its section 271 application on the very rates it is appealing. In that case, as in this one, the Commission based its determination on the merits of the applicant's present rates.[201] The mere existence of the possibility that TELRIC-compliant UNE rates might be amended in the future, in and of itself, is not justification for denying a section 271 application. We conclude that SBC's pending appeals before the state and federal courts do not preclude us from finding that SBC satisfies checklist item two.

c. Ohio

(i) Background

51. The Ohio Commission opened a proceeding to review SBC Ohio's costs and rates for interconnection and UNEs on September 3, 1996,[202] shortly after the release of the *Local Competition Order*.[203] Competitive LECs and other interested parties, including AT&T, MCI, Sprint, Time Warner, CompTel, the Ohio Cable Telecommunications Association, and the Ohio Consumers' Counsel, participated in the proceeding. On the basis of a voluminous record that included cost studies, computer models, testimony about TELRIC methodology, thirty-three

---

[200] *Qwest Minnesota Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 13349, para. 49; *Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26469, paras. 306-307 (wherein the Commission rejects the notion that a pending state commission review of TELRIC-compliant UNE rates in Utah should result in the denial of a section 271 application); *Application by Verizon Maryland Inc., Verizon Washington, D.C. Inc., Verizon West Virginia Inc., Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc. (d/b/a Verizon Long Distance), NYNEX Long Distance Company (d/b/a Verizon Enterprise Solutions), Verizon Global Networks Inc., and Verizon Select Services Inc., for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Maryland, Washington, D.C., and West Virginia*, WC Docket No. 02-384, Memorandum and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 5212, 5311, para. 170 (2003) (*Verizon DC/MD/WVA Order*) (involving a rejection by the Commission of commenters' contention that Verizon's pending appeal of UNE rates should result in the rejection of its section 271 application); Application by Verizon New England Inc., Verizon Delaware Inc., Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc. (d/b/a Verizon Long Distance), NYNEX Long Distance Company (d/b/a Verizon Enterprise Solutions), Verizon Global Networks Inc., and Verizon Select Services Inc., for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in New Hampshire and Delaware, WC Docket No. 02-157, Memorandum and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 18660, 18735, paras. 130-131 (2002) (*Verizon New Hampshire/Delaware Order*) (wherein the Commission rejects a commenter's argument that a section 271 application should fail on the basis that the applicant is appealing TELRIC-compliant collocation power rates to the state supreme court, citing the *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC at 18394, para. 87).

[201] *Qwest Minnesota Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 13349, para. 49.

[202] *Review of Ameritech Ohio's Economic Costs of Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements, and Reciprocal Compensation for Transport and Termination of Local Telecommunications Traffic*, Memorandum, Case No. 96-922-TP-UNC (Ohio Commission Sept. 3, 1996).

[203] *See, generally, Local Competition Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 15499.

days of hearings, and the cross-examination of witnesses, the Ohio Commission on June 19, 1997, established the methodology and inputs to be used for cost studies that underlie UNE pricing.[204]

52. In the course of its evaluation and findings, the Ohio Commission consistently demonstrated its commitment to TELRIC principles.[205] It used the Ameritech Facility Analysis Model to compute the capital investment required to construct loop facilities and the Switching Cost Information System for the switching cost model, but made numerous modifications to SBC's proposed cost study assumptions based on the evidence submitted by competitive LECs.[206] The Ohio Commission ordered the use of FCC-prescribed depreciation lives and a 9.74 percent cost of capital, and made other determinations with respect to fill factors, shared and common cost factors, non-recurring charges, switching, loops, and collocation.[207] SBC's cost studies for unbundled loops were geographically deaveraged based on three geographic zones or access areas, reflecting cost differences for each zone.[208] Following a period for rehearing, various parties entered into a stipulation, additional issues were resolved, and on the basis of revised cost studies, SBC filed UNE rates on June 9, 1999, in compliance with Ohio Commission orders.[209]

53. The Ohio Commission used the same docket on an ongoing basis to establish rates for other UNEs and interconnection services as well. For example, on October 4, 2001, the Ohio Commission determined the scope and pricing of UNE-platform and its related non-recurring charge.[210] More recently, it issued an order on March 13, 2003, regarding loop

---

[204] *Review of Ameritech Ohio's Economic Costs of Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements, and Reciprocal Compensation for Transport and Termination of Local Telecommunications Traffic*, *Application of Ameritech Ohio to Revise its Ameritech Tariff, P.U.C.O. No. 20, to Introduce Unbundled Network Components, Petition of Ameritech Ohio for Approval of a Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* Opinion and Order, Case Nos. 96-922-TP-UNC, 96-974-TP-ATA, 96-1057-TP-UNC (Ohio Commission June 19, 1997) (*Ohio Commission UNE Order*).

[205] *See, e.g.,Ohio Commission UNE Order* at 10, 11, 24, 30, 44, 86.

[206] SBC Application App. A Vol. 3, Tab 12, Affidavit of Dr. Kent A. Currie at A-5 (SBC Currie Aff.). *See also, generally, Ohio Commission UNE Order*.

[207] *Ohio Commission UNE Order* at 8-11, 22, 28-29, 48-49, 53-58, 61-82.

[208] *Ohio Commission UNE Order* at 65; SBC Currie Aff. at para. 47.

[209] SBC Application App. D-OH, Vol. 9, Tab 99-100, *Review of Ameritech Ohio's Economic Costs of Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements, and Reciprocal Compensation for Transport and Termination of Local Telecommunications Traffic*, Letter, Case No. 96-922-TP-UNC (Ohio Commission May 27, 1999). SBC Application App. D-OH, Vol. 9, Tab 101, Letter from Susan Drombetta, SBC, to Daisy Crockron, Chief of the Docketing Division, Case No. 96-922-TP-UNC (Ohio Commission June 9, 1999).

[210] *Review of Ameritech Ohio's Economic Costs of Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements, and Reciprocal Compensation for Transport and Termination of Local Telecommunications Traffic*, *Application of Ameritech Ohio for Approval of Carrier to Carrier Tariff,* Opinion and Order, Case Nos. 96-922-TP-UNC, 00-1368-TP-ATA (Ohio (continued….)

conditioning, loop qualification, and shared cage and cageless collocation.[211] SBC presently has a proceeding before the Ohio Commission to update prices for unbundled loops and other UNEs related to the UNE-platform based on new 2002 cost studies that update the original 1996 studies.[212] The Ohio Commission has recommended that SBC's section 271 application be approved after finding that the carrier's UNE "rates are reasonable and consistent with the FCC's and the [Ohio Commission's] TELRIC-based pricing methodology."[213]

(ii) Discussion

54. The Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC) contends that SBC's section 271 application should be conditioned on the continued affordability of the UNE-platform because this is so vital to ongoing competition.[214] More specifically, the OCC criticizes SBC for seeking UNE rate increases soon after these rates were approved and cites the pending Ohio UNE proceeding as an example.[215] The OCC also asserts that since there is no "requirement that SBC continue the UNE-P at present rates," SBC's section 271 application should be rejected as not

(Continued from previous page)
Commission Oct. 4, 2001); *see also Review of Ameritech Ohio's Economic Costs of Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements, and Reciprocal Compensation for Transport and Termination of Local Telecommunications Traffic*, *Application of Ameritech Ohio for Approval of Carrier to Carrier Tariff,* Entry on Rehearing, Case Nos. 96-922-TP-UNC, 00-1368-TP-ATA at 32 (Ohio Commission Jan. 31, 2002) (affirming and stating that although the Ohio Commission does not rely on a survey by Commerce Capital Markets for its decision, "[i]t is worthwhile to note that a review of the survey dated November 12, 2001…demonstrates that Ohio has the lowest rates nationwide for unbundled loop, per minute local switching, and considering the $0.74 non-recurring charge, the UNE-P offering.").

[211] *Review of Ameritech Ohio's Economic Costs of Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements, and Reciprocal Compensation for Transport and Termination of Local Telecommunications Traffic*, Opinion and Order, Case Nos. 96-922-TP-UNC, 00-1368-TP-ATA (Ohio Commission March 13, 2003). Loop qualification information allows competitive LECs to determine if a loop is suitable for Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) service. Loop conditioning is sometimes necessary to make a loop that carries voice traffic capable of providing high speed data traffic, also known as a DSL-capable line.

[212] *Review of Ameritech Ohio's TELRIC Costs for Unbundled Network Elements,* SBC Ameritech Ohio's Application for Approval of Unbundled Network Element Prices, Case No. 02-1280-TP-UNC (Ohio Commission May 31, 2002).

[213] *Ohio Commission 271 Order* at 134.

[214] OCC Comments at 2.

[215] OCC Comments at 4. The OCC notes that it specifically addresses SBC's section 271 application in Ohio and then asserts that many of the principles it raises apply to the other three states in this section 271 application. OCC Reply at n.1. As a result, we address this complaint specifically to Ohio in this section of our order but also take into account the other states in our analysis and conclusion. The OCC specifically refers to legislation in Illinois that would have increased UNE rates but was stayed by the court. OCC Comments at 3 n.8. This issue is discussed in Part IV.B.1.a.(ii), *supra.*

being in the public interest.[216]

55. We disagree. The OCC's allegations do not support a finding that SBC's proposed UNE rate increase in Ohio or other states constitutes a checklist item two violation or that SBC fails to meet its public interest requirements.[217] As we have consistently concluded, where the incumbent LEC has filed a section 271 application while pursuing a UNE rate increase in a pending state proceeding, we perform our analysis on the rates before us—the rates the LEC submitted in its section 271 application.[218] If we find SBC's currently available UNE rates in a state to be TELRIC-compliant, SBC has met its obligation to set UNE-platform rates in compliance with checklist item two.

56. We note that the OCC raised this issue in the state's section 271 proceeding, but the Ohio Commission rejected it.[219] Furthermore, we note that in SBC's pending UNE proceeding before the Ohio Commission, SBC asserts that its proposed UNE rate increase is based on its updating of cost studies and experience in providing UNEs to competitors over the past five years.[220] We believe that the public interest is well served where, as here, rates are timely reviewed in light of rapid changes in technology, the regulatory environment or market

---

[216] OCC Comments at 5. Although OCC characterizes this as a public interest issue, a basis for OCC's complaint is that SBC has proposed to increase the UNE rates that SBC relies on for approval of its section 271 application. This issue was raised in the context of checklist item 2 in previous section 271 proceedings. As a result, we analyze OCC's allegation in this part of our order from both a public interest and checklist item 2 standpoint.

[217] We noted above that the OCC also refers to Illinois legislation, which is further discussed in Part IV.B.1.a.(ii), *supra*, and only generally to other states. OCC Comments at 3-5. The Commission must make a separate determination that approval of a section 271 application is "consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity," but it may neither limit nor extend the terms of the competitive checklist of section 271(c)(2)(B). 47 U.S.C. §§ 271(d)(3)(C), (d)(4). Thus, the Commission views the public interest requirement as an opportunity to review the circumstances presented by the application to ensure that no other relevant factors exist that would frustrate the congressional intent that markets be open, as required by the competitive checklist, and that entry will serve the public interest as Congress expected.

[218] *Application by Qwest Communications International, Inc., for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in New Mexico, Oregon and South Dakota,* Memorandum Opinion and Order, WC Docket No. 03-11, 18 FCC Rcd 7325, 7372, paras. 83-84 (2003) (*Qwest Three State* Order); *Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26469-70, para. 307; *BellSouth Georgia/Louisiana Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 9066-67, para. 97 (citing *Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3317, para. 31).

[219] *Ohio Commission 271 Order* at 4, 6-7. "The [Ohio] Commission does not see the need . . . to tie our recommendation to a specific requirement regarding SBC Ohio's current or proposed UNE-P rates." *Id.* at 7. The Ohio Commission recommended that the FCC approve SBC Ohio's section 271 application. *Id.* at 1. The Wisconsin Commission also rejected a UNE rate freeze proposed by competitive LECs on public interest grounds, finding that this is contrary to the Act and state law. *Wisconsin 271 Phase I Order* at 30, 280.

[220] *Review of Ameritech Ohio's TELRIC Costs for Unbundled Network Elements,* SBC Ameritech Ohio's Application for Approval of Unbundled Network Element Prices, Case No. 02-1280-TP-UNC at 4 (Ohio Commission May 31, 2002).

conditions.[221]

57. Indeed, a UNE rate freeze, rather than acting to remove a barrier to competitive entry, may pose a barrier to compliance with the Act itself. Under the Act, state commissions have a duty to set cost-based rates for UNEs, and we recognize that there may be factors that cause costs to change over time. This is precisely why state commissions devote the time and resources necessary to hold hearings to update rates, either upward or downward as necessary, based on consideration of all new information and relevant data brought before them. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (D.C. Circuit) also has agreed that "rates may often need adjustment to reflect newly discovered information."[222] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit has made clear that we may rely upon state commissions to set UNE rates.[223]

58. We also find OCC's allegations too speculative to consider because they require us to speculate as to what rates the Ohio Commission ultimately may adopt, and we have no basis to assume such rates would be inconsistent with TELRIC principles. In fact, the OCC itself points out that "[m]any of the public service commissions in the former Ameritech states conducted painstaking reviews of SBC costs for the UNE-P and arrived at cost-based rates that have helped spur local service competition in their states."[224] This demonstrated commitment to setting UNE rates at TELRIC levels only adds to our confidence that the Ohio Commission will modify rates appropriately in the future based on the evidence before it.[225]

59. The OCC has not demonstrated that the lack of a requirement to freeze UNE-platform rates for a period of time poses a barrier to competitive entry, and we can find no public interest violation.[226] Additionally, we note that section 271(d)(6)(B) of the Act provides a mechanism for an interested party to challenge any UNE rates as not being TELRIC-based following the grant of section 271 authority.[227] Under section 271(d)(6)(A), the Commission has the authority to review any future SBC rate increase, including the one now pending in Ohio. Should we determine that any such increase is not TELRIC-based in compliance with checklist

---

221 *See, e.g., Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4085-86, para. 247.

222 *AT&T Corp. v. FCC*, 220 F.3d at 617 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

223 *WorldCom v. FCC*, 308 F.3d 1, 8 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

224 OCC Comments at 4.

225 This conclusion applies to the other state commissions as well.

226 The Commission must make a separate determination that approval of a section 271 application is "consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity," but it may neither limit nor extend the terms of the competitive checklist of section 271(c)(2)(B). 47 U.S.C. §§ 271(d)(3)(C), (d)(4). Thus, the Commission views the public interest requirement as an opportunity to review the circumstances presented by the application to ensure that no other relevant factors exist that would frustrate the congressional intent that markets be open, as required by the competitive checklist, and that entry will serve the public interest as Congress expected.

227 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(6)(B).

item two, section 271(d)(6)(A) empowers the Commission to suspend or revoke SBC's section 271 authority or impose other penalties.[228]

d. Wisconsin

60. The Wisconsin Commission initially established SBC's UNE rates in two proceedings in 1996-97.[229] The state commission in 1999 then opened a new docket to review the UNEs that SBC was required to offer and their costs.[230] Extensive testimony was filed and numerous parties participated in hearings, including AT&T, Covad, KMC Telecom, McCleod, MCI, Rhythm Links, Time Warner, and the Wisconsin Department of Justice. Parties had the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses in seven days of hearings. The Wisconsin Commission concluded this proceeding in 2002 and comprehensively addressed the availability of UNEs and the methodology for SBC in setting UNE rates.[231]

61. The Wisconsin Commission used Ameritech's Loop Facility Analysis Model to compute the capital investment required to construct loop facilities and the Ameritech Regional Partners in Provisioning Switching Model for determining switching costs, but made many adjustments and modifications to the inputs and assumptions proposed by SBC.[232] Among its determinations, the Wisconsin Commission established cost inputs for cost of capital,[233] switching,[234] fill factors,[235] depreciation,[236] non-recurring costs,[237] and collocation.[238] Further, the

---

[228] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(6)(A).

[229] *Investigation of the Appropriate Standards to Promote Effective Competition in the Local Exchange Telecommunications Market in Wisconsin*, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and First Final Order, Docket No. 05-TI-138 (Wisconsin Commission July 2, 1996). *Matters Relating to Satisfaction of Conditions for Offering InterLATA Service* (*Wisconsin Bell, Inc. d/b/a Ameritech Wisconsin*), Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Second Order, Docket No. 6720-T1-120 (Wisconsin Commission May 29, 1997).

[230] *Investigation Into Ameritech Wisconsin's Unbundled Network Elements*, Notice of Proceeding, Docket No. 6720-TI-161 (Wisconsin Commission Dec. 15, 1999).

[231] *Investigation Into Ameritech Wisconsin's Unbundled Network Elements*, Final Decision, Docket No. 6720-TI-161 at 22-25 (Wisconsin Commission Mar. 22, 2002) (*Wisconsin Commission UNE Order*). "[A]pplying TELRIC . . . is also consistent with the Wisconsin definition of total service long incremental costs (TSLRIC), which is a pricing method similar to TELRIC." *Id.* at 24. "While all parties agree that TELRIC is the pricing standard to apply, the parties have differing interpretations as to the proper implementation [of TELRIC]." *Id.* at 25.

[232] SBC Application App. A, Vol. 11, Tab 36, Affidavit of Barbara A. Smith Regarding Wisconsin, Attach. A-4 (SBC Smith Wisconsin Aff.). *See also Wisconsin Commission UNE Order* at 134.

[233] *Wisconsin UNE Order* at 3. The Wisconsin Commission found 13% return on equity and 7.18% cost of debt to be reasonable, and adjusted the capital structure proposals of its staff and SBC. *Id.*

[234] *Id.* at 7-9; 73-83. Competitive LECs did not challenge the calculations in SBC's switching models, the ARPSM (Ameritech Regional Partners in Provisioning Switching Model) and NUCAT (Network Usage Cost Analysis Tool), but disagreed with SBC's inputs and assumptions. *Id.* at 73. The Wisconsin Commission was "reluctant to go against the traditional rate structure for unbundled switching" that included a usage rate, but found (continued….)

Wisconsin Commission on July 9, 2003, determined that, except for certain issues that required additional evaluation, SBC had filed revised cost studies that comply with the state commission's requirements for setting rates.[239] In a separate proceeding, the Wisconsin Commission established three defined geographic areas that reflect cost differences for each area and were used to deaverage UNE loop rates.[240] The Wisconsin Commission has determined that SBC offers its competitors nondiscriminatory access to UNEs as required by the Act and supports SBC's section 271 application.[241]

62. No party raises any issues specific to UNE rates in Wisconsin alone. Challenges to rates that affect Wisconsin in addition to the other states at issue in this proceeding are addressed below.

e. Other Issues

(i) EEL NRCs

63. *Background.* Globalcom argues that SBC has failed to demonstrate compliance with checklist item two because its non-recurring charges (NRCs) for enhanced extended links (EELs) in Illinois and Wisconsin are not TELRIC-based.[242] Globalcom asserts that in Illinois SBC charges NRCs of $2,285.85 for a 4-wire DS1 digital loop to DS1 dedicated transport combination for an uncollocated customer.[243] According to Globalcom, these NRCs are outside the range that a reasonable application of TELRIC would produce, are over 13 times the NRCs of $173 applied for the same EEL combination in California, and are over 240 percent of the

(Continued from previous page)
"compelling policy reasons" to set a flat per-line rate; it based the shared transport per-minute charge on an estimate of the average distance a call will be transported. *Id.* at 83-84.

[235] *Id.* at 14. The Wisconsin Commission found it was "reasonable to use [competitive] LECs' fill factors in determining unbundled loop costs." *Id.*

[236] *Id.* at 15, 153-54.

[237] *Id.* at 166-185. The Wisconsin Commission found it was easier to incorporate its adjustments into the SBC model for non-recurring costs. *Id.* at 185.

[238] *Id.* at 4-32; 40-67. The Wisconsin Commission found that its adjustments would "be best implemented by using the [competitive] LECs' Collocation Cost Model (CCM)." *Id.* at 67.

[239] *Investigation Into Ameritech Wisconsin's Unbundled Network Elements*, UNE Compliance Order, Docket No. 6720-TI-161 (Wisconsin Commission July 9, 2003) (*Wisconsin UNE Compliance Order*).

[240] *Investigation into the Establishment of Cost-Related Zones for Unbundled Network Elements,* Order, Docket No. 05-TI-349 (Wisconsin Commission Jan. 17, 2003).

[241] *See, generally, Wisconsin 271 Phase II Order*.

[242] Globalcom Comments at 4-14.

[243] Globalcom Comments at 2.

NRCs SBC recently proposed in an Illinois cost proceeding.[244] In December 2002, SBC tariffed new recurring and non-recurring UNE rates, and the Illinois Commission suspended the rates pending an investigation.[245] The NRCs filed by SBC in that tariff submission for the 4-wire DS1 digital loop to DS1 dedicated transport combination (non-collocated) were $932.06.[246] The Illinois Commission's tariff investigation was abated by section 13-408(c) of the Illinois Public Utilities Act on May 9, 2003.[247] Globalcom also alleges that SBC's EEL NRCs in Illinois violate section 271's public interest standard by precluding competitive entry.[248]

64. In its proceeding investigating SBC's compliance with the requirements of section 271, the Illinois Commission identified several rates as interim, including NRCs for UNE combinations, such as EELs.[249] In Phase I of the section 271 proceeding, the Illinois Commission made these interim rates subject to true up.[250] In Phase II of the section 271 proceeding, the Illinois Commission assessed the reasonableness of SBC's interim EEL NRCs by comparing the combined EEL NRCs and EEL recurring rates of SBC in Illinois to the combined rates in California, Texas and Michigan.[251] The Illinois Commission also examined the Commission's universal service fund (USF) cost model to compare relative cost differences between the four states.[252] Based on this analysis, the Illinois Commission found that SBC's combined EEL NRCs and recurring charges in Illinois were reasonable when compared to the combined EEL charges in California.[253] The Illinois Commission found that, although SBC's Illinois interim EEL NRCs were at the upper end of any zone of reasonableness, 1) the commission had found these rates to be reasonable as interim rates in another UNE proceeding,[254] and 2) the commission was currently investigating the interim EEL NRCs.[255]

---

244 Globalcom Comments at 2

245 Globalcom Comments at 12 and Tab 3 (Letter from Rhonda Johnson, Vice President Illinois Regulatory, SBC, to Illinois Commerce Commission, Advice No. IL-02-1637 (Dec. 24, 2002)) (*SBC Dec. 24, 2002 Tariff Filing*).

246 Globalcom Comments at Tab 3 (*SBC Dec. 24, 2002 Tariff Filing*, Ill. C.C. Tariff No. 20, Part 19, Section 20, 1st Revised Sheet No. 6.6).

247 22 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/13-408(c).

248 Globalcom Comments at 23-24.

249 *Illinois Section 271 Phase I Order* at 170.

250 *Illinois Section 271 Phase I Order* at 177.

251 *Illinois Section 271 Order* at 206.

252 *Illinois Section 271 Order* at 206.

253 *Illinois Section 271 Order* at 206. The Illinois Commission found that SBC's Illinois EEL rates were high when compared to the rates in Texas and Michigan under this analysis. *Id.*

254 *See Illinois Commerce Commission on its Own Motion Investigation into the Compliance of Illinois Bell Telephone Company with the Order in Docket 96-0486/0569 Consolidated Regarding the Filing of Tariffs and the* (continued….)

65. In its reply, SBC defends its $2,285 EEL NRCs as TELRIC-compliant, but also offers to amend Globalcom's interconnection agreement to include the lower EEL NRCs it had proposed in the abated tariff investigation proceeding.[256] According to SBC, upon approval of the amended interconnection agreement, these EEL NRCs would be available to all other carriers in Illinois on an opt-in basis, or alternatively SBC will offer the same rates to any interested competitive LEC in Illinois.[257] These NRCs and the tariffed $2,285 NRCs would be interim subject to true-up to February 6, 2003, after the Illinois Commission concludes an investigation into the charges.[258]

66. *Complete-As-Filed Waiver.* We waive the complete-as-filed requirement on our own motion pursuant to section 1.3 of the Commission's rules to the limited extent necessary to consider SBC's revised EEL NRCs.[259] The Commission maintains certain procedural requirements governing section 271 applications.[260] In particular, the "complete-as-filed" requirement provides that when an applicant files new information after the comment date, the Commission reserves the right to start the 90-day review period again or to accord such information no weight in determining section 271 compliance.[261] We maintain this requirement to afford interested parties a fair opportunity to comment on the BOC's application, to ensure that the Attorney General and the state commission can fulfill their statutory consultative roles, and to afford the Commission adequate time to evaluate the record.[262] The Commission can waive its procedural rules, however, "if special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule and such deviation will serve the public interest."[263]

(Continued from previous page)
Accompanying Cost Studies for Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements and Local Transport and Termination and Regarding End To End Bundling Issues, ICC Docket No. 98-0396, Order on Reopening (Illinois Commission Apr. 30, 2002) (adopting these rates as interim NRCs for UNE-P and special access-to-EEL conversions).

255 *Illinois Section 271 Order* at 206-207.

256 SBC Reply at 62, SBC Application Reply App.,Vol. 3, Tab 13, Reply Affidavit of W. Karl Wardin (SBC Wardin Reply Aff.) at para. 40.

257 SBC Wardin Reply Aff. at para. 40.

258 SBC Wardin Reply Aff. at para. 40.

259 47 C.F.R. § 1.3.

260 *See Updated 271 Filing Requirements Public Notice*.

261 *Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3306-06, para. 7 (2002); *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6247, para. 21.

262 *Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3306, para. 7; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20572-73, paras. 52-54.

263 *Northeast Cellular Telephone Co. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d at 1166; *WAIT Radio v. FCC*, 418 F.2d 1153. *See also* 47 U.S.C. § 154(j); 47 C.F.R. § 1.3.

67. We find that a waiver is appropriate in these circumstances. SBC's offering of lower EEL NRCs constitutes a change in its rates subsequent to the filing of its application.[264] In prior cases the Commission has found cause to grant a waiver of the complete-as-filed rule where the rate changes are responsive to criticisms on the record, as compared to new information that "consists of additional arguments or information" concerning current pricing.[265] The rate reductions made by SBC in this case satisfy this standard. The changes were responsive to arguments raised in the record of this proceeding, and the rate reductions provide a pro-competitive response to commenters' stated concerns.[266] The newly-available interim EEL NRCs are the rates proposed by SBC in a tariff investigation proceeding, and therefore these rates are likely to be the maximum rates that could be adopted by the Illinois Commission when it sets permanent EEL NRCs. We find that it is fully consistent with our precedent under section 271 to consider the type of responsive information without requiring the BOC to make a new filing.

68. Another major concern that we have identified in prior cases where rates have changed during a proceeding is that interested parties be afforded a sufficient opportunity to review the new rates, and that the analytical burden of doing so is not too great in light of the time constraints inherent in the section 271 application process.[267] Although SBC did not provide notice of this rate change until it filed its reply comments on day 43 of the 90-day statutory period, in prior cases we have considered rate reductions made much later in the 90-day application cycle.[268] We also find no undue burden associated with analyzing the new rates. Globalcom provided an analysis of the new rates in its comments, which were filed on day 20 of the application period.[269]

69. *Discussion.* Although we have concerns about the method used by the Illinois

---

[264] *See* SBC Reply at 62; SBC Wardin Reply Aff. at paras. 40-41 (setting forth SBC's offer to make available to Globalcom or any other interested competitive LEC its previously tariffed EEL NRCs).

[265] *Verizon Rhode Island Order* 17 FCC Rcd at 3308-09, para. 12; *Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26409-10, para. 180.

[266] *See* Globalcom Comments at 2, 12-13.

[267] *Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3308, paras. 10-11.

[268] *See, e.g., Verizon Rhode Island Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 3306-10, paras. 8-17 (considering changes in rates filed on day 80 of the application); *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6247-49, paras. 22-26 (considering changes in rates filed on day 63 of the application); *Verizon New Hampshire/Delaware Order* 17 FCC Rcd at 18666-67, para. 11 (considering changes in rates filed on day 64 of the application); *Application by SBC Communications Inc., Pacific Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services Inc., for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in California*, WC Docket No. 02-306, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 25650, 25663-65, paras. 26-31 (2002) (*SBC California Order*) (considering changes in rates filed on day 45 of the application).

[269] Globalcom Comments at Tab 3 (*SBC Dec. 24, 2002 Tariff Filing*, Ill. C.C. Tariff No. 20, Part 19, Section 20, 1st Revised Sheet No. 6.6).

Commission to determine that the interim EEL NRCs are reasonable,[270] we find that the revised EEL NRCs that SBC has committed to provide to competitive LECs in interconnection agreements are reasonable interim rates. These rates fall within the range of EEL NRCs SBC charges in its other states.[271] We expect that the Illinois Commission, which has demonstrated a strong commitment to setting TELRIC-based rates in its many rate proceedings, will review the interim EEL NRCs in the near future. The interim EEL NRCs will then be subject to true up back to February 6, 2003. We also find that the availability of the lower EEL NRC to competitors adequately addresses Globalcom's concern that the $2,285 EEL NRC impedes competitive entry.

70. Globalcom also argues that SBC's EEL NRCs in Wisconsin are not TELRIC-based in violation of checklist item two and preclude competitive entry in contravention of the public interest.[272] Globalcom alleges that the total NRCs for a 4-wire DS1 digital loop to DS1 dedicated transport combination for an uncollocated customer in Wisconsin would be $2,159.08, and that the Wisconsin Commission has not investigated many of the rate elements in the total NRC.[273] Globalcom notes, however, that the Wisconsin Commission found that the EEL NRCs were in a category of rate elements that were likely to be used by only a limited number of carriers,[274] and therefore found that, "in light of the limited number of providers utilizing these rate elements, it is reasonable to have the final determinations regarding the application of the [c]ommission's methodologies to take place in the context of negotiation and/or arbitration of interconnection agreements per 47 U.S.C. §§ 251 and 252."[275] In its reply, SBC argues that the tariffed EEL NRCs are based on rate structures for DS1 loops and interoffice transport approved by the Wisconsin Commission, and the most recent TELRIC-compliant rates available.[276] These tariffed rates are the maximum rate, and carriers can adopt, negotiate, or arbitrate lower rates.[277]

---

[270] In its reply SBC asserts that Commission precedent supports its position that it is reasonable to aggregate NRCs with recurring charges to determine their reasonableness. SBC Reply at 59-60. SBC is incorrect. Although the Commission aggregates *recurring* non-loop charges in conducting its benchmark analysis, the Commission has never allowed applicants to aggregate recurring charges with NRCs to demonstrate compliance with TELRIC. *See, e.g., Verizon New Jersey Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 12302-12305, paras. 61-68 (examining Verizon's NRCs for hot cuts).

[271] SBC Wardin Reply Aff. at Attach. B; Globalcom Comments at Tab 1, Affidavit of August H. Ankum at para. 10.

[272] Globalcom Comments at 24-25.

[273] Globalcom Comments at 24-25.

[274] We note that non-collocated carriers will not be entitled to order this type of EEL under the framework adopted in the *Triennial Review Order*. *Triennial Review Order* at para. 597.

[275] Globalcom Comments at 25, citing *Wisconsin UNE Compliance Order* at 9.

[276] SBC Reply, Vol. 3, Tab 12, Reply Affidavit of Scott T. VanderSanden (SBC VanderSanden Reply Aff.) at para. 10.

[277] SBC VanderSanden Reply Aff. at para. 11.

SBC also asserts that Globalcom is availing itself of the ability to opt into another carrier's interconnection agreement.[278]

71. Globalcom does not dispute SBC's claim that it is able to negotiate, arbitrate, or opt into existing interconnection agreements to receive lower EEL NRCs than are available through SBC's Wisconsin tariff. It also does not claim to have raised this issue before the Wisconsin Commission. We find that, to the extent Globalcom is not able to negotiate EEL NRCs that it believes are TELRIC-compliant, Globalcom should raise the issue before the Wisconsin Commission in the context of an interconnection agreement arbitration, as the Wisconsin Commission intended.[279] Accordingly, we conclude that the current EEL NRCs in Illinois and Wisconsin do not demonstrate a failure to comply with checklist item two.

(ii) Access to UNEs at TELRIC-Compliant Rates

72. Z-Tel submitted extensive comments in opposition to SBC's section 271 application. Z-Tel argues that it cannot opt into SBC's most favorable UNE rates in Illinois and Indiana unless it also agrees to accept amendments to its interconnection agreement that contain onerous reservations of rights provisions and a provision that gives SBC unilateral authority to change rates.[280]

73. Additionally, Z-Tel argues that SBC's refusal to make available a single set of currently-approved TELRIC-compliant rates and to automatically bill competitive LECs at such rates is unlawful because it results in discriminatory treatment.[281] Z-Tel believes that by this practice, SBC is maintaining a policy of price discrimination whereby some competitive LECs are given an advantage over others.[282] Since July 2002, Z-Tel and SBC have been engaged in formal dispute resolutions before the Illinois and Indiana Commissions over these issues.[283] Z-Tel indicates that it may reach settlement with SBC in the near future.[284] In its evaluation, the Department of Justice references Z-Tel's claims, and defers to the Commission's determination whether SBC's conduct could violate the Commission's rules or the Act.[285]

74. SBC responds that Z-Tel's comments are in the nature of a carrier-to-carrier

---

[278] SBC VanderSanden Reply Aff. at para. 12.

[279] *See Wisconsin UNE Compliance Order* at 9.

[280] Z-Tel Comments at 2, 6-9.

[281] *Id.* at 3-6.

[282] *Id.* at 4.

[283] *Id.* at 2.

[284] *Id.*

[285] Department of Justice Evaluation at 17.

dispute that is inappropriate for consideration in a section 271 proceeding.[286] Despite SBC's position that this issue should be resolved before the state commissions, SBC asserts that competitive LECs are not entitled to an automatic tariff flow-through of rates unless the terms of their interconnection agreements include a provision allowing such,[287] that the terms of agreement provisions to which Z-Tel objects were provided only as proposals for good-faith negotiation purposes,[288] and that, to date, Z-Tel has not been improperly billed by SBC at higher rates because Z-Tel has not purchased any UNEs from SBC.[289] Additionally, SBC argues that the law does not require it to include all TELRIC-compliant rates in a single document or interconnection agreement.[290] Despite its position on this issue, however, SBC has developed and submitted into the record of this proceeding a single document for each state clarifying all rates it is relying on for each state.[291] Ultimately, SBC argues, this dispute with Z-Tel should be adjudicated before the state commissions.[292]

75. We agree with SBC that this dispute should be resolved before the state commissions. As we have noted in previous orders, the Act authorizes the state commissions to resolve specific carrier-to-carrier disputes arising under the local competition provisions, and it authorizes the federal district courts to ensure the legality of the results of the state arbitration process.[293] In this particular case, the dispute appears to be over the way SBC structures new interconnection arrangements and access to existing arrangements, areas that are squarely within the authority of the states as delineated by the 1996 Act.[294] We are reluctant to deny a section 271 application because a BOC is engaged in an unresolved dispute with its competitors before the state commissions, which have primary jurisdiction over the matter.[295] We believe this dispute is a local arbitration matter for the appropriate state commissions to decide in the first instance.

---

[286] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at paras. 38-40.

[287] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at paras. 43, 45, 48.

[288] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 49.

[289] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 45 n.26.

[290] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 43.

[291] SBC September 9 *Ex Parte* Letter at Attach. A-D.

[292] SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 39.

[293] *See SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18541, para. 383; *see also* 47 U.S.C. 252(c), (e)(6); *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999).

[294] 47 U.S.C. § 252(e).

[295] *SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd 25718, at para. 120.

2. Access to Operations Support Systems

76. Checklist item two requires a BOC to demonstrate that competitors have nondiscriminatory access to the various systems, databases, and personnel (collectively referred to as OSS) that a BOC uses in providing service to its customers.[296] SBC uses the same OSS throughout its Midwest region[297] and we recently determined that SBC affords competitors nondiscriminatory access to its OSS in our *SBC Michigan II Order*.[298] Consistent with our findings made in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we determine that SBC has demonstrated that it provides nondiscriminatory access to its OSS in compliance with this checklist item in the remaining four states of this region. As in previous section 271 orders, we focus our review on those OSS issues in controversy and do not address each aspect of SBC's performance where our review of the record satisfies us that there is little or no dispute that SBC complies with its nondiscrimination obligations.[299]

a. Third-Party Testing

77. Since the Commission must rely on BOC-provided commercial data to evaluate compliance with this and several other checklist items, we must first determine whether those data are indeed reliable and accurate. To do so, we look at several factors – namely, third-party testing of the BOC's OSS, state commission oversight, and the ability of a competitive LEC to audit its carrier-specific data and perform, if necessary, data reconciliations with the BOC.[300] Together with its commercial data, SBC submitted into the record the results of two third-party tests, as it did in the *SBC Michigan II* section 271 proceeding. Like Michigan, the two independent auditors are BearingPoint (formerly known as KPMG Consulting, Inc.), whose review is in progress, and Ernst & Young, LLP (E&Y).[301]

78. We reject commenters' concerns regarding the integrity and status of SBC's third-party tests. The third-party tests that SBC submitted in this proceeding are similar to those the

---

[296] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3989-90, para. 83.

[297] *See, e.g.*, Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg, Counsel for SBC, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167, Attach. A at 1 (filed Sept. 12, 2003) (SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter); DOJ Evaluation at 8 ("SBC uses the same [OSS] across all five states in the Ameritech region, including the four involved in the present application. Thus, issues concerning OSS are generally the same throughout the four states.").

[298] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 55.

[299] *See, e.g.*, *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 55; *Verizon New Jersey Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 12309, para. 77; *BellSouth Georgia/Louisiana Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 9144, para. 219.

[300] *See, e.g.*, *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 13 (citing *BellSouth Georgia/Louisiana Order*, *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, *SWBT Texas Order*) (further citations omitted).

[301] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 14.

Commission has considered and relied on previously[302] and, as we have already mentioned above, SBC's OSS are the same across this region. Almost without exception, these commenters raise identical claims and offer the same supporting information as they did in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding.[303] We rejected those arguments in our *SBC Michigan II Order* and find that it is appropriate to do so here. Thus, we continue to find that the E&Y final test results and the data SBC provided in this joint application are reliable for purposes of determining SBC's checklist compliance.[304]

(i) BearingPoint Tests

79. Each state commission in this joint application retained BearingPoint to perform a third-party test of SBC's OSS.[305] Although each state commission oversaw its own BearingPoint test, we determine that it is appropriate to consider the findings of the tests together because BearingPoint reviewed the same subject matter and the same OSS,[306] and conducted its tests in an identical fashion across the four states.[307] For example, the MTP for each state was developed

[302] *See, e.g.*, *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 22.

[303] For example, several commenters contend that the different "materiality" standard used by E&Y masked problems with SBC's OSS that would have been identified if this auditor used the standard followed by BearingPoint (*i.e.*, E&Y would exclude failures from its analysis where the difference between SBC's results and E&Y's results was less than 5% whereas BearingPoint uses a 1% materiality standard). *See* AT&T Comments at 72. We do not credit this and other criticisms of E&Y's methodology because we have previously considered and relied on third-party tests using substantially similar, if not identical, methodologies. *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 22 & n.71 (citing tests performed in Missouri, Texas, and California).

[304] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 21. *See also*, Illinois Commission Comments at 16; Ohio Commission Comments at 2-3 (noting that BearingPoint's "overall test results demonstrate statutory compliance based on information that is sufficiently reliable for purposes of Section 271."); *Wisconsin Commission Phase II Order* at 16 ("the overall [BearingPoint] test results support SBC's claim that its systems satisfy established § 271 standards.").

[305] Together with SBC, the state commissions of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin retained BearingPoint in May 2000 to design a Master Test Plan (MTP) and conduct a third-party test of the commercial readiness of SBC's OSS interfaces, documentation, and processes. *See* SBC Application, App. A, Vol. 2, Tab 11, Affidavit of Mark J. Cottrell and Beth Lawson (SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff.), Attach. A (BearingPoint's Third Party OSS Test for Illinois Bell) at para. 2; SBC Application, App. M, Vol. 31, Tab 165-Part A (BearingPoint's Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report) at 7; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. D (BearingPoint's Third Party OSS Test for Wisconsin Bell), at para. 2. On June 1, 2000, the Ohio Commission and SBC retained BearingPoint as that state's third-party test administrator. Ohio Commission Comments at 3.

[306] For these same reasons, we also determine that it is appropriate to apply our analysis of the BearingPoint test in the *SBC Michigan II Order* to the instant joint application. *See, e.g.,* SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 1; SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 1a, Tab 3, Reply Affidavit of Justin W. Brown, Mark J. Cottrell, and Beth Lawson (SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff.) at para. 7 (indicating that, with minor differences, BearingPoint's tests developed in all five of the Midwest states are very similar). We discuss the E &Y test below. *See* paras. 86-87 *infra*.

[307] In its reply, SBC notes that the MTPs developed in all five of the Midwest states are very similar "with only minor differences resulting from state-specific issues, such as testing line splitting/line sharing orders in Illinois and (continued….)

through a collaborative process involving state commission staff, BearingPoint, SBC, competitive LECs, and other interested parties.[308] BearingPoint tested five domains of OSS functionality (pre-order and order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, billing, and relationship management and infrastructure) across three different test families in the four states. The first, Transaction Verification and Validation (TVV), consisted of transaction-based tests and the second, Processes and Procedures Review (PPR), reviewed SBC's wholesale business processes and management practices. BearingPoint completed tests of both of these families in all four states. As described below, BearingPoint has not completed its test of the third family, PMR.

80. As noted in our *SBC Michigan II Order*, BearingPoint's testing for the four states was analogous to that previously considered and relied upon by the Commission in various states served by Verizon and BellSouth.[309] Specifically, BearingPoint used a "test until pass" approach[310] and took certain steps to maintain the blindness and independence of the testing process. Among other things, BearingPoint and Hewlett-Packard Consulting, which BearingPoint employed to serve as a pseudo-competitive LEC, relied on SBC's published documentation to establish a wholesale account relationship and build system interfaces that interact with SBC's OSS. In addition, the pseudo-competitive LEC serviced customers (which it obtained from SBC and competitive LECs) by submitting orders, receiving bills, and conducting maintenance and repair activities.[311] Moreover, competitive LECs provided live test cases, allowing BearingPoint to test additional aspects of SBC's systems.[312] BearingPoint also held weekly conference calls with competitive LECs and state commission staff to discuss areas of

(Continued from previous page)
Michigan. . . ." SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 7. We determine that these minor differences among the BearingPoint tests do not affect the results of these tests. For example, unlike the Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio commissions, which permitted BearingPoint to use regional samples in its testing, the Wisconsin Commission required BearingPoint to test state-specific data samples. *See* SBC Application App. A, Vol. 8, Tab 22, Affidavit of James D. Ehr and Salvatore T. Fioretti (Ehr/Fioretti Aff.) at para. 57. Despite this difference, we agree with SBC that it is reasonable to conclude that the individual state test scores will be nearly identical for most of the OSS tests (assuming the results are viewed at the same time) because SBC's reporting processes and systems are largely common to all of its Midwest states. *Id.* Indeed, as SBC notes, the BearingPoint results for its Performance Metrics Review (PMR) tests in Ohio and Wisconsin are identical. *Id.*

[308] *See* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. A at para. 2; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. B (BearingPoint's Third Party OSS Test for Indiana Bell) at para. 2; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. C (BearingPoint's Third Party OSS Test for Ohio Bell) at para. 2; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. D at para. 2.

[309] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 15 (citing *Bell Atlantic New York Order* and *BellSouth Georgia/Louisiana Order*) (further citations omitted).

[310] The "test until pass" or military-style test means that when situations arose where testing revealed that a BOC process, document, or system did not meet expectations, the BOC would respond by providing a clarification or describing its intended fix and BearingPoint would perform a retest as required. *See, e.g., Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3998, para. 98; *Verizon Massachusetts Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 9011-12, para. 45.

[311] *See, e.g.*, BearingPoint's Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report at 8.

[312] *See, e.g.,* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. A at para. 11.

concern about the tests and provide updates on the tests' progress.[313]

81. During May through June 2003, BearingPoint filed reports with the four state commissions that provided updates on its testing.[314] In Illinois, BearingPoint found that SBC satisfied over 95 percent of the 496 evaluation criteria.[315] Similarly, in Indiana and Ohio, BearingPoint determined that SBC satisfied over 95 percent of the 502 evaluation criteria tested in those states.[316] Finally, in Wisconsin, BearingPoint found that SBC satisfied over 95 percent of the 498 evaluation criteria.[317] As we did in our *SBC Michigan II Order*, we determine that BearingPoint's results constitute important evidence that SBC is providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS.[318]

82. As was the case in Michigan, BearingPoint has not completed three of five PMR test areas: PMR 1 (Data Collection and Storage Verification and Validation Review); PMR 4 (Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review); and PMR 5 (Metrics Calculations and Reporting Verification and Validation Review).[319] We describe the open issues in these tests below and conclude, as we have previously in our *SBC Michigan II Order* and as did three of the four state commissions, that SBC's performance data are accurate and reliable.[320] Since filing its

[313] *Id.* at 4. Furthermore, state commission staff randomly monitored telephone calls between BearingPoint and SBC. *Id.*

[314] BearingPoint filed its most recent Metrics Update Report for Indiana on May 12, 2003 (revised on May 13, 2003); Illinois on June 2, 2003; and Ohio and Wisconsin on June 30, 2003. SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 32.

[315] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. A at para. 1.

[316] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. B at para. 1; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. C at para. 1.

[317] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. D at para. 1.

[318] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 58.

[319] BearingPoint's testing of PMR 2 (Metrics Definitions and Standards) and PMR 3 (Performance Measurement Change Management) is completed and all of the evaluation criteria (*i.e.*, test points) in these two test areas were satisfied. *See* SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 3, Tab 9, Reply Affidavit of James D. Ehr and Salvatore T. Fioretti (SBC Ehr/Fioretti Reply Aff.) Attach. A at 5 (Illinois OSS Evaluation Project Report Metrics Update, filed August 1, 2003).

[320] The four state commissions have approached the incomplete BearingPoint PMR test in different ways. For example, the Ohio Commission concluded that SBC satisfied all OSS-related checklist requirements. Ohio Commission Comments, App. A at 19. According to the Ohio Commission, its recently issued Compliance Order, which allows for financial sanctions, will ensure that BearingPoint's PMR test is completed in a timely manner and SBC will honor its commitments for resolving all pending TVV and PMR criteria. *Id*. Similarly, based on the totality of the evidence before it, the Illinois Commission found that SBC's commercial performance data are sufficiently reliable. Illinois Commission Comments at 16. Specifically, the Illinois Commission considered the BearingPoint Interim PM Report, the Ernst & Young Performance Measurement Examination, the availability of raw performance data to competitive LECs, SBC's internal and external data controls, collaborative metric workshops, and the adoption of a process to ensure the completion of the BearingPoint test. *Id.* at 20-22. The Wisconsin Commission found that the overall BearingPoint test results support SBC's claim that its OSS satisfy (continued….)

joint application, BearingPoint filed a metrics update with all SBC Midwest state commissions. Importantly, these reports show improvement in BearingPoint's testing results while providing no indication of any notable issue affecting data integrity.[321]

83. *PMR 1*. This test evaluates SBC's data collection and storage policies and practices.[322] As of June 30, 2003, BearingPoint's PMR 1 test had three open exceptions,[323] which are identical to those BearingPoint identified in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding: 186 (concerning SBC's data retention policies), 187, and 188 (both of which relate to technical documentation).[324] As we determined in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, SBC has taken appropriate corrective actions to address these exceptions and, more importantly, these exceptions do not call into question SBC's ability to process and calculate its data accurately and reliably.[325]

84. *PMR 4*. This test evaluates SBC's policies and practices for processing data used in the production of the reported performance results.[326] In the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we addressed one of the two open exceptions currently before us: Exception 181, which identifies a discrepancy found in Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin between SBC's source systems and its

(Continued from previous page)
section 271 standards and the unfinished status of the test does not compel a finding of non-compliance. *See Wisconsin Commission Phase II Order* at 16. Like the Ohio and Illinois commissions, the Wisconsin Commission established procedures to ensure that SBC completes this test. *Id.* at 17-18 (explaining that, among other things, it will monitor SBC's performance data and compliance, and has established an expedited dispute resolution process for OSS issues). The Indiana Commission, however, stated that it was unable to determine whether SBC provides nondiscriminatory access for those performance measures, products, and services where there is no retail analogue. Indiana Commission Comments at 144. The Indiana Commission thus deferred its analysis of the commercial results for checklist item 2 to the Commission. *See, e.g., id.* at 149. Because we determine that we may rely on SBC's reported commercial data, we find that SBC's commercial performance, as described below, demonstrates its compliance with this aspect of checklist item 2.

[321] *See* SBC Ehr/Fioretti Reply Aff. at para. 8 & n.8. *See also id.*, Illinois OSS Evaluation Project Report Metrics Update. Specifically, according to BearingPoint, as of August 1, 2003, BearingPoint's testing demonstrated that SBC satisfied approximately 64% of the PMR 1 evaluation criteria, over 32% of the PMR 4 criteria (with 60% of the criteria being "indeterminate"), and almost 58% of the PMR 5 evaluation criteria (with almost 18% of the criteria listed as indeterminate). *Id.* at 5.

[322] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 67.

[323] BearingPoint will create an exception after determining that a test indicates that one of SBC's practices, policies, or system characteristics did not satisfy one or more of the evaluation criteria defined for the test. *See e.g.*, BearingPoint's Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report at 9. The exception will remain open until either the issue is resolved through retesting activities, BearingPoint determines that further action is not warranted or possible, or the state commission specifically exempts the exception from further testing. *Id.*

[324] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 69.

[325] *SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 29-31.

[326] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 98.

processed records for the performance metric PM 104.1.[327] We note that the second exception open in the instant application, Exception 182, is the identical issue but applicable to Wisconsin only.[328] As explained above, the Wisconsin Commission required BearingPoint to test state-specific data; however, since SBC's systems are nearly identical across its Midwest region, we would expect that BearingPoint's exceptions for PMR 4 would be the same across the four states.[329] Thus, we will treat these two exceptions as one for purposes of our analysis.[330] For the reasons provided in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we conclude that this BearingPoint test result does not bar a finding that SBC's data are accurate and reliable.[331] Most notably, SBC has demonstrated that it has taken remedial actions related to this exception,[332] the problem had no material impact on the reported measurements that are the subject of this application,[333] and no commenter has disputed SBC's performance in this regard.

85. *PMR 5.* This test evaluates SBC's processes to calculate state-specific performance results.[334] Within PMR 5, there are four test criteria, one of which has been completely satisfied.[335] Of the remaining three, the first (PMR 5-2) tests whether BearingPoint can independently replicate SBC's performance results using SBC's unfiltered data.[336] As in Michigan, we agree with SBC that BearingPoint's inability to replicate (*i.e.,* "match") several of SBC's performance measures has no material effect on the March-July 2003 performance data on which SBC relies.[337] BearingPoint identified two exceptions in the PMR 5-3 test criterion,

---

[327] This metric measures the average time it takes to unlock the 911 record to allow the record to be claimed by the competitive LEC. *See* SBC/Ameritech Performance Measurement User Guide, Version 1.9, at 159.

[328] *See* SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 58, n.23.

[329] *See* n.307, *supra*.

[330] *See* SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 2 & n.3 (indicating that these exceptions reflect the same BearingPoint finding).

[331] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 33.

[332] *See* SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at paras. 109-10 (describing SBC's corrective actions beginning in 2002 and explaining that this discrepancy was identified by E&Y's audit). Among other things, SBC implemented process changes both to ensure that manually unlocked numbers were included in its performance results and to improve the match rate between 911 unlock and SOC records. *Id; see also SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 33.

[333] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 109.

[334] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 114.

[335] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at paras. 115, 121 (explaining that there are no open issues in PMR 5-1, which tests whether SBC reports its performance measure disaggregations consistent with the business rules).

[336] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 115.

[337] *SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 35-39. *See also* SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at paras. 139-42. Finally, using E&Y's 5% materiality standard, described above in note 303, SBC notes that its four-state match rate is 95.6 percent. SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at 139.

which tests whether SBC is calculating each state's results consistent with that state's business rules.[338] SBC explains that it has fully addressed the issues raised in both exceptions, Exceptions 111 and 113, which, as was the case in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, no commenter disputes.[339] Therefore, we find that the open status of these exceptions does not affect our determination that SBC's data are reliable.

(ii) E&Y Test

86. In addition to the BearingPoint tests, in October 2002, SBC requested E&Y to expand its audit of Michigan Bell's compliance with the business rules to include the other SBC Midwest states.[340] As in Michigan, E&Y evaluated whether SBC's performance results were calculated and reported accurately and in compliance with the business rules in the four states at issue in the application.[341] In its analysis, E&Y reviewed all 150 performance measures approved by the state commissions and in effect for the three months of its audit.[342] As we noted in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, E&Y's audit included parts of BearingPoint's ongoing metrics review, PMR 1 and PMR 3, and all of PMR 4 and PMR 5.[343] In each state, E&Y issued reports concerning SBC's compliance with its business rules and state business rules, SBC's controls to produce accurate and complete performance measurements, and E&Y's testing methodology.[344] Like in Michigan, on April 16, 2003, E&Y issued its final opinion that all instances of material noncompliance previously identified by E&Y in earlier reports have been corrected or do not require corrective action.[345]

---

[338] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at 139. We note that BearingPoint has issued no exceptions in PMR 5-4, which tests whether SBC excludes data in accordance with each state commission's business rules. *Id.* We further note that no commenter has raised any concerns regarding SBC's performance in this area.

[339] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 128; *see also SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 39. Exception 111 concerns SBC's treatment of "no access" and "delayed maintenance" for PM 66 through PM 68 and Exception 113 relates to the proper interpretation of the business rules for PM 2, which calculates the speed of responses to pre-order inquiries. SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 128.

[340] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 18 (noting that each BOC applicant retained E&Y to perform a "substantially identical performance measurement audit for its respective performance measurements").

[341] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 17-18; *see also* SBC Application, App. C-OH, Tab 106 at 275 (Ernst & Young, SBC Ohio 271 Performance Measurement Examination, Supplemental Report at 1 (dated Jan. 13, 2003)).

[342] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 19. Because E&Y reviewed all metrics in effect in the application states, SBC states that these audits were "substantially more comprehensive than the audit E&Y performed in Missouri," which the Commission considered in the *SBC Arkansas/Missouri Order*. *Id.*

[343] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 17.

[344] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at paras. 20-21.

[345] SBC Ehr/Fioretti Aff. at para. 22. *See also SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 18. E&Y defined "material noncompliance" as when an exception has greater than a plus or minus five percent impact on the reported (continued….)

87. For the same reasons as provided in our *SBC Michigan II Order*, we conclude that SBC's data are accurate and reliable and we can substantially rely on the E&Y audits to support these findings. As noted previously, the Commission has relied on identical or similar audits in approving SBC's Michigan, Missouri, California and Texas applications.[346] Since we find that the parties raise no new objections with respect to E&Y's audits in the instant joint application than were raised in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, we reject parties' arguments about the inadequacies of the E&Y audits.[347] Similarly, we again find no merit in the argument that since BearingPoint's test continues, we cannot fully credit E&Y's findings.[348] We have considered and rejected the same assertion in our *SBC Michigan II Order* and similarly we find it is appropriate to do so here.[349]

b. Pre-Ordering

88. SBC Midwest's OSS, including its pre-ordering interfaces, is essentially the same in each of the application states as that which we recently approved in the *SBC Michigan II Order*.[350] Consistent with our determination in the *SBC Michigan II Order* and the findings of the state commissions, we find that SBC provides carriers in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin with nondiscriminatory access to all pre-ordering functions.[351] In this section, we describe SBC's pre-ordering systems, address their performance, and reject commenters' criticisms regarding the availability of SBC's pre-ordering interfaces and the accuracy of its loop qualification database.

(Continued from previous page)
performance measure or if parity/benchmark result is affected. *See* Ernst & Young, SBC Ohio 271 Performance Measurement Examination, Supplemental Report at 6.

346 *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 21.

347 *See* AT&T Comments at 69-80; IUCC Comments at 12; OCC at 12-13. We also reject commenters' allegations concerning E&Y's objectivity. *See also* AT&T Comments, Declaration of Karen W. Moore and Timothy M. Connelly (AT&T Moore/Connelly Decl.) at paras. 32-33. Again, for reasons set forth in our *SBC Michigan II Order*, we are satisfied with E&Y's independence. *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 22. *See also* Illinois Commission Comments at 18 (concluding that E&Y is objective); SBC Application, App. C-IL, Tab 135 at para. 2939 (Illinois Commission Order on Investigation, May 13, 2003).

348 *See, e.g.*, IUCC Comments at 8-11; OCC Comments at 5-8. We also disagree that SBC's joint application is premature because of the ongoing nature of BearingPoint's tests. *See e.g.*, AT&T Comments at 10; MCI Comments at 14; TDS Metrocom Comments at 5-6. As explained in our *SBC Michigan II Order*, the Commission has never required that all third-party tests be completed when the BOC files its section 271 application in order for the Commission to determine that the BOC has satisfied its section 271 obligations. *See SBC Michigan II Order* at 23 (citing *BellSouth Georgia/Louisiana Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 9028-29, para. 17).

349 *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 23.

350 *See SBC Michigan II Order*, para. 59; SBC Application at 56.

351 *See SBC Michigan II Order*, para. 59; Illinois Commission Comments at 79; Ohio Commission Comments at 147; Wisconsin Commission Comments at 1. We note that the Indiana Commission deferred the determination of whether SBC is in compliance with checklist item 2 to the Commission. Indiana Commission Comments at 17-18.

89. Competing carriers have access to three principal electronic interfaces, including Enhanced Verigate, which is a graphical user interface, as well as EDI and CORBA, which are application-to-application interfaces.[352] Enhanced Verigate is launched from the web-based SBC Toolbar platform that operates with Windows and provides competitive LECs with plain English access to pre-ordering functions available from SBC Midwest's legacy systems.[353] While EDI and CORBA are different protocols and allow competitive LECs to select which format they wish to use in their pre-ordering interfaces, they provide access to the same pre-ordering functionality.[354] Competing carriers are able to use any of the three interfaces to perform all of the key functions identified in prior section 271 orders.[355] The performance data show that SBC typically meets every benchmark or retail analogue, providing persuasive evidence that competitors have equivalent access to SBC's pre-ordering databases in the four states.[356]

90. We also conclude that SBC provides competitive LECs with the information necessary to integrate their pre-ordering and ordering systems. Specifically, SBC's three pre-ordering interfaces provide "parsed" customer service information pursuant to the guidelines of the ordering and billing form (OBF) – that is, information divided into identifiable fields.[357] As

[352] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at paras. 56, 59.

[353] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 59. The term SBC Midwest refers collectively to the five state local exchange carrier operations of Illinois Bell Telephone Company (Illinois Bell); Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Incorporated (Indiana Bell); Michigan Bell Telephone Company (Michigan Bell); The Ohio Bell Telephone Company (Ohio Bell); and Wisconsin Bell, Inc (Wisconsin Bell). SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 1 n.1.

[354] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 55.

[355] *See, e.g., SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25690, para. 81; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18427, para. 209. SBC's pre-ordering systems allow carriers to perform functions required by our section 271 orders as well as several additional functions. SBC's pre-ordering systems include the ability for carriers to inquire regarding: (1) address validation; (2) customer service information (CSI); (3) telephone number (TN) reservation and cancellation of a TN reservation; (4) common language location identifier codes (CLLI); (4) connection facility assignments (CFA); (5) directory listings; (6) feature/service availability; (7) primary interexchange carrier (PIC)/local primary interLATA Carrier (LPIC); (8) loop pre-qualification; (9) loop qualification; (10) network channel (NC)/network channel interface (NCI) validation; (11) pending order status; (12) provisioning order status; (13) scheduling – both dispatches and due dates, (14) TN confirmation; (15) remote access to call forwarding (RACF); and (16) pooled TNs. SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 54.

[356] *See, e.g.*, SBC Application App. A, Vol. 4, Tab 18, Affidavit of James D. Ehr Regarding Illinois (SBC Ehr Illinois Aff.); SBC Application App. A, Vol. 5, Tab 19, Affidavit of James D. Ehr Regarding Indiana (SBC Ehr Indiana Aff.); SBC Application App. A, Vol. 6, Tab 20, Affidavit of James D. Ehr Regarding Ohio (SBC Ehr Ohio Aff.); SBC Application App. A, Vol. 7, Tab 21, Affidavit of James D. Ehr Regarding Wisconsin (SBC Ehr Wisconsin Aff); Appendices B-E. SBC has submitted actual commercial data for almost 125 submeasures relating to the timeliness, accuracy, and availability of SBC's pre-ordering systems. With almost no exceptions, SBC satisfies all applicable metrics in the PM 1, PM 2, PM 4, and PM 10 families – which measure timeliness of responses to pre-order queries, the availability of pre-ordering databases, and the incidence of "time out" transactions – in all five relevant months.

[357] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at paras. 63-64.

the Commission previously has held, a BOC's provision of pre-ordering information in a parsed format is a strong indicator that competitive LECs can integrate SBC's systems.[358] In addition to offering customer service record information in parsed form, SBC offers competitive LECs synchronization of all data fields of its pre-ordering and ordering interfaces.[359]

91. *Pre-Ordering Interface Availability*. We reject CIMCO's allegation that SBC's pre-ordering process, in particular SBC's implementation of LSOG 5, deprives CIMCO of a meaningful ability to compete with SBC.[360] According to CIMCO, under SBC's LSOG 5, SBC requires a more cumbersome two-step manual/auto process for complex orders, compared to the one-step automated ordering process formerly available under LSOG 4.[361] Specifically, CIMCO states that under LSOG 4, CIMCO was able to submit a one-step order to SBC that contained placeholders for the various elements of the order (*i.e.*, telephone number, trunk group number, circuit ID, route index, station numbers).[362] Under LSOG 5, CIMCO states that SBC removed the placeholder functionality, resulting in a two-step manual/auto process for ordering, which has approximately doubled the turn-around time as compared to LSOG 4.[363] In addition, CIMCO argues that it should not have to fax manual pre-order requests to SBC.[364]

92. We reject CIMCO's claims, and agree with SBC that its pre-ordering process is nondiscriminatory.[365] SBC's LSOG 5 pre-ordering process was developed as part of the Uniform and Enhanced Plan of Record (U&E POR), a collaborative process open to participation by all competitive LECs, including CIMCO, to facilitate pre-ordering, ordering, and other functions by which competitive LECs order and deploy resold services and UNEs throughout SBC's territories.[366] As of April 2002, effective with the release of LSOG 5 as part of the U&E POR, SBC began to use a uniform 13-state platform for both pre-ordering and ordering functions.[367] As a result, SBC, in its Midwest region, adopted the same manual pre-order process as that used

---

358 *See SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25690-91, para. 82; *BellSouth Georgia/Louisiana Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 9078, para. 120.

359 SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para 64.

360 CIMCO Comments at 3-6.

361 CIMCO Comments at 3.

362 CIMCO Comments at 4.

363 CIMCO Comments at 4.

364 CIMCO Comments at 5.

365 SBC Application at 60.

366 Letter from Colin S. Stretch, Counsel for SBC, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 at Attach. (filed August 13, 2003) (SBC Aug. 13 *Ex Parte* Letter).

367 SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 133; SBC Aug. 13 *Ex Parte* Letter at Attach.

in the other SBC states.[368] We note that while the pre-order process for complex orders does require competitive LECs to fax a complete LSR when requesting TN reservations, SBC recognizes that this process has become cumbersome and is committed to streamlining the process by requiring competitive LECs to submit only those fields needed to reserve TNs.[369] On August 22, 2003, SBC began a series of trials to determine with CIMCO exactly what needs to be submitted during the pre-order phase for complex products.[370] Given that SBC had processes in place at the time of filing to quickly respond to competing LEC's requests for this feature, we decline to find that the fact that complex orders had to be faxed warrants a finding of checklist noncompliance. Since SBC's pre-ordering process was developed through a joint effort between competitive LECs and SBC, and is one that the Commission has approved in prior section 271 applications, we do not find that CIMCO's complaints indicate that SBC's LSOG 5 deprives competitive LECs of a meaningful opportunity to compete in the application states.[371]

93. We also dismiss RCN's claims that SBC does not allow competitors to perform pre-ordering functions in substantially the same time and manner as the BOC's retail operations.[372] In particular, RCN argues that SBC's refusal to provide RCN with access to SBC's Living Unit (LIV) database in a format that would be usable by RCN to scrub customer address data prior to address validation is discriminatory.[373] According to SBC, the problem RCN is having is due to the fact that RCN is using billing information from the United States Postal Service (USPS) to populate the service address field on its LSRs, instead of using SBC's pre-order address validation function.[374] Because RCN is using a service address based on the USPS' records, instead of the address information available through SBC, the service order

[368] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 133. SBC communicated the details of this process to competitive LECs via Accessible Letter CLECAM02-198 (dated May 14, 2002). SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 133. According to SBC, the LSOG 4 placeholders created a situation in which SBC was required to provide this pre-order activity, in addition to normal ordering activity, in accordance with ordering performance standards (*i.e.*, the 24 hour FOC interval). However, the record shows that the requirements for LSOG 5 were negotiated as part of the Plan of Record Collaboratives and that SBC notified competitive LECs of the functionality afforded in LSOG 5 via Accessible Letters and walk-throughs. Therefore, according to CLEC Online, a website developed by SBC to support competitive LECs within its 13-state region through a single access point, the LSC will now "return the pre-order information back to the CLEC [competitive LEC] within 72 hours of receiving the pre-order request." SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para 41; SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at paras. 135-136. If CIMCO does not believe that the 72 hour standard is sufficient, CIMCO may raise the issue at the CLEC User Forum.

[369] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 134.

[370] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 134.

[371] *See e.g.*, *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 59.

[372] RCN Comments at 1-2.

[373] RCN Comments at 1-2.

[374] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 55.

address sometimes does not match.[375] The record shows that SBC makes a pre-order address validation query available through each of its three pre-order interfaces – CORBA, EDI, and Enhanced Verigate.[376] Such a query enables a competitive LEC to determine, prior to submitting an LSR, whether the service address to be populated on its LSR matches the service address maintained in SBC's back office systems.[377] Among other things, the pre-order address validation query accesses and verifies information in the LIV database before returning a response to the competitive LECs.[378] We find that RCN does not indicate that it is unable to utilize SBC's processes for pre-order address validation, which would enable them to access the LIV database. Therefore, we find that RCN's claims do not demonstrate checklist noncompliance.

94. We further find that AT&T's allegations that SBC's CORBA pre-ordering interface suffers from substantial outages do not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance.[379] Although AT&T states that outages of CORBA have increased significantly during June, July, and August 2003 and that recent outages have ranged in duration between 72 minutes and 2 hours and 21 minutes,[380] the record shows that SBC's performance under PM-4 indicates that all three of SBC's pre-ordering interfaces – CORBA, EDI, and Enhanced Verigate – were available almost the entire time they were scheduled to be available.[381] In addition, SBC's performance for PM 4-17 (OSS Interface Availability; CORBA Pre-Order) in all four application states shows that SBC's interfaces were available well over 99 percent of the time in March through July.[382] Therefore, as we found in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we find that competitors using SBC's

[375] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 55.

[376] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 56.

[377] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 56.

[378] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 56.

[379] AT&T Comments at 62-63; AT&T Comments, Declaration of Sarah DeYoung and Walter W. Willard (AT&T DeYoung/Willard Decl.) at paras. 34-51; AT&T Reply at 28-34.

[380] Three of the outages in June were between 72 and 105 minutes in duration. AT&T DeYoung/Willard Decl. at para. 38. The 2 hour and 21 minute outage occurred in August. AT&T DeYoung/Willard Decl. at para. 40.

[381] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 42.

[382] Appendices B-E. We note, however, that in April and June, SBC missed the relevant 99.5% benchmark by 0.43% and 0.06% respectively. Such narrow misses are competitively insignificant. PM-4 measures the impact of interruptions to interface availability on the competitive LEC community. According to SBC, if the interface is completely unavailable, 100% of the outage duration is counted against SBC. In cases where an interface is partially available, an "availability factor" – which is stated as a percentage, and represents the impact of the degraded service to the competitive LEC community as a whole – is applied to the calculation of downtime. According to SBC, examples of degraded service situations include slow response on one of the pre-order services, such as CSI inquiry or address validation, which can result in user time-outs. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 45 n.41. *But see* AT&T Reply at 29 n.91 (stating that "the business impact of a partial CORBA outage can be as crippling as that of a total CORBA outage").

CORBA interface are not denied a meaningful opportunity to compete.[383]

95. *Loop Qualification*. We also find that SBC provides competitive LECs with nondiscriminatory access to loop qualification information.[384] We do not find that ACN Group's criticisms of SBC's loop qualification performance rise to the level of checklist noncompliance.[385] ACN Group maintains that Mpower has had to cancel 40 percent of its DSL orders in Illinois due to erroneous loop makeup information it receives from SBC's OSS.[386] In particular, ACN Group details that SBC provides loops which are too long and with equipment such as bridge taps or repeaters that will preclude the use of the loop for DSL service.[387] However, as we found in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, SBC's advanced services affiliate receives precisely the same loop make-up information that is available to unaffiliated competitive LECs,

[383] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 62.

[384] *See, e.g.*, PM 1.1-01 (Average Response Time for Manual Loop Make-Up Information); PM 1.2 (Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders). Although SBC missed three loop makeup timeliness metrics for several months, we find that SBC's overall performance remained high. SBC missed the 95% benchmark for PM 2-42 (% Responses Received within 30 seconds; OSS interface; Actual LMU Information Requested (5 or less loops searched)) by an average of 3.5% for March through July 2003 in all four states. However, this appears to be attributable to a difficulty in disaggregating the data, and not due to a problem with actual performance. SBC states that system changes necessary to monitor performance for searches of five or fewer loops were not in place until April 7, 2003. SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para 64. Thus, searches of more than five loops, which are expected to take longer, were included with the results for searches of five or fewer loops up to that date. SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para 64. SBC's performance in May, following that correction, showed that it only missed the 95% benchmark by an average of 2.5%, and it met the benchmark in June and July. *See* Appendices B-E. Given this upward trend, we find the misses to be competitively insignificant. SBC also missed the applicable 95% benchmark for PM 2-43 (% Responses Received within 60 seconds; OSS Interface; Actual LMU Information Requested (greater than 5 loops searched)) by an average of 31.1% for April through July 2003 in all four states. However, the requests captured by this measurement represent on average less than 11% of all Actual LMU Information requests in the application states from April through July 2003. SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 2a, Tab 8, Reply Affidavit of James D. Ehr (SBC Ehr Reply Aff.), Attach. C at 1, 9, 12, 15. Given such low volumes (*e.g.*, actual data show 86 transactions in Indiana in April 2003), a small number of requests returned outside the 60-second interval would cause a failure to meet the 95% benchmark. *Id.* With respect to PM 2-43, SBC Midwest has established an internal forum to focus on improvements to the response times for greater than five loops searched. SBC has two issues under investigation: (1) synching up internal timeouts and (2) resolution of a known CORBA problem, which requires third-party software involvement. Although not a factor in our decision, SBC Midwest expects its performance under PM 2-43 to improve once these issues are resolved. SBC Application at 61 n.102. We also note that SBC missed the parity metric PM 1.1-01 (Average Response Time for Manual Loop Make-Up Information) in Illinois during each month from April through July. Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 1. Since March, the average response for loop make-up has averaged 0.88 seconds for competitive LECs versus 0.76 seconds for SBC's data affiliate. *Id*. We do not find the difference of .12 seconds to be competitively significant.

[385] ACN Group Comments at 29-30.

[386] ACN Group Comments at 29.

[387] ACN Group Comments at 29.

through the same interfaces available to unaffiliated competitive LECs.[388] As the Commission has previously held, any inaccuracies or omissions in a BOC's database are not discriminatory to the extent they are provided in the exact same form to both retail and wholesale customers.[389] Therefore, we conclude that ACN Group's allegations do not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance.

c. Ordering

96. Consistent with our findings in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we determine that SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to its ordering OSS functions.[390] We first discuss SBC's performance and then parties' assertions that SBC's ordering processes are deficient and warrant a finding of noncompliance. These competitive LEC allegations fall into several categories: (1) rejection of valid orders; (2) inaccurate service order completion notices (SOCs); and (3) inaccurate and untimely line loss notifications (LLNs) and billing completion notifications (BCNs).[391] For the reasons provided below, we reject these claims.

97. *Performance Measurements.* The commercial data reported during the relevant five months demonstrate that SBC satisfies checklist item two with regard to ordering.[392] SBC consistently satisfies the performance standards for ordering metrics with few exceptions. Although SBC has missed the relevant benchmark for several metrics three or more times during the five-month period of review, based on the record before us, we conclude that such misses are

---

[388] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 64; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 1, Tab 10, Affidavit of Carol A. Chapman (SBC Chapman Aff.) at para. 23 n.15; SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 2a, Tab 5, Reply Affidavit of Carol A. Chapman (SBC Chapman Reply Aff.) at 40.

[389] *Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26345-46, para. 69; *Verizon Massachusetts Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 9024, para. 66.

[390] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 65-77.

[391] As noted in our *SBC Michigan II Order*, a line loss occurs when a competitive LEC loses a customer to another competitive LEC or to the incumbent LEC. A LLN notifies the competitive LEC of such an occurrence. *SBC Michigan II Order* at n.206. BCNs inform competitive LECs that all activities necessary to establish service or migrate an end user customer from one carrier to another are complete and the competitive LEC can therefore begin to bill the customer for service. *Id.* at para. 74 (citing *Verizon New Hampshire/Delaware Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 18717-18, para. 99; *Verizon Pennsylvania Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 17446, para. 43). We note that while SBC refers to BCNs as "post to bill" (PTB) notices, consistent with Commission precedent, we will refer to these notices as BCNs.

[392] SBC's ordering performance is captured in the following families of performance measurements: PM 5, PM 6, PM 7, PM 8 (all of which report the timeliness of SBC's completion notices), PM 9, PM 10 and PM 11 (all of which report SBC's rejection and jeopardy notices), PM 12.01 (concerning mechanized provisioning accuracy), and PM 13 (which reports SBC's flow-through rates).

not indicative of OSS problems that are competitively significant.[393] For example, SBC's failure to meet several metrics in the PM 5 category, which measures firm order commitments (FOCs), can be attributed to low volumes, which tend to skew the results.[394] Additionally, as noted in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, SBC's wholesale flow-through rates in the four states that are the subject of this joint application are within the range that we have accepted in previous applications.[395] Moreover, SBC consistently returns timely order confirmation and rejection notices, accurately handles manually processed orders, and is able to scale its systems to process orders at projected future transaction volumes, thus, as we found in our *SBC Michigan II Order*,

[393] *See* PM 12-01 (Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy). Although SBC has been unable to achieve parity for this metric in Indiana for four months, approximately 95% of competitive LECs orders in Indiana were provisioned accurately during the five months of our review. *See* SBC Ehr Indiana Aff. at para. 47.

[394] *See* SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at para. 41. SBC states that during March through May, SBC issued 493,464 FOCs, of which just 456 (or 0.09%) were associated with order types captured by the following metrics: PM 5-16; PM 5-32; PM 5-34; and PM 5-40. *Id.* Specifically, for PM 5-32 (% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs – Man Sub Req – Complex Bus (1-200 lines)), which SBC missed the benchmark in Illinois three times during the five-month period, if SBC had issued four additional FOCs in March and one in April, SBC would have met the benchmark in this category for those months. *Id.* Moreover, we determine that BearingPoint's test results involving FOCs support our conclusion. In Indiana, for example, SBC returned FOCs on BearingPoint's test orders within the specified interval for 99.7% of orders that were submitted and processed electronically, 96.4% of FOCs that were submitted electronically and input manually, and 95.8% of orders that were submitted manually. *See* Indiana Commission Comments at 153 (citing BearingPoint's Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report at 816-17, 820).

[395] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 66, nn.194-95 (citing the flow-through rates before the Commission in its *SBC Michigan II Order*, *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, *Verizon Massachusetts Order*, *Verizon Rhode Island Order*, *Verizon Connecticut Order*, and *Verizon Vermont Order*). In the instant application, the rates for SBC's UNE flow-through for UNE Loops (PM 13-01) in Ohio, the only state where SBC failed to meet the 95% benchmark three or more times during the five-month period, range from 86% to 90%. We agree with SBC's contention that its performance in Ohio is attributable to a "consolidation of Billing Account Numbers being conducted for one particular CLEC," which caused affected local service requests (LSRs) to drop out for manual processing thereby lowering SBC's overall flow-through performance. *See* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 118. Moreover, we note that SBC met the benchmark for this measurement in July (97.36%). SBC also was unable to achieve parity for three or more months in one or more of the application states for the following flow-through submetrics: PM 13-02 (resale); PM 13-03 (UNE-P); PM 13-04 (LNP); PM 13-05 (LSNP); and PM 13-06 (Line Sharing). For PM 13-06, for example, we note that SBC's aggregate flow-through rate was high (ranging from 94% in Ohio to 97% in Illinois) and the volumes were low. *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 3, 10, 13. *See also id.* at 9, 12-13, 16 (explaining that SBC's flow-through performance for PM 13-03 was high, ranging from 93% to 95% in Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin). Similarly, for PM 13-04, SBC explains that the volumes were low so that if about a dozen more orders had flowed through each month in Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin, SBC would have achieved parity. *See id.* at 9, 13, 16. We also find that SBC has taken several corrective actions region-wide to address its flow-through performance. *See* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at paras. 120-22. Additionally, BearingPoint determined that SBC satisfied all criteria both for orders designed to flow through and for manual input of orders that do not flow through. *See, e.g.*, Indiana Commission Comments at 155 (citing BearingPoint Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report at 613-26, 915-18).

SBC's flow-through difficulties are not competitively significant.[396]

98. *Rejections*. We find that SBC returns rejection notices in a timely manner.[397] Several carriers allege that SBC's rejection notices are inaccurate and late.[398] Specifically, CIMCO and Access One argue that they have been unable to submit complex orders electronically using LSOG 5 without having those orders rejected and thus falling out for manual handling.[399] CIMCO also alleges that its orders for customers that have existing contracts with SBC are rejected.[400] In its reply comments, SBC explains that complex orders, by their very nature, are complicated and more likely to generate errors by both the competitive LEC's

[396] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 66. SBC has satisfied almost all PM 5 submeasures (which report FOC timeliness) in all four states during the five-month period of review. In the few instances where SBC has missed the appropriate benchmark, we determine that the difference is not competitively significant. For example, in SBC missed PM 5-31 (% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs – Man Sub Req – Simple Res & Bus) in Wisconsin three months out of five but by only 0.88% to 5% and we note further that SBC's performance is improving (meeting the benchmark for this metric in Wisconsin in both June and July). Similarly, SBC missed the benchmark for PM 5-32 in Illinois three months out of five but, as SBC notes, its performance would have to be nearly perfect to meet the 94% benchmark because there are so few orders captured by this metric. *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 2. *See also* BearingPoint's Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report at 182-92 (describing BearingPoint's peak and stress volume testing of SBC's OSS based on future volumes).

[397] We note that SBC met the benchmark in all four states for PM 10-03 (% of Rejects Returned Within 8 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Electronically (A/M)) and it generally satisfied PM 10-04 (% of Rejects Returned Within 24 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Manually (M/M)) in all four states. ACN Group allege that SBC was unable to meet an earlier reject metric, which was included in the March commercial data that are the subject of this joint application, and was able to have it modified to the current PM 10-3 and PM 10-4. ACN Group Comments at 19-20. We note that metrics are developed and modified through a collaborative, with competitive LEC participation and supervision by state commission staff. Three of the four state commissions expressly approved the modification to this metric and the fourth, Illinois, noted the change in its Order on Investigation. *See* SBC Ehr Indiana Aff. at para. 14 & n.20; SBC Ehr Ohio Aff. at para. 18 & n.18; SBC Ehr Wisconsin Aff. at para. 18 & n.26; Illinois Commission Order on Investigation at 364. Moreover, BearingPoint concluded that SBC provided timely mechanized rejection messages in response to electronically submitted orders and noted that, applying the new benchmark of 8 hours, now found in PM 10-03, and 24 hours, now found in PM 10-04, SBC met the benchmark 99% of the time. *See* OSS Indiana Bell Interim and Performance Measurement Status Report at 796-98. Finally, we also note that the rate of SBC-caused reject errors has shown general improvement during the past five months. *See* PM- 9-02 (Percent Rejects – SBC/Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders)). In Illinois, this rate was 0.22% in March, 0.22% in April, 0.43% in May, 0.13% in June, and 0.13% in July. In Indiana, this rate was 0.20% in March, 0.22% in April, 0.11% in May, 0.18% in June, and 0.14% in July. In Ohio, the rate was 0.20% in March, 0.21% in April, 0.19% in May, 0.11% in June, and 0.12% in July. In Wisconsin, the rate was 0.43% in March, 0.34% in April, 0.20% in May, 0.14% in June, and 0.18% in July.

[398] *See* Access One Comments at 5-6; ACN Group Comments at 18-20; CIMCO Comments at 9-12.

[399] *See* Access One Comments at 5-6; CIMCO Comments at 9-12. We discuss LSOG 5 issues in our Change Management discussion below. *See infra* Part IV.B.2.g.

[400] CIMCO Comments at 8-9.

employees and by SBC's employees.[401] SBC has demonstrated that it has taken appropriate steps to assist competitive LECs with such complex orders (*e.g.*, competitive LEC training, workshops, frequent – if not daily – operational telephone calls).[402] Additionally, we find that SBC is responsive to competitive LEC-reported problems[403] and that it has created solutions or work-arounds for competitive LECs so that these carriers may continue to submit their orders electronically while SBC completes a permanent solution.[404] Moreover, SBC has demonstrated that the number of affected orders was small and the problems were not of sufficient scope and duration to raise serious competitive concerns.[405]

99. SBC has also persuasively explained that it never refused to allow CIMCO to convert an SBC end-user customer.[406] Rather, CIMCO's orders were rejected because SBC's systems did not recognize certain information contained in CIMCO's orders (*i.e.*, the calling plan Universal Service Order Code (USOC) or the contract information that followed the USOC). SBC opened a defect report the day after CIMCO reported the problem and, while creating a fix, offered to accept a spreadsheet of all of CIMCO's pending LSRs, which SBC would convert to the appropriate service orders.[407] With CIMCO's agreement, SBC closed this report on July 25,

[401] For example, in response to CIMCO's complaint concerning Centrex orders, SBC notes that "Centrex accounts can contain hundreds of lines, with many different locations, all under the same Centrex block," which requires an order for each address, entries in at least two systems, and additional information about the switch type. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 121. SBC reviewed several of CIMCO's orders and determined that the majority of the errors requiring multiple submissions were attributable to CIMCO. *See id*. at paras. 123-26. In addition, SBC indicated that CIMCO's failure to follow SBC's CLEC Handbook resulted in CIMCO's electronic orders for accounts containing mixed services to fail. *See id.* at para. 144 (citing CIMCO Comments at 11-12). We note that CIMCO has not contested SBC's various complex order analyses.

[402] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at paras. 127-28.

[403] *See, e.g.*, SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 142 (explaining that SBC opened three defect reports on July 23-24, 2003 after CIMCO reported difficulties with Direct Inward Dial orders and closed all three reports just over one week later).

[404] *See, e.g.*, SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 139 (explaining that CIMCO could submit Centrex orders electronically through a spreadsheet during the several weeks in July that SBC experienced problems with its LASR); *id.* at para. 141 (stating that it initiated a change request to address a Basic Rate Interface (BRI) issue raised by CIMCO and, in the interim, competitive LECs may submit their BRI orders electronically with certain information contained in the "Remarks" section of the order form). We note that several of the problems that CIMCO raised, and SBC's responses, occurred during our consideration of SBC's application. Although we do not rely on SBC's responses to find compliance with this aspect of checklist item 2, we note that the issues raised by CIMCO do not rise to the level of checklist noncompliance.

[405] *See, e.g.*, SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at nn.62-63. After determining that the percentages contained in these two footnotes were not confidential, SBC included those percentages in an *ex parte* letter. *See* SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 3 (noting that the percentage found in footnote 62 is 0.3% and the percentage found in footnote 63 is 0.5%).

[406] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 138.

[407] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 137.

2003, and we note that CIMCO has not disputed SBC's explanation. Finally, in response to Access One's claim that most of its electronic orders are rejected, data provided by SBC indicate that Access One's rejection rates far exceed the aggregate competitive LEC rate.[408] For this very reason, as noted in previous section 271 orders and absent any evidence of discriminatory action directed against the specific carrier, the Commission does not perform a parity or direct benchmark analysis of a BOC's rejection rates because a high rejection rate could be attributable to the errors of a competitive LEC and not the BOC.[409]

100. *Service Order Completion Notices*. We find that SBC is providing timely service order completion notices (SOCs).[410] Several commenters argue that SBC issues inaccurate SOCs.[411] For example, Forte claims that almost 20 percent of the SOCs it received from SBC from April through June 2003 were incorrect.[412] Forte also raised the issue of invalid SOCs before the Illinois Commission in its section 271 proceeding.[413] According to the Illinois Commission, SBC's performance data indicated that Forte actually received better service (*i.e.,* lower rate of installation trouble reports) than what SBC provided to its retail operations.[414] We agree and note that the data that SBC filed with the Commission also demonstrate that SBC

---

[408] *See* SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 59. *See also id.* at Attach. J (showing that Access One received more than 181 different error codes in the month of June 2003). We agree with SBC that this variety of errors demonstrates that there is no systemic problem on SBC's side causing these rejection notices and we note that Access One has not contested SBC's statements. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 60.

[409] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 67 (citing *SBC California Order* and *SWBT Texas Order*) (further citations omitted). We note that Access One has provided no evidence to refute SBC's explanation.

[410] Our finding is supported by BearingPoint, which tested SBC's ability to return SOCs in a timely manner. *See, e.g.*, BearingPoint Indiana May 2003 Report at 801-02 (indicating that SBC satisfied this test, TVV 1-32). *See also* BearingPoint Service Order Completion Final Report. Finally, see SBC's performance captured by PM 7. For example, SBC met the benchmark each month in all four states for the following metrics: PM 7.1-01 (% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day of Work Completion – Resale); PM 7.1-02 (% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day of Work Completion – UNE); and PM 7.1-03 (% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day of Work Completion – UNE-P). While ACN Group note that SBC has missed the benchmark for PM 7.1-04 (the same metric but measuring LNP) in Illinois, we find that the volumes for this metric are low. *See* ACN Group Comments at 22; *see also* SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at para. 53; SBC Ehr Reply at para. 18 & Attach. C at 2 (noting that SBC's performance has averaged over 95% for this metric and LNP orders made up only 0.28% of the total mechanized completions in Illinois during March through July, 2003). *See also* Illinois Commission Comments at 65 (finding that SBC took "prompt and aggressive actions" to respond to SOC issues).

[411] *See* ACN Group Comments at 20-22; Forte Comments at 3-5. We note that AT&T raised but then seeks to withdraw its arguments concerning SOCs. *See* Motion of AT&T Corp. to Withdraw Certain Issues, WC Docket No. 03-167 (filed on Oct. 2, 2003) (AT&T Motion to Withdraw). We note that no party objected, and accordingly, we grant AT&T's motion.

[412] Forte Comments at 3.

[413] *See* Illinois Commission Comments at 64.

[414] *Id.*

consistently achieves parity for PM 35, which captures the percentage of trouble reports filed within a 30-day period. Indeed, the data show that competitors' customers generally reported fewer installation problems than SBC's customers.[415]

101. *Other Ordering Issues*. Several parties allege that SBC fails to provide timely, complete, and accurate LLNs and BCNs.[416] These parties raised the same concerns in our *SBC Michigan II* proceeding.[417] As we found in that order, the performance data under review in the instant joint application show that SBC generally satisfies the relevant metrics,[418] and many of the commenters' complaints fall outside of the relevant five-month period of review for this joint application and involve isolated incidents that do not demonstrate any pattern of discrimination.[419] Additionally, SBC's processes were the subject of BearingPoint's test and the state commissions are actively involved in monitoring SBC's performance in these areas.[420]

102. We further find that SBC has taken appropriate corrective actions to address its past LLN problems, as highlighted in its response to two instances of erroneous LLNs reported by MCI. For example, as of May 1, 2003, SBC now issues daily reports (Service Order Quality Accuracy Reports or SOQAR) comparing certain critical fields on the service order to the corresponding fields on the LSR. These reports capture discrepancies between the fields and are made available to competitive LECs on SBC's Intranet. According to SBC, 27 of the 36 erroneous LLNs that MCI reported to SBC on August 6, 2003, would have been caught by this report if they had occurred after May 1, 2003.[421] SBC also makes available a "lines in service"

---

[415] *See* SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 4 (stating that since competitive LECs file trouble reports when a problem occurs in the provisioning of a No Field Work order, those reports would be captured in PM 35-06 and PM 35-08 – UNE-P No Field Work for residential and business orders, respectively).

[416] *See* ACN Group Comments at 15-18; AT&T Comments at 64-67; MCI Comments at 9-10.

[417] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 70-77. We will not repeat our analysis provided in the *SBC Michigan II Order* of identical claims made by competitive LECs in both proceedings (*e.g.,* MCI's claims concerning two instances of erroneous LLNs). *See id.* at n. 214.

[418] *See, e.g.,* PM MI 13-05 (% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion – All), where SBC met the 97% benchmark each month for all four states; PM MI 13-06 (% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion – SBC Winback), where SBC met the 97% benchmark in each state for each month; PM MI 13-07 (% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion – CLEC-to-CLEC), where SBC missed the 97% benchmark only twice (both times in Wisconsin) in the past five months for all four states.

[419] *SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 70, 75.

[420] *See, e.g.,* Illinois Commission Comments at 62-64; Illinois Commission Order on Investigation at 355-57.

[421] *See* SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 1a, Tab 2, Reply Affidavit of Justin W. Brown, Mark J. Cotrell and Michael E. Flynn (SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff.) at para. 61; SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 4 & Attach. B. *See also* MCI Comments at 10 (explaining that it received 36 LLNs for lines that were still included in SBC's lines-in-service report).

(LIS) report, which provides a snapshot of a competitive LEC's active lines in SBC's ACIS database, including a list of the competitive LEC's working telephone numbers at any given moment.[422] The LIS report enables competitors to audit SBC's records and this report, according to SBC, would have permitted MCI to discover six of the remaining eight erroneous LLNs. These erroneous LLNs constitute a small fraction of MCI's lines in service and, thus, we find that they do not impede MCI's ability to compete and are not indicative of any systemic problem with SBC's OSS.

103. One issue not addressed in our *SBC Michigan II Order* concerns the amount of time SBC requires to post a completed service order to its billing systems. AT&T argues that a major cause of the delay in the transmission of SBC's BCNs is attributable to the ten days required by SBC to perform this task.[423] By contrast, AT&T claims that other BOCs require five days, at most, and that SBC rejected its request to implement in the Midwest region the standard that SBC follows in Texas (*i.e.*, five days).[424] SBC responds that the Texas metric AT&T seeks to add in the Midwest region, PM 17.1, does not measure the amount of time from the completion of the service order to the transmission of the BCN.[425] Moreover, SBC explains that it initially expressed concerns about importing this metric because of differences in SBC Midwest's SOC and billing OSS architectures and because such a measurement would largely duplicate an existing Midwest metric, PM 17.[426] Nonetheless, SBC states that it is willing to discuss a modified PM 17.1 and currently is awaiting competitive LEC approval of this proposed metric.[427]

104. SBC's ability to post BCNs in a timely fashion was a subject of BearingPoint's tests in this region. After opening one observation in this area in November 2002, BearingPoint closed this exception early this year and reported no further BCN issues.[428] While SBC is

---

[422] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at para. 56.

[423] *See* AT&T DeYoung/Willard Decl. at paras. 60-62. AT&T also claims that in response to this ten-day period, it created a workaround (at a cost of over $80,000) that "stacks" (or holds) change orders after receipt of a SOC and "forces them to complete in the absence of a BCN after a certain period of time in the hope that the orders have, by that time, posted to SBC's billing systems." AT&T Comments at 66.

[424] *See* AT&T DeYoung/Willard Decl. at para. 61.

[425] SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at para. 224. According to SBC, AT&T has not proposed the Texas PM 17.1 in the Midwest region but, rather, a modified version of it. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 83. In addition, SBC argues that AT&T's proposal is based on PMs from other regions with different system architectures. *Id.* at para. 85.

[426] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. SBC states that PM 17 captures the same process with the exception of the actual delivery of the notification. SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at para. 224.

[427] SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at para. 224.

[428] *See, e.g.,* BearingPoint's Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report at 786-87 (indicating that, after retesting, it closed in March 2003 an observation concerning SBC's Web GUI systems failing to return Post to Bill responses). *See also* SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 82 & n.54.

unwilling to commit to a five-day benchmark because of the Midwest region's system differences,[429] it has provided data demonstrating that the overwhelming majority of BCNs are sent in fewer than ten days. Indeed, in April, SBC posted almost 94 percent of its BCNs within five days, based on a California measurement modified to reflect the regional differences in its systems.[430] Based on its current performance, we believe SBC has met this 271 criterion. Moreover, the parties, with supervision by the state commissions, have established a collaborative to address such issues. As SBC has explained, this very issue is pending before this collaborative and we determine that it is the appropriate forum, rather than a section 271 proceeding, to resolve this issue.[431] We also agree with SBC that the amount of time SBC requires to post BCNs did not force AT&T to create a work-around solution but, rather, AT&T chose to define when an order is "completed" for its billing purposes based on parameters different than those used by SBC. Presumably, AT&T's parameters are also different from those used by other competitive LECs because no other carrier has commented on this issue.[432]

d. Provisioning

105. We conclude, consistent with our findings in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, that SBC provisions competing LECs' customer orders in a nondiscriminatory manner.[433] Only two commenters, Forte and AT&T, express concerns with SBC's provisioning processes.

106. In previous orders – most recently our *SBC Michigan II Order* – the Commission has focused on two areas of a BOC's provisioning performance: timeliness and quality.[434] Performance data measuring SBC's ability to provision competitive LEC orders in a timely fashion demonstrate that SBC generally meets the requisite standards. For example, SBC meets its installation due dates with few exceptions, including SBC-caused missed due dates[435] and

---

[429] *See, e.g.*, SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 4 (citing SBC Application App. A.. Vol. 1, Tab 6, Affidavit of Justin W. Brown, Mark J. Cottrell and Michael E. Flynn (SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff.) Attach. D, which depicts SBC Midwest's UNE-P billing process).

[430] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 88.

[431] *See, e.g.*, *Verizon New Jersey Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 12343, para. 138 n.408 (noting that the Commission accords much weight to the judgment of collaborative state proceedings and it encourages carriers to work together in such fora to resolve metrics and other issues).

[432] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 99. SBC states that its definition of "complete" is when the service is provisioned and the SOC is returned to the initiating party. *Id.* We note that Forte's BCN allegation concerned supposed changes made to LSOG 5. We address change management issues below.

[433] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 78. *See also* Illinois Commission Comments at 67.

[434] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 79-80.

[435] *See, e.g.*, PM 29 & PM 30 (the percent of SBC-caused missed due dates). SBC was unable to meet only one of the 20 submetrics within these performance metrics and only in one state: PM 29-07 (% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates – UNE-P Business – Field Work) in Illinois. SBC achieved parity in July for this submetric in Illinois (missing only 2.15% of its due dates) and we note that even in those months where SBC did not meet the (continued….)

customer-requested due dates,[436] and spends approximately the same amount of time to perform installations for competitive LEC customers as for its own retail customers.[437] Moreover, BearingPoint's test results support our finding that SBC satisfies this part of checklist item two, and no commenter contests SBC's provisioning timeliness.[438] Our record also indicates that SBC's provisioning quality is strong. Specifically, the data demonstrate that competitive LEC

(Continued from previous page)

standard, the difference, 3.16%, is not competitively significant and does not warrant a finding of noncompliance. *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 4.

[436] *See generally* PM 28. Of the eleven submetrics in this family, SBC had difficulty meeting the relevant standard in only a handful of them. For example, in Illinois, SBC missed the 97% benchmark set for PM 28-02 (% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date – POTS – Res – No FW) for three months out of five; however, we determine that the difference, ranging from 0.03% to 2.86%, is not competitively significant. Moreover, SBC consistently meets the standard set in PM 29-02 (% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates – POTS - Res – No FW). According to SBC, since March, only twelve of Illinois competitive LEC orders for resold residential loops not requiring field work have been affected by missed due dates. *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 3. Similarly, while SBC missed the 97% benchmark in PM 28-04 (% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date – POTS – Bus – No FW) three or more times in the application states, SBC's performance remains high. SBC missed the benchmark by less than a percentage point in Indiana and Wisconsin, for example, when averaged over the relevant five-month period. *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 10, 17. In addition, SBC data show that it causes very few missed due dates for resold business loops without field work. *See* PM 29-04 (% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates – POTS – Bus – No FW). *See also* SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 4, 10, 13, 17. For PM 28-07 (% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date – UNE-P Bus – FW), SBC missed the benchmark only in Illinois and by narrow margins. *See id*. at 4 (noting that it was just 35 orders short of achieving parity during March through June combined and that it achieved parity in July). Finally, SBC missed the benchmark for PM 28-08 (% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date – UNE-P Bus – No FW) three or more times in Illinois and Wisconsin. Again, we find that the amount by which SBC missed the standard is not competitively significant. In Illinois, the difference ranged from 0.69% to 1.85% and in Wisconsin, the difference ranged from 0.25% to 2.64%. SBC's performance has been improving (*i.e.*, it met the benchmark in both states in July) and only a fraction of competitive LEC orders for business UNE-P orders without field work have been affected by missed due dates. *See id.* at 4, 17.

[437] *See generally* PM 27. Indeed, the data show that SBC usually provides superior service to competitive LEC customers than to its own retail customers. *See, e.g.,* PM 27-01 through PM 27-10. SBC missed only one metric in this family, PM 27-05 (Mean Installation Interval – UNE-P Res – FW (Days)), during three or more of the five months for just one state, Wisconsin. We conclude that the differences in this interval (March: 2.67 vs. 2.25; April: 2.84 vs. 2.25; May: 2.97 vs. 2.37) are not competitively significant.

[438] For example, BearingPoint determined that SBC-Indiana satisfied all 24 provisioning criteria and provisions orders consistent with documented methods and procedures, on the due date, and in an accurate manner. *See* Indiana Commission Comments at 156 (citing BearingPoint Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report at 921-935). *See also* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. A at para. 40 (explaining that, in Illinois, BearingPoint found that SBC satisfied 76 of the 82 test criteria for provisioning functionality, five of the remaining six were categorized as "Indeterminate" due a lack of commercial demand for the product or feature that was supposed to be tested, and only one of the 82 criteria was found to be not satisfied); *id.*, Attach. B at para. 40 (noting that, in Indiana, BearingPoint found that SBC satisfied 78 of the 84 provisioning functionality test criteria and the remaining six criteria were indeterminate); *id.*, Attach. C at para. 40 (noting that, in Ohio, SBC satisfied 77 of the 84 provisioning functionality test criteria, six of the remaining seven criteria were indeterminate, and only one of 84 criteria was not satisfied); *id.*, Attach. D at para. 40 (mentioning that SBC satisfied 78 of the 84 provisioning functionality test criteria in Wisconsin, with all remaining six criteria categorized as indeterminate).

customers generally experience fewer problems within 30 days of the installation than do SBC's retail customers.[439] Furthermore, we note that no competitor raises any concern about SBC's provisioning quality in this proceeding.

107. Forte argues that SBC is impermissibly preventing it from placing dial tone on the line from SBC's central offices.[440] According to Forte, giving its technicians this diagnostic tool would help them locate a customer's new line in a multi-dwelling residence.[441] Forte claims that it successfully completed testing in July 2002 with SBC to place tone on the lines using the same system as SBC, but that, as of today, SBC refuses to allow Forte's technicians to use this functionality.[442] SBC states that through its Bona Fide Request (BFR) process, it is willing to allow Forte's technicians to perform this test, at no charge, in lieu of SBC dispatching a technician for dial tone trouble associated with new UNE-P lines within 30 days of order completion.[443] SBC also explains that Forte misunderstands how agenda items are added and removed from the CLEC User Forum and, contrary to Forte's assertion, its "tone on the line" issue was not removed from the agenda.[444] Given the fact that SBC has an established process in place (*i.e.*, the BFR process) to allow a requesting carrier to obtain this particular service should it so desire and SBC appears to be working collaboratively with Forte to institute this feature, we decline to find that this issue warrants a finding of checklist noncompliance.

108. AT&T contends that SBC is improperly limiting AT&T's access to SBC's systems by allowing only three AT&T production IP addresses through SBC's security firewalls.[445] As part of AT&T's proposed disaster recovery plan, AT&T seeks to shift its local consumer traffic from the Midwest to servers located in the Southeast. To do so, AT&T argues that it needs another IP address that is recognizable by SBC's systems and, absent an additional

---

[439] *See* PM 35 (% Trouble Reports w/i 30 Days of Install for POTS and UNE-P).

[440] Forte Comments at 5-7.

[441] Forte Comments at 5.

[442] Forte Comments at 5. Additionally, Forte claims that it added this issue to the CLEC User Forum agenda in May 2002 but that the item was dropped from the agenda in January 2003. *Id.*

[443] SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 3, Tab 10, Affidavit of John J. Muhs (SBC Muhs Reply Aff.) at para. 19. SBC states that if Forte requests this service outside of the 30-day period, SBC would assess a fee. In addition, SBC would charge a one-time fee for the costs to create a billing interface and for training. Moreover, SBC indicates that development for this service will proceed upon Forte's approval, pursuant to the BFR process. *Id.*

[444] SBC Muhs Reply Aff. at para. 21. In response to Forte's assertions about the availability of binding post assignments, and cable and pair assignments, SBC explains that any competitive LEC can obtain binding post information from SBC's LOC at no charge, and it has never made available cable and pair assignments to any competitive LEC anywhere in SBC's footprint. *Id.* at para. 22. *See also* SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 5. We note that the Commission has never required BOCs to make available cable and pair assignments to competitive LECs to comply with the obligations set forth in section 271.

[445] AT&T Comments at 61.

IP address, AT&T maintains that it would be unable to offer consumer services in the Ameritech region in the event of a disaster.[446]

109. SBC disagrees that AT&T requires additional IP addresses in order to establish a disaster recovery plan. Indeed, SBC states that it has already given AT&T three additional IP addresses for each SBC region in 2001.[447] SBC states that it allows competitive LECs to establish three IP address combinations per function (pre-ordering and ordering), per environment (test and production), and per region.[448] According to SBC, there are no technical limitations that prevent a competitive LEC from using, for example, a single IP address for production pre-ordering and ordering functions, which would then leave two additional addresses for disaster recovery.[449] Moreover, SBC explains that its IP address cap serves as a security measure because each originating IP address represents an opening or breach through SBC's security firewalls.[450] However, SBC has indicated that its policy is not inflexible and it is willing to work with competitive LECs to obtain additional IP addresses.[451] We conclude that SBC's IP address policy appears to be a reasonable network management practice and, in any event, does not in and of itself warrant a denial of the instant application. We note that AT&T and SBC have resolved their IP address dispute and that SBC has agreed to make available to any carrier the same IP address arrangement reached with AT&T, although we do not rely on this resolution.[452]

---

[446] AT&T Comments at 62.

[447] *See* SBC Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. C at 1 (explaining that SBC agreed to treat AT&T's business and consumer operations as two separate companies for IP address allocation purposes).

[448] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 108. Thus, according to SBC, a competitive LEC could establish three direct connections to SBC's remote access facility for ordering and three connections for pre-ordering in the production environment for each SBC region. *Id*. Similarly, SBC states that three connections can be established for ordering and three for pre-ordering in the test environment for a total of 12 combinations per SBC region. *Id.* (citing SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 44).

[449] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 109. In fact, SBC explains that in SBC's West and Southwest regions, AT&T has configured its consumer unit to use only one IP address and trading partner ID combination whereas in the Midwest region, AT&T's consumer unit uses three IP addresses across two trading partner IDs. SBC Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. C at 2.

[450] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 109.

[451] *See* Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg, Counsel for SBC, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167, Attach. at 1 (filed Oct. 2, 2003) (SBC Oct. 2 *Ex Parte* Letter).

[452] *See* SBC Oct. 2 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. at 2-3 & Ex. at 1. SBC also indicates that it will include its IP address modification in the next update of its Interconnection Procedures document, available on its CLEC Online web site. *Id.*, Attach. at 3.

e. Maintenance & Repair

110. We conclude that SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to maintenance and repair OSS functions. SBC has deployed the necessary interfaces, systems, and personnel to enable requesting carriers to access the same maintenance and repair functions that SBC provides itself.[453] We find that SBC's performance data support a finding of checklist compliance in this area. We also find that BearingPoint's test results demonstrate that SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to maintenance and repair functionality.[454]

111. We specifically find that SBC restores service to competing carriers' customers in substantially the same time and manner[455] and with a similar level of quality[456] as it restores

---

[453] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4067, para. 211. SBC provides competing carriers with several options for requesting maintenance and reporting troubles. Competing carriers may use the Electronic Bonding Trouble Administration/Graphical User Interface ("EBTA/GUI") and the Electronic Bonding Trouble Administration application-to-application interface ("EBTA") for access to maintenance and repair functionality. SBC Application at 72; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 139.

[454] *See* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. A, at paras. 47-51 (indicating that SBC satisfied 98 percent of BearingPoint maintenance and repair testing (excluding volume test criteria) in Illinois); SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. B, at paras. 48-52 (indicating that SBC satisfied 98 percent of BearingPoint maintenance and repair testing (excluding volume test criteria) in Indiana); SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. C, at paras. 48-52 (indicating that SBC satisfied 98 percent of BearingPoint maintenance and repair testing (excluding volume test criteria) in Ohio); SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. D, at paras. 47-50 (indicating that SBC satisfied 100 percent of BearingPoint maintenance and repair testing (excluding volume test criteria) in Wisconsin). We reject OCC's general arguments that the issue of SBC's performance relative to the timeliness of maintenance and repair, among other issues, remains unresolved because the Ohio Commission relegated the resolution of some OSS functionality issues to performance plans. OCC Comments at 7-8. As we discuss above, we find that the testing of the performance data was sufficient. We also find, as we have in other section 271 applications, that the maintenance and repair functionality that SBC provides to competitive LECs is sufficient for a finding of checklist compliance. *See SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25694, para. 86.

[455] *See generally* PM 38 (Percent Missed Repair Commitments); PM 39 (Receipt to Clear Duration); PM 40 (Percent Out of Service Less Than 24 Hours); PM 67 (Mean Time to Restore). In Wisconsin, SBC met the parity standard for three of the five relevant months under PM 38-07 (Percent Missed Repair Commitments – UNE-P – Bus – Dispatch) (indicating misses in April and June with competitive LEC percentages of 8.22% and 9.80%, and SBC percentages of 4.21% and 5.45%). In Indiana, SBC met the 95% benchmark for three of the five relevant months under MI 14-05 (Percent Completion Notifications Returned w/in "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket – UNE-P – Manual – Next Day)(only indicating misses in March and June with competitive LEC percentages of 91% and 88.05%). Also in Ohio, SBC met the 95% benchmark for three of the five relevant months under MI 14-05 (Percent Completion Notifications Returned w/in "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket – UNE-P – Manual – Next Day)(only indicating misses in March and June with competitive LEC percentages of 88.17% and 85.66%). We note that even under each of the metrics mentioned above for some of the states, SBC still met the parity or benchmark standard for the majority of months under consideration. We thus do not find the few misses observed to be competitively significant.

[456] *See generally* PM 37 (Trouble Report Rate); PM 37.1 (Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports); PM 41 (Percent Repeat Reports); PM 42 (percent trouble reports with no access); PM 53 (Percent Repeat (continued….)

service to its own customers, with few exceptions. SBC generally met the relevant parity and benchmark standards regarding timeliness of maintenance and repair in all relevant states, with certain *de minimis* exceptions.[457]

112. SBC also generally met the relevant parity and benchmark standards regarding maintenance and repair quality in all relevant states, with a few exceptions described below. With respect to SBC's performance under measures of maintenance and repair quality, we note that although SBC missed the parity standard for at least three months under certain trouble report rate metrics in the relevant states,[458] the record indicates that in most cases the disparity between the trouble report rate for competitive LEC lines/circuits and SBC retail lines/circuits was minimal. We find that this small difference between wholesale and retail maintenance and repair quality is unlikely to have adversely affected competitive LECs in the affected states, given that competitive LEC trouble report rates under many of these measures are still low,[459] and that SBC's performance is generally sufficient across all other PM 37 (Trouble Report Rate)

(Continued from previous page)
Reports); PM 54 (Failure Frequency); PM 54.1 (Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports); PM 65 (Trouble Report Rate); PM 65.1 (Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports); PM 69 (Percent Repeat Reports).

[457] We note that SBC missed the 95% benchmark under PM MI 14-05 (Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket – UNE-P – Manual – Next Day) for three months in Illinois and Wisconsin. IL PM MI 14-05 (Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket – UNE-P – Manual – Next Day) (indicating that SBC missed the 95% benchmark in Illinois in March – 86.34%, April – 94.54%, and June – 86.04%); WI PM MI 14-05 (Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket – UNE-P – Manual – Next Day) (indicating that SBC missed the 95% benchmark in Wisconsin in March – 88.13%, April – 94.16%, and June – 85.94%). The record reflects, however, that SBC's performance is minimally deficient for one of the three months missed in each state, and in light of SBC's overall performance under measures of maintenance and repair timeliness, we find that these isolated misses, do not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance.

[458] IL PM 37-01 (Trouble Report Rate – POTS – Res) (Trouble Reports/100 Lines) (indicating misses in March, April, May and June with competitive LEC rates of 2.73, 2.90, 3.47 and 2.73, and SBC rates of 2.13, 2.28, 2.72 and 2.25); IL PM 37-04 (Trouble Report Rate – UNE-P – Bus) (Trouble Reports/100 Lines) (indicating misses in April, May and July with competitive LEC rates of 0.77, 0.89, and 0.96, and SBC rates of 0.72, 0.81 and 0.85); IN PM 37-04 (Trouble Report Rate – UNE-P – Bus) (Trouble Reports/100 Lines) (indicating misses in March, April, May and July with competitive LEC rates of 0.98, 0.94, 1.08 and 1.82, and SBC rates of 0.77, 0.76, 0.88 and 1.01); OH PM 37-04 (Trouble Report Rate – UNE-P – Bus) (Trouble Reports/100 Lines) (indicating misses in March, April, May, June and July with competitive LEC rates of 1.08, 1.02, 1.02, 1.00 and 1.22, and SBC rates of 0.86, 0.85, 0.90, 0.85 and 1.05); WI PM 37-04 (Trouble Report Rate – UNE-P – Bus) (Trouble Reports/100 Lines) (indicating misses in April, May, June and July with competitive LEC rates of 0.74, 0.77, 0.61 and 0.76, and SBC rates of 0.54, 0.59, 0.51 and 0.59).

[459] *See* SBC Application App. A, Vol. 11, Tab 33, Affidavit of John J. Muhs (SBC Muhs Aff.) at para. 29 (arguing that even though performance under PM 37-01 and PM 37-04 falls short of parity, competitive LEC trouble report rates under these measures are low).

submeasures.[460]

f. Billing

113. We find that SBC has demonstrated that competing carriers have nondiscriminatory access to its billing systems in Indiana, Illinois, Ohio and Wisconsin. As the Commission has established in prior section 271 orders, a BOC seeking section 271 approval must demonstrate nondiscriminatory access to billing by showing that it provides two essential billing functions: (1) complete, accurate, and timely reports on the service usage of competing carriers' customers; and (2) complete, accurate, and timely wholesale bills.[461] These billing functions serve different purposes. Service-usage reports generally are issued to competitive LECs that purchase unbundled switching, and they measure the types and amounts of incumbent LEC services that a competitive LEC's end users use for a limited period of time.[462] In contrast, wholesale bills are issued to competitive LECs to collect compensation for the wholesale inputs, such as unbundled network elements, used by competitive LECs to provide service to their end users.[463]

(i) Service Usage Reports

114. We find that SBC complies with its obligation to provide complete, accurate, and timely reports on service usage in substantially the same time and manner that SBC provides such information to itself.[464] The record in this proceeding indicates that SBC provides competitive LECs with timely and accurate daily usage files (DUFs), which allow competitive LECs access to usage records, including end user, access, and interconnection records.[465] Based

---

[460] *See* SBC Muhs Aff. at para. 30 (arguing that even though performance under PM 37-01 and PM 37-04 falls short of parity, performance under the PM 37.1 disaggregations of the same measures typically meets parity). SBC also suggests that the results under PM 37, measuring the number of trouble reports per 100 lines, may be skewed by the fact that the incumbent has a larger base of installed lines, and thus the ratio of orders to installed lines is likely to be significantly higher for wholesale than for retail service given parity of installation trouble reports. SBC Muhs Aff. at para. 31. Taking all of the evidence into consideration, we find that SBC's performance under PM 37 does not deprive competitive LECs a meaningful opportunity to compete.

[461] *Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26374, para. 115; *SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25696, para. 88.

[462] *SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25696, para. 88. These reports are usually generated for competitive carriers on a daily basis. *Id.*

[463] *Id.* These bills are usually generated for competitive carriers on a monthly basis, and allow competitors to monitor the cost of providing service.

[464] *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6316-17, para. 163; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18461, para. 210; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4075, para. 226.

[465] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 17. Competitive LECs can use the DUFs to bill their end-user customers and bill interconnecting carriers. The DUF may be delivered electronically, or via magnetic tape/cartridge, and competitive LECs have the option of receiving their DUF file on a daily basis. *Id. See also* SBC (continued….)

on the record evidence, we therefore conclude that SBC's provision of service usage data through the DUF meets its obligations in this regard.[466]

(ii) Wholesale Bills

115. We find that SBC has demonstrated that it provides competitive LECs with wholesale bills in a manner that gives competing carriers a meaningful opportunity to compete, consistent with the obligations established in prior section 271 orders.[467] SBC has submitted evidence of its internal billing processes and procedures, successful third-party testing, and commercial billing performance to show that it provides complete, accurate, and timely wholesale bills. Moreover, in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, we found that SBC has substantially resolved the prior mismatch between certain UNE-P records in its retail and wholesale billing databases. Notwithstanding SBC's showing, competitive LECs have expressed a variety of concerns about the accuracy of SBC's wholesale bills, and the adequacy of its billing processes and procedures.[468] As discussed below, SBC responds by showing that it has internal processes to address problems expeditiously as they arise, and that where problems have occurred, they have quickly been addressed.[469]

(Continued from previous page)
Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 25, 33; Appendices B-E. Although AT&T argues that E&Y's testing does not address whether SBC is generating accurate usage reports, AT&T does not challenge the results of BearingPoint testing. *See AT*&T Comments at 40; *see also* SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 33, 160 (indicating that it was not necessary for E&Y to examine the DUF processes in light of the BearingPoint review and noting that one of the billing tests performed by BearingPoint was a Billing Functional Usage Evaluation (TVV 8) which examined SBC's ability to capture and deliver customer telephone usage records to competitive LECs in a complete, accurate and timely manner).

[466] We note that AT&T claims that SBC is sending usage records for customers that have disconnected their AT&T service. AT&T Comments at 36-37 (referring to claims raised in the Michigan proceeding). MCI also raises similar claims (discussed below) regarding apparent discrepancies between the usage records it receives, information in SBC's April 30th lines-in-service report, and SBC's bills. MCI Comments at 7-8. As we stated in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, AT&T identified only a few, isolated problems with SBC's DUF files, which we do not find to be competitively significant, in light of SBC's DUF metric performance and successful third-party tests. *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 114. We also find unpersuasive Forte's general claims that SBC sends incorrect UNE-P usage bills, because Forte does not provide any support or explanation for this assertion. Forte Comments at 12.

[467] *See Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26374, para. 115.

[468] Competitive carriers also raise concerns about the adequacy of SBC's resolution of the UNE-P records mismatch. Because we fully resolved this issue in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, we decline to readdress the issue here. *See SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 104-108.

[469] In the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, the Commission noted that one competitive LEC, Vartec, indicated it had "seen a marked improvement in the accuracy of [Michigan Bell's] bills" since January 2003, and that any billing problems it experienced did not appear to "constitute vast, systemic or procedural billing problems. These problems are discrete and independent occurrences in a very complex system." *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 88 (quoting *Letter* from Connie F. Mitchell, Chief Administrative Officer, VarTec Telecom, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-138 at 2 (filed July 14, 2003 in the *SBC* (continued….)

116. Assessing the totality of the record and circumstances presented, we find that the commenters' concerns represent isolated instances of errors that may generally occur with high-volume carrier-to-carrier commercial billing rather than systemic problems, and thus we find that the allegations about billing raised in this record do not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance.[470] We are mindful of our precedent, which makes clear that the checklist does not require perfect billing systems or other supporting processes.[471] It is inevitable, particularly considering the complexity of billing systems and volume of transactions handled in the relevant states, that errors and carrier-to-carrier disputes will occur. The question before us, however, is whether SBC's processes are adequate to ensure that competitors have a meaningful opportunity to enter the market and pose a competitive alternative to SBC. As we found in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we find here that SBC's billing processes do provide competitors such an opportunity. We begin our analysis with an overview of SBC's wholesale billing systems and processes, including successful third-party testing and commercial billing performance of those systems. We then address the specific areas of concern raised by commenters.

(a) Overview

117. SBC uses the same wholesale billing systems throughout the five-state region. Specifically, SBC indicates that it uses the Ameritech Customer Information System (ACIS) provisioning database to bill residential and business customers for retail products.[472] SBC's Resale Billing System (RBS) uses information extracted from the ACIS databases to generate resale bills for competitive LECs that are reselling services.[473] SBC's Carrier Access Billing System (CABS) generates bills for competitive LECs that purchase UNE and interconnection products including UNE loops, UNE-P, local transport and interconnection trunks.[474]

118. In August 2001, SBC started migrating its billing of UNE-P switch ports from RBS to CABS in order to improve wholesale billing of UNE-P and allow competitive LECs to receive a single UNE-P bill.[475] In October 2001, it completed this conversion process and

(Continued from previous page)
Michigan II proceeding) (VarTec *SBC Michigan II* July 14 *Ex Parte* Letter)). VarTec indicated that it operates in all five states in the SBC Midwest region. *Id*. at 1.

[470] As the D.C. Circuit recently held, weighing conflicting evidence is "a matter peculiarly within the province of the Commission." *Z-Tel Communications, Inc. v. FCC*, No. 01-1461, slip op. at 17 (D.C. Cir. July 1, 2003).

[471] *See SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25697, para. 90; *Verizon New Jersey* Order, 17 FCC Rcd at 12336-37, para. 126; *Verizon Pennsylvania Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 17433-37, paras. 25-29.

[472] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 9.

[473] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 10.

[474] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 11.

[475] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 44. SBC states that prior to the conversion, competitive LECs received two separate bills, one from RBS for the UNE-P switch port, and one from CABS for the UNE-P loop. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 44.

consolidated billing for UNE-P charges into CABS.[476] SBC explains, however, that during the migration to CABS, certain programming flaws and other errors caused some of the migrated UNE-P data to be placed on CABS customer service records (CSR) incorrectly, resulting in a mismatch between ACIS and CABS records.[477] When service order activity was held from billing during the August-October 2001 migration, it created an unexpectedly large backlog of service orders that still required posting to CABS.[478] This backlog of held service order activity was released for mechanical posting to CABS in December, but existing errors resulted in the fallout of an unexpectedly large number of service orders for manual handling by the Local Service Center (LSC).[479] SBC states that the manual handling of these service orders led to a "cascade" effect in terms of additional errors, but SBC was able to make several improvements to its mechanized and manual posting systems and processes to reduce the number of backlogged service orders to approximately 100,000 as of September 2002.[480]

119. SBC states that certain backlogged service orders could not efficiently be posted to CABS following the conversion due to the lack of synchronization between the ACIS and CABS databases.[481] SBC submits, however, that the CABS database errors represented by these remaining service orders, and any other underlying errors stemming from the initial CABS conversion, were ultimately resolved through the ACIS/CABS database reconciliation that took place in January 2003.[482] For the reasons stated in the *SBC Michigan II* Order, we conclude that

[476] SBC Application at 82; SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 45.

[477] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 46-47, 57.

[478] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 48.

[479] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 49. SBC states that approximately 250,000 service orders fell out from mechanical posting. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 49.

[480] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 50-57. SBC submits that these improvements have helped to solve the problem of low flow-through rates for mechanized posting of billing service orders and have significantly reduced the potential for error from manual handling, thus helping to ensure that the ACIS and CABS databases remain in sync. *Id.* at para. 87. SBC states that its data, which has now been validated by E&Y, shows that SBC's mechanized posting of billing service orders improved from 71% in March 2002 to 96% in March 2003. *Id*. SBC also made improvements to its manual handling of service order fallout by developing the Informix database system to mechanize certain aspects of the process. *Id*. at paras. 53-57.

[481] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 57.

[482] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 57. SBC states that during the reconciliation, special programs analyzed differences between the ACIS and CABS records on a circuit-by-circuit basis and updated the CABS CSR to match the ACIS record. SBC posted debits and credits to the next competitive LEC wholesale bills following the reconciliation based on the results of circuits that were added to, and deleted from, the CABS billing records. *Id*. at para. 58. Ernst & Young (E&Y) verified that SBC properly performed the reconciliation of the ACIS and CABS databases and correctly provided competitive LECs with appropriate debits and credits. SBC Application at 84; SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 32-41, Attach. F (Affidavit of Brian Horst, WC Docket No. 03-138 (filed June 19, 2003) (Michigan Bell Horst Supplemental Aff.) Attach. A at 1, Attach B at 4-8). We discuss the billing reconciliation in further detail in our recent order granting SBC 271 authority in Michigan. *See SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 104-108.

SBC has sufficiently remedied the problems associated with the CABS migration.[483]

120. SBC also demonstrates that it has processes in place to ensure that rate changes are implemented in a timely and accurate manner.[484] BearingPoint testing verified SBC's timely and accurate posting of rate table updates.[485] SBC's processes require that assigned managers assume responsibility for the development of the price schedules for each interconnection agreement, and management personnel work together with regulatory personnel to identify potential rate impacts of state commission orders.[486] SBC also routinely audits the rates for a sample of the most commonly ordered products on a monthly basis to ensure that the correct rates are being applied.[487] Even though SBC recently identified errors in certain loop zone rates in its rate tables and in its classification of business and residential loops,[488] SBC had corrected these errors by June 2003, as validated by E&Y.[489]

121. SBC also shows that it provides auditable bills. SBC indicates that its processes allow competitive LECs to receive wholesale CABS bills through electronic media Billing Data Tapes (BDT) that follow the industry standard Billing Output Specification (BOS) guidelines, in paper format, or by both means.[490] These processes also allow competitive LECs to receive RBS bills via Electronic Data Interchange (EDI811), in paper format, or by both means.[491] SBC provides additional detail for competitive LECs that require more detail than the summary level information provided on RBS paper bills, with its Ameritech Electronic Billing Service (AEBS 450).[492] The CABS UNE bills and RBS data provided via AEBS 450 also provide sufficient detail to allow competing carriers to audit the bills and identify any disputed charges, including the universal service order code (USOC) for the particular charge, and a description of the product or service.[493]

---

[483] *SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 104-108.

[484] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 88-93; SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at paras. 81, 85-88.

[485] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 88.

[486] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 90, 93.

[487] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at para. 81.

[488] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 105-106, 119-120.

[489] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 105-126. Specifically, these problems were corrected by SBC and validated by E&Y during March through June 2003. *Id*.

[490] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 19.

[491] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 20.

[492] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 21.

[493] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 22-23. A USOC is a code associated with a particular SBC product or service.

122. SBC also demonstrates that it offers effective procedures to resolve wholesale billing disputes. Specifically, SBC states that its "CLEC Handbook" explains the procedures that its wholesale customers should follow to resolve billing disputes.[494] According to these procedures, the local service center (LSC) is designated as the initial point of contact for all non-collocation and non-LEC Services Billing (LSB)[495] wholesale billing claims and disputes, and is tasked with reaching a final resolution of claims within 30 days.[496] SBC policy specifies that when a claim cannot be processed within 30 days, the competitive LEC will be notified by telephone or e-mail and periodically updated on the status until it is resolved.[497] When a claim or adjustment is resolved, SBC issues a resolution letter.[498] Claims or adjustments that are approved will have the adjustment applied to the next account billing cycle, while those denied will be provided with an explanation of the denial.[499] In addition, SBC states that it has fully complied with modified improvement plans filed in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin regarding billing auditability and dispute resolution.[500] We thus find that SBC currently offers effective procedures to resolve wholesale billing disputes, and note that SBC is taking steps to address billing issues as they arise. SBC indicates that it has revised the documentation for use by its LSC employees in resolving claims, and is engaged in an ongoing dialogue with competitive LECs to address billing dispute resolution issues through a sub-committee of the CLEC User Forum.[501] SBC states that it has resolved 38 of the 56 billing issues raised since the creation of the billing sub-committee on February 19, 2003. We note that the Wisconsin Commission also has initiated a proceeding to evaluate SBC's billing systems, which will allow competitive LECs to resolve any billing problems they experience in the future.[502]

---

494 SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 134.

495 SBC indicates that LEC Services Billing bills for certain miscellaneous services including certain operator services and directory assistance. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 134 n.131.

496 SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 134-35. SBC indicates that the LSC monitors claims on a case-by-case basis, and when quality reviews are conducted, the managers note whether a claim was completed within 30 days, and if not, whether the appropriate communications were made to the competitive LEC. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at para. 102.

497 SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 135.

498 *Id.*

499 *Id*. SBC states that in accordance with its dispute resolution process, competitive LECs should receive an explanation that includes information indicating how the Local Service Center came to the resolution of denial including, for example, citations to documents or resources used in making the determination. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at paras. 103-104.

500 SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at paras. 137-38.

501 *Id.*

502 SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at para. 93. We are not persuaded by TDS Metrocom's contention that SBC's application should not be granted unless a regional billing collaborative like the one initiated in Wisconsin is (continued….)

123. With respect to the commercial performance of SBC's billing systems, we find that SBC generally met the relevant parity and benchmark standards regarding the timeliness and accuracy of its wholesale billing.[503] SBC also satisfied 100 percent of BearingPoint's tests of its wholesale billing systems and processes.[504] We thus conclude that SBC satisfies its evidentiary burden of demonstrating that its wholesale bills give competitive LECs a meaningful opportunity to compete.

124. Although many competing carriers commented on the quality of SBC's billing systems, we note that many of the issues raised are identical to those raised in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding.[505] To the extent that the issues raised in this proceeding are the same, we incorporate and reference the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding. As we have stated previously, "to the extent that issues have already been briefed, reviewed and resolved in a prior section 271 proceeding, and absent new evidence or changed circumstances, an application for a related state should not be a forum for re-litigating and reconsidering those issues."[506] However, to the extent carriers raise new issues or cite new evidence concerning SBC's billing systems that was not considered in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, we address them below.

(b) Specific Billing Disputes

125. Although commenters reference several specific SBC billing mistakes and other disputes between them and SBC, as discussed below, we do not find that these claims warrant a

(Continued from previous page)
established in other states. TDS Metrocom Comments at 21-23. A regional billing collaborative has never been required to demonstrate checklist compliance. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at para. 143. Moreover, because SBC's systems appear to be regional, we expect that any improvements made as a result of the Wisconsin collaborative will be executed region-wide.

[503] *See* PM 14 (Billing Accuracy); PM 15 (% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills); PM 18 (Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)); *see also* generally PM 17 (Billing Completeness); *but see* PM 17-04 in Illinois (Billing Completeness – Resale) (indicating slight misses in March, April and June, but with competitive LEC rates of 97.67%, 97.46%, and 97.53%).

[504] BearingPoint found that SBC met the relevant benchmarks regarding the accuracy of its wholesale bills, the timeliness of delivering its wholesale bills, and the timeliness of posting resale and UNE-loop service order activity to the billing systems. *See* SBC Application, App. M, Tab 161, BearingPoint Illinois Bell OSS Evaluation Project Report, at 9, 775-787 (May 1, 2003); SBC Application, App. M, Tab 165, BearingPoint Indiana Bell Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report, at 10, 1005-1017 (May 12, 2003); SBC Application, App. C-OH, Tab 126, BearingPoint Ohio Interim OSS Status Report, at 10, 803-816 (May 23, 2003); SBC Application, App. M, Tab 117, BearingPoint Wisconsin Bell OSS Evaluation Project Interim Report, at 10, 1029-1041 (Jan. 15, 2003).

[505] These issues include: (1) problems associated with the migration to CABS; (2) records mismatches causing competitive LECs to be billed for incorrect customers; (3) SBC's processes related to wholesale billing; (4) SBC's ability to provide auditable wholesale bills; (5) issues regarding SBC's billing reconciliation; and (6) restatement of PM 17. These issues were all thoroughly addressed in the *SBC Michigan II Order*. *See SBC Michigan II Order*, at paras. 99-108.

[506] *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6254, para. 35.

finding of checklist noncompliance. Commenters claim that SBC's bills are inaccurate because of specific instances of improper charges for products or services, or the application of incorrect rates.[507] We find that SBC has demonstrated that the vast majority of these billing disputes are historical problems that SBC has resolved, or are disputes that SBC is addressing on a carrier-to-carrier basis.[508] We also note that a number of commenters' allegations are largely anecdotal in nature and lack sufficient supporting evidence. For example, Access One, CIMCO , and Forte all argue generally that they have never received an accurate bill from SBC, but they fail to provide evidence to sufficiently support their claims.[509] Similarly, the National Alternative Local Exchange Carrier Association (NALA) presents a number of general complaints regarding SBC's bills, but fails to provide specific evidence regarding those complaints.[510] Accordingly, we do not find that these claims are sufficient to overcome SBC's affirmative evidence that its billing systems meet the Commission's requirements.[511]

126. ACN Group claims that SBC billed Mpower incorrectly for local termination traffic at the local rate.[512] SBC states that it acknowledged that Mpower's contract language for local traffic is bill and keep and therefore adjusted the rate tables on April 15, 2003. SBC submits that this issue was related to a manual error and that all credit adjustments related to the incident have been processed.[513] Based on the evidence in the record, we are not persuaded that

---

[507] AT&T Comments at 31-35; MCI Comments, Attach. Tab 2, Declaration of Sherry Lichtenberg (in WC Docket No. 03-138) at paras. 12-13, 33-45 (MCI Lichtenberg *SBC Michigan II* Decl.); TDS Metrocom Comments at 11, 14-16.

[508] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 110.

[509] Access One Comments at 2; CIMCO Comments at 7; Forte Comments at 11.

[510] Letter from Norman D. Mason, Chairman of the National Alternative Local Exchange Carrier Association (NALA), to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 at 2 (filed September 11, 2003)(NALA Sept. 11 *Ex Parte* Letter). Specifically, NALA argues that SBC denies billing disputes without providing a reason and never presents billing details. However, NALA fails to provide sufficient evidence to support these claims and fails to respond to SBC's evidence that it does have a reasonable billing dispute process and does provide sufficient call detail. *See* SBC Brown/Cottrell/Fynn Aff. at paras. 22-23, 134-37. Moreover, NALA also makes reference to an unsupported claim it made in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding regarding the bills it receives for end user calls that should allegedly be blocked. As we found in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, NALA has provided no specific evidence upon which we could conclude that SBC is allowing calls to proceed that should be blocked; and any dispute over who should bear the financial responsibility for such calls involves interpretation of the parties' interconnection agreement; and such a dispute is more appropriately addressed outside of the context of this section 271 proceeding. *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 154.

[511] *Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26511, para. 378 n.1423 ("When considering commenters' filings in opposition to the BOC's application, we look for evidence that the BOC's policies, procedures, or capabilities preclude it from satisfying the requirements of the checklist item. Mere unsupported evidence in opposition will not suffice.") (quoting *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18375, para. 50).

[512] ACN Group Comments at 6.

[513] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at para. 130.

this instance represents a systemic flaw in SBC's billing that impedes a competitive LEC's opportunity to compete. We therefore find that this issue does not demonstrate checklist noncompliance.

127. ACN Group and NTD also challenge SBC's dispute resolution process, arguing that it can take several months – or more – for disputes to be resolved.[514] They further argue that such delays lead to problems with extensive backbilling that harm competitive LEC financial plans.[515] Other commenters similarly claim that such delays tie up revenues if the carriers' interconnection agreements require them to pay the disputed amounts or place them in escrow while the disputes are pending.[516] In addition, commenters claim that SBC provides insufficient explanation of its billing adjustments or its reasons for denying a dispute.[517] We do not find, however, that these claims warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance in light of SBC's demonstration of its dispute resolution process. As we found in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, commenters' claims regarding dispute resolution delays and backbilling do not overcome SBC's affirmative showing based on evidence of a functioning dispute resolution process.[518] SBC has again provided a full description of the process it follows to resolve billing disputes, and we find that commenters have failed to counter this showing with specific instances that indicate that this process is not adhered to by SBC, or is otherwise insufficient to allow competitive LECs a meaningful opportunity to compete.

128. MCI argues that while SBC agreed to make payments to resolve a number of billing issues, SBC has refused to pay interest at the rate required by the interconnection agreement.[519] SBC states that it has already completed the process of calculating the interest in this instance, and will be working with MCI to identify the appropriate MCI billing account number to credit.[520] We find that MCI's claim in this instance represents a factual dispute over the terms of their interconnection agreement that appears to be resolved. In the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we found that many of the billing disputes raised had been resolved or were being addressed on a carrier-to-carrier basis.[521] In this instance, we similarly find that MCI's claim

---

[514] ACN Group Comments at 6-7 (arguing that the dispute resolution process is flawed, and that the speed with which SBC makes a commitment to resolve billing disputes should be investigated); NTD Comments at 8-9; *see also* TDS Metrocom Comments at 18.

[515] ACN Group Comments at 8; NTD Comments at 3-4, 6-8.

[516] NALA Sept. 11 *Ex Parte* Letter at 3; TDS Metrocom Comments at 9.

[517] NALA Sept. 11 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2; TDS Metrocom Comments at 19-20.

[518] *SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 109-110.

[519] MCI Reply at 7.

[520] SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter at Attach. A, p. 7.

[521] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 110.

does not reflect a systemic problem with SBC's billing systems. MCI also argues that SBC has failed to true-up certain UNE rates in Wisconsin, and states that it has raised this issue in the Wisconsin billing proceeding.[522] We find that this claim fails to indicate any problem with SBC's billing systems, and note that according to MCI, SBC recently stated that the true-up will be addressed shortly.[523] Accordingly, we reject MCI's arguments as they pertain to SBC's checklist compliance, and note that these issues are more appropriately raised as complaints before the state commission.

129. Mpower claims that SBC improperly assessed trip charges on approximately 14,000 trouble tickets in Illinois from April 2002 through August 2003, and that this is an indication of SBC's inability to issue accurate wholesale bills.[524] According to Mpower, SBC agreed to investigate these trip charges using a sample of 75 trouble tickets and agreed to apply the results from that sample to the entire group of disputed trouble tickets.[525] However, Mpower alleges that SBC broke its agreement when the investigation determined that 70 of the 75 sample trouble tickets were billed to Mpower incorrectly.[526] Mpower states that, as of September 22, 2003, approximately $1.2 million associated with SBC's billing of trip charges in Illinois remains in dispute.[527] SBC responds that the sample of 75 tickets that Mpower references was largely comprised of trouble tickets that should have been excluded under the terms of SBC and Mpower's confidential agreement.[528] SBC also submits that two prior samples the parties tried to use confirmed the accuracy of SBC's trouble ticket processes, but were rejected by Mpower.[529] SBC indicates that during the week of September 15 it again offered to try to work with Mpower to select a sample that would be representative of the timeframe encompassing their dispute and

---

522 MCI Reply at 6.

523 *See Id*.

524 *See* Letter from Ross A. Buntrock, Counsel for Mpower, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 at 1 (filed September 16, 2003)(Mpower Sept. 16 *Ex Parte* Letter); *see also* Letter from Ross A. Buntrock, Counsel for Mpower, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 at 1 (filed September 22, 2003)(Mpower Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter); Letter from Ross A. Buntrock, Counsel for Mpower, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 at 1-5 (filed September 24, 2003)(Mpower Sept. 24 *Ex Parte* Letter). A trip charge is a charge assessed on a competitive LEC for SBC performing maintenance and repair on a particular circuit.

525 Mpower Sept. 16 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2. Mpower states that the results of this testing indicated that 70 out of the 75 trouble tickets examined, or 93%, were billed incorrectly. *Id*. at 2-3.

526 Mpower Sept. 16 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2-3.

527 Mpower Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 1.

528 SBC Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 1.

529 *Id.*

that would not include trouble tickets subject to a prior settlement.[530] Based on the evidence in record, we are not persuaded that Mpower's claim indicates a systemic problem with SBC's billing systems. We agree with SBC that Mpower's claim represents a factual dispute that can more appropriately be handled through carrier-to-carrier billing negotiations.[531] In addition, we note that SBC employs the same billing system in Illinois that we recently approved in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, and that parties to this proceeding, other than Mpower, have not raised this trip charge issue to indicate a systemic problem with SBC's billing. We further note that any remaining dispute regarding the number of trouble tickets with improper trip charges, or the parties' adherence to any agreement, may also be raised by either party as a complaint before the state commission or an appropriate court. Accordingly, we reject Mpower's claims as they pertain to SBC's checklist compliance.

130. NTD argues that SBC's billing problems led to the disconnection of NTD services, and NTD gives reference to an instance on March 5, 2003 when SBC disconnected NTD's nine largest customers, allegedly without warning.[532] SBC responds however that the disconnection in this instance was for non-payment of access services.[533] SBC further explains that NTD was notified and given sufficient time to make payment before the disconnection, and indicates that it had attempted to negotiate access payment arrangements with NTD without success.[534] Based on the evidence in the record, we are not persuaded that the discontinuance of NTD's services resulted from a flaw in SBC's billing systems, and thus we do not find that this instance justifies a finding of checklist noncompliance.

131. TDS Metrocom references a specific dispute regarding improper charges for joint SONET facilities, and argues that even when SBC acknowledges an error, it is sometimes slow to fix the underlying problems and issue proper credits.[535] SBC states, however, that in October 2002 it updated the Trunk Inventory Record Keeping System (TIRKS) database[536] that led to the

---

[530] SBC Oct. 2 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. at 3.

[531] SBC Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 1.

[532] NTD Comments at 4. NTD also claims that SBC provides it with inaccurate bills and frequently issues backbills. NTD Comments at 6-8. However, we find that NTD did not provide the Commission with sufficient specificity to conclude that these allegations rise to a level of checklist noncompliance. Accordingly, we reject NTD's claims.

[533] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at para. 133.

[534] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at para. 133.

[535] TDS Metrocom Comments at 13.

[536] SBC states that as a result of the TIRKS error, it was not able to determine which circuits were joint circuits and not subject to charges under its agreement with TDS, but that this problem was with the TIRKS database and thus does not raise issues with SBC's billing OSS. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 175.

erroneous billing, and provided the vast majority of credits to TDS Metrocom by May 2003.[537] We thus find that the specific dispute raised by TDS Metrocom in this instance is being resolved by SBC on a carrier-to-carrier basis. TDS Metrocom further complains that the scope of BearingPoint's testing was inadequate to identify certain problems it experienced.[538] As in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we reject TDS Metrocom's complaint that the scope of BearingPoint's testing was inadequate to identify certain problems it experienced.[539] We also note that TDS Metrocom has raised a variety of small billing claims against SBC.[540] We find that TDS Metrocom's claims have either been corrected or are being handled on a carrier-to-carrier basis, and that they fail to indicate checklist noncompliance.[541] As in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, we also find that SBC's evidence that it addresses billing problems as they arise is sufficient to respond to TDS Metrocom's isolated billing allegations.[542]

132. Z-Tel argues that problems persist with SBC's billing because SBC fails to update its underlying billing system to correct known errors, and claims that SBC consistently misbills for UNEs.[543] SBC indicates that the LSC Billing Claims process corrects inaccuracies and makes adjustments prior to notifying the competitive LEC that the claim has been resolved. SBC further states that if a competitive LEC believes that any issues are ongoing, they should be worked through management in the LSC in accordance with the escalation guidelines posted on "CLEC Online." Based on the evidence in record, we are not persuaded by Z-Tel's claims that SBC's billing systems and processes are systemically flawed.

133. After a review of SBC's performance during the relevant period, as we concluded in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, we find that SBC has produced sufficient evidence that its billing systems and processes allow competitive LECs a meaningful opportunity to compete. We note that the Department of Justice has mentioned that competitive LECs allege a number of problems with their wholesale bills that rise to a great enough level to raise a genuine issue, and

---

[537] SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Aff. at para. 175. SBC notes, however, that since that time TDS Metrocom has identified one additional SONET node that was misbilled, and that SBC is in the process of crediting the account. *Id.*

[538] TDS Metrocom Comments at 6-7 (referring to Letter from Mark Jenn, Manager – CLEC Federal Affairs, TDS Metrocom, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-138 at 1-4 (filed July 30, 2003) (TDS Metrocom July 30 *Ex Parte* Letter)).

[539] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 111.

[540] For example, TDS Metrocom claims that SBC charged it improper loop rate zone classifications, misclassified lines between business and residential categories, and charged incorrect rates for transit traffic. TDS Metrocom Comments at 13-17.

[541] We note that SBC has indicated that it has already resolved these disputes, and issued credits where appropriate. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Flynn Reply Aff. at paras. 139-42. *See also SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 109.

[542] *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 112.

[543] Z-Tel Comments at 10-11.

that the Department of Justice was therefore unable to support SBC's application based on the record.[544] Notably, however, the Department of Justice does not contend, nor put forward any additional evidence to suggest that SBC' billing system is systemically flawed. The Department of Justice also acknowledges that competitive LECs "could have more fully demonstrated the extent to which these problems have adversely affected their ability to compete."[545] The Commission has previously found that a BOC meets its evidentiary burden by showing that it has adequately responded to problems as they have arisen, because there inevitably will be errors and carrier-to-carrier disputes, particularly considering the complexity of billing systems and the volume of transactions handled in states such as these.[546] We conclude that commenters fail to demonstrate that SBC's errors are indicative of a systemic problem, rather than isolated instances of problems typical of high-volume carrier-to-carrier commercial billing. In addition, we note that SBC has demonstrated that it has internal processes to expeditiously address problems as they arise, and that where problems have occurred, they have generally been addressed in a timely manner. Although we judge SBC's wholesale billing at the time of its application, we recognize that access to OSS is an evolutionary process, and we expect that SBC will continue to improve its wholesale billing in the future. If this situation deteriorates, we will not hesitate to take appropriate enforcement action pursuant to section 271(d)(6).[547]

g. Change Management

134. We find that SBC satisfies its checklist item two obligations regarding change management. As discussed below, SBC demonstrates that it uses the same change management

---

[544] Department of Justice Evaluation at 12.

[545] Department of Justice Evaluation at 12.

[546] *See, e.g.*, *Verizon DC/MD/WVA Order,* 18 FCC Rcd at 5227-32, paras. 28-34 (finding that "[w]hile competing carriers advance a number of arguments about Verizon's billing, many of these problems appear to be resolved historical problems," and thus the claims are "not reflective of a systemic problem that would warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance"); *SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25696-702, paras. 90-95 (finding that the competitive LECs' disputes "have little relevance to the effectiveness of Pacific Bell's billing systems," and "did not provide sufficient information to rebut Pacific Bell's response that it took appropriate action with regard to these disputes," and thus concluding that "[m]any of the problems identified by commenters appear to be resolved historical problems, and even in the aggregate, these claims do not overcome Pacific Bell's demonstration of checklist compliance"); *Application by Verizon Virginia Inc., Verizon Long Distance Virginia, Inc., Verizon Enterprise Solutions Virginia Inc., Verizon Global Networks Inc., and Verizon Select Services of Virginia Inc., for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Virginia*, WC Docket No. 02-214 , Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 21880, 21901-12, paras. 40-55 (2002) (*Verizon Virginia Order*) (finding that "[w]hile competing carriers advance a number of arguments about Verizon's billing, many of these problems appear to be resolved historical problems and, even in the aggregate, these claims do not overcome Verizon's demonstration of checklist compliance" where the claims "do not indicate current systemic or recurring billing problems"); *Verizon New Jersey Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 12336-37, para. 126 (finding that the Commission "cannot, without further evidence find that the parties have demonstrated systemic inaccuracies in Verizon's wholesale bills that would require a finding of checklist noncompliance").

[547] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(6).

process (CMP) in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin as in SBC's wider 13-state region, and that this improved CMP includes the change management process that the Commission has already reviewed and found to be checklist compliant in previous section 271 orders.[548] In addition, we note that BearingPoint's review of SBC's change management plan, documentation, and performance supports our findings.[549]

135. The Commission has explained that, in order to comply with the checklist requirements, a BOC's change management procedures must afford an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete by providing sufficient access to the BOC's OSS.[550] After determining whether the BOC's change management plan is adequate, we evaluate whether the BOC has demonstrated a pattern of compliance with this plan.[551]

136. *Adequacy of Change Management Plan*. SBC indicates that it implemented its 13-state change management process in March 2001.[552] In response to some competitive LEC

---

[548] SBC Application at 75; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 145-146; *see also e.g.*, *SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25702-03, para. 96.

[549] *See* SBC Application at 75; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. A at paras. 57-66, Attach. B at paras. 58-67, Attach. C at paras. 58-67, Attach. D at paras. 56-63. We reject the OCC's general arguments that the issue of SBC's performance relative to the timeliness of change management processes, among other issues, remains unresolved because the Ohio Commission relegated the resolution of some OSS functionality issues to performance plans. OCC Comments at 7-8; *see also generally* IUCC Reply at 1-3 (arguing that the OSS testing process is incomplete). As we have discussed above, we find that the testing of the change management process was sufficient.

[550] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3999-4000, paras. 102-03; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18403-04, paras. 106-08. In evaluating whether a BOC's change management plan affords an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete, we first assess whether the plan is adequate by determining whether the evidence demonstrates: (1) that information relating to the change management process is clearly organized and readily accessible to competing carriers; (2) that competing carriers had substantial input in the design and continued operation of the change management process; (3) that the change management plan defines a procedure for the timely resolution of change management disputes; (4) the availability of a stable testing environment that mirrors production; and (5) the efficacy of the documentation the BOC makes available for the purpose of building an electronic gateway. *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18404, para. 108. We have also noted previously that we are open to consideration of change management plans that differ from those already found to be compliant with section 271. *Bell Atlantic New York* Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 4004, para. 111; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC at 18404, para. 109.

[551] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3999, 4004-05, paras. 101, 112.

[552] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 145. The 13-state CMP applies to SBC and all competitive LECs operating in Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas and Wisconsin. SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. O-5. The Commission previously reviewed and approved SBC's 13-state CMP in the Arkansas/Missouri and California section 271 proceedings. *SWBT Arkansas/Missouri Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 20725, para. 15; *SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25702, para. 96. SBC also adds that much of the current CMP that is used in the 13-state process was taken from its predecessor, SBC's eight-state CMP, which was reviewed and approved by the Commission in the Texas and Kansas/Oklahoma (continued….)

concerns, SBC states that it further improved on its processes with the Change Management Communication Plan (CMCP) which was adopted by the Michigan Public Service Commission on March 26, 2003,[553] and has now been implemented by SBC on a 13-state basis.[554] The CMCP improvements were developed in order to provide competitive LECs with sufficient notice of competitive LEC-impacting programming changes made outside of normal release schedules.[555] We agreed that the CMP revision, including the addition of the CMCP, should assist in diminishing issues regarding changes that were not already specifically addressed under the initial 13-state CMP and, therefore, approved the revised CMP in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding.[556] In addition, because SBC is utilizing the same revised CMP that we approved in Michigan, we conclude that the design of SBC's CMP is adequate for the four application states. Some commenters argue, however, that specific aspects of SBC's change management process are inadequate. We address and reject these various claims below.

137. *Competitive LEC Input*. We find that SBC provides sufficient opportunity for competitive LECs to have substantial input in the design and continued operation of the change management process. Specifically, we are not persuaded by various commenters' claims that SBC's CMP is inadequate because it allows too many defects in each release and does not sufficiently incorporate competitive LEC-initiated change requests.[557] We also note that the

(Continued from previous page)
Section 271 applications. SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 145-146. *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd. at 6318, para. 166; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18403, para. 105.

[553] *In the Matter*, *on the Commission's Own Motion, to Consider SBC's, f/k/a Ameritech Michigan, Compliance with the Competitive Checklist in Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Case No. U-12320, Opinion and Order (Michigan Commission Mar. 26, 2003) (*Michigan Commission Compliance Plan Order*).

[554] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at paras. 164-168.

[555] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 165.

[556] *See* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 166; *Michigan Commission Compliance Plan Order* at 5. We reject NALA's general argument that the functionality of SBC's OSS is frequently and arbitrarily changed. *See* NALA Sept. 11 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2. The record indicates that SBC has implemented an adequate change management plan, and we agree that there is no support for the contention that changes are "unilateral," "frequent," or "arbitrary." *See* SBC Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. B at 1.

[557] *See* Access One Comments at 5 (arguing that SBC has refused requests for a change in SBC's processes to facilitate "CLEC-to-CLEC" conversions, and has refused to provide a written account of SBC's standards for completing "CLEC-to-CLEC" conversions); ACN Group Comments at 23-24, 28-29 (arguing that change management has not helped to avoid defects in each release, and has not produced requested changes to allow local service requests to be "unrejected" instead of requiring a manual faxed order, and to allow for seamless "CLEC-to-CLEC customer migrations"); MCI Comments at 10-12 (arguing that SBC's process allows too many defects and fails to implement competitive LEC change requests); MCI Reply at 8 (arguing that the number of defects reported for SBC's latest EDI release, version 6.0, has increased to 79 defects as of August 27th); TDS Metrocom Comments at 25-27 (arguing that change management flaws allowed pre-ordering problems to arise in LSOG 5); *but see e.g.*, SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. A at 5-7 (stating *inter alia* that the number of defects reflected in the EDR can vary widely because the EDR is updated daily and contains defect reports that upon analysis may be determined not to be actual defects. Also indicating that while there was no such preordering edit in LSOG 4 as claimed by TDS Metrocom, an edit is planned for SBC's September 27th quarterly release).

Department of Justice requested that the Commission carefully consider the adequacy of SBC's pre-release testing and defect resolution processes.[558] As we discuss below, we find that SBC's processes, while not perfect, do not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance. As ACN Group admits, an error free release is a "logically unattainable" goal, and we find that commenters do not provide sufficient evidence that efficient competitors are denied a reasonable opportunity to compete by the volume of defects found in each release.[559] SBC states, and we agree, that any increase in the number of defects reported does not necessarily reflect a decrease in the quality of SBC's releases or an increase in the actual number of defects, but may rather be a reflection of the improved reporting of information with SBC's Enhanced Defect Report (EDR), which now includes potentially competitive LEC-impacting defects identified by SBC.[560] We note that SBC's processes also allow competitive LECs to recommend changes by submitting a "CLEC Change Request" (CCR), and that CCRs are prioritized based on the average competitive LEC rating that competitive LECs assign for each CCR.[561] We therefore conclude, consistent with BearingPoint's findings, that competitive LECs are allowed substantial input in the change management process.[562]

138. *Testing Environment*. TDS Metrocom claims that one example of the problems with SBC's testing is that it allowed a defect that is now causing all of TDS Metrocom's orders for service in South Beloit, Illinois to be rejected.[563] Based on the entire record, we are not persuaded by TDS Metrocom's argument that SBC fails to provide a testing environment that mirrors production.[564] SBC indicates that, in this instance, its systems were rejecting TDS Metrocom's orders because of a conflict between the South Beloit, Illinois end-user locations, and the circuit ID of the Wisconsin central office that served customers from that location.[565]

---

[558] Department of Justice Evaluation at 15-16.

[559] *See* ACN Group Comments at 28.

[560] *See* SBC Reply at 41; SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff. at para. 16-18.

[561] *See* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 148-149. SBC indicates that it has implemented approximately 180 competitive LEC-initiated change requests since 1998. SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 152. SBC also states that CCR's like Choice One's (ACN Group's) request for "unreject" functionality have not been summarily dismissed, but rather have been fully considered and discussed at CMP meetings, in accordance with the CMP. SBC Reply at 40-41.

[562] *See* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. A at para. 61; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. B at para. 62; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. C at para. 62; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. D at para. 59.

[563] TDS Metrocom Comments at 24-25 (arguing that the testing environment differs substantially from the production environment so that problems appear in the production environment when the exact same ordering information that passed through the testing environment is entered).

[564] TDS Metrocom Comments at 24-25.

[565] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 162. SBC also indicates that the only other instance of a TDS Metrocom reject occurring in production after passing in the test environment was caused by a LSC representative that failed to recognize that the LSR should have been rejected in the test environment. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply (continued….)

SBC states that it is in the process of implementing a change to permanently address this situation and that it has arranged for these orders to drop to the local service center for manual handling in the interim.[566] Furthermore, SBC indicates that its joint testing environment mirrors its production environment except during the competitive LEC test window for a new release.[567] BearingPoint's testing also confirms that SBC provides competitive LECs with an adequate and functional test environment that is separate from, but mirrors, the commercial production environment.[568] Because SBC's demonstration and BearingPoint's testing results indicate that SBC provides a sufficient testing environment, we are unable to conclude that SBC's testing suffers from any systemic flaws based on TDS Metrocom's claim, which appears to represent an isolated instance. We do not find such isolated instances to be competitively significant. We further note that the same testing processes and systems that are used to perform testing in the relevant states were reviewed and approved in the Arkansas/Missouri, California, and Michigan II proceedings.[569] Thus, we find that SBC's test environment satisfies the requirements of checklist item two.

139. *Adherence to the CMP*. Finally, we find that SBC has demonstrated a pattern of compliance with its change management plan.[570] For example, SBC demonstrates how it complied with the CMP notification, documentation and testing requirements that applied to the June 2003 release of LSOG 6 for ordering and pre-ordering.[571] Moreover, as noted above, SBC revised its CMP to contain increased notice requirements, including additional training for SBC

(Continued from previous page)
Aff., Attach. D at para. 41. SBC states that it has reinforced with the LSC representatives that the same tools, guides, and checks used in production must also be used for competitive LEC testing. SBC Brown/Cottrell/Lawson Reply Aff., Attach. D at para. 41.

[566] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 162.

[567] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 190.

[568] *See* SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. A at para. 64; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. B at para. 65; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. C at para. 65; SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff., Attach. D at para 61.

[569] *See SWBT Arkansas/Missouri Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 20725, para. 15; *SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25702, para. 96; *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 121.

[570] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3999, 4004-05, paras. 101, 112. As we stated above, we reject various commenters' allegations that SBC's CMP fails to sufficiently incorporate competitive LEC-initiated change requests. *See supra* para. 137. Even if we were to accept MCI's allegations that several requests for changes remain outstanding, we note that MCI fails to cite any provision of the CMP that SBC violates. *See* MCI Comments at 11-12. Furthermore, in prior section 271 proceedings, we have found that an isolated instance of noncompliance with CMP does not rise to a level of checklist noncompliance when a BOC shows a pattern of adherence to its CMP. *Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26393, para. 148 (finding that an isolated instance of noncompliance with CMP was not sufficient to undercut Qwest's overall performance); *Verizon Virginia Order,* 17 FCC Rcd at 21913, para. 57 (finding that an "isolated incident" did not undermine Verizon's pattern of adherence to its CMP).

[571] SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at paras. 155-157.

personnel, and quarterly status reports on compliance.[572] SBC filed the first quarterly status report describing its compliance with the new CMP on April 30, 2003, in accordance with the CMCP, which further supports a finding that SBC is complying with the notice provisions of the new CMP.[573] Therefore, we conclude that SBC complies with the change management requirements of checklist item two.

140. As we stated in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, although we find SBC's performance to be adequate here, we believe it is essential that SBC follow through on its commitment to continue to improve its change management process and adherence.[574] It is critical that SBC continue to work collaboratively with competitive LECs on the continued operation of the change management process. Failure to observe an effective change management process could lead to review by the relevant state commissions or enforcement action by this Commission in accordance with section 271(d)(6).

h. UNE Combinations

141. As part of its requirements under checklist item two, a BOC must demonstrate that it provides nondiscriminatory access to network elements in a manner that allows requesting carriers to combine such elements, and it does not separate already combined elements, except at the specific request of a competing carrier.[575] We find, as did the state commissions, that SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to combinations of UNEs in compliance with the Commission's rules.[576] Specifically, we determine that competitive LECs may order already-combined UNE combinations from SBC, which SBC will not separate unless requested to do so by the competitive LEC.[577] Moreover, pursuant to interconnection agreements, SBC combines UNEs, including new UNE-P combinations and enhanced extended links, upon a competitive

---

572 SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at paras. 168-169; SBC Sept. 12 *Ex Parte* Letter at Attach. A, p. 5.

573 SBC Cottrell/Lawson Aff. at para. 169; *In the Matter, on the Commission's Own Motion, to Consider SBC's, f/k/a Ameritech Michigan. Compliance with the Competitive Checklist in Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Case No. U-12320, Change Management Communications Plan Status Report (Michigan Commission Apr. 30, 2003) (CMCP Status Report).

574 *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 126.

575 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ii); 47 C.F.R. § 51.313(b) (2002).

576 *See Wisconsin Commission Phase I Order* at 121; Illinois Commission Comments at 50-51; Ohio Commission Comments at 132-41. Indiana states that, on the whole, SBC Indiana has complied with the availability requirements of checklist item 2. Indiana Commission Comments at 75.

577 SBC Application App. A, Vol. 1, Tab 1, Affidavit of Scott J. Alexander Regarding Illinois (SBC Alexander Illinois Aff.) at para. 81; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 1, Tab 2, Affidavit of Scott J. Alexander Regarding Indiana (SBC Alexander Indiana Aff.) at para. 81; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 1, Tab 3, Affidavit of Scott J. Alexander Regarding Ohio (SBC Alexander Ohio Aff.) at para. 81; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 1, Tab 4, Affidavit of Scott J. Alexander Regarding Wisconsin (SBC Alexander Wisconsin Aff.) at para. 81.

LEC's request.[578] SBC has also demonstrated that it allows competitors to combine their own UNE combinations.[579] Finally, we note that no commenter has expressed any concern about SBC's provision of UNE combinations.

C. Checklist item 4 – Unbundled Local Loops

142. Section 271(c)(2)(B) of the Act requires that a BOC provide "[l]ocal loop transmission from the central office to the customer's premises, unbundled from local switching or other services."[580] Based on the evidence in the record, we conclude, consistent with the state commissions, that SBC provides unbundled local loops in accordance with the requirements of section 271 and our rules.[581] Our conclusion is based on our review of SBC's performance for all loop types, which include voice-grade loops, xDSL-capable loops, digital loops, and high-capacity loops, as well as our review of SBC's processes for hot cut provisioning, and line sharing and line splitting. SBC has provisioned thousands of stand-alone loop UNEs in the four application states; 319,000 in Illinois; 53,000 in Indiana; 125,470 in Ohio; and 229,539 in Wisconsin.[582]

143. *xDSL-Capable Loops.* We find that SBC provides xDSL-capable loops to competitors in a nondiscriminatory manner.[583] Although SBC missed one installation interval

---

[578] SBC Alexander Illinois Aff. at paras. 82-83; SBC Alexander Indiana Aff. at paras. 82-83; SBC Alexander Ohio Aff. at paras. 82-83; SBC Alexander Wisconsin Aff. at paras. 82-84.

[579] SBC Application at 42 (citing, as an example, SBC Alexander Illinois Aff. at paras. 39-53, 80 and SBC Application App. A, Vol. 3, Tab 13, Affidavit of William C. Deere Regarding Illinois (SBC Deere Illinois Aff.) at para. 9).

[580] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(iv); *see also* Appendix F (setting forth the requirements under checklist item 4).

[581] Illinois Commission Comments at 96; Ohio Commission Comments at 186; Wisconsin Commission Comments at 1. We note that the Indiana Commission deferred the determination of whether SBC is in compliance with checklist item 4 to the Commission. Indiana Commission Comments at 17-18. As we discuss below, we find that SBC has demonstrated compliance in all four states, including Indiana.

[582] SBC Application at 91; SBC Heritage Illinois Aff. at Appendix A; SBC Heritage Indiana Aff. at Appendix A; SBC Heritage Ohio Aff. at Appendix E; SBC Heritage Wisconsin Aff. at Appendix E.

[583] SBC generally met the relevant parity or benchmark standard regarding provisioning and maintenance and repair of xDSL-capable loops. *See, e.g.*, PM 58-04 (Percent Ameritech-Caused Missed Due Dates; DSL; No Line Sharing); PM 59-04 (Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Installation; DSL; No Line Sharing); PM 65-04 (Trouble Report Rate; DSL; No Line Sharing); PM 67-04 (Mean Time to Restore; Dispatch; DSL; No Line Sharing); PM 67-19 (Mean Time to Restore; No Dispatch; DSL; No Line Sharing); PM 69-04 (Percent Repeat Trouble Reports; DSL; No Line Sharing); *see also* Appendices B-E. We note that SBC missed the benchmark PM 67-04 (Mean Time to Restore; Dispatch; DSL; No Line Sharing) in Wisconsin by 1.28 hours in March 2003 and 0.45 hours in July 2003. SBC also missed the benchmark PM 69-04 (Percent Repeat Trouble Reports; DSL; No Line Sharing) in Indiana by 2.29% in March 2003 and 1.33% in June 2003. Since the misses to both metrics were by small margins, we do not find the misses to be competitively significant.

metric for DSL loops for several months in Wisconsin,[584] as the Commission has noted in prior section 271 orders, we accord the installation interval metrics little weight because results can be affected by a variety of factors outside the BOC's control that are unrelated to provisioning timeliness.[585] Instead, we conclude that the missed due date metric is a more reliable indicator of provisioning timeliness. In this regard, SBC met the applicable standard for missed due dates for all months under review.[586] In addition, MCI complains that SBC is unable to include a DSL line in a "hunt group" that also contains non-DSL lines. However, we note that MCI raised this issue in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, and as we determined there, we find that MCI's complaints do not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance.[587]

---

[584] SBC missed PM 55-12 (Average Installation Interval; DSL Loops Requiring No Conditioning; Line Sharing) in Wisconsin in March through May 2003 by an average of 0.47 days. However, since SBC has shown improvement by achieving parity for PM 55-12 in Wisconsin for the months of June and July 2003, we do not find that the earlier misses indicate a systemic problem with SBC's performance. Appendices B-E; SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 18. In June 2003, the average installation interval was 2.97 days for SBC versus 2.94 days for competitive LECs and, in July 2003, SBC's average was 2.96 days versus 2.89 days for competitive LECs. Appendices B-E. Therefore, we reject ACN Group's arguments that SBC's installation intervals for stand-alone DSL loops were much longer than those for its retail affiliate. ACN Group Comments at 37.

[585] *See, e.g.*, *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 128 n. 429; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4061, paras. 202-10 (listing factors beyond the BOC's control that affect the average installation interval metric: "(1) competitive LECs are choosing installation dates beyond the first installation date made available by Bell Atlantic's systems (the 'W-coding' problem); (2) for non-dispatch orders, competitive LECs are ordering a relatively larger share of services and UNEs that have long standard intervals (the 'order mix' problem); and (3) for dispatch orders, competitive LECs are ordering a relatively larger share of services in geographic areas that are served by busier garages and, as a result, reflect later available due dates (the 'geographic mix' problem)."; *see also Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26402, para. 163; *Application by BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Florida and Tennessee*, WC Docket No. 02-307, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 25828, 25896-97, para. 136 and n.463 (2002) (*BellSouth Florida/Tennessee Order*).

[586] PM 58-04 (Percent Ameritech-Caused Missed Due Dates; DSL; No Line Sharing). Although SBC missed the benchmark PM IN 1-01 (Percent Loop Acceptance Test (LAT) Completed on or Prior to the Completion Date of the Order – DSL Loops without line sharing) in Wisconsin by 3.3% in March, 27.5% in April, and 10% in June, the volume of orders was low (*e.g.* only 16 competitive LEC orders in April). Appendices B-E; SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C. at 19. Since a small number of missed due dates led to the missed metric, we do not find the misses of PM IN 1-01 to be competitively significant.

[587] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 131. A hunt group is a series of telephone lines, and their associated telephone numbers and switch ports, which are organized so that if a call comes in to a line in the hunt group that is busy, the call will be passed to the next line in the hunt group until a free line is found. *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 131 n.442. SBC responds that while it currently does not provide such a feature, MCI only recently raised this issue in June, 2003. Moreover, SBC explains that it does have a currently available process that emulates the hunting functionality between a ULS-ST port and a UNE-P hunt group by using existing switch feature technology (*i.e.* the use of Busy Line Transfer), and if competitive LECs are not satisfied with the Busy Line Transfer option, they have the ability to formally request the development of a process that allows actual hunt groups containing both UNE-P and stand alone ULS-ST ports either through a BFR or through Change Management. *See* SBC Chapman Reply Aff. at paras. 33-34.

144. *Voice-Grade Loops, Digital Loops, Dark Fiber and Hot Cuts*. Based on the evidence in the record we find that SBC demonstrates that it provides voice-grade loops,[588] digital loops,[589] dark fiber,[590] and hot cuts[591] in accordance with the requirements of checklist item

[588] *See, e.g.,* PM 58-05 (Percent Ameritech-Caused Missed Due Dates; 8.0 dB Loops); PM 59-05 (Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Installation; 8.0 dB Loops); *see also* Appendices B-E. SBC has satisfied the performance standards for these important metrics in all four states over the relevant five months. Therefore, we disagree with ACN Group's arguments that SBC's performance regarding voice grade loops is problematic. ACN Group Comments at 38. SBC generally met the relevant parity or benchmark standard regarding maintenance and repair of voice grade loops. *See, e.g.*, PM 66-04 (Percent Missed Repair Commitments; UNE; 2 Wire Analog 8 dB Loops); PM 67-05 (Mean Time to Restore (Hours); Dispatch; 8.0 dB Loops); PM 67-20 (Mean Time to Restore (Hours); No Dispatch; 8.0 dB Loops); PM 68-01 (Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours; 2 Wire Analog 8.0 dB Loops); PM 69-05 (Percent Repeat Reports; 8.0 dB Loops).

[589] *See, e.g.*, PM 58-06 (Percent Ameritech-Caused Missed Due Dates: BRI Loops with Test Access); PM 58-08 (Percent Ameritech-Caused Missed Due Dates; DS1 Loops); PM 59-06 (Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Installation; BRI Loops with Test Access); PM 59-08 (Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Installation; DS1 Loops with Test Access); *see also* Appendices B-E. SBC missed an ordering metric for loops for several of the application months. SBC missed the 95% benchmark for PM 5-34 (Percent of FOCs Returned within 24 Clock Hours; Manually Submitted Requests UNE Loop (1-49 loops)) in Illinois by an average of over 5% for March through June 2003. SBC also missed PM 55-03 (Average Installation Interval; UNE DS1 Loop (includes PRI)) in Indiana from March through July 2003, in Illinois from April through July 2003, and in Wisconsin from May through July 2003. SBC also missed PM 56-03 (Percentage of Installations Completed within Customer Requested Due Date-UNE-DS1) in Indiana in May through July 2003. However, in Illinois and Wisconsin, SBC met PM 56-03 (Percent Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date) during four of the five application months and, in Indiana, SBC only missed ten installations during the five application months, resulting in 96.3% of all Indiana competitive LECs' DS1 loops since March being installed within the requested due date. SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 11. Therefore, we find that overall, SBC installed DS1 loops in a timely manner as requested by the competitive LECs, and we do not find SBC's misses of the installation metrics to be competitively significant. In addition, SBC generally met the relevant parity or benchmark standard regarding maintenance and repair of digital loops. *See, e.g.*, PM 67-06 (Mean Time to Restore (Hours); Dispatch; BRI Loops with Test Access); PM 67-21 (Mean Time to Restore (Hours); No Dispatch; BRI Loops with Test Access); PM 69-06 (Percent Repeat Reports; BRI Loops with Test Access); PM 67-08 (Mean Time to Restore (Hours); Dispatch; DS1 Loops with Test Access); PM 67-23 (Mean Time to Restore (Hours); No Dispatch; DS1 Loops with Test Access); PM 69-08 (Percent Repeat Reports; DS1 Loops with Test Access); *see also* Appendices B-E. However, SBC missed PM 65-06 (Trouble Report Rate; BRI Loops with Test Access) in Illinois by an average of 0.3 trouble reports per month per 100 UNE loops. Similarly, since the performance difference was less than one trouble report (0.3) per 100 circuits, we again do not find the misses to be competitively significant. Appendices B-E; SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 7. SBC also missed PM 65-08 (Trouble Report Rate; DS1 Loops with Test Access) in Illinois and Ohio by an average of .9 trouble reports per month per 100 UNE loops. Nonetheless, since the performance difference was less than one trouble report (0.9) per 100 circuits, we do not find the misses to be competitively significant. Appendices B-E; Ehr Reply Aff., Attach C. at 7, 14. We therefore reject ACN Group's arguments that SBC's performance regarding voice grade loops is discriminatory. ACN Group Comments at 38.

[590] SBC Deere Illinois Aff. at paras. 92-98; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 3, Tab 14, Affidavit of William C. Deere Regarding Indiana SBC Deere Indiana Aff.) at paras. 92-98; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 3, Tab 15, Affidavit of William C. Deere Regarding Ohio (SBC Deere Ohio Aff.) at paras. 92-98; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 3, Tab 16, Affidavit of William C. Deere Regarding Wisconsin (SBC Deere Wisconsin Aff.) at paras. 92-98.

[591] *See* PM 114 (Percentage Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)); PM 114.1 (CHC/FDT LNP w/Loop Provisioning Interval); PM 115 (Percent Ameritech-Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers)). We note that SBC (continued….)

four. We disagree with ACN Group's arguments that SBC has failed to provide nondiscriminatory access to unbundled DS1 and DSL loops.[592] In particular, ACN Group argues that SBC's trouble rate in Illinois for DS1 loops has generally been far below the trouble rate for Mpower and the trouble rate for all competitive LECs.[593] As we stated previously, contrary to ACN Group's claims, we found that, although SBC did not meet parity every month for PM 65-08 (Trouble Report Rate; DS1 Loops with Test Access) in Illinois, the misses were not competitively significant.[594]

145. *Line Sharing and Line Splitting.* Based on the evidence in the record, we find that SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to the high frequency portion of the loop (line sharing). SBC's performance data for line shared loops demonstrate that it is generally in compliance with the parity and benchmark measures established in the application states.[595]

146. SBC also provides access to network elements necessary for competing providers to provide line splitting. Line splitting is the shared use of an unbundled loop for the provision of voice and data services where the incumbent LEC provides neither voice nor data services.[596] SBC states that it supports line splitting where a competitive LEC purchases separate elements (including unbundled loops, unbundled switching, and cross connects for these UNEs) and

(Continued from previous page)
missed the benchmark PM 114 (Percentage Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers) by 2% in March and .15% in June 2003. However, since both of those misses were by small margins, we do not find the misses to be competitively significant.

[592] ACN Group Comments at 39.

[593] ACN Group Comments at 39.

[594] *See* note 588, *supra*. *See also* SBC Chapman Reply Aff. at paras. 22-27 (describing SBC's processes for reporting and resolving trouble in connection with line splitting).

[595] *See, e.g.*, PM 58-03 (Percent Ameritech-Caused Missed Due Dates; DSL; Line Sharing); PM 65-03 (Trouble Report Rate; DSL; Line Sharing); PM 66-03 (Percent Missed Repair Commitments; DSL; Line Sharing); PM 67-03 (Mean Time to Restore; Dispatch; DSL; Line Sharing); PM 67-18 (Mean Time to Restore; No Dispatch; DSL; Line Sharing); PM 69-03 (Percent Repeat (Trouble) Reports; DSL; Line Sharing); *see also* Appendices B-E. We note that SBC missed the parity PM 65-03 in Illinois (Trouble Report Rate; DSL; Line Sharing) in March 2003 by .26 trouble reports per 100 circuits and in April 2003 by .13 trouble reports per 100 circuits. However, SBC has shown improvement by meeting the parity metric in each of the past three application months. Therefore, we do not find the misses to be competitively significant. Although SBC missed the parity metric PM 59-03 (Percent Installation Trouble Reports Within 30 days (I-30) of Installation) in Illinois by an average of approximately .9% between March and June 2003, competitive LECs achieved parity in July. Appendices B-E; SBC Ehr Reply Aff., Attach. C at 7. Given SBC's improved performance, we disagree with ACN Group's arguments that SBC's performance regarding the installation interval metrics for line shared loops is discriminatory. ACN Group Comments at 38. Moreover, as discussed above, we accord the installation interval metrics little weight because results can be affected by a variety of factors outside the BOC's control that are unrelated to provisioning timeliness. *See, e.g.*, *Qwest Nine State Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 26402, para. 163; *BellSouth Florida/Tennessee Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25896-97, para. 136 and n.463; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4061, paras. 202-10.

[596] SBC Chapman Aff. at para. 82.

combines them with their own (or a partner competitive LEC's) splitter in a collocation arrangement.[597] SBC demonstrates that it has a legal obligation to provide line splitting through nondiscriminatory rates, terms, and conditions in interconnection agreements and that it offers competing carriers the ability to order an unbundled xDSL-capable loop terminated to a collocated splitter and DSLAM equipment, and to combine it with unbundled switching and shared transport.[598]

147. Competitive LECs raise a number of claims in this proceeding regarding SBC's procedures and costs for ordering, installing and disconnecting line splitting arrangements.[599] The Department of Justice also notes that for the same reasons as in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, the "Commission should determine whether SBC's processes provide non-discriminatory access to line-splitting and UNE-platform services."[600] We note that these claims were raised and rejected in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding.[601] Therefore, we incorporate and reference the *SBC Michigan II Order*, and find it unnecessary to readdress these issues here. We conclude, as we did in the *SBC Michigan II Order*, that SBC's line splitting policies do not warrant a finding of checklist noncompliance.[602]

148. *Facilities Provisioning*. We do not find that ACN Group's claims that SBC

---

[597] *Id*.

[598] *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6348, para. 220.

[599] We note that AT&T withdrew its comments related to SBC's non-recurring charges for line splitting. *See AT&T Motion to Withdraw*. As a result, AT&T no longer raises this issue for our consideration. We do, however, consider the related cost issues that MCI raises.

[600] Department of Justice Evaluation at 16.

[601] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 133-143. Specifically, commenters assert that if a competitive LEC's customer wishes to discontinue xDSL service provided through line splitting, SBC requires installation of a new loop, rather than simply changing out cross-connects using the existing loop that is already in service, and this increases the cost to the competitive LEC. AT&T Comments at 10-22; MCI Comments at 1-5; AT&T Reply at 6-11; MCI Reply at 1-5; Letter from Kimberly A. Scardino, Director, Federal Regulatory, MCI, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 03-167 at 1-2 (filed September 5, 2003) (MCI September 5 *Ex Parte* Letter). Furthermore, commenters argue that SBC's process is more complicated, creates unnecessary service outages, risks service quality problems, and allows SBC to levy a substantial non-recurring charge for the establishment of a new unbundled loop. AT&T Comments at 14; MCI Comments at 1-4; MCI September 5 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2. Commenters also argue that none of these problems are incurred by SBC retail customers who purchase DSL and subsequently disconnect it, as SBC removes the DSL on the existing line without installation of a new line. AT&T Comments at 17; MCI Comments at 2; MCI September 5 *Ex Parte* Letter at 3. Competitive LECs further complain that data LECs are unable to submit line splitting orders on behalf of competitive LECs unless they are on the same version of EDI. AT&T Comments at 21-22; MCI Comments at 5.

[602] *See SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 133-143. In the circumstances brought before us here, where there is no clear state error and MCI raises fact-specific and technical issues which may involve underlying cost studies, we defer to the states for determining pricing for line splitting.

charges competitive LECs erroneous trip charges rise to the level of checklist noncompliance.[603] Specifically, ACN Group argues that SBC mistakenly bills Mpower for dispatches to other competitive LECs and also bills Mpower trip charges for repairs, even though the problem was with SBC's facilities.[604] In response to the claim that SBC mistakenly bills Mpower for dispatches to other competitive LECs, SBC states that it has no knowledge of such instances, and that ACN Group fails to provide the Commission with sufficient specificity to evaluate this complaint.[605] Regarding the trip charges for repairs, the record shows that SBC and Mpower are working together to investigate the improper billing of Mpower for trip charges for repairs.[606] As part of that process, SBC and Mpower are taking a random sampling of SBC's trouble tickets and investigation of closure codes used by SBC's outside technicians.[607] Upon completion of the investigation, Mpower and SBC will determine the next step in the dispute process, including whether any potential adjustments need to be made.[608] Based on SBC's current performance and its efforts thus far to work with competitive LECs to resolve this issue, we do not find that the issue rises to the level of checklist noncompliance.

149. We also reject ACN Group's argument that SBC has a different facilities provisioning policy if it has a section 271 application pending in a state than it does once it has section 271 authority granted for the state.[609] Specifically, ACN Group argues that when SBC has a section 271 application pending, if a facility a competitive LEC ordered needs additional equipment, such as a line card or repeater, SBC will add the additional equipment at no additional charge.[610] However, ACN Group argues that once section 271 authority has been granted, requests concerning facilities needing additional equipment are rejected on a "no facilities available basis," requiring competitive LECs to order the facility out of SBC's special access tariff.[611] We do not find that this issue rises to the level of checklist noncompliance. First, we note that ACN Group does not raise an issue that is currently in existence in the application states. Second, the record shows that SBC Midwest's entire facilities modification policy was developed collaboratively in conjunction with competitive LECs and the state commissions.[612] If

603 ACN Group Comments at 40.

604 *Id*.

605 SBC Muhs Reply Aff. at para. 38.

606 SBC Muhs Reply Aff. at para. 37.

607 SBC Muhs Reply Aff. at paras. 36-37.

608 SBC Muhs Reply Aff. at para. 37.

609 ACN Group Comments at 40-41.

610 ACN Group Comments at 40-41.

611 ACN Group Comments at 41.

612 SBC Reply at 77; SBC Application Reply App., Vol. 2a, Tab 7, Reply Affidavit of William C. Deere (SBC Deere Reply Aff.) at para. 7 n.4.

competitive LECs have concerns with SBC's facilities modification policy, those concerns should be addressed with either the state commissions or the Commission's Enforcement Bureau.

150. *Unbundled IDLC/NGDLC*. ACN Group contends that SBC is required to provide integrated digital loop carrier (IDLC) facilities and next generation digital loop carrier (NGDLC) facilities and associated packet switching facilities to competitive LECs on an unbundled basis and at TELRIC rates, but does not do so in Illinois.[613] According to ACN Group, SBC's denial of access to these facilities renders approval of this application contrary to the public interest. We disagree. First, the rules under which we evaluate this application do not require SBC to unbundle its digital loop carrier (DLC) facilities under all circumstances.[614] When a competitive LEC orders a loop that is being served using IDLC, SBC will migrate the loop to spare copper facilities at no additional charge to the competitor so long as such facilities exist.[615] If no spare facilities exist, SBC will perform the construction necessary to install a copper loop in accordance with its "facilities modification" policy.[616] Thus, SBC's policies do not deprive competitors of access to transmission facilities, even where its loops are fed by DLC that SBC will not or cannot unbundle. Second, the applicable rules require SBC to provide access to its packet switching facilities only if, among other things, it has refused to permit a requesting carrier "to deploy a Digital Subscriber Line Access multiplexer in the remote terminal, pedestal or environmentally controlled vault or other interconnection point [or to provide] a virtual collocation arrangement at these subloop interconnection points."[617] SBC, however, permits competitive LECs to deploy DSLAMs at its remote terminals,[618] and no commenter has claimed otherwise. Thus, SBC's policies with respect to IDLC and NGDLC loops, and the associated packet switching facilities, do not warrant rejection of this application.

---

613 ACN Group contends that SBC either: (1) does not offer such access or at all; or (2) denies any obligation to price such offerings at TELRIC levels. *See* ACN Group Comments at 44, 52.

614 The Commission made clear in the *UNE Remand Order* that, notwithstanding earlier hopes that IDLC-fed loops could feasibly be unbundled, such unbundling "ha[d] not proven practicable," and "[c]ompetitors [were] not yet able economically to separate and access IDLC customers' traffic on the wire-center side of the IDLC multiplexing devices." *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3794, para. 217 n.418.

615 *See* SBC Deere Illinois Aff. at para. 101.

616 *See id.* at paras. 101, 103-119.

617 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(c)(5) (2000).

618 *See* SBC Chapman Aff. at para. 79.

V. OTHER CHECKLIST ITEMS

A. Checklist Item 7 – Access to 911/E911 and Operator Services/Directory Assistance

1. Access to 911/E911

151. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act requires a BOC to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to 911 and E911 services."[619] A BOC must provide competitors with access to its 911 and E911 services in the same manner that it provides such access to itself, *i.e.*, at parity.[620] Specifically, the BOC "must maintain the 911 database entries for competing LECs with the same accuracy and reliability that it maintains the database entries for its own customers."[621] We find, as did the state commissions,[622] that SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to 911 and E911 services in the applicant states.[623]

152. We reject the argument, raised by AT&T and MCI, that SBC's policies regarding population of the E911 database violate the competitive checklist. On June 20, 2003, SBC delivered to all competitive LECs within its entire 13-state region an accessible letter offering "clarification" of its E911 policies (June 20 Accessible Letter). The letter addressed "those instances in which a CLEC[] wishes to engage in line splitting by reusing facilities previously used as part of a UNE-P or line shared arrangement."[624] SBC indicated that it would retain end-user information upon the transition from UNE-P or line sharing to line splitting, but explained that because "[t]he CLEC may physically rearrange or disconnect the UNEs used in the original line splitting arrangement . . . without [SBC] having any knowledge or information as to the change in service," it was "the responsibility of the CLEC to ensure the 911/E911 database accurately reflects its end-user customer's information" after the transition.[625]

153. On July 15, SBC followed the June 20 Accessible Letter with another accessible letter, delivered only to competitive LECs within the five-state SBC Midwest Region (July 15

---

619 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vii).

620 *Qwest Three State Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 7389, para. 109.

621 *Id.* (citing *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20679, para. 256).

622 *See* Illinois Commission Comments at 109-10; Indiana Commission Comments at 121-22; Ohio Commission Comments at 231; *Wisconsin Commission Phase I Order* at 14, 26-27.

623 *See* SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at paras. 148-53; SBC Ehr Indiana Aff. at paras. 129-33; SBC Ehr Ohio Aff. at paras. 134-38; SBC Ehr Wisconsin Aff. at paras. 130-36.

624 SBC Application, App. K, Tab 25, CLECALL03-077.

625 *Id.*

Accessible Letter).[626] This second letter further clarified SBC's policy, explaining that the June 20 Accessible Letter "was intended solely to address a potential situation in which a CLEC initially engages in line-splitting by reusing facilities previously used as part of a UNE-P or line-shared arrangement, but subsequently physically rearranges the UNE loop and switch port within the CLEC's collocation arrangement (or that of its partnering CLEC)."[627] The July 15 letter also made clear that the policy applied only in cases involving a change in "the customer's physical service address," and emphasized that "SBC Midwest 5-State remains responsible for implementing MSAG changes" – that is, changes of general applicability, such as modifications of a town name, a street name, or the directional rules governing a street.[628]

154. We do not believe that the policy, as clarified, constitutes discriminatory provision of 911 or E911 services in violation of checklist item seven.[629] During the course of the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding, in an affidavit incorporated here,[630] SBC explained that "the CLEC is in physical control of the loop and the switch port once those have been provided to the CLEC's collocation space, and because the CLEC has the ability to disconnect and rearrange the original combination, SBC cannot be responsible for changes made without its knowledge."[631] We are thus persuaded that competitive LECs could change a customer's address without notifying SBC,[632] and believe that this possibility justifies SBC's policy requiring competitive

---

[626] AT&T Comments, Declaration of Sarah DeYound, James F. Henson and Walter W. Willard (AT&T DeYoung/Henson/Willard Decl.) Ex. 1.

[627] *Id.*

[628] *Id.*

[629] Nor do we believe that the activity about which AT&T and MCI complain violates checklist item 10. *See, e.g.*, AT&T Comments at 22. Irrespective of whether that checklist item is relevant to a BOC's purported failure to provide nondiscriminatory access to 911 and E911, checklist item 10 does not set forth requirements with respect to 911 and E911 services that are distinct from the obligations imposed by checklist item seven. Therefore, because we conclude that SBC satisfies checklist item seven, we also conclude that it satisfies checklist item 10 with respect to any obligations that item might impose regarding the provision of 911 and E911.

[630] *See* SBC Reply App., Vol. 3, Tab 11, Reply Affidavit of Bernard Eugene Valentine (SBC Valentine Reply Aff.) at para. 2.

[631] *See Application by SBC Communications Inc., Michigan Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Michigan*, Supplemental Reply Affidavit of Bernard Eugene Valentine at paras. 9, 19-29, WC Docket No. 03-138 (filed Jul. 21, 2003) (SBC Valentine *Michigan II* Reply Aff.).

[632] *See* SBC Valentine *Michigan II* Reply Aff. at 19 ("When a CLEC employs a line-splitting arrangement, it controls the physical connection of both the switch port and the unbundled loop to a splitter located within its collocation arrangement (or the collocation arrangement of a partnering CLEC). Unlike a typical resale or UNE-P scenario, wherein SBC Midwest maintains control of all physical connections in the network, and can thus ensure that the physical end-user service address associated with the loop is appropriately reflected in the E911 database, SBC Midwest loses that capability in the line-splitting scenario – even where the switch port and loop were previously elements of a UNE-P."); *see also id.* at para. 20.

carriers to notify it of a line splitting customer's post-conversion change of address.

155. AT&T and MCI contend that even given the clarifications above, SBC is still in violation of checklist item seven. Specifically, they complain that the breadth of the June 20 Accessible Letter indicates that SBC initially planned to implement a more discriminatory policy;[633] that SBC's policies in California violate the competitive checklist;[634] and that the policy, as clarified, remains ambiguous.[635] As we explained more fully in our recent *SBC Michigan II Order*, however, SBC's policy in the Midwest region, as clarified, does not violate the competitive checklist, and allegations regarding its policies in states other than those at issue in this application, as well as allegations regarding plans that have not been implemented, are irrelevant to our section 271 inquiry. Moreover, SBC's policy in the states at issue here is clear. Specifically, as set forth above, the July 15 Accessible Letter stated plainly that the policy described applied "solely" to "situation[s] in which a CLEC initially engages in line-splitting by reusing facilities previously used as part of a UNE-P or line-shared arrangement," and only required competitive carriers "to provide updated end-user service address information based upon a change in the customer's physical service address."[636] We thus reject AT&T's and MCI's complaints.

2. Access to Operator Services/Directory Assistance

156. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II) and section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III) require a BOC to provide nondiscriminatory access to "directory assistance services to allow the other carrier's customers to obtain telephone numbers" and "operator call completion services," respectively.[637] Additionally, section 251(b)(3) of the 1996 Act imposes on each LEC "the duty to permit all [competing providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service] to have nondiscriminatory access to . . . operator services, directory assistance, and directory listing, with no unreasonable dialing delays."[638] Based on our review of the record, we conclude, as did the state commissions,[639] that SBC offers nondiscriminatory access to its directory assistance

633 *See* AT&T Comments at 23-24.

634 *See id.* at 24-25.

635 *See* MCI Comments at 6.

636 AT&T DeYoung/Henson/Willard Decl. Ex. 1. *See generally SBC Michigan II Order* at paras. 148-49.

637 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II)-(III). *See also Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4131, para. 351.

638 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(3). We have previously held that a BOC must be in compliance with section 251(b)(3) in order to satisfy sections 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II) and (III). *See Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20740 n.763. *See also Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4132-33, para. 352.

639 *See* Illinois Commission Comments at 109-10; Indiana Commission Comments at 121-22 (finding that SBC provided OS and DA services at TELRIC rates), 171 (deferring to this Commission analysis of commercial performance results regarding OS/DA); Ohio Commission Comments at 231; *Wisconsin Commission Phase I Order* at 14, 26-27.

services and operator services (OS/DA).[640]

B. Checklist Item 10 – Databases and Signaling

157. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(x) of the Act requires a BOC to provide to other telecommunications carriers "nondiscriminatory access to databases and associated signaling necessary for call routing and completion."[641] Based on the evidence in the record, we find, as did the state commissions,[642] that SBC provides nondiscriminatory access to databases and signaling networks in their respective states.[643]

158. TSI argues that SBC is violating checklist item ten.[644] Specifically, TSI claims that it should be able to purchase signaling from SBC as an unbundled network element at TELRIC rates, rather than from tariffs at higher rates.[645] Pursuant to section 271(c)(2)(B) of the Act, SBC only is required to make checklist items available to other telecommunications carriers.[646] TSI, however, is not a telecommunications carrier.[647] Therefore, we find that SBC has no obligation under the Act to provide signaling services to TSI at UNE rates.[648]

---

[640] *See* SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at paras. 148-53; SBC Ehr Indiana Aff. at paras. 129-33; SBC Ehr Ohio Aff. at paras. 134-38; SBC Ehr Wisconsin Aff. at paras. 130-36. We note that NALA appears to raise the same argument as it raised in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding regarding branding fees. NALA argues that SBC requires competitive LECs to pay one-time branding fees to access its OS/DA services in violation of the Commission's requirements. NALA Sept. 11 *Ex Parte* Letter at 3. SBC submitted the same evidence it submitted in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding demonstrating that SBC does allow competitive LECs to default to SBC branding, and that carriers choosing SBC branding are not subject to the non-recurring loading charges applied to carriers electing their own branding. *See* SBC Sept. 22 *Ex Parte* Letter, Attach. B, at 1-2. Accordingly, for the same reasons we rejected NALA's claims in the SBC Michigan II proceeding, we reject them here as well. *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 152.

[641] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(x).

[642] Illinois Commission Comments at 123; Indiana Commission Comments at 135; Ohio Commission Comments at 232; *Wisconsin Commission Phase I Order* at 28.

[643] SBC Application at 114-115; SBC Deere Illinois Aff. at paras. 170-210; SBC Deere Indiana Aff. at paras. 170-210; SBC Deere Ohio Aff. at paras. 175-215; SBC Deere Wisconsin Aff. at paras. 170-210.

[644] Letter from David J. Robinson, TSI, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, at 1-2 (filed July 21, 2003)(TSI July 21 *Ex Parte* Letter). We note that TSI raised identical allegations against Michigan Bell, which the Commission rejected. *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 160.

[645] TSI July 21 *Ex Parte* Letter at 1-2.

[646] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B).

[647] TSI is a third-party provider offering signaling services to telecommunications carriers. TSI July 21 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2.

[648] *See Verizon DC/MD/WVA Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 5294, para. 139; *SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 160.

Accordingly, TSI's allegations are not relevant to our finding of checklist compliance.[649]

C. Checklist Item 13 – Reciprocal Compensation

159. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii) of the Act requires BOCs to enter into "[r]eciprocal compensation arrangements in accordance with the requirements of section 252(d)(2)."[650] In turn, section 252(d)(2)(A) specifies the conditions necessary for a state commission to find that the terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation are just and reasonable.[651] We conclude that AT&T raises a pricing issue that it has already appropriately raised before the federal court, as Congress intended, where it is pending resolution. Under these circumstances, we do not find a violation of checklist item thirteen.

160. Reciprocal compensation generally applies in the situation where two carriers combine to complete a local call, and the carrier that originates the traffic pays the terminating carrier for completing the call.[652] AT&T contends that the state commission misapplied a Commission rule regarding reciprocal compensation rates in an arbitration proceeding.[653] AT&T disputes the Ohio Commission's decision requiring AT&T to charge the lower, end-office rate when the AT&T tandem-equivalent switch connects with an SBC end office.[654] AT&T asserts that the state commission's arbitration proceeding determined that AT&T's switch will serve an area geographically comparable to the incumbent LEC's tandem switch, and therefore, the Commission's rules provide that the appropriate rate for traffic terminated to AT&T's tandem-

---

[649] TSI also argues that SBC fails to provide billing detail necessary for TSI to "determine accurate signaling message counts and proper jurisdictional billing treatment associated with those calls." TSI July 21 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2. We note that TSI provides no details regarding its complaint and thus, consistent with prior section 271 orders, we do not find that its claim overcomes SBC's affirmative showing of checklist compliance. *See Verizon DC/MD/WVA Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 5225, para. 24 ("[W]e give little, if any, weight to allegations in a section 271 proceeding without the minimum amount of detail necessary for us to determine whether the applicant fails the checklist."). Furthermore, TSI is not a telecommunications carrier so we do not review SBC's performance in providing bills to TSI under section 271. 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B).

[650] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii).

[651] 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(2)(A).

[652] *Local Competition Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 496, para. 1034.

[653] AT&T Comments 54-57 (citing 47 C.F.R. § 51.711; *AT&T Communications of Ohio, Inc.'s and TCG Ohio's Petition for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms, and Conditions and Related Arrangements with Ameritech Ohio,* Arbitration Award, Case No. 00-1188-TP-ARB (Ohio Commission June 21, 2001) (*Ohio Commission Reciprocal Compensation Order*); *AT&T Communications of Ohio, Inc.'s and TCG Ohio's Petition for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms, and Conditions and Related Arrangements with Ameritech Ohio,* Entry on Rehearing, Case No. 00-1188-TP-ARB (Ohio Commission Oct. 16, 2001) (*Ohio Commission Reciprocal Compensation Rehearing Order*)).

[654] AT&T Comments at 54.

equivalent switch in all cases is the incumbent LEC's tandem interconnection rate.[655] AT&T on May 23, 2003, appealed the state commission arbitration order to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, seeking declaratory and injunctive relief.[656] AT&T also argues that the Ohio Commission allowed MCI to collect the tandem rate once MCI established that its switches met the geographic comparability test in an arbitration of an MCI/SBC interconnection agreement, and "[t]here is no basis to treat AT&T's switches under a different legal standard."[657]

161. SBC responds that the contract language AT&T attacks is irrelevant to this proceeding.[658] SBC asserts that it does not rely on the AT&T agreement for checklist compliance but instead, relies on its interconnection agreement with Ohiotelnet.com that mirrors relevant language in section 51.711 of the Commission's rules which no party disputes as satisfying the rule's requirements.[659] Additionally, SBC argues that the Ohio Commission has consistently applied section 51.711 of the Commission's rules as demonstrated by a previous arbitration decision between other parties.[660] Noting AT&T's recently filed appeal, SBC has filed a counterclaim with the district court and believes that "AT&T failed to demonstrate before the PUCO [Ohio Commission] that AT&T's switches satisfy the geographic area test as defined by the Commission's rules and controlling precedent."[661]

162. As an initial matter, we note that no parties raised reciprocal compensation issues in the state 271 proceeding.[662] The Ohio Commission found compliance with checklist item thirteen, stating "that SBC Ohio has provided reciprocal compensation arrangements pursuant to . . . TELRIC-based rates approved in June 1999."[663] As noted above, the dispute that AT&T now

---

655 AT&T Comments at 54-55 (citing 47 C.F.R. § 51.711(a)(3); *Local Competition Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 526-27, para. 1090; *Ohio Commission Reciprocal Compensation Order*; *Ohio Commission Reciprocal Compensation Rehearing Order*).

656 *AT&T Communications of Ohio, Inc. v. Ohio Bell Telephone Company, et al,* Complaint, Case No. C2-03-472, (filed S.D. Ohio, May 23, 2003).

657 AT&T Comments at 57. SBC asserts that AT&T's reliance on this 1997 arbitration between SBC Ohio and MCI is misplaced for several reasons. SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 59 n.35. In any event, it would not change our conclusion that AT&T's dispute is now before the district court, the appropriate forum for resolving it.

658 SBC Reply at 67.

659 SBC Reply at 67.

660 SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 59 n.35.

661 SBC Alexander Reply Aff. at para. 59. SBC contends that "numerous courts have recognized that the so-called 'geographic use' test created by [47 C.F.R. § 51.711(a)(3)] requires the CLEC to demonstrate, at a minimum, that its switch *actually* serves an area comparable to that of the ILEC tandem, not that it conceivably could do so." (emphasis in original). SBC Reply at 68-69.

662 Ohio Commission 271 Order at 226-27.

663 Ohio Commission 271 Order at 227.

raises is presently before the District Court. The Commission has continually instructed that the 1996 Act authorizes the state commissions to resolve specific carrier-to-carrier disputes arising under the local competition provisions, and it authorizes the federal district courts to ensure that the results of the state arbitration process are consistent with federal law.[664] Thus, AT&T's contentions are no basis for finding that SBC does not meet the requirements of checklist item thirteen.

163. In an *ex parte* filing, TSI alleges that SBC's intrastate SS7 rate structure violates applicable reciprocal compensation rules and policies.[665] We note that TSI raised the identical issue in the *SBC Michigan II* proceeding. As we concluded in that Order,[666] we find that disputes regarding SBC's reciprocal compensation rate structure are best resolved before the state commissions or, to the extent TSI alleges a violation of federal rules, through a complaint brought to this Commission in the context of a section 208 proceeding.

D. Remaining Checklist Items (3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14)

164. In addition to showing that it is in compliance with the requirements discussed above, an applicant under section 271 must demonstrate that it complies with checklist item three (access to poles, ducts, and conduits),[667] item five (unbundled transport),[668] item six (unbundled switching),[669] item eight (white pages),[670] item nine (numbering administration),[671] item eleven (number portability),[672] item twelve (dialing parity),[673] and item fourteen (resale).[674] No parties object to SBC's compliance with these checklist items. Based on the evidence in the

---

664 *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18394, 18541, paras. 88, 383 (citing 47 U.S.C. §§ 252(c), (e)(6); *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.,* 525 U.S. 366 (1999)). "[F]ederal courts must be presumed to apply the law correctly . . . ." *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18475, para. 237.

665 TSI July 21 *Ex Parte* Letter at 2.

666 *See SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 167.

667 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(iii).

668 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(v).

669 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vi).

670 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(viii).

671 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ix).

672 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xi).

673 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xii).

674 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv).

record,[675] we conclude, as did the state commissions,[676] that SBC demonstrates that it is in compliance with these checklist items.

VI. SECTION 272 COMPLIANCE

165. Section 271(d)(3)(B) provides that the Commission shall not approve a BOC's application to provide interLATA services unless the BOC demonstrates that the "requested authorization will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of section 272."[677] Based on the record, we conclude that SBC has demonstrated that it will comply with the requirements of section 272.[678] Significantly, SBC provides evidence that it maintains the same structural separation and nondiscrimination safeguards in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin as it does in Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas, California, and Michigan – states for which SBC has already received section 271 authority.[679] No party challenges SBC's section 272 showing.[680]

---

[675] *See* SBC Application at 88-91 (checklist item 3), 104-06 (checklist item 5), 107-08 (checklist item 6), 112-13 (checklist item 8), 113-15 (checklist item 9), 115-17 (checklist item 11), 117-18 (checklist item 12), 120-22 (checklist item 14).

[676] We note that the Illinois Commission, the Ohio Commission, and the Wisconsin Commission also concluded that SBC is in compliance with these checklist items. *See* Illinois Commission Comments at 82 (checklist item 3), 98 (checklist item 5), 102 (checklist item 6), 114 (checklist item 8), 116 (checklist item 9), 126 (checklist item 11), 127 (checklist item 12), and 143-44 (checklist item 14); *Ohio Commission 271 Order* at 175 (checklist item 3), 207 (checklist item 5), 218 (checklist item 6), 240 (checklist item 8), 241 (checklist item 9), 255 (checklist item 11), 257 (checklist item 12), and 270 (checklist item 14); *Wisconsin Commission Phase I Order* at 129 (checklist item 3), 183-84 (checklist item 5), 197-202 (checklist item 6), 221 (checklist item 8), 223 (checklist item 9), 237 (checklist item 11), 239 (checklist item 12), and 251-52 (checklist item 14). The Indiana Commission, while generally finding that SBC was in compliance with these checklist items, deferred the determination as to whether SBC met the nondiscrimination and "meaningful opportunity to compete" standards to the Commission. *See* Indiana Commission Comments at 78, 168 (checklist item 3), 107, 170 (checklist item 5), 113, 170 (checklist item 6), 125, 171-72 (checklist item 8), 127, 172 (checklist item 9), 137, 173 (checklist item 11), 138, 174 (checklist item 12), and 143, 174-75 (checklist item 14).

[677] 47 U. S.C. § 271(d)(3)(B); App. F at paras. 68-69.

[678] *See* SBC Application at 138-144; SBC Application App. A, Vol. 1, Tab 9, Affidavit of Joe Carrisalez (SBC Carrisalez Aff.); SBC Application App. A, Vol. 3, Tab 17, Affidavit of Timothy Dominak (SBC Dominak Aff.); SBC Application App. A, Vol. 11, Tab 42, Affidavit of Linda G. Yohe (SBC Yohe Aff.).

[679] *See* SBC Carrisalez Aff. at para. 5; SBC Yohe Aff. at para. 6. *See also SBC Michigan II Order* at para. 170; *SBC California Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 25731-33, paras. 145-46; *SWBT Arkansas/Missouri Order,* 16 FCC Rcd at 20780-81, paras. 122-23; *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order,* 16 FCC Rcd at 6370-74, paras. 256-65; *SWBT Texas Order,* 15 FCC Rcd at 18548-57, paras. 394-415.

[680] Ernst & Young has completed the first independent audit of SBC's section 272 compliance pursuant to section 53.209 of the Commission's rules. 47 C.F.R. § 53.209. *See* Letter from Brian Horst, Partner, Ernst & Young, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communication Commission (Sept. 16, 2002)(transmitting audit report). Only Texas, Kansas, and Oklahoma were included in the first SBC biennial audit.

VII. PUBLIC INTEREST ANALYSIS

A. Public Interest Test

166. Apart from determining whether a BOC satisfies the competitive checklist and will comply with section 272, Congress directed the Commission to assess whether the requested authorization would be consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.[681] At the same time, section 271(d)(4) of the Act states that "[t]he Commission may not, by rule or otherwise, limit or extend the terms used in the competitive checklist set forth in subsection (c)(2)(B)."[682] Accordingly, although the Commission must make a separate determination that approval of a section 271 application is "consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity," it may neither limit nor extend the terms of the competitive checklist of section 271(c)(2)(B). Thus, the Commission views the public interest requirement as an opportunity to review the circumstances presented by the application to ensure that no other relevant factors would frustrate the congressional intent that markets be open, as required by the competitive checklist, and that entry will serve the public interest as Congress expected.

167. We conclude that approval of this application is consistent with the public interest. After extensive review of the competitive checklist, we find that barriers to competitive entry into the local exchange markets of the four applicant states have been removed, and that these local exchange markets are open to competition. As set forth below, SBC's performance plans provide assurance of future compliance.[683]

---

[681] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(C).

[682] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(4).

[683] We also reject three miscellaneous "public interest" issues raised by commenters. We find that these issues are more appropriately addressed as checklist issues, and having determined that SBC has satisfied the relevant checklist items, we conclude that the parties have submitted no additional evidence to suggest that SBC's application fails the public interest test. First, ACN Group complains that SBC's refusal to unbundle IDLC and NGDLC loops and the associated packet switching facilities at TELRIC rates warrants rejection of this application. As we state above, this issue is more appropriately addressed in our discussion of SBC's compliance with checklist item 4, which requires that a BOC provide "[l]ocal loop transmission from the central office to the customer's premises, unbundled from local switching or other services." 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(iv). Accordingly, we discuss ACN Group's claim above, in Part IV.C.

Second, several parties cite SBC's legal and regulatory efforts to raise UNE prices and curtail the availability of UNE-P as grounds for holding that approval of its application would be contrary to the public interest. *See* OCC Comments at 4 (arguing that SBC is attempting "to thwart competition by undermining the UNE-P," principally by working to increase TELRIC rates and to remove local circuit switching from the list of elements it must provide to competitors on an unbundled basis pursuant to section 251(c)); ACN Group Comments at 54-56 (citing SBC's efforts to increase UNE-P rates through legislative activities in Illinois); IUCC Comments at 15-17 (arguing that SBC's outstanding legal appeals challenging the Indiana Commission's orders regarding UNE pricing impede competition in that state). We reject these arguments, which are premised on the erroneous assumption that SBC should be penalized simply for exercising its entitlement to engage in advocacy before courts, legislatures, and regulatory bodies.

(continued….)

B. Assurance of Future Performance

168. We find that the performance remedy plans currently in place in the four applicant states provide assurance that local markets will remain open after SBC receives section 271 authorization. Although it is not a requirement for section 271 approval that a BOC be subject to such post-entry performance assurance mechanisms, the Commission has previously found that the existence of a satisfactory performance monitoring and enforcement mechanism constitutes probative evidence that the BOC will continue to meet its section 271 obligations.[684]

169. We conclude that the SBC performance plans provide sufficient incentives to foster post-entry checklist compliance. As in prior section 271 orders, our conclusions are based on a review of several key elements: total liability at risk in the plan, performance measurement and standards definitions, structure of the plan, self-executing nature of remedies, data validation and audit procedures in the plan, and accounting requirements.[685] We discuss the four states' plans, and address the criticisms directed at each, in turn. We note at the outset, though, that the remedy plans in place in these states are not the only means of ensuring that SBC continues to provide nondiscriminatory service to competing carriers. In addition to the monetary payments at stake under the plans, any SBC failure to sustain an acceptable level of service to competing carriers may trigger enforcement provisions in interconnection agreements, federal enforcement action pursuant to section 271(d)(6), and other legal actions.[686] We consider the specific plans against the backdrop of these additional assurances of future compliance.

170. *Illinois*. The Illinois Commission approved the remedy plan currently in place in its order recommending approval of SBC's section 271 application.[687] This plan places at least 36 percent of SBC's statewide annual net return from local exchange service at risk in a given year, and 1/12th that amount, or 3 percent, in a given month.[688] This level of liability is

(Continued from previous page)

Third, Globalcom raises a "public interest" argument regarding SBC's billing for EELs. *See* Globalcom Comments at 23-24. We address and reject this argument above, in our discussion of SBC's UNE pricing. *See supra* Part IV.B.1.

[684] *See, e.g.*, *Verizon New Jersey Order*, 17 FCC Rcd at 12362, para. 176; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20748-50, paras. 393-98. We note that in all of the previous applications that the Commission has granted to date, the applicant was subject to a performance assurance plan designed to protect against backsliding after BOC entry into the long distance market.

[685] *See, e.g.*, *Verizon Massachusetts Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 9121-24, paras. 240-247; *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6378-81, paras. 273-80.

[686] *Qwest Minnesota Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 13362, para. 72; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4165, para. 430 (stating that the BOC "risks liability through antitrust and other private causes of action if it performs in an unlawfully discriminatory manner"); *see also SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18560, para. 421.

[687] *See, e.g.*, SBC Johnson Aff. at para. 39.

[688] If it appears that these caps will be exceeded, SBC may request a hearing before the Illinois Commission. In such cases, "SBC Illinois will have the burden of proof to demonstrate why, under the circumstances, it should not (continued….)

consistent with that of remedy plans in other states for which this Commission has granted section 271 authority.[689] Moreover, the Illinois plan includes self-executing penalties,[690] which are keyed to performance metrics substantially identical to those the Commission considered, and approved, in the context of SBC's section 271 application for Texas.[691] Finally, in its consultative report to this Commission, the Illinois Commission concluded that the plan, "along with other oversight and enforcement authority of the [Illinois Commission] and the FCC," would help ensure that SBC continues to comply with its checklist obligations post-entry.[692] Based on the features described above, we agree.

171. AT&T and MCI complain that the Illinois plan is deficient because any modifications require SBC's consent.[693] We disagree. The Illinois plan expressly accords competitive LECs the option to "participate with SBC Illinois, other CLECs, and [Illinois Commission] representatives to review the performance measures to determine (a) whether measurements should be added, deleted, or modified; (b) whether the applicable benchmark standards should be modified or replaced by parity standards, or vice versa; and (c) whether to move a classification of a measure . . . from Remedied to Diagnostic, or vice versa." Although "[a]ny changes to existing performance measures and this remedy plan shall be by mutual agreement of the parties and approval of the Commission," the plan states plainly that any disputes "regarding changes, additions and/or deletions to the performance measurements . . . shall be referred to the [Illinois Commission] for resolution."[694] Thus, contrary to the commenters' claims, the Illinois Commission is empowered to add, remove, or modify performance metrics without SBC's consent.

172. *Indiana.* The remedy plan in place in Indiana was initially approved for use in an interconnection agreement between SBC and Time Warner.[695] After a federal district court

(Continued from previous page)
be required to pay liquidated damages in excess of the applicable threshold amount." SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at Attach. A § 7.5.

689 *See, e.g., Qwest Minnesota Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 13361, para. 71 & n.263; *Verizon Massachusetts Order,* 16 FCC Rcd at 9121, para. 241 & n. 769; *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order,* 16 FCC Rcd at 6378 para. 274 & n.837; *SWBT Texas Order,* 15 FCC Rcd at 18561-62, para. 424 & n.1235; *Bell Atlantic New York Order,* 15 FCC Rcd at 4168, para. 436 & n.1332.

690 *See* SBC Ehr Illinois Aff. at para. 218.

691 *See* SBC Johnson Aff. at para. 36.

692 Illinois Commission Comments at 160.

693 *See* AT&T Comments at 86; MCI Comments at 13.

694 *See* SBC Ehr Illinois Aff., Attach A at § 6.4. Moreover, as SBC states, a competitive LEC or the state commission could request modification through means other than those expressly set forth in the plan, though such attempts might face resistance from SBC. *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff. at para. 34.

695 *See* SBC Application at 134.

struck down a previous plan imposed by the Indiana Commission, SBC agreed to make the Time Warner plan available on a nondiscriminatory basis to any competitive LEC and to implement several other modifications to that plan.[696] As in Illinois, the plan places at least 36 percent of SBC's statewide annual net return from local exchange service at risk in a given year, and 1/12th that amount, or 3 percent, in a given month.[697] As explained above, this level of liability is consistent with that of remedy plans in other states for which this Commission has granted section 271 authority.[698] Moreover, the Indiana plan includes self-executing penalties,[699] which are keyed to performance metrics based on those the Commission considered, and approved, in the context of SBC's section 271 application for Texas.[700] The Indiana Commission has concluded that, as modified, the plan "is adequate to satisfy the FCC's requirements for a post-approval 'performance assurance plan' in the context of Section 271," subject to specific concerns that we address below.[701] Based on the features described above, we agree that the plan, in conjunction with state and federal enforcement mechanisms, will help ensure that SBC continues to meet its checklist obligations after receiving section 271 authority.

173. The Indiana Commission expresses concern that pursuant to a recent federal district court order, it may lack authority to enforce SBC's remedy plan.[702] We disagree. *Indiana Bell v. Indiana Commission* overturned a specific remedy plan that the Indiana Commission had required SBC to adopt in late 2002.[703] The court recognized that state commissions are empowered to impose remedy plans pursuant to section 252, but determined that the Indiana Commission was *not* permitted to do so pursuant to section 271, which accords state commissions a purely "advisory" role. Believing that the Indiana Commission had attempted to impose the plan at issue under authority purportedly granted by section 271, the court enjoined enforcement of the plan.[704] As described above, however, the plan on which we

---

[696] *See, e.g.*, Indiana Commission Comments at 187-88 (citing *Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Inc. v. Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission*, 2003 WL 1903363 (S.D. Ind. Mar. 11, 2003) (*Indiana Bell v. Indiana Commission*)).

[697] SBC Ehr Indiana Aff. at para. 176. As in Illinois, if it appears that these caps will be exceeded, SBC may request a hearing before the state commission. In such cases, SBC "will have the burden of proof to demonstrate why, under the circumstances, it should not be required to pay liquidated damages in excess of the applicable threshold amount." SBC Ehr Indiana Aff., Attach. A at § 7.5.

[698] *See supra* para. 170 & note 689.

[699] SBC Ehr Indiana Aff. at para. 191.

[700] *Id.* at paras. 13-18.

[701] *See* Indiana Commission Comments at 200.

[702] *See* Indiana Commission Comments at 197-99 (citing *Indiana Bell v. Indiana Commission*).

[703] *See id.*; *see also* SBC Application at 134.

[704] *See Indiana Bell v. Indiana Commission*. Because the court limited its inquiry to the Indiana Commission's authority under section 271, and acknowledged that state commissions have been permitted to impose penalty plans (continued….)

base our decision was *not* imposed by the Indiana Commission, but rather voluntarily adopted by SBC. The only question relevant here is a question that the district court did not address, much less resolve: whether the Indiana Commission has the authority to enforce a plan that SBC voluntarily has made available to competitive LECs for insertion into their interconnection agreements. As numerous federal courts have made clear, section 252 grants this authority.[705] Furthermore, we note that even if the Indiana Commission were unwilling or unable to exercise jurisdiction to enforce the remedy plan, this Commission may have the authority to act in its place pursuant to section 252(e).[706] We are thus persuaded that the Indiana plan is capable of being enforced in a manner adequate to prevent backsliding post-entry.

174. *Ohio.* In approving the SBC/Ameritech merger, the Ohio Commission required SBC to implement the performance measures and remedy plan that this Commission approved in its *SWBT Texas Order*.[707] Pursuant to collaborative discussions including Ohio Commission staff, industry participants and other interested parties, SBC has modified the applicable performance metrics to render them more specific to Ohio.[708] Like the plans discussed above, the Ohio plan places at least 36 percent of SBC's statewide annual net return from local exchange service at risk in a given year – a level consistent with that of remedy plans in other states for

(Continued from previous page)
pursuant to the Act's local competition provisions, there is nothing preventing competitive LECs in Indiana from seeking imposition of a penalty plan pursuant to the section 252 arbitration process.

[705] *See, e.g.*, *BellSouth Telecomms., Inc. v. MCIMetro Access Transmission Servs., Inc.*, 317 F.3d 1270, 1276-77 (11th Cir. 2003) ("[I]n granting to the public service commissions the power to approve or reject interconnection agreements, Congress intended to include the power to interpret and enforce in the first instance."); *S.W. Bell Tel. Co. v. Brooks Fiber Communications of Okla., Inc.*, 235 F.3d 493, 497 (10th Cir. 2000) (finding that state commission's authority "to approve or reject and mediate or arbitrate interconnection agreements necessarily implies the authority to interpret and enforce specific provisions contained in those agreements"); *S.W. Bell Tel. Co. v. Connect Communications Corp.*, 225 F.3d 942, 946 (8th Cir. 2000) (finding that section 252's "grant of power to state commissions necessarily includes the power to enforce the interconnection agreement"); *MCI Telecomms. v. Ill. Bell Tel. Co.*, 222 F.3d 323, 337-38 (7th Cir. 2000) ("A state commission's authority to approve or reject interconnection agreements under the Act necessarily includes the authority to interpret and enforce, to the same extent, the terms of those agreements once they have been approved by that commission."); *S.W. Bell Tel. Co. v. Pub. Util. Com'n of Tex.*, 208 F.3d 475, 479-80 (5th Cir. 2000) ("[T]he Act's grant to the state commissions of plenary authority to approve or disapprove these interconnection agreements necessarily carries with it the authority to interpret and enforce the provisions of agreements that state commissions have approved.").

[706] *See, e.g.*, *SWBT Arkansas/Missouri Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 20784-85, para. 131 ("We note that the Arkansas Commission has repeatedly held that it has jurisdiction to adjudicate complaints against SWBT for alleged violations of interconnection agreements. Furthermore, we note that if the Arkansas Commission were to decline to exercise jurisdiction, this Commission may have the authority to act in its place pursuant to section 252(e). The Commission has previously held that failure of a state commission to carry out its responsibilities, including the resolution of disputes arising from the interpretation and enforcement of interconnection agreements, may result in this Commission's preemption of state commission jurisdiction under section 252(e)(5).").

[707] *See* SBC Application at 135; SBC McKenzie Aff. at para. 40.

[708] *See, e.g.*, SBC McKenzie Aff. at para. 40; Ohio Commission Comments at 287-88.

which this Commission has granted section 271 authority.[709] Moreover, the Ohio plan includes self-executing penalties,[710] which are keyed to performance metrics substantially identical to those the Commission considered, and approved, in the context of SBC's section 271 application for Texas.[711] Further, notwithstanding modification of the performance measures, the plan retains the basic structure of the Texas Remedy Plan. Finally, the Ohio Commission has determined that this plan is adequate for purposes of section 271.[712] Based on the features described above, we agree.

175. AT&T complains that the current Ohio plan is deficient because any modifications require SBC's consent. Here, as with regard to the Illinois plan, we disagree. The Ohio plan accords competitive LECs an opportunity to "participate with Ameritech, other CLECs, and [Ohio Commission] representatives to review the performance measures to determine whether measurements should be added, deleted or modified," and whether existing standards should be "modified or replaced." Modifications require SBC's consent, but the plan states plainly that disputes regarding new measures and their appropriate classification are subject to arbitration.[713] Thus, contrary to the commenters' claims, performance measures may be added or modified notwithstanding SBC's objection.

176. AT&T and MCI both complain that the Ohio plan is not sufficiently state-specific.[714] We disagree. The Commission repeatedly has approved applications in which the performance plan at issue was based on a plan originally developed for a different state.[715] Indeed, the Commission expressly has endorsed the use of one state's plan in another state.[716]

---

[709] *See supra* para. 170 & note 689. We therefore reject OCC's claim that the remedies set forth in the Ohio plan are insufficient. *See* OCC Comments at 10.

[710] *See* SBC Ehr Ohio Aff. at para. 198.

[711] SBC McKenzie Aff. at para. 40. As explained below, SBC and competitive LECs have continued to collaborate on the development of performance measures through six-month collaboratives, rendering the measures more specific to Ohio systems and processes. *See infra* para. 176.

[712] Ohio Commission Comments at 287.

[713] *See* SBC Ehr Ohio Aff., Attach. A at § 6.4. As in Illinois, a competitive LEC or the state commission could also request modification through means other than those expressly set forth in the plan. *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff. at para. 34.

[714] *See* AT&T Comments at 87; MCI Comments at 14.

[715] *See, e.g.*, *Qwest Minnesota Order,* 18 FCC Rcd at 13361, para. 70 (evaluating plan based Colorado plan); *Qwest Three State Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 7394, para. 120 (evaluating plans modeled on Texas plan); *Verizon DC/MD/WVA Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 5310, para. 16 (noting that "the New York and Virginia PAPs form the bases for the PAPs in the application states"); *SWBT Arkansas/Missouri Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 20784, para. 129 (noting that plans at issue were based on Texas plan).

[716] *See SWBT Arkansas/Missouri Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 20783, para. 128 ("While we do not require that one state commission adopt or use another state's plan, we recognize the efficiency gained by all involved state commissions, (continued….)

Further, notwithstanding AT&T's and MCI's contention that the Ohio plan simply mirrors the Texas plan, the Ohio Commission explains that "the measurements have continued to be updated pursuant to the Ohio-specific collaborative process that has been ongoing over the past couple of years."[717] For these reasons, we do not agree that the current plan is deficient.

177. AT&T also contends that the Ohio plan is faulty because it did not result from a collaborative process involving competitive LECs.[718] We disagree. SBC points out that in the course of considering SBC's section 271 application, the Ohio Commission in fact held a workshop, the last day of which was devoted to public interest concerns. AT&T participated in that workshop, and specifically addressed the remedy plan issue.[719] Moreover, while we believe that competitive LEC participation in the development of a remedy plan might sometimes result in a more demanding plan, what ultimately matters most is the plan's content – its structure, the penalties it imposes, the nature of the performance measures, and so forth – rather than the details of its development.[720] Thus, we do not believe that the extent of competitive LECs' participation in the Ohio plan's development constitutes an independent basis on which to find that plan inadequate for section 271 purposes.

178. *Wisconsin.* SBC developed the remedy plan currently available to competitive LECs in Wisconsin during its interconnection negotiations with TDS Metrocom and Time Warner in late 2002.[721] The Wisconsin Commission approved the interconnection agreement amendments incorporating the compromise plan in January 2003.[722] Like the plans discussed above, the Wisconsin plan places at least 36 percent of SBC's statewide annual net return from local exchange service at risk in a given year[723] – a level consistent with that of remedy plans in other states for which this Commission has granted section 271 authority.[724] The Wisconsin plan

(Continued from previous page)
SWBT and competing carriers from working together to develop and monitor common performance measures and similar remedy plans.").

717 Ohio Commission Comments at 287. *See also* SBC McKenzie Aff. at para. 40.

718 *See* AT&T Comments at 87-88.

719 *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff. at para. 46.

720 *See supra* para. 169 & note 685 (setting forth relevant factors in Commission's evaluation of performance plans).

721 *See* SBC Application at 137.

722 *See id.*; *see also* SBC Application App. B-WI, Tab 13, Wisconsin Bell Interconnection Agreement Under Section 251/252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

723 SBC Ehr Wisconsin Aff. at para. 180.

724 *See supra* para. 170 & note 689. As in Illinois and Indiana, if it appears that these caps will be exceeded, SBC may request a hearing before the state commission. In such cases, SBC "will have the burden of proof to demonstrate why, under the circumstances, it should not be required to pay liquidated damages in excess of the applicable threshold amount." SBC Ehr Wisconsin Aff., Attach. A at § 7.5. Given that the overall potential liability (continued….)

includes self-executing penalties,[725] which are keyed to performance metrics substantially identical to those the Commission considered, and approved, in the context of SBC's section 271 application for Texas.[726] The plan, moreover, retains the basic structure of the Texas Remedy Plan.[727] Based on the features described above, we believe that the Wisconsin plan, in conjunction with state and federal enforcement, will help ensure that SBC continues to comply with its checklist obligations post-entry.[728]

179. AT&T and MCI complain that the Wisconsin plan is deficient because any modifications require SBC's consent.[729] We disagree. As in Illinois and Ohio, the Wisconsin plan accords competitive LECs an entitlement to meet, every six months, with SBC, other competitive LECs, and state commission representatives to review the performance measures. Modifications require the consent of the parties and the Wisconsin Commission, but "[s]hould disputes occur regarding changes, additions and/or deletions to the performance measurements, the dispute shall be referred to the [Wisconsin Commission] for resolution."[730] Thus, contrary to the commenters' claims, the Wisconsin Commission is empowered to add, remove, or modify performance metrics without SBC's consent.

VIII. SECTION 271(d)(6) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

180. Section 271(d)(6) of the Act requires SBC to continue to satisfy the "conditions required for . . . approval" of its section 271 application after the Commission approves its application.[731] Thus, the Commission has a responsibility not only to ensure that SBC is in

(Continued from previous page)
is in line with the potential liability imposed by plans the Commission has deemed adequate before, we reject MCI's claim that the Wisconsin plan imposes insufficient penalties. *See* MCI Comments at 13.

[725] SBC Ehr Wisconsin Aff. at para. 195.

[726] SBC Vandersanden Aff. at para. 34. SBC and competitive LECs have continued to collaborate on the development of performance measures through six-month collaboratives. *See id.* at para. 35.

[727] *Id.* at para. 40.

[728] The Wisconsin Commission, which supports an alternative plan that was overturned by a state court but is still subject to ongoing judicial review, has declined to assess whether the current plan is sufficient for section 271 purposes. *See Wisconsin Commission Phase II Order* at 30. However, the Wisconsin Commission has noted that "the existence of remedy plans in interconnection agreements, the compliance and improvement plans embodied in the consent order, along with ongoing regulatory activity, will serve to prevent backsliding." *Id.* This conclusion is consistent with our determination that the Wisconsin plan, in conjunction with other enforcement mechanisms, will help ensure post-entry compliance.

[729] *See* AT&T Comments at 86; MCI Comments at 13.

[730] SBC Ehr Wisconsin Aff., Attach. A at § 6.4. As in Illinois and Ohio, a competitive LEC or the state commission could also request modification through means other than those expressly set forth in the plan. *See* SBC Ehr Reply Aff. at para. 34.

[731] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(6).

compliance with section 271 today, but also that it remains in compliance in the future. As the Commission has already described the post-approval enforcement framework and its section 271(d)(6) enforcement powers in detail in prior orders, it is unnecessary to do so again here.[732]

181. Working in concert with the state commissions, we intend to monitor closely SBC's post-approval compliance to ensure that SBC does not "cease[] to meet any of the conditions required for [section 271] approval."[733] We stand ready to exercise our various statutory enforcement powers quickly and decisively in appropriate circumstances to ensure that the local market remains open in each of the four states. We are prepared to use our authority under section 271(d)(6) if evidence shows market opening conditions have not been maintained.

182. Consistent with prior section 271 orders, we require SBC to report to the Commission all carrier-to-carrier performance measure results and PRP reports for Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin beginning with the first full month after the effective date of this Order, and for each month thereafter for one year unless extended by the Commission. These results and reports will allow us to review, on an ongoing basis, SBC's performance to ensure continued compliance with the statutory requirements. We are confident that cooperative state and federal oversight and enforcement can address any backsliding that may arise with respect to SBC's entry into the long distance market in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin.[734]

IX. CONCLUSION

183. For the reasons discussed above, we grant SBC's application for authorization under section 271 of the Act to provide in-region, interLATA services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

X. ORDERING CLAUSES

184. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), and 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), and 271, SBC's application to provide in-region, interLATA service in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin, filed on July 17, 2003, IS GRANTED.

---

[732] *See, e.g.*, *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6382-84, paras. 283-85; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18567-68, paras. 434-36; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4174, paras. 446-53.

[733] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(6)(A).

[734] *See, e.g.*, *Bell Atlantic-New York, Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York*, Order, 15 FCC Rcd 5413, 5413-23 (2000) (adopting consent decree between the Commission and Bell Atlantic that included provisions for Bell Atlantic to make a voluntary payment of $3,000,000 to the United States Treasury, with additional payments if Bell Atlantic failed to meet specific performance standards and weekly reporting requirements to gauge Bell Atlantic's performance in correcting the problems associated with its electronic ordering systems).

185. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), and 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), and 271, the Motion to Withdraw Certain Issues of AT&T, filed on October 2, 2003, IS GRANTED.

186. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE October 24, 2003.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary

APPENDIX A

WC Docket No. 03-167
SBC – Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin

Commenters	Abbreviation
1. ACN Communicatons Services, Inc.; BullsEye Telecom, Inc.; Choice One Communications, Inc,; CIMCO Communications, Inc.; Indiana Fiber Works, LLC, MPower Communications Corp.; and PowerNet Global Communications, Inc.	ACN Group
2. Access One, Inc.	Access One
3. Alliance for Public Technology	
4. AT&T Corp.	AT&T
5. CIMCO Communications, Inc.	CIMCO
6. Communications Workers of America	
7. Forte Communications, Inc.	Forte
8. Globalcom, Inc.	Globalcom
9. Illinois Commerce Commission	Illinois Commission
10. Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	IUCC
11. Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission	Indiana Commission
12. MCI	MCI
13. Northern Telephone and Data Corporation	NTD
14. NuVox Communications, Inc.	NuVox
15. Ohio Consumers' Counsel	OCC
16. Public Service Commission of Wisconsin	Wisconsin Commission
17. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio	Ohio Commission
18. RCN Telecom Services of Illinois, LLC	RCN
19. TDS Metrocom, LLC	TDS Metrocom
20. Z-Tel Communications, Inc.	Z-Tel

Reply Commenters

1. AT&T Corp.	AT&T
2. Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	IUCC
3. MCI	MCI
4. Ohio Consumers' Counsel	OCC
5. SBC Communications Inc.	SBC

Appendix B

Illinois Performance Metrics

All data included here are taken from the Illinois Carrier-to-Carrier Reports. This table is provided as a reference tool for the convenience of the reader. No conclusions are to be drawn from the raw data contained in this table. Our analysis is based on the totality of the circumstances, such that we may use non-metric evidence, and may rely more heavily on some metrics more than others, in making our determination. The inclusion of these particular metrics in this table does not necessarily mean that we relied on all of these metrics nor that other metrics may not also be important in our analysis. Some metrics that we have relied on in the past and may rely on for a future application were not included here because there was no data provided for them (usually either because there was no activity, or because the metrics are still under development). Metrics with no retail analog provided are usually compared with a benchmark. Note that for some metrics during the period provided, there may be changes in the metric definition, or changes in the retail analog applied, making it difficult to compare the data over time.

PERFORMANCE METRICS CATAGORIES

Metric Number	Metric Name
	Pre-Ordering
1.1	Avg Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information
1.2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders
4	OSS Interface Availability
	Billing
14	Billing Accuracy
15	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills
16	% Usage Records Transmitted Correctly
17	Billing Completeness
19	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness
	Ordering
5	% FOCs Returned w/in x Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req
7.1	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion
9	% Rejects
10	% Rejects Returned w/in x Hour
10.1	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned w/in 5 Hrs
10.3	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned w/in 5 Hrs
10.4	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects
11.1	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (Hrs)
11.2	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (Hrs)
12	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy

Metric Number	Metric Name
13	Order Process % Flow Through
MI 13	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 13.1	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications
MI 9	% Missing FOCs
	Provisioning
27	Mean Installation Interval - POTS
28	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date
29	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
35	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install
43	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials
44	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials
45	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials
46	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials
55	Avg Installation Interval
55.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP
56	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD
56.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD
59	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) Inst
114	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval
115	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers

PERFORMANCE METRICS CATAGORIES

Metric Number	Metric Name
115.1	% Provisioning Trouble Reports
IN 1	% Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date - DSL Loops w/out Line Sharing
MI 3	Coordination Conversions Started w/in 1 Hour of Scheduled Time
	Maintenance
37	Trouble Report Rate
37.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports
38	% Missed Repair Commitments
39	Rcpt to Clear Duration
40	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs
41	% Repeat Reports
53	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials
54	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials
54.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials
65	Trouble Report Rate
65.1	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports
66	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE
67	Mean Time to Restore
69	% Repeat Reports

Metric Number	Metric Name
	OS/DA
80	Directory Assistance Avg Speed of Answer (Sec)
82	Operator Services Speed of Answer (Sec)
112	% Directory Assistance Database Accuracy for Manual Updates
113	% of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process w/out Manual Intervention
	Collocation
70	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech
70.2	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech
73	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks
78	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval
107	% Missed Collocation Due Dates
108	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates
109	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines
MI 4	Avg Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement - Physical
	Miscellaneous
96	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders
MI 14	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt
MI 15	Change Management

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
	Pre-Ordering											
1.1 - 01	Avg Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.66	0.86	0.68	0.85	0.72	1.10	0.89	
1.2 - 01	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
1.2 - 02	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
2 - 34	% Response Received w/in 10 Sec--OSS Interface--Address Verification	98.65%	95.00%	98.64%	95.00%	98.70%	95.00%	97.01%	95.00%	97.90%	95.00%	
2 - 35	% Response Received w/in 10 Sec--OSS Interface--Telephone Number Assignment	98.24%	95.00%	98.58%	95.00%	99.33%	95.00%	97.11%	95.00%	98.92%	95.00%	
2 - 36	% Response Received w/in 15 Sec-OSS Interface-Customer Service Inquiries < or = 30 WTNs/lines	96.14%	95.00%	97.40%	95.00%	98.77%	95.00%	96.67%	95.00%	98.37%	95.00%	
2 - 37	% Response Received w/in 60 Sec--OSS Interface--Customer Service Inquiries > 30 WTNs/lines	75.36%	n/a	84.58%	n/a	81.53%	n/a	78.28%	n/a	72.69%	95.00%	
2 - 38	% Response Received w/in 13 Sec--OSS Interface--Service Availability	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.94%	95.00%	99.60%	95.00%	99.89%	95.00%	
2 - 39	% Response Received w/in 5 Sec--OSS Interface--Service Appointment Scheduling (Due Date)	99.22%	95.00%	99.40%	95.00%	99.82%	95.00%	99.12%	95.00%	99.45%	95.00%	
2 - 40	% Response Received w/in 19 Sec--OSS Interface--Dispatch Required	97.17%	95.00%	98.78%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.90%	95.00%	99.79%	95.00%	
2 - 41	% Response Received w/in 25 Sec--OSS Interface--PIC	97.27%	95.00%	99.80%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	95.26%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
2 - 42	%Response Recd w/in 30 Sec-OSS Interface-Actual LMU Information requested (5 or less loops searched)	80.81%	95.00%	88.25%	95.00%	93.47%	95.00%	98.60%	95.00%	99.06%	95.00%	
2 - 43	%Resp Recd w/in 60Sec-OSS Interface-Actual LMU Information requested (greater than 5 loops searched)	n/a	n/a	60.70%	95.00%	68.38%	95.00%	53.63%	95.00%	60.04%	95.00%	
2 - 44	% Resp Recd w/in 15 Sec-OSS Interface-Design LMU Information requested (incl Pre-Qual transactions)	99.70%	95.00%	99.58%	95.00%	98.34%	95.00%	99.15%	95.00%	99.79%	95.00%	
2 - 45	% Response Received w/in 4 Sec-OSS Interface-Protocol Translation Time-EDI (input & output)	98.80%	95.00%	98.85%	95.00%	72.63%	95.00%	96.60%	95.00%	91.33%	95.00%	
2 - 46	% Response Received w/in 1 Sec-OSS Interface-Protocol Translation Time-CORBA (input & output)	99.33%	95.00%	99.46%	95.00%	99.50%	95.00%	99.82%	95.00%	99.69%	95.00%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
2 - 47	% Response Received w/in 1 Sec-OSS Interfac--Protocol Translation Time-Web Verigate (input & output)	99.89%	n/a	99.87%	n/a	99.88%	n/a	99.87%	n/a	99.88%	n/a	
4 - 01	OSS Interface Availability - TCNET	100%	99.50%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 02	OSS Interface Availability - AEMS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 04	OSS Interface Availablity - EB/TA	99.91%	99.50%	99.98%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	99.99%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	
4 - 05	OSS Interface Availability - EB/TA - GUI	100%	99.50%	99.97%	99.50%	99.80%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.64%	99.50%	
4 - 06	OSS Interface Availability - ARIS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 07	OSS Interface Availability - BOP - GUI	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 08	OSS Interface Availability - Web Verigate	99.83%	99.50%	99.57%	99.50%	99.93%	99.50%	99.68%	99.50%	99.71%	99.50%	
4 - 09	OSS Interface Availability -- Web LEX	99.83%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.92%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 10	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI LSOG 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 11	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (Van)	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 12	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (SSL3)	99.98%	99.50%	99.87%	99.50%	99.99%	99.50%	99.98%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 13	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (NDM)	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 14	OSS Interface Availability -- Web Toolbar	99.89%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.94%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 15	OSS Interface Availability -- ARAF	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 16	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Pre-Order	99.86%	99.50%	99.07%	99.50%	99.95%	99.50%	99.44%	99.50%	99.75%	99.50%	
4 - 17	OSS Interface Availability -- CORBA Pre-Order	99.84%	99.50%	99.07%	99.50%	99.95%	99.50%	99.44%	99.50%	99.71%	99.50%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
4 - 18	OSS Interface Availability -- AEMS LSOG 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Billing											
14 - 01	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring / Non-recurring	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	4.92%	0.08%	0.00%	0.06%	
14 - 02	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	0.00%	0.82%	0.21%	0.00%	3.52%	0.06%	0.00%	0.06%	0.00%	0.12%	
14 - 03	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.95%	0.00%	0.79%	0.00%	1.97%	0.00%	
15 - 01	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills--EDI	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	
15 - 02	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills--BDT	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	
16 - 01	% Usage Records Transmitted Correctly	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.81%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
17 - 02	Billing Completeness--Lineshare	99.11%	98.23%	98.40%	96.80%	98.91%	98.11%	99.07%	98.44%	98.81%	97.75%	
17 - 03	Billing Completeness--UNE-P	98.64%	98.78%	98.57%	98.65%	98.78%	98.63%	99.38%	97.98%	98.57%	98.27%	
17 - 04	Billing Completeness--Resale	97.67%	98.78%	97.46%	98.65%	98.58%	98.63%	97.53%	97.98%	97.38%	98.27%	
17 - 05	Billing Completeness--All Other Products (UNE, EOI, ULT, EELs)	99.74%	100%	98.21%	98.65%	99.71%	98.63%	99.43%	97.98%	99.86%	98.27%	
18 - 03	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)-Electronic	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
18 - 04	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)-Paper	100%	95.00%	98.74%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
19 - 01	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	99.91%	95.00%	99.91%	95.00%	99.90%	95.00%	99.91%	95.00%	99.92%	95.00%	
	Ordering											
5 - 01	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus	98.23%	95.00%	97.01%	95.00%	94.97%	95.00%	97.55%	95.00%	98.06%	95.00%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 02	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus	98.98%	95.00%	98.76%	95.00%	97.71%	95.00%	97.09%	95.00%	99.85%	95.00%	
5 - 03	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	96.75%	94.00%	98.93%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	99.32%	94.00%	98.35%	94.00%	
5 - 04	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a
5 - 05	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops)	97.52%	95.00%	99.40%	95.00%	98.25%	95.00%	94.66%	95.00%	99.51%	95.00%	
5 - 06	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops)	97.98%	95.00%	98.72%	95.00%	98.58%	95.00%	99.21%	95.00%	99.72%	95.00%	
5 - 07	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>49 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 08	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	ace
5 - 09	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	de
5 - 10	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1	95.65%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	90.91%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	e
5 - 11	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines)	98.41%	95.00%	99.27%	95.00%	99.38%	95.00%	98.77%	95.00%	99.29%	95.00%	
5 - 13	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 14	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus	90.84%	95.00%	96.57%	95.00%	77.68%	95.00%	95.45%	95.00%	99.18%	95.00%	
5 - 15	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus	97.86%	95.00%	98.81%	95.00%	97.24%	95.00%	95.70%	95.00%	99.87%	95.00%	
5 - 16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	89.47%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	81.65%	94.00%	96.72%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
5 - 18	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 Hrs	99.76%	95.00%	99.73%	95.00%	99.10%	95.00%	98.99%	95.00%	99.77%	95.00%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 19	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 20	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps)	99.22%	95.00%	99.43%	95.00%	99.80%	95.00%	99.75%	95.00%	99.96%	95.00%	
5 - 21	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 22	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines)	99.71%	95.00%	99.78%	95.00%	96.35%	95.00%	92.39%	95.00%	99.64%	95.00%	
5 - 23	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines)	99.70%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	97.91%	95.00%	99.75%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 24	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	98.54%	95.00%	99.63%	95.00%	95.91%	95.00%	91.97%	95.00%	97.57%	95.00%	
5 - 25	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	98.19%	95.00%	98.78%	95.00%	97.10%	95.00%	98.90%	95.00%	99.61%	95.00%	
5 - 26	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (>19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	94.44%	95.00%	
5 - 27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (>19 Loops)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	de
5 - 28	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines)	100%	94.00%	98.65%	94.00%	98.61%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 29	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (>19 Lines)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 30	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 31	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus	100%	95.00%	99.49%	95.00%	90.57%	95.00%	92.73%	95.00%	97.44%	95.00%	
5 - 32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines)	82.76%	94.00%	92.31%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	93.75%	94.00%	
5 - 33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops)	90.91%	95.00%	92.31%	95.00%	83.33%	95.00%	93.33%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 49 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 36	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	de
5 - 37	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines)	50.00%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	92.00%	95.00%	90.00%	95.00%	98.08%	95.00%	ab
5 - 38	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 39	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	49.12%	94.00%	87.80%	94.00%	95.65%	94.00%	95.45%	94.00%	95.83%	94.00%	
5 - 41	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 42	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a
5 - 43	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 44	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps)	95.45%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	d
5 - 45	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 46	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	abcde
5 - 47	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
5 - 48	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 49	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (>19 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 50	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 51	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 52	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 53	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 54	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.72%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
7.1 - 01	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - Resale	98.71%	97.00%	98.49%	97.00%	98.30%	97.00%	98.42%	97.00%	98.89%	97.00%	
7.1 - 02	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - UNE	99.52%	97.00%	99.58%	97.00%	99.37%	97.00%	99.62%	97.00%	99.48%	97.00%	
7.1 - 03	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - UNE-P	99.56%	97.00%	99.55%	97.00%	99.36%	97.00%	99.61%	97.00%	99.59%	97.00%	
7.1 - 04	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - LNP Only	97.49%	97.00%	96.59%	97.00%	94.92%	97.00%	95.57%	97.00%	90.98%	97.00%	
9 - 01	% Rejects - CLEC Caused Rejects	15.34%	n/a	16.21%	n/a	19.51%	n/a	14.38%	n/a	15.50%	n/a	
9 - 02	% Rejects - SBC/Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders)	0.22%	n/a	0.22%	n/a	0.43%	n/a	0.13%	n/a	0.13%	n/a	
10 - 01	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	99.94%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10 - 03	% Rejects Returned Within 8 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Electronically (A/M)	n/a	n/a	95.60%	95.00%	96.41%	95.00%	98.21%	95.00%	98.44%	95.00%	
10 - 04	% Rejects Returned Within 24 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Manually (M/M)	n/a	n/a	94.78%	95.00%	95.86%	95.00%	94.89%	95.00%	97.93%	95.00%	
10.1 - 01	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Order	92.15%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.2 - 01	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned w/in 5 Hrs	91.83%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.3 - 01	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned w/in 5 Hrs	61.46%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 01	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Res - FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 02	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Res - No FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 03	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Bus - FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
10.4 - 04	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Bus - No FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 05	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Specials - FW	2.87%	5.00%	3.08%	5.00%	1.98%	5.00%	0.88%	5.00%	0.90%	5.00%	
10.4 - 06	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Specials - No FW	4.12%	5.00%	1.91%	5.00%	1.27%	5.00%	2.32%	5.00%	3.81%	5.00%	
10.4 - 07	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loops with LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 08	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loops without LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 09	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 10	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-Ps	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11 - 01	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (Hrs)	0.17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11.1 - 01	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (Hrs)	3.61	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11.2 - 01	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (Hrs)	5.06	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
12 - 01	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	97.52%	99.81%	97.69%	98.47%	97.45%	95.62%	97.83%	99.15%	97.46%	97.87%	
13 - 01	Order Process % Flow Through - UNE Loops	97.73%	95.00%	97.37%	95.00%	96.72%	95.00%	97.18%	95.00%	97.78%	95.00%	
13 - 02	Order Process % Flow Through - Resale	91.38%	95.16%	91.80%	93.49%	92.63%	95.23%	94.44%	96.13%	97.41%	96.66%	
13 - 03	Order Process % Flow Through - UNE-P	95.78%	95.16%	97.15%	93.49%	96.26%	95.23%	98.00%	96.13%	98.11%	96.66%	
13 - 04	Order Process % Flow Through - LNP	91.99%	95.16%	93.54%	93.49%	94.07%	95.23%	98.02%	96.13%	93.93%	96.66%	
13 - 05	Order Process % Flow Through - LSNP	83.76%	95.16%	86.44%	93.49%	93.77%	95.23%	97.32%	96.13%	90.74%	96.66%	
13 - 06	Order Process % Flow Through - Line Sharing	96.73%	95.63%	94.06%	94.87%	83.03%	95.95%	91.05%	96.13%	91.70%	96.66%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
MI 9 - 01	% Missing FOCs - Resale	0.05%	n/a	0.12%	n/a	0.11%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.01%	n/a	
MI 9 - 02	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, & LSNP)	0.09%	n/a	0.13%	n/a	0.05%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 9 - 03	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P	0.30%	n/a	0.35%	n/a	0.03%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 13 - 01	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 02	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 03	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 04	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 05	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--All	99.10%	97.00%	98.76%	97.00%	98.43%	97.00%	98.08%	97.00%	99.12%	97.00%	
MI 13 - 06	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--SBC Winback	99.70%	97.00%	99.84%	97.00%	98.11%	97.00%	97.96%	97.00%	99.70%	97.00%	
MI 13 - 07	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--CLEC-to-CLEC	98.54%	97.00%	97.45%	97.00%	98.79%	97.00%	98.29%	97.00%	98.27%	97.00%	
MI 13.1 - 01	Average Delays Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--All	6.01	n/a	6.30	n/a	8.92	n/a	3.84	n/a	4.26	n/a	
MI 13.1 - 02	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--SBC Winback	3.00	n/a	4.26	n/a	10.88	n/a	2.76	n/a	7.69	n/a	
MI 13.1 - 03	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--CLEC-to-CLEC	6.60	n/a	6.46	n/a	5.53	n/a	6.21	n/a	3.39	n/a	
	Provisioning											
27 - 01	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res - FW (Days)	1.85	3.15	1.86	3.17	1.73	3.15	1.68	3.11	2.10	3.85	
27 - 02	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res - No FW (Days)	0.24	1.05	0.24	1.02	0.26	1.18	0.25	1.13	0.27	1.10	
27 - 03	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus - FW (Days)	2.92	3.37	2.38	3.36	3.04	3.43	2.79	3.34	4.23	3.61	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
27 - 04	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus - No FW (Days)	0.20	0.73	0.22	0.73	0.24	0.77	0.21	0.73	0.18	0.68	
27 - 05	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Res - FW (Days)	2.38	3.15	2.41	3.17	2.87	3.15	2.73	3.11	2.99	3.85	
27 - 06	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Res - No FW (Days)	0.36	1.05	0.40	1.02	0.49	1.18	0.24	1.13	0.26	1.10	
27 - 07	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Bus - FW (Days)	3.44	3.37	2.71	3.36	2.65	3.43	2.69	3.34	2.66	3.61	
27 - 08	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Bus - No FW (Days)	0.28	0.73	0.30	0.73	0.25	0.77	0.22	0.73	0.19	0.68	
27 - 09	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex - FW (Days)	3.15	3.08	2.85	2.66	2.63	2.84	2.94	2.86	4.73	3.00	
27 - 10	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex - No FW (Days)	3.15	4.00	3.38	4.00	2.78	4.00	2.88	4.00	2.37	4.00	
28 - 01	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res - FW	99.46%	96.82%	99.68%	97.27%	99.30%	97.51%	99.48%	96.69%	99.38%	96.60%	
28 - 02	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res - No FW	97.89%	97.00%	98.05%	97.00%	96.97%	97.00%	94.14%	97.00%	95.05%	97.00%	
28 - 03	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus - FW	98.31%	98.16%	98.61%	98.37%	99.26%	98.70%	98.36%	98.51%	97.09%	97.72%	
28 - 04	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus - No FW	88.82%	97.00%	94.15%	97.00%	94.97%	97.00%	96.23%	97.00%	96.01%	97.00%	
28 - 05	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Res - FW	98.89%	96.82%	98.99%	97.27%	98.94%	97.51%	98.53%	96.69%	99.01%	96.60%	
28 - 06	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Res - No FW	98.50%	97.00%	98.88%	97.00%	98.97%	97.00%	99.15%	97.00%	98.37%	97.00%	
28 - 07	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Bus - FW	96.55%	98.16%	95.95%	98.37%	96.56%	98.70%	94.12%	98.51%	97.50%	97.72%	
28 - 08	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Bus - No FW	95.15%	97.00%	95.67%	97.00%	95.36%	97.00%	96.31%	97.00%	97.76%	97.00%	
28 - 09	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex - FW	100%	99.24%	97.44%	99.09%	100%	99.22%	100%	99.47%	94.12%	99.11%	
28 - 10	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex - No FW	83.96%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
28 - 11	% Installs Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.82%	95.00%	99.72%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	ab
29 - 01	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res - FW	0.42%	2.60%	0.27%	2.17%	0.62%	2.00%	0.47%	2.65%	0.63%	2.68%	
29 - 02	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res - No FW	0.05%	3.00%	0.03%	3.00%	0.16%	3.00%	0.05%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	
29 - 03	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus - FW	1.78%	1.59%	1.58%	1.44%	0.47%	1.18%	1.08%	1.26%	2.44%	2.05%	
29 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus - No FW	0.13%	3.00%	0.13%	3.00%	0.16%	3.00%	0.24%	3.00%	0.28%	3.00%	
29 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Res - FW	0.78%	2.60%	0.68%	2.17%	0.67%	2.00%	1.15%	2.65%	0.84%	2.68%	
29 - 06	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Res - No FW	0.05%	3.00%	0.04%	3.00%	0.02%	3.00%	0.05%	3.00%	0.06%	3.00%	
29 - 07	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Bus - FW	2.86%	1.59%	3.45%	1.44%	2.86%	1.18%	4.46%	1.26%	2.15%	2.05%	
29 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Bus - No FW	0.20%	3.00%	0.36%	3.00%	0.11%	3.00%	0.25%	3.00%	0.36%	3.00%	
35 - 01	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	2.87%	10.75%	3.82%	10.31%	4.37%	10.86%	3.96%	10.76%	4.96%	14.69%	
35 - 02	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	4.50%	4.97%	4.59%	4.99%	3.89%	5.87%	3.96%	5.63%	3.29%	6.64%	
35 - 03	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	7.11%	8.46%	5.56%	8.47%	6.64%	8.84%	6.45%	9.18%	7.32%	10.82%	
35 - 04	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	0.77%	4.11%	0.66%	4.30%	1.02%	4.17%	1.41%	4.88%	1.79%	5.87%	
35 - 05	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	10.39%	10.75%	9.86%	10.31%	8.96%	10.86%	9.58%	10.76%	11.55%	14.69%	
35 - 06	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	2.18%	4.97%	2.21%	4.99%	1.95%	5.87%	1.72%	5.63%	3.09%	6.64%	
35 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	8.31%	8.46%	7.16%	8.47%	4.76%	8.84%	7.04%	9.18%	9.07%	10.82%	
35 - 08	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	2.69%	4.11%	3.00%	4.30%	2.36%	4.17%	2.89%	4.88%	3.07%	5.87%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
43 - 01	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DDS (days)	3.80	9.31	7.60	6.53	3.00	7.98	5.80	8.84	8.00	5.16	abce
43 - 02	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DS1 (days)	7.64	9.03	9.44	10.22	8.52	9.19	8.71	9.19	9.82	9.42	
43 - 03	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DS3 (days)	0.00	16.03	0.00	12.27	0.00	12.27	0.00	13.05	14.50	13.89	e
43 - 04	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL (days)	7.06	7.63	12.57	5.71	5.88	4.28	6.50	5.75	6.04	8.95	
43 - 05	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI (days)	0.00	8.94	0.00	9.58	0.00	7.82	10.00	8.82	13.86	10.15	de
43 - 06	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI (days)	6.11	10.40	6.42	9.82	7.33	11.00	8.00	12.83	11.50	9.63	ace
43 - 07	Avg Installation Interval - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI (days)	2.50	3.86	5.40	3.63	0.00	3.94	0.00	4.60	4.67	4.00	ae
43 - 08	Avg Installation Interval-Design-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI (days)	10.58	10.40	10.68	9.82	15.56	11.00	7.80	12.83	10.50	9.63	cde
43 - 09	Avg Installation Interval - Design - UNE Loop & Port - Other Combinations (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
43 - 10	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - Other Services Avail for Resale (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
44 - 01	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	93.33%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93.75%	bcde
44 - 02	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	100%	98.22%	100%	96.85%	92.86%	98.61%	100%	96.93%	96.43%	94.66%	b
44 - 03	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	97.14%	100%	100%	e
44 - 04	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	100%	99.84%	100%	99.82%	100%	100%	97.26%	99.50%	100%	99.79%	
44 - 05	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	100%	42.86%	e
44 - 06	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	100%	94.74%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	ce
44 - 07	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN BRI	100%	97.78%	100%	97.81%	0.00%	99.55%	100%	98.12%	100%	97.13%	ade

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
44 - 08	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	100%	94.74%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	de
44 - 09	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - UNE Loop & Port - Other Combinations	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
44 - 10	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - Other Svcs Avail for Resale	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
45 - 01	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.75%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.79%	abe
45 - 02	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	2.47%	0.00%	3.02%	6.67%	2.71%	0.00%	2.28%	0.00%	6.58%	
45 - 03	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%	0.00%	0.00%	e
45 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	0.67%	0.00%	0.96%	0.00%	0.03%	3.37%	1.12%	0.00%	0.99%	
45 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.81%	e
45 - 06	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	0.58%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	abcde
45 - 07	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	1.11%	0.00%	1.45%	0.00%	0.94%	0.00%	1.41%	0.00%	1.60%	ade
45 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates-Design-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00%	0.58%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
46 - 01	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	8.82%	0.00%	3.03%	0.00%	5.36%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	10.00%	abe
46 - 02	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	9.09%	4.65%	0.00%	3.69%	6.67%	3.63%	5.00%	2.89%	0.00%	4.77%	
46 - 03	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	2.97%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	1.09%	0.00%	2.82%	0.00%	0.00%	e
46 - 04	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	7.50%	1.14%	2.15%	2.44%	4.81%	2.25%	3.70%	2.94%	3.19%	3.84%	
46 - 05	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	8.82%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	9.09%	e
46 - 06	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	3.11%	0.00%	8.62%	50.00%	6.51%	0.00%	1.29%	16.67%	5.08%	abcde

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
46 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	6.98%	0.00%	5.98%	0.00%	4.57%	0.00%	3.69%	33.33%	5.36%	ade
46 - 08	% Trbl Rpts w/in 30 Days of Install - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00%	3.11%	2.27%	8.62%	0.00%	6.51%	0.00%	1.29%	0.00%	5.08%	
55 - 01.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (1-10) (days)	4.80	4.64	3.17	5.72	3.28	5.81	2.83	5.75	2.76	5.77	
55 - 01.2	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) (days)	7.68	7.68	7.64	17.94	7.18	16.67	6.08	17.64	6.77	13.73	
55 - 01.3	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (20+) (days)	0.00	11.25	0.00	15.50	0.00	28.20	0.00	10.00	n/a	14.50	
55 - 02.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (1-10) (days)	5.93	4.80	2.82	7.02	3.37	6.39	4.78	7.96	3.97	7.36	
55 - 02.2	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (11-20) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 02.3	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (20+) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 03	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - DS1 loop (includes PRI) (days)	7.21	13.07	3.45	2.33	4.43	1.84	4.19	2.20	4.62	1.62	
55 - 09.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Dedicated Transport - DS1 (1-10) (days)	0.00	12.98	0.00	2.44	0.00	1.82	4.00	2.21	n/a	1.65	d
55 - 10.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Dedicated Transport - DS3 (1-10) (days)	22.40	30.01	0.00	6.22	0.00	9.67	0.00	14.00	n/a	n/a	a
55 - 12	Avg Installation Interval - DSL Loops Requiring No Conditioning-Line Sharing	3.65	2.96	3.44	2.97	2.97	2.97	2.89	2.98	2.86	2.97	
55.2 - 01.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (1-10)	4.96	n/a	4.87	n/a	4.84	n/a	4.79	n/a	4.70	n/a	
55.2 - 01.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (11-20)	6.36	n/a	6.36	n/a	6.02	n/a	6.91	n/a	6.64	n/a	
55.2 - 01.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (21-24)	8.71	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.00	n/a	
55.2 - 02.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (1-10)	3.15	n/a	3.56	n/a	3.31	n/a	3.26	n/a	3.36	n/a	
55.2 - 02.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (11-20)	6.82	n/a	5.96	n/a	6.04	n/a	6.44	n/a	6.19	n/a	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
55.2 - 02.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (21+)	8.60	n/a	10.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	9.00	n/a	
55.2 - 03.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP (1-10)	5.07	n/a	4.74	n/a	4.82	n/a	4.52	n/a	4.57	n/a	
55.2 - 03.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP(11-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 03.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 01.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-2 Wire Analog (1-10)-3 Days	99.46%	95.51%	99.88%	97.95%	99.86%	98.07%	99.90%	97.70%	99.72%	97.46%	
56 - 01.2	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE -2 Wire Analog (11-20)-7 Days	100%	91.67%	100%	97.92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95.00%	
56 - 01.3	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD- UNE - 2 Wire Analog (20+)-10 Days	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	
56 - 02.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-Digital (1-10)-3 Days	94.74%	92.38%	96.71%	97.94%	99.69%	99.12%	99.32%	98.10%	99.39%	96.53%	
56 - 03	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-DS1 Loop (includes PRI)-3 Days	96.04%	97.54%	98.91%	96.97%	99.27%	97.74%	96.72%	97.82%	81.58%	92.93%	
56 - 10.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-Dedicated Transport-DS3 (1-10)-3 Days	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.70%	100%	100%	abcde
56 - 11	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop Projects	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	e
56 - 12.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/No Line Share-Conditioned -10 days	100%	n/a	96.67%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56 - 12.2	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/No Line Share-Non Conditioned-5 Days	99.48%	n/a	99.26%	n/a	98.88%	n/a	99.71%	n/a	99.69%	n/a	
56 - 13	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/Line Sharing-Parity w/ASI	99.84%	99.70%	100%	99.53%	100%	98.91%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 01.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)	99.95%	95.00%	99.57%	95.00%	99.90%	95.00%	99.78%	95.00%	99.74%	95.00%	
56.1 - 01.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56.1 - 01.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (>20)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
56.1 - 02.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	99.92%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 02.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 02.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (21-24)	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 03.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 03.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 03.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 04	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Projects Loop w/LNP (>100)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
58 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	0.71%	5.00%	0.86%	5.00%	0.92%	5.00%	0.37%	5.00%	0.34%	5.00%	
58 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	0.25%	4.30%	0.15%	1.97%	0.12%	1.78%	0.08%	2.28%	0.25%	2.52%	
58 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	2.74%	1.98%	0.62%	2.30%	0.99%	2.02%	1.77%	1.53%	11.49%	4.67%	
59 - 01	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) Inst - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	1.67%	0.00%	0.85%	0.00%	1.16%	0.00%	0.55%	2.36%	1.19%	abc
59 - 02	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
59 - 03	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	3.00%	1.11%	2.24%	1.30%	1.69%	1.32%	2.13%	1.18%	1.95%	1.63%	
59 - 04	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Install - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	3.07%	6.00%	1.90%	6.00%	2.89%	6.00%	2.69%	6.00%	2.59%	6.00%	
59 - 05	% Installation Trb Reports W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop W/out Test Access	3.26%	11.96%	3.84%	11.50%	3.95%	12.00%	3.43%	11.54%	3.55%	12.13%	
59 - 06	% Installation Trouble Reports W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	8.05%	11.95%	7.76%	8.95%	6.53%	7.89%	10.06%	6.59%	9.38%	9.04%	
59 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	8.82%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	4.35%	n/a	9.09%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
59 - 08	% Installation Trble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	5.11%	4.24%	3.31%	4.85%	4.93%	4.36%	5.23%	2.37%	8.02%	4.86%	
59 - 09	% Installation Trb Rpts W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	4.65%	0.00%	3.69%	0.00%	3.63%	0.00%	2.89%	n/a	4.77%	d
59 - 12	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00%	1.14%	0.00%	2.44%	0.00%	2.25%	0.00%	2.94%	n/a	3.84%	
59 - 13	% Trb Rpts W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
59 - 14	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	2.97%	0.00%	4.35%	33.33%	1.09%	0.00%	2.82%	0.00%	0.00%	abcde
59 - 15	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	1.09%	0.00%	2.82%	n/a	0.00%	
114 - 01	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)-FDT-LNP W/Loop	4.72%	2.00%	1.20%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	2.15%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
114 - 02	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)-CHC- LNP W/Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.21%	2.00%	0.16%	2.00%	0.14%	2.00%	
114.1 - 01	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - FDT - LNP with Loop (< 10 Lines)	96.09%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	99.17%	90.00%	99.19%	90.00%	
114.1 - 02	CHC/FDT LNP w/Loop Provisioning Interval - FDT - LNP with Loop (10-24 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	90.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
114.1 - 03	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - CHC - LNP with Loop (<10 lines)	99.85%	90.00%	97.69%	90.00%	98.59%	90.00%	98.51%	90.00%	98.15%	90.00%	
114.1 - 04	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - CHC - LNP with Loop (10-24 Lines)	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	
115 - 01	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115 - 01.1	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop (>30 Min)	0.94%	8.00%	4.82%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	1.08%	8.00%	0.97%	8.00%	
115 - 01.2	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop (>60 Min)	0.94%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.97%	2.00%	
115 - 01.3	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT- LNP W/Loop (>120 Min)	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115 - 02	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC- LNP W/Loop	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
115 - 02.1	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>30 Min)	0.00%	8.00%	0.12%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.14%	8.00%	
115 - 02.2	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>60 Min)	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
115 - 02.3	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>120 Min)	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115.1 - 01	% Provisioning Trouble Reports -- FDT	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
115.1 - 02	% Provisioning Trouble Reports - CHC	0.08%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
IN 1 - 01	% Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date - DSL Loops w/out Line Sharing	98.86%	90.00%	98.90%	90.00%	97.75%	90.00%	98.90%	90.00%	95.29%	90.00%	
MI 3 - 01	Coordination Conversions Started w/in 1 Hour of Scheduled Time	100%	n/a	98.28%	n/a	99.00%	n/a	98.74%	n/a	98.44%	n/a	
	Maintenance											
37 - 01	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	2.73	2.13	2.90	2.28	3.47	2.72	2.73	2.25	3.11	3.09	
37 - 02	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	0.56	0.72	0.54	0.72	0.66	0.81	0.53	0.69	0.63	0.85	
37 - 03	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	1.50	2.13	1.52	2.28	1.80	2.72	1.51	2.25	2.09	3.09	
37 - 04	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	0.71	0.72	0.77	0.72	0.89	0.81	0.68	0.69	0.96	0.85	
37.1 - 01	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-POTS-Res	1.23	2.22	1.52	2.33	1.83	2.79	1.48	2.28	2.03	3.41	
37.1 - 02	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-POTS-Bus	0.53	0.78	0.48	0.77	0.65	0.89	0.50	0.73	0.67	0.97	
37.1 - 03	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-UNE-P-Res	1.07	2.22	1.14	2.33	1.42	2.79	1.13	2.28	1.63	3.41	
37.1 - 04	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-UNE-P Bus	0.59	0.78	0.65	0.77	0.77	0.89	0.57	0.73	0.88	0.97	
38 - 01	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch	3.07%	9.12%	4.39%	9.64%	4.40%	9.48%	5.24%	9.49%	6.39%	14.36%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
38 - 02	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	0.00%	0.94%	0.00%	1.16%	3.70%	0.85%	1.47%	0.79%	0.00%	2.13%	
38 - 03	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch	5.85%	9.67%	5.87%	9.86%	8.69%	9.95%	6.98%	10.15%	9.69%	14.90%	
38 - 04	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch	0.00%	2.42%	1.05%	2.37%	5.15%	1.84%	0.00%	2.34%	1.30%	2.20%	
38 - 05	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	4.44%	9.12%	4.82%	9.64%	4.67%	9.48%	4.91%	9.49%	7.40%	14.36%	
38 - 06	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch	1.24%	0.94%	2.16%	1.16%	1.01%	0.85%	0.95%	0.79%	1.62%	2.13%	
38 - 07	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch	5.41%	9.67%	6.20%	9.86%	5.99%	9.95%	5.17%	10.15%	6.82%	14.90%	
38 - 08	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch	0.00%	2.42%	2.94%	2.37%	2.13%	1.84%	2.70%	2.34%	0.68%	2.20%	
39 - 01	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	16.60	36.77	25.17	37.43	20.42	41.49	20.95	36.04	30.84	57.32	
39 - 02	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	8.87	17.21	8.98	17.43	10.30	17.77	11.48	16.62	14.86	23.24	
39 - 03	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.04	6.76	1.99	5.78	1.18	4.93	1.08	3.94	1.15	9.02	
39 - 04	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	2.87	3.41	2.19	3.18	2.40	3.21	1.71	3.12	2.08	4.65	
39 - 05	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS-Bus-Dispatch-Affecting Service (Hrs)	11.56	23.44	19.26	25.98	14.60	30.29	21.20	25.16	28.34	46.53	
39 - 06	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	13.02	14.19	12.05	14.28	12.83	15.55	12.00	14.56	17.15	20.40	
39 - 07	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.52	3.62	1.40	4.53	1.72	3.19	1.60	4.67	2.27	7.96	
39 - 08	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	1.55	2.94	2.41	2.99	4.25	2.87	2.01	3.08	5.55	3.80	
39 - 09	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	15.24	36.77	17.06	37.43	18.84	41.49	18.67	36.04	35.41	57.32	
39 - 10	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	12.75	17.21	12.96	17.43	12.36	17.77	12.71	16.62	17.88	23.24	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
39 - 11	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	4.05	6.76	1.53	5.78	1.64	4.93	1.62	3.94	2.62	9.02	
39 - 12	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	3.43	3.41	2.95	3.18	2.54	3.21	2.57	3.12	3.99	4.65	
39 - 13	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	17.09	23.44	16.14	25.98	18.28	30.29	21.43	25.16	38.25	46.53	
39 - 14	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	11.49	14.19	13.86	14.28	12.71	15.55	12.78	14.56	16.51	20.40	
39 - 15	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.07	3.62	1.99	4.53	2.59	3.19	0.76	4.67	1.00	7.96	
39 - 16	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	2.12	2.94	3.15	2.99	2.21	2.87	3.05	3.08	2.16	3.80	
40 - 01	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - POTS - Residence	99.12%	94.26%	98.48%	95.67%	98.39%	94.64%	97.89%	96.14%	96.23%	90.99%	
40 - 02	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - POTS - Business	97.83%	96.18%	97.85%	96.87%	96.69%	96.03%	98.83%	96.41%	92.94%	91.35%	
40 - 03	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - UNE-P Res	96.69%	94.26%	97.59%	95.67%	97.54%	94.64%	97.29%	96.14%	94.76%	90.99%	
40 - 04	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - UNE-P Bus	98.08%	96.18%	97.42%	96.87%	97.83%	96.03%	98.57%	96.41%	95.88%	91.35%	
41 - 01	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	3.23%	11.13%	3.94%	11.86%	6.00%	11.84%	3.95%	10.63%	3.07%	11.36%	
41 - 02	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	9.94%	10.40%	9.49%	10.44%	10.52%	10.54%	12.60%	10.02%	8.28%	10.47%	
41 - 03	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	6.15%	11.13%	6.08%	11.86%	6.37%	11.84%	5.99%	10.63%	6.92%	11.36%	
41 - 04	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	7.74%	10.40%	7.47%	10.44%	7.15%	10.54%	6.66%	10.02%	6.67%	10.47%	
53 - 01	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	33.33%	19.67%	0.00%	17.05%	0.00%	13.97%	0.00%	18.82%	0.00%	16.60%	abde
53 - 02	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	19.23%	14.51%	35.29%	18.14%	40.00%	18.44%	26.47%	15.72%	18.00%	18.50%	
53 - 03	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	8.57%	0.00%	9.68%	0.00%	8.82%	0.00%	6.06%	n/a	17.65%	a

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
53 - 04	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	26.00%	15.51%	33.33%	14.64%	14.58%	16.74%	21.43%	15.63%	21.43%	16.79%	
53 - 05	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	10.11%	0.00%	23.76%	0.00%	13.68%	0.00%	15.56%	n/a	13.73%	
53 - 06	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	22.22%	13.68%	0.00%	16.36%	33.33%	5.26%	0.00%	9.33%	14.29%	7.92%	abcde
53 - 07	% Repeat Reports - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	19.35%	0.00%	17.65%	16.67%	11.68%	0.00%	8.88%	0.00%	13.70%	acde
53 - 08	% Repeat Reports - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00%	13.68%	0.00%	16.36%	0.00%	5.26%	0.00%	9.33%	0.00%	7.92%	bcde
54 - 01	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	1.29	2.24	1.72	2.18	0.00	2.90	0.43	2.39	1.28	3.45	
54 - 02	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	9.24	2.28	5.99	2.35	7.75	2.65	5.76	2.41	7.82	3.65	
54 - 03	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.74	0.00	0.38	abcde
54 - 04	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	1.15	0.37	0.40	0.38	1.09	0.47	0.95	0.40	0.63	0.45	
54 - 05	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00	1.05	0.00	1.19	0.00	1.13	0.00	1.08	0.00	1.24	
54 - 06	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	4.05	0.91	1.42	0.89	2.86	0.79	1.36	0.63	3.17	0.85	
54 - 07	Failure Frequency - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.53	0.83	0.00	0.78	3.05	0.71	1.03	0.59	0.53	0.83	
54 - 08	Failure Frequency - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00	0.91	10.00	0.89	70.00	0.79	10.00	0.63	75.00	0.85	e
54.1 - 01	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DDS	0.86	1.76	1.72	1.80	0.00	2.45	0.43	1.84	1.28	2.81	
54.1 - 02	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DS1	7.21	1.91	3.87	1.88	4.48	2.12	4.07	2.00	6.42	2.91	
54.1 - 03	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DS3	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.59	0.00	0.65	0.00	0.31	abcde
54.1 - 04	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-VGPL	0.71	0.31	0.22	0.31	0.81	0.37	0.65	0.32	0.43	0.36	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
54.1 - 05	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-ISDN BRI	0.00	0.93	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.90	0.00	1.02	
54.1 - 06	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-ISDN PRI	3.15	0.74	0.95	0.63	1.43	0.66	1.36	0.55	2.26	0.68	
54.1 - 07	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN BRI	0.53	0.60	0.00	0.58	2.54	0.58	1.03	0.50	0.00	0.66	
54.1 - 08	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00	0.74	0.00	0.63	70.00	0.66	10.00	0.55	75.00	0.68	e
65 - 01	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.22	3.27	0.46	abc
65 - 02	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65 - 03	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.47	0.21	0.39	0.26	0.32	0.29	0.25	0.27	0.41	0.37	
65 - 04	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	0.48	3.00	0.45	3.00	0.50	3.00	0.52	3.00	0.75	3.00	
65 - 05	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	0.61	0.72	0.67	0.72	0.83	0.81	0.66	0.69	0.91	0.85	
65 - 06	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	1.06	0.77	1.04	0.77	0.90	0.70	1.17	0.58	1.42	0.75	
65 - 07	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00	1.05	0.00	1.19	0.00	1.13	0.00	1.08	n/a	1.24	
65 - 08	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	5.43	1.99	2.28	2.06	3.24	2.27	2.60	2.03	4.04	3.05	
65 - 09	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00	2.28	0.22	2.35	0.00	2.65	0.00	2.41	0.00	3.65	
65 - 12	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00	0.37	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.45	abcde
65 - 13	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65 - 14	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.93	0.69	0.00	0.62	0.34	0.67	0.35	0.74	0.00	0.38	
65 - 15	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.74	n/a	0.38	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
65 - 16	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Interconnection Trunks	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	
65.1 - 01	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports- Broadband DSL-Line Sharing	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.09	0.41	0.23	abc
65.1 - 02	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports- Broadband DSL-No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65.1 - 03	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.44	0.21	0.39	0.26	0.18	0.17	0.10	0.13	0.23	0.19	
65.1 - 04	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports- DSL Loops - No line Sharing	0.39	3.00	0.36	3.00	0.41	3.00	0.39	3.00	0.54	3.00	
65.1 - 05	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - 8.0 dB Loop W/out Test Access	0.49	0.55	0.53	0.55	0.69	0.63	0.53	0.53	0.77	0.65	
65.1 - 06	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - BRI Loop with Test Access	0.60	0.58	0.62	0.57	0.62	0.58	0.76	0.49	0.94	0.60	
65.1 - 07	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - ISDN BRI Port	0.00	0.93	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.90	n/a	1.02	
65.1 - 08	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS1 Loop with Test Access	3.72	1.66	1.56	1.63	2.06	1.82	1.68	1.69	2.69	2.43	
65.1 - 09	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00	1.91	0.22	1.88	0.00	2.12	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.91	
65.1 - 12	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Analog Trunk Port	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.37	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.36	abcde
65.1 - 14	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.62	0.58	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.59	0.35	0.65	0.00	0.31	
65.1 - 15	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.59	0.00	0.65	n/a	0.31	
65.1 - 16	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Interconnection Trunks	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	
66 - 01	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	8.97%	0.00%	3.92%	0.00%	8.57%	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	8.00%	e
66 - 02	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
66 - 03	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - DSL - Line Sharing	8.11%	11.94%	3.19%	8.14%	6.41%	8.43%	4.76%	8.50%	2.91%	10.46%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
66 - 04	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - 2 Wire Analog 8db Loop	6.25%	7.49%	4.40%	7.58%	4.53%	7.33%	3.09%	7.71%	6.54%	11.48%	
67 - 01	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (Hrs)	0.00	19.08	0.00	8.41	0.00	10.09	0.00	8.70	11.15	13.47	e
67 - 02	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (Hrs)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 03	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	11.72	12.05	10.58	11.77	9.96	11.40	9.64	10.14	7.38	11.52	
67 - 04	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	7.67	9.00	6.97	9.00	5.80	9.00	7.02	9.00	8.55	9.00	
67 - 05	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	9.08	18.55	7.63	18.50	8.34	20.25	7.19	18.55	9.24	27.86	
67 - 06	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	11.97	15.19	16.15	22.75	17.71	12.67	20.16	13.47	13.91	16.59	
67 - 07	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	10.45	0.00	10.01	0.00	9.39	0.00	7.68	n/a	9.63	
67 - 08	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	5.13	6.79	5.34	7.47	5.20	8.32	6.03	7.75	6.88	8.44	
67 - 09	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	6.81	1.02	7.53	0.00	8.34	0.00	7.73	n/a	8.46	b
67 - 12	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	6.54	0.00	6.62	0.00	7.17	0.00	5.98	n/a	8.53	
67 - 14	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	4.96	0.00	3.68	0.00	3.89	0.00	3.59	n/a	4.74	
67 - 15	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (Hrs)-Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.00	3.68	0.00	3.89	0.00	3.59	n/a	4.74	
67 - 16	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (Hrs)	0.00	1.30	0.00	3.56	0.00	1.76	0.00	0.96	2.35	1.80	e
67 - 17	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (Hrs)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 18	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	3.67	2.17	2.03	2.61	1.72	2.74	4.25	3.12	2.46	3.29	
67 - 19	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	1.35	9.00	2.10	9.00	1.41	9.00	1.38	9.00	2.32	9.00	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
67 - 20	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.74	5.31	1.64	5.01	1.72	4.33	2.03	4.26	2.12	8.00	
67 - 21	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.85	4.61	2.12	4.40	2.09	3.92	1.95	4.52	2.98	4.01	
67 - 22	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	1.58	0.00	1.64	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	n/a	1.92	
67 - 23	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.55	1.50	1.40	1.60	1.50	1.61	1.59	1.50	1.75	1.42	
67 - 24	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	1.49	0.00	1.59	0.00	1.54	0.00	1.52	n/a	1.40	
67 - 25	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (Hrs)-No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 27	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	1.98	0.00	2.03	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.12	n/a	2.06	
67 - 29	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-No Dispatch	2.01	1.20	0.00	0.89	2.38	1.76	1.20	1.08	n/a	0.89	acd
67 - 30	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (Hrs)-No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.00	0.89	0.00	1.76	0.00	1.08	n/a	0.89	
69 - 01	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	5.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.29%	0.00%	9.52%	12.50%	6.00%	e
69 - 02	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
69 - 03	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	5.41%	2.61%	0.00%	0.00%	3.85%	5.03%	6.35%	3.85%	6.80%	2.89%	
69 - 04	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	3.73%	12.00%	8.39%	12.00%	2.89%	12.00%	8.78%	12.00%	8.55%	12.00%	
69 - 05	% Repeat Reports - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	4.98%	11.14%	6.97%	11.56%	6.26%	11.61%	7.83%	10.42%	7.17%	11.27%	
69 - 06	% Repeat Reports - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	14.81%	17.21%	9.35%	19.15%	7.61%	12.07%	9.17%	10.55%	11.03%	13.22%	
69 - 07	% Repeat Reports - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00%	10.11%	0.00%	23.76%	0.00%	13.68%	0.00%	15.56%	n/a	13.73%	
69 - 08	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	18.78%	14.43%	19.61%	17.98%	25.49%	17.51%	22.66%	15.30%	21.05%	17.87%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
69 - 09	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	14.51%	0.00%	18.14%	0.00%	18.44%	0.00%	15.72%	n/a	18.50%	b
69 - 12	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00%	15.51%	0.00%	14.64%	0.00%	16.74%	0.00%	15.63%	n/a	16.79%	
69 - 14	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	33.33%	8.57%	0.00%	9.68%	0.00%	8.82%	0.00%	6.06%	n/a	17.65%	acd
69 - 15	% Repeat Reportss - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00%	9.68%	0.00%	8.82%	0.00%	6.06%	n/a	17.65%	
69 - 16	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Interconnection Trunks	0.00%	2.38%	0.00%	7.32%	11.11%	8.77%	0.00%	6.12%	0.00%	2.70%	acde
	OS/DA											
80 - 01	Directory Assistance Avg Speed of Answer (Sec)	4.49	7.00	5.57	7.00	5.79	7.00	4.86	7.00	5.19	7.00	
82 - 01	Operator Services Speed of Answer (Sec)	3.26	3.60	2.95	3.60	2.83	3.60	2.90	3.60	2.92	3.60	
112 - 01	% DA Database Accuracy for Manual Updates for Facility-Based CLECs	99.89%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	99.95%	97.00%	99.91%	97.00%	99.77%	97.00%	
113 - 01	% of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process w/out Manual Intervention	99.63%	99.57%	99.78%	99.71%	99.56%	99.62%	99.45%	99.68%	99.82%	99.64%	
	Collocation											
70 - 01	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech End Office to CLEC End Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
70 - 02	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech Tandem to CLEC End Office	0.02%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.00%	
70.2 - 01	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech Tandem to CLEC End Office	0.53%	n/a	0.65%	n/a	0.35%	n/a	0.20%	n/a	0.07%	n/a	
70.2 - 02	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech End Office to CLEC End Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 01	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-911	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	b
73 - 02	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-OS/DA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
73 - 03	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-SS7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 04	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-Non-Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
73 - 05	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.98%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
78 - 01	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	16.00	6.00	16.00	277.22	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8.00	8.00	abe
78 - 02	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	0.00	32.00	0.00	13.00	0.00	12.33	0.00	10.63	n/a	10.70	
78 - 03	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	n/a	n/a	0.00	10.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
78 - 04	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	14.02	69.30	13.85	28.49	12.24	20.34	14.64	336.25	13.04	13.68	
107 - 01	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Caged	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 02	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Shared Caged	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 03	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Caged Common	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 04	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Cageless	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	abcde
107 - 05	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Adjacent On-Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 06	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Adjacent Off-Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 07	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Virtual	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	cd
107 - 08	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Augments to Physical Collocation	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	abde
107 - 09	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Augments to Virtual	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	bcd
108 - 01	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Physical	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
108 - 02	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Virtual	0.00	n/a	0.00	n/a	0.00	n/a	0.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	
108 - 03	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Additions	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
108 - 04	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Cageless	0.00	n/a	0.00	n/a	0.00	n/a	0.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	
109 - 01	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Physical	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	bc
109 - 02	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Virtual	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	100%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	c
109 - 03	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Additions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
109 - 04	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Cageless	100%	n/a	0.00%	100%	100%	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	acd
MI 4 - 01	Avg Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement - Physical Collocation (Days)	71.00	n/a	66.69	n/a	60.92	n/a	65.00	n/a	56.33	n/a	ae
	Miscellaneous											
96 - 01	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP Only	0.11%	2.00%	0.02%	2.00%	4.10%	2.00%	0.15%	2.00%	0.08%	2.00%	
96 - 02	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP w/ Loop	0.94%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
MI 14 - 01	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-Resale Manual-Next Day	89.54%	95.00%	96.44%	95.00%	98.15%	95.00%	88.78%	95.00%	96.99%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 02	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic	98.33%	95.00%	96.81%	95.00%	95.83%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.60%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 03	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-UNE Loops Manual-Next Day	99.14%	95.00%	98.08%	95.00%	97.98%	95.00%	96.08%	95.00%	92.13%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 04	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic	96.81%	95.00%	93.22%	95.00%	96.65%	95.00%	99.90%	95.00%	99.08%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 05	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-UNE P Manual-Next Day	86.34%	95.00%	94.54%	95.00%	96.61%	95.00%	86.04%	95.00%	97.13%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 06	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic	98.99%	95.00%	98.80%	95.00%	99.14%	95.00%	99.94%	95.00%	99.78%	95.00%	

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
MI 15 - 01	Change Management - Changes to Existing Interfaces (days) - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
MI 15 - 02	Change Management - Changes to Existing Interfaces (days) - GUI	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	95.00%	bcd
MI 15 - 03	Change Management - Introductions of New Interfaces (days) - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 04	Change Management - Introductions of New Interfaces (days) - GUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 05	Change Management - Retirements of Existing Interfaces (days) - Wholesale Interfaces - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 06	Change Management - Retirements of Existing Interfaces (days) - Wholesale Interfaces - GUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Abbreviations:

n/a = No Activity.

Notes: a = Sample Size under 10 for March.
b = Sample Size under 10 for April.
c = Sample Size under 10 for May.
d = Sample Size under 10 for June.
e = Sample Size under 10 for July.

Appendix C

Indiana Performance Metrics

All data included here are taken from the Indiana Carrier-to-Carrier Reports. This table is provided as a reference tool for the convenience of the reader. No conclusions are to be drawn from the raw data contained in this table. Our analysis is based on the totality of the circumstances, such that we may use non-metric evidence, and may rely more heavily on some metrics more than others, in making our determination. The inclusion of these particular metrics in this table does not necessarily mean that we relied on all of these metrics nor that other metrics may not also be important in our analysis. Some metrics that we have relied on in the past and may rely on for a future application were not included here because there was no data provided for them (usually either because there was no activity, or because the metrics are still under development). Metrics with no retail analog provided are usually compared with a benchmark. Note that for some metrics during the period provided, there may be changes in the metric definition, or changes in the retail analog applied, making it difficult to compare the data over time.

PERFORMANCE METRICS CATAGORIES

Metric Number	Metric Name
	Pre-Ordering
1.1	Avg Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information
1.2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders
4	OSS Interface Availability
	Billing
14	Billing Accuracy
15	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills
16	% Usage Records Transmitted Correctly
17	Billing Completeness
19	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness
	Ordering
5	% FOCs Returned w/in x Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req
7.1	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion
9	% Rejects
10	% Rejects Returned w/in x Hour
10.1	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned w/in 5 Hrs
10.3	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned w/in 5 Hrs
10.4	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects
11.1	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (Hrs)
11.2	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (Hrs)
12	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy

Metric Number	Metric Name
13	Order Process % Flow Through
MI 13	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 13.1	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications
MI 9	% Missing FOCs
	Provisioning
27	Mean Installation Interval - POTS
28	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date
29	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
35	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install
43	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials
44	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials
45	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials
46	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials
55	Avg Installation Interval
55.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP
56	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD
56.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD
59	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) Inst
114	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval
115	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers

PERFORMANCE METRICS CATAGORIES

Metric Number	Metric Name
115.1	% Provisioning Trouble Reports
IN 1	% Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date - DSL Loops w/out Line Sharing
MI 3	Coordination Conversions Started w/in 1 Hour of Scheduled Time
	Maintenance
37	Trouble Report Rate
37.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports
38	% Missed Repair Commitments
39	Rcpt to Clear Duration
40	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs
41	% Repeat Reports
53	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials
54	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials
54.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials
65	Trouble Report Rate
65.1	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports
66	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE
67	Mean Time to Restore
69	% Repeat Reports

Metric Number	Metric Name
	OS/DA
80	Directory Assistance Avg Speed of Answer (Sec)
82	Operator Services Speed of Answer (Sec)
112	% Directory Assistance Database Accuracy for Manual Updates
113	% of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process w/out Manual Intervention
	Collocation
70	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech
70.2	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech
73	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks
78	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval
107	% Missed Collocation Due Dates
108	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates
109	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines
MI 4	Avg Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement - Physical
	Miscellaneous
96	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders
MI 14	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt
MI 15	Change Management

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
	Pre-Ordering											
1.1 - 01	Avg Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information	0.77	0.51	0.94	0.89	1.02	0.90	1.61	0.90	0.95	0.72	
1.2 - 01	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
1.2 - 02	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
2 - 34	% Response Received w/in 10 Sec--OSS Interface--Address Verification	98.92%	95.00%	98.89%	95.00%	98.98%	95.00%	96.91%	95.00%	98.20%	95.00%	
2 - 35	% Response Received w/in 10 Sec--OSS Interface--Telephone Number Assignment	98.02%	95.00%	98.02%	95.00%	99.19%	95.00%	96.83%	95.00%	98.48%	95.00%	
2 - 36	% Response Received w/in 15 Sec-OSS Interface-Customer Service Inquiries < or = 30 WTNs/lines	97.75%	95.00%	98.61%	95.00%	99.24%	95.00%	97.08%	95.00%	98.87%	95.00%	
2 - 37	% Response Received w/in 60 Sec--OSS Interface--Customer Service Inquiries > 30 WTNs/lines	84.64%	n/a	94.61%	n/a	88.89%	n/a	86.29%	n/a	90.48%	95.00%	
2 - 38	% Response Received w/in 13 Sec--OSS Interface--Service Availability	100%	95.00%	99.78%	95.00%	99.56%	95.00%	98.86%	95.00%	99.54%	95.00%	
2 - 39	% Response Received w/in 5 Sec--OSS Interface--Service Appointment Scheduling (Due Date)	98.68%	95.00%	99.43%	95.00%	99.83%	95.00%	99.03%	95.00%	99.51%	95.00%	
2 - 40	% Response Received w/in 19 Sec--OSS Interface--Dispatch Required	99.60%	95.00%	99.65%	95.00%	99.81%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
2 - 41	% Response Received w/in 25 Sec--OSS Interface--PIC	93.75%	95.00%	96.04%	95.00%	98.04%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
2 - 42	%Response Recd w/in 30 Sec-OSS Interface-Actual LMU Information requested (5 or less loops searched)	78.45%	95.00%	87.63%	95.00%	91.51%	95.00%	99.05%	95.00%	98.35%	95.00%	
2 - 43	%Resp Recd w/in 60Sec-OSS Interface-Actual LMU Information requested (greater than 5 loops searched)	n/a	n/a	63.95%	95.00%	62.88%	95.00%	50.53%	95.00%	52.49%	95.00%	
2 - 44	% Resp Recd w/in 15 Sec-OSS Interface-Design LMU Information requested (incl Pre-Qual transactions)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	98.10%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
2 - 45	% Response Received w/in 4 Sec-OSS Interface-Protocol Translation Time-EDI (input & output)	98.77%	95.00%	98.89%	95.00%	71.40%	95.00%	96.55%	95.00%	91.32%	95.00%	
2 - 46	% Response Received w/in 1 Sec-OSS Interface-Protocol Translation Time-CORBA (input & output)	99.14%	95.00%	99.44%	95.00%	99.47%	95.00%	99.83%	95.00%	99.69%	95.00%	
2 - 47	% Response Received w/in 1 Sec-OSS Interfac--Protocol Translation Time-Web Verigate (input & output)	99.86%	n/a	99.85%	n/a	99.86%	n/a	99.86%	n/a	99.87%	n/a	
4 - 01	OSS Interface Availability - TCNET	100%	99.50%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 02	OSS Interface Availability - AEMS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
4 - 04	OSS Interface Availablity - EB/TA	99.91%	99.50%	99.98%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	99.99%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	
4 - 05	OSS Interface Availability - EB/TA - GUI	100%	99.50%	99.97%	99.50%	99.80%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.64%	99.50%	
4 - 06	OSS Interface Availability - ARIS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 07	OSS Interface Availability - BOP - GUI	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 08	OSS Interface Availability - Web Verigate	99.83%	99.50%	99.57%	99.50%	99.93%	99.50%	99.68%	99.50%	99.71%	99.50%	
4 - 09	OSS Interface Availability -- Web LEX	99.83%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.92%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 10	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI LSOG 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 11	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (Van)	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 12	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (SSL3)	99.98%	99.50%	99.87%	99.50%	99.99%	99.50%	99.98%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 13	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (NDM)	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 14	OSS Interface Availability -- Web Toolbar	99.89%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.94%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 15	OSS Interface Availability -- ARAF	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 16	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Pre-Order	99.86%	99.50%	99.07%	99.50%	99.95%	99.50%	99.44%	99.50%	99.75%	99.50%	
4 - 17	OSS Interface Availability -- CORBA Pre-Order	99.84%	99.50%	99.07%	99.50%	99.95%	99.50%	99.44%	99.50%	99.71%	99.50%	
4 - 18	OSS Interface Availability -- AEMS LSOG 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Billing											
14 - 01	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring / Non-recurring	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	4.92%	0.08%	0.00%	0.06%	
14 - 02	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	0.00%	0.82%	0.21%	0.00%	3.52%	0.06%	0.00%	0.06%	0.00%	0.12%	
14 - 03	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.95%	0.00%	0.79%	0.00%	1.97%	0.00%	
15 - 01	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills--EDI	97.89%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
15 - 02	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills--BDT	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	
16 - 01	% Usage Records Transmitted Correctly	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.64%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
17 - 02	Billing Completeness--Lineshare	98.86%	97.67%	98.75%	96.11%	99.44%	96.62%	99.57%	97.60%	98.69%	98.09%	
17 - 03	Billing Completeness--UNE-P	99.01%	99.16%	98.33%	99.07%	99.06%	99.06%	99.12%	98.30%	98.32%	98.29%	
17 - 04	Billing Completeness--Resale	97.41%	99.16%	98.98%	99.07%	99.59%	99.06%	99.25%	98.30%	98.29%	98.29%	
17 - 05	Billing Completeness--All Other Products (UNE, EOI, ULT, EELs)	99.71%	100%	99.46%	99.07%	99.08%	99.06%	99.87%	98.30%	99.86%	98.29%	
18 - 03	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)-Electronic	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
18 - 04	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)-Paper	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
19 - 01	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	99.91%	95.00%	99.93%	95.00%	99.95%	95.00%	99.95%	95.00%	99.92%	95.00%	
	Ordering											
5 - 01	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus	95.69%	95.00%	97.91%	95.00%	97.11%	95.00%	99.17%	95.00%	99.86%	95.00%	
5 - 02	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus	99.71%	95.00%	98.31%	95.00%	98.61%	95.00%	95.31%	95.00%	99.97%	95.00%	
5 - 03	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 04	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 05	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops)	99.58%	95.00%	98.53%	95.00%	97.75%	95.00%	93.69%	95.00%	99.28%	95.00%	
5 - 06	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops)	98.06%	95.00%	99.37%	95.00%	98.84%	95.00%	99.02%	95.00%	99.84%	95.00%	
5 - 07	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>49 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 08	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 09	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 10	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	bcd

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 11	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	c
5 - 12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines)	95.24%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 13	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 14	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus	92.08%	95.00%	96.59%	95.00%	74.48%	95.00%	95.77%	95.00%	99.43%	95.00%	
5 - 15	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus	94.64%	95.00%	98.50%	95.00%	91.08%	95.00%	96.81%	95.00%	99.90%	95.00%	
5 - 16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	88.24%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	cde
5 - 17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 18	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 Hrs	98.98%	95.00%	99.32%	95.00%	97.25%	95.00%	96.59%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 19	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 20	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.14%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 21	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 22	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	99.21%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	90.07%	95.00%	82.22%	95.00%	
5 - 23	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 24	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	100%	95.00%	98.50%	95.00%	97.64%	95.00%	94.29%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 25	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	99.21%	95.00%	99.44%	95.00%	98.61%	95.00%	96.20%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 26	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	cd
5 - 27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (>19 Loops)	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	bcd
5 - 28	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines)	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 29	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (>19 Lines)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a
5 - 30	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 31	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	de
5 - 32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines)	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	83.33%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	abcd
5 - 33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops)	80.00%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	abcde
5 - 35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 49 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 36	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 37	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 38	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 39	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus	95.65%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 41	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 42	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 43	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 44	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a
5 - 45	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 46	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	cde
5 - 47	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 48	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 49	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (>19 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 50	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	bd

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 51	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 52	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 53	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 54	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
7.1 - 01	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - Resale	99.65%	97.00%	99.59%	97.00%	99.23%	97.00%	99.02%	97.00%	99.54%	97.00%	
7.1 - 02	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - UNE	97.25%	97.00%	99.42%	97.00%	98.91%	97.00%	99.35%	97.00%	99.74%	97.00%	
7.1 - 03	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - UNE-P	99.76%	97.00%	97.60%	97.00%	99.66%	97.00%	99.05%	97.00%	99.17%	97.00%	
7.1 - 04	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - LNP Only	98.40%	97.00%	98.95%	97.00%	97.76%	97.00%	99.47%	97.00%	95.85%	97.00%	
9 - 01	% Rejects - CLEC Caused Rejects	24.71%	n/a	16.23%	n/a	14.78%	n/a	14.30%	n/a	14.81%	n/a	
9 - 02	% Rejects - SBC/Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders)	0.20%	n/a	0.22%	n/a	0.11%	n/a	0.18%	n/a	0.14%	n/a	
10 - 01	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	99.97%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10 - 03	% Rejects Returned Within 8 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Electronically (A/M)	n/a	n/a	98.23%	95.00%	98.88%	95.00%	99.35%	95.00%	99.78%	95.00%	
10 - 04	% Rejects Returned Within 24 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Manually (M/M)	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	90.91%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
10.1 - 01	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Order	97.68%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.2 - 01	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned w/in 5 Hrs	95.23%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.3 - 01	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned w/in 5 Hrs	83.10%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 01	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Res - FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 02	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Res - No FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 03	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Bus - FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 04	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Bus - No FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
10.4 - 05	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Specials - FW	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	bcde
10.4 - 06	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Specials - No FW	12.50%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	bcde
10.4 - 07	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loops with LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 08	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loops without LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 09	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 10	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-Ps	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11 - 01	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (Hrs)	0.16	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11.1 - 01	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (Hrs)	3.27	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11.2 - 01	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (Hrs)	3.17	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
12 - 01	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	95.78%	100%	95.36%	95.99%	96.09%	96.28%	96.78%	96.01%	94.83%	96.37%	
13 - 01	Order Process % Flow Through - UNE Loops	100%	95.00%	97.87%	95.00%	96.85%	95.00%	96.53%	95.00%	96.09%	95.00%	
13 - 02	Order Process % Flow Through - Resale	94.94%	97.14%	95.45%	95.63%	95.18%	96.71%	96.03%	97.67%	97.41%	98.18%	
13 - 03	Order Process % Flow Through - UNE-P	96.67%	97.14%	96.21%	95.63%	96.05%	96.71%	93.55%	97.67%	94.11%	98.18%	
13 - 04	Order Process % Flow Through - LNP	98.28%	97.14%	97.25%	95.63%	93.55%	96.71%	94.89%	97.67%	93.42%	98.18%	
13 - 05	Order Process % Flow Through - LSNP	98.80%	97.14%	79.72%	95.63%	91.18%	96.71%	97.30%	97.67%	90.18%	98.18%	
13 - 06	Order Process % Flow Through - Line Sharing	97.96%	97.14%	96.43%	95.63%	90.58%	96.71%	94.90%	97.67%	95.59%	98.18%	
MI 9 - 01	% Missing FOCs - Resale	0.02%	n/a	0.02%	n/a	0.02%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 9 - 02	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, & LSNP)	0.15%	n/a	0.14%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.06%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 9 - 03	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P	0.41%	n/a	0.43%	n/a	0.02%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 13 - 01	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
MI 13 - 02	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 03	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 04	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 05	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--All	99.49%	97.00%	99.27%	97.00%	99.32%	97.00%	99.53%	97.00%	99.31%	97.00%	
MI 13 - 06	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--SBC Winback	99.42%	97.00%	99.85%	97.00%	99.39%	97.00%	99.64%	97.00%	98.94%	97.00%	
MI 13 - 07	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--CLEC-to-CLEC	99.54%	97.00%	98.43%	97.00%	99.24%	97.00%	99.39%	97.00%	99.69%	97.00%	
MI 13.1 - 01	Average Delays Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--All	2.93	n/a	8.75	n/a	15.41	n/a	5.13	n/a	7.04	n/a	
MI 13.1 - 02	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--SBC Winback	2.55	n/a	5.75	n/a	24.03	n/a	4.00	n/a	6.62	n/a	b
MI 13.1 - 03	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--CLEC-to-CLEC	3.33	n/a	9.18	n/a	5.88	n/a	6.29	n/a	8.57	n/a	
	Provisioning											
27 - 01	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res - FW (Days)	2.19	2.83	1.96	2.56	1.75	2.62	1.56	2.89	1.99	3.52	
27 - 02	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res - No FW (Days)	0.19	0.94	0.19	0.91	0.21	0.96	0.17	0.93	0.17	0.88	
27 - 03	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus - FW (Days)	2.47	2.75	2.76	2.57	2.76	2.58	3.00	2.56	3.64	2.94	
27 - 04	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus - No FW (Days)	0.12	0.66	0.14	0.67	0.22	0.66	0.37	0.65	0.28	0.59	
27 - 05	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Res - FW (Days)	1.80	2.83	1.40	2.56	2.82	2.62	2.82	2.89	3.37	3.52	
27 - 06	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Res - No FW (Days)	0.44	0.94	0.45	0.91	0.30	0.96	0.34	0.93	0.27	0.88	
27 - 07	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Bus - FW (Days)	2.00	2.75	2.18	2.57	2.41	2.58	2.27	2.56	2.80	2.94	
27 - 08	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Bus - No FW (Days)	0.38	0.66	0.38	0.67	0.27	0.66	0.26	0.65	0.20	0.59	
27 - 09	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex - FW (Days)	0.00	2.42	0.00	2.31	0.00	2.40	0.00	2.09	n/a	2.46	
27 - 10	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex - No FW (Days)	3.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.67	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	acde

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
28 - 01	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res - FW	99.71%	97.56%	99.92%	97.93%	99.30%	97.86%	99.91%	98.37%	99.68%	97.01%	
28 - 02	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res - No FW	97.84%	97.00%	97.03%	97.00%	97.80%	97.00%	96.52%	97.00%	97.72%	97.00%	
28 - 03	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus - FW	100%	97.61%	95.45%	97.84%	100%	97.58%	100%	98.73%	94.44%	98.20%	
28 - 04	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus - No FW	96.54%	97.00%	97.09%	97.00%	92.86%	97.00%	95.95%	97.00%	98.70%	97.00%	
28 - 05	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Res - FW	99.70%	97.56%	99.83%	97.93%	99.28%	97.86%	99.61%	98.37%	99.40%	97.01%	
28 - 06	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Res - No FW	99.41%	97.00%	99.33%	97.00%	99.64%	97.00%	99.51%	97.00%	99.34%	97.00%	
28 - 07	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Bus - FW	98.31%	97.61%	97.92%	97.84%	98.59%	97.58%	100%	98.73%	98.75%	98.20%	
28 - 08	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Bus - No FW	96.89%	97.00%	97.71%	97.00%	95.82%	97.00%	97.79%	97.00%	98.38%	97.00%	
28 - 09	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex - FW	0.00%	98.13%	0.00%	98.15%	0.00%	98.92%	0.00%	99.60%	n/a	98.87%	
28 - 10	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex - No FW	100%	95.00%	0.00%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	acde
28 - 11	% Installs Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Projects	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	cde
29 - 01	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res - FW	0.19%	2.14%	0.07%	1.83%	0.71%	1.93%	0.08%	1.47%	0.30%	2.67%	
29 - 02	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res - No FW	0.04%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.03%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.04%	3.00%	
29 - 03	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus - FW	0.00%	2.18%	4.35%	2.21%	0.00%	2.19%	0.00%	1.24%	4.55%	1.64%	
29 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus - No FW	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	
29 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Res - FW	0.27%	2.14%	0.15%	1.83%	0.62%	1.93%	0.27%	1.47%	0.60%	2.67%	
29 - 06	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Res - No FW	0.01%	3.00%	0.02%	3.00%	0.03%	3.00%	0.03%	3.00%	0.04%	3.00%	
29 - 07	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Bus - FW	2.94%	2.18%	1.79%	2.21%	1.20%	2.19%	0.00%	1.24%	1.19%	1.64%	
29 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Bus - No FW	0.06%	3.00%	0.06%	3.00%	0.15%	3.00%	0.20%	3.00%	0.26%	3.00%	
35 - 01	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	3.25%	9.10%	3.95%	9.04%	3.93%	10.67%	3.16%	10.45%	5.68%	12.63%	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
35 - 02	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	2.60%	4.96%	1.87%	4.77%	2.63%	5.17%	3.31%	5.34%	3.79%	6.34%	
35 - 03	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	8.70%	6.99%	13.04%	6.94%	4.17%	5.12%	12.50%	6.29%	13.64%	7.23%	
35 - 04	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	1.46%	4.07%	1.27%	5.14%	3.16%	4.39%	3.41%	4.73%	5.81%	5.52%	
35 - 05	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	3.49%	9.10%	1.77%	9.04%	5.96%	10.67%	3.99%	10.45%	6.20%	12.63%	
35 - 06	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	1.25%	4.96%	1.43%	4.77%	1.16%	5.17%	1.84%	5.34%	2.16%	6.34%	
35 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	8.96%	6.99%	8.93%	6.94%	7.23%	5.12%	9.30%	6.29%	10.71%	7.23%	
35 - 08	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	1.89%	4.07%	2.46%	5.14%	1.77%	4.39%	2.47%	4.73%	2.76%	5.52%	
43 - 01	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DDS (days)	0.00	12.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	9.89	n/a	5.20	
43 - 02	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DS1 (days)	0.00	8.92	0.00	9.56	19.00	9.84	0.00	9.37	n/a	9.93	c
43 - 03	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DS3 (days)	0.00	20.00	0.00	13.27	0.00	13.33	0.00	12.38	n/a	14.43	
43 - 04	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL (days)	10.88	8.59	25.00	6.77	0.00	6.73	2.00	4.11	n/a	6.32	bd
43 - 05	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI (days)	0.00	12.00	0.00	8.45	0.00	13.25	0.00	4.60	n/a	10.82	
43 - 06	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI (days)	0.00	3.63	0.00	9.50	19.00	9.08	0.00	10.00	n/a	8.90	c
43 - 07	Avg Installation Interval - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI (days)	0.00	4.63	0.00	4.98	0.00	5.40	0.00	3.51	n/a	3.92	
43 - 08	Avg Installation Interval-Design-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI (days)	0.00	3.63	0.00	9.50	0.00	9.08	0.00	10.00	n/a	8.90	
43 - 09	Avg Installation Interval - Design - UNE Loop & Port - Other Combinations (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
43 - 10	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - Other Services Avail for Resale (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
44 - 01	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	n/a	
44 - 02	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	100%	0.00%	93.98%	0.00%	98.73%	0.00%	95.00%	n/a	84.85%	c
44 - 03	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
44 - 04	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	100%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	
44 - 05	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	
44 - 06	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	92.86%	0.00%	100%	n/a	33.33%	
44 - 07	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN BRI	0.00%	95.06%	0.00%	94.25%	0.00%	93.67%	0.00%	100%	n/a	90.38%	
44 - 08	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	92.86%	0.00%	100%	n/a	33.33%	
44 - 09	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - UNE Loop & Port - Other Combinations	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
44 - 10	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - Other Svcs Avail for Resale	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
45 - 01	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 02	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	1.08%	0.00%	5.61%	100%	2.42%	0.00%	6.67%	n/a	13.64%	c
45 - 03	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	0.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.41%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 06	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	19.51%	c
45 - 07	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	2.11%	0.00%	2.86%	0.00%	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	5.77%	
45 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates-Design-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	19.51%	
46 - 01	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	n/a	0.00%	
46 - 02	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	4.49%	0.00%	5.83%	0.00%	2.56%	0.00%	5.26%	n/a	10.23%	c
46 - 03	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
46 - 04	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	3.85%	2.17%	0.00%	3.81%	0.00%	0.47%	0.00%	7.14%	n/a	5.59%	
46 - 05	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
46 - 06	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.89%	n/a	5.26%	c
46 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	11.05%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	5.36%	0.00%	6.11%	n/a	7.69%	
46 - 08	% Trbl Rpts w/in 30 Days of Install - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.89%	n/a	5.26%	
55 - 01.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (1-10) (days)	2.64	3.00	3.04	3.00	2.73	3.00	2.90	3.00	2.66	3.00	
55 - 01.2	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) (days)	4.83	7.00	4.89	7.00	7.00	7.00	3.17	7.00	6.43	7.00	
55 - 01.3	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (20+) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 02.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (1-10) (days)	3.00	3.00	4.33	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.60	3.00	5.67	3.00	abcde
55 - 02.2	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (11-20) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 02.3	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (20+) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 03	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - DS1 loop (includes PRI) (days)	4.00	3.00	3.79	3.00	4.18	3.00	3.25	3.00	4.43	3.00	
55 - 09.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Dedicated Transport - DS1 (1-10) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 10.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Dedicated Transport - DS3 (1-10) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 12	Avg Installation Interval - DSL Loops Requiring No Conditioning-Line Sharing	4.64	2.97	3.40	2.97	2.98	2.96	2.96	2.97	2.91	2.96	
55.2 - 01.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (1-10)	4.95	n/a	4.97	n/a	5.04	n/a	5.43	n/a	4.79	n/a	
55.2 - 01.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (11-20)	5.50	n/a	6.04	n/a	5.73	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.26	n/a	
55.2 - 01.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	11.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 02.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (1-10)	4.60	n/a	4.30	n/a	4.00	n/a	3.80	n/a	5.00	n/a	ace
55.2 - 02.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (11-20)	6.08	n/a	6.00	n/a	6.74	n/a	7.00	n/a	8.00	n/a	
55.2 - 02.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (21+)	10.00	n/a	10.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 03.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP (1-10)	4.64	n/a	4.79	n/a	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
55.2 - 03.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP(11-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 03.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 01.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-2 Wire Analog (1-10)-3 Days	100%	95.00%	99.70%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.38%	95.00%	
56 - 01.2	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE -2 Wire Analog (11-20)-7 Days	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	
56 - 01.3	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD- UNE - 2 Wire Analog (20+)-10 Days	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 02.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-Digital (1-10)-3 Days	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	98.44%	95.00%	96.15%	95.00%	
56 - 03	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-DS1 Loop (includes PRI)-3 Days	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	92.11%	95.00%	94.12%	95.00%	94.52%	95.00%	
56 - 10.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-Dedicated Transport-DS3 (1-10)-3 Days	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 11	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop Projects	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56 - 12.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/No Line Share-Conditioned -10 days	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	abcd
56 - 12.2	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/No Line Share-Non Conditioned-5 Days	99.15%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56 - 13	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/Line Sharing-Parity w/ASI	99.01%	99.85%	100%	99.94%	100%	99.94%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 01.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	95.00%	99.86%	95.00%	99.73%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56.1 - 01.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56.1 - 01.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (>20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 02.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 02.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 02.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 03.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
56.1 - 03.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
56.1 - 03.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 04	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Projects Loop w/LNP (>100)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
58 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	0.75%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.44%	5.00%	
58 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	0.00%	3.97%	0.08%	1.94%	0.00%	2.01%	0.00%	1.40%	0.12%	2.36%	
58 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	0.00%	0.77%	0.00%	4.08%	5.17%	2.22%	4.17%	4.83%	3.48%	15.50%	
59 - 01	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) Inst - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	1.28%	0.00%	0.64%	0.00%	1.38%	0.00%	1.20%	n/a	1.40%	
59 - 02	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
59 - 03	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.00%	1.27%	0.00%	1.07%	1.47%	1.20%	2.08%	1.09%	1.23%	1.22%	
59 - 04	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Install - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	0.00%	6.00%	7.45%	6.00%	3.60%	6.00%	3.54%	6.00%	4.19%	6.00%	
59 - 05	% Installation Trb Reports W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop W/out Test Access	2.48%	10.11%	3.08%	9.94%	4.33%	10.48%	3.64%	10.59%	4.73%	10.15%	
59 - 06	% Installation Trouble Reports W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	0.00%	13.49%	1.32%	11.97%	7.02%	8.41%	3.03%	10.81%	1.96%	7.89%	
59 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
59 - 08	% Installation Trble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	5.75%	5.88%	6.78%	4.93%	4.69%	1.80%	1.23%	6.02%	2.42%	8.73%	
59 - 09	% Installation Trb Rpts W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	4.49%	0.00%	5.83%	0.00%	2.56%	0.00%	5.26%	n/a	10.23%	
59 - 12	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00%	2.17%	0.00%	3.81%	0.00%	0.47%	0.00%	7.14%	n/a	5.59%	
59 - 13	% Trb Rpts W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
59 - 14	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	ab
59 - 15	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
114 - 01	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)-FDT-LNP W/Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	50.00%	2.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
114 - 02	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)-CHC- LNP W/Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
114.1 - 01	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - FDT - LNP with Loop (< 10 Lines)	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
114.1 - 02	CHC/FDT LNP w/Loop Provisioning Interval - FDT - LNP with Loop (10-24 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
114.1 - 03	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - CHC - LNP with Loop (<10 lines)	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	
114.1 - 04	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - CHC - LNP with Loop (10-24 Lines)	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	
115 - 01	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
115 - 01.1	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop (>30 Min)	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
115 - 01.2	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop (>60 Min)	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
115 - 01.3	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT- LNP W/Loop (>120 Min)	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
115 - 02	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC- LNP W/Loop	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115 - 02.1	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>30 Min)	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	
115 - 02.2	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>60 Min)	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
115 - 02.3	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>120 Min)	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115.1 - 01	% Provisioning Trouble Reports -- FDT	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
115.1 - 02	% Provisioning Trouble Reports - CHC	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
IN 1 - 01	% Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date - DSL Loops w/out Line Sharing	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	b
MI 3 - 01	Coordination Conversions Started w/in 1 Hour of Scheduled Time	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
	Maintenance											
37 - 01	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	2.04	2.13	1.70	2.33	2.02	3.06	1.96	2.68	2.83	3.84	
37 - 02	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	0.59	0.77	0.70	0.76	0.67	0.88	0.83	0.81	1.04	1.01	
37 - 03	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	1.43	2.13	1.30	2.33	1.74	3.06	1.61	2.68	2.30	3.84	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
37 - 04	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	0.98	0.77	0.94	0.76	1.08	0.88	0.90	0.81	1.82	1.01	
37.1 - 01	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-POTS-Res	1.32	2.13	0.97	2.27	1.02	3.15	1.02	2.71	1.40	4.18	
37.1 - 02	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-POTS-Bus	0.48	0.82	0.50	0.80	0.56	1.01	0.76	0.90	0.97	1.18	
37.1 - 03	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-UNE-P-Res	1.03	2.13	0.94	2.27	1.31	3.15	0.92	2.71	1.63	4.18	
37.1 - 04	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-UNE-P Bus	0.71	0.82	0.73	0.80	0.92	1.01	0.69	0.90	1.45	1.18	
38 - 01	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch	0.74%	5.63%	1.40%	4.60%	2.39%	5.52%	3.14%	6.69%	5.35%	9.83%	
38 - 02	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	0.00%	0.52%	2.33%	0.66%	0.00%	0.65%	0.00%	0.91%	3.57%	1.30%	
38 - 03	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch	0.00%	6.49%	0.00%	6.74%	0.00%	7.05%	9.30%	7.49%	12.50%	8.95%	
38 - 04	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch	0.00%	2.42%	25.00%	2.09%	0.00%	1.94%	0.00%	1.95%	0.00%	1.34%	abcde
38 - 05	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	2.61%	5.63%	2.06%	4.60%	2.70%	5.52%	4.48%	6.69%	7.01%	9.83%	
38 - 06	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch	0.99%	0.52%	0.87%	0.66%	2.39%	0.65%	1.24%	0.91%	0.92%	1.30%	
38 - 07	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch	4.24%	6.49%	4.62%	6.74%	2.23%	7.05%	8.86%	7.49%	5.97%	8.95%	
38 - 08	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch	0.00%	2.42%	0.00%	2.09%	2.70%	1.94%	2.50%	1.95%	0.00%	1.34%	
39 - 01	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	21.79	38.13	10.33	40.71	11.63	37.80	9.36	28.44	14.27	45.36	
39 - 02	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	8.25	15.42	7.74	13.97	9.27	17.07	8.83	16.85	10.71	26.51	
39 - 03	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	0.91	6.28	0.61	5.56	0.28	4.29	0.45	4.44	1.86	6.94	de
39 - 04	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	1.45	3.05	2.49	3.08	2.56	3.88	1.95	4.24	6.70	7.70	
39 - 05	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS-Bus-Dispatch-Affecting Service (Hrs)	9.17	25.54	11.43	30.32	7.16	28.24	16.16	19.94	13.91	39.07	
39 - 06	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	10.09	12.67	12.93	12.64	7.00	15.19	7.40	14.30	11.18	23.31	
39 - 07	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.05	3.70	3.90	3.59	0.28	3.78	0.34	4.59	0.26	6.19	abcde

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
39 - 08	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	4.57	3.11	10.42	2.82	0.00	2.99	5.71	3.21	1.78	5.59	abde
39 - 09	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	14.90	38.13	14.11	40.71	13.28	37.80	11.56	28.44	20.05	45.36	
39 - 10	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	10.15	15.42	10.72	13.97	10.75	17.07	11.71	16.85	13.90	26.51	
39 - 11	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.57	6.28	1.57	5.56	2.05	4.29	1.64	4.44	1.17	6.94	
39 - 12	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	2.72	3.05	3.20	3.08	4.19	3.88	3.55	4.24	3.72	7.70	
39 - 13	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	13.20	25.54	13.97	30.32	10.86	28.24	11.11	19.94	17.07	39.07	
39 - 14	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	10.83	12.67	10.35	12.64	10.19	15.19	11.12	14.30	12.77	23.31	
39 - 15	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.10	3.70	1.24	3.59	1.02	3.78	1.25	4.59	1.42	6.19	
39 - 16	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	2.39	3.11	6.16	2.82	2.72	2.99	4.41	3.21	1.95	5.59	
40 - 01	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - POTS - Residence	100%	97.37%	100%	97.84%	98.89%	95.87%	98.31%	94.92%	99.18%	93.22%	
40 - 02	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - POTS - Business	97.22%	97.25%	100%	96.86%	100%	95.50%	100%	94.64%	98.86%	92.18%	
40 - 03	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - UNE-P Res	99.35%	97.37%	99.69%	97.84%	98.57%	95.87%	97.54%	94.92%	98.47%	93.22%	
40 - 04	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - UNE-P Bus	98.27%	97.25%	98.34%	96.86%	99.30%	95.50%	98.12%	94.64%	98.63%	92.18%	
41 - 01	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	2.27%	10.23%	5.04%	10.13%	3.57%	10.84%	4.56%	10.74%	5.54%	11.49%	
41 - 02	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	5.26%	9.68%	15.22%	10.23%	6.98%	10.65%	5.88%	10.13%	7.94%	10.16%	
41 - 03	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	6.90%	10.23%	5.60%	10.13%	6.38%	10.84%	5.46%	10.74%	6.97%	11.49%	
41 - 04	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	7.19%	9.68%	2.94%	10.23%	5.09%	10.65%	2.53%	10.13%	13.20%	10.16%	
53 - 01	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	29.41%	0.00%	15.79%	0.00%	5.56%	n/a	25.00%	
53 - 02	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	14.43%	0.00%	19.77%	0.00%	19.03%	0.00%	17.16%	0.00%	16.53%	e
53 - 03	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	n/a	25.00%	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
53 - 04	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	21.21%	0.00%	11.30%	0.00%	10.48%	n/a	14.00%	ab
53 - 05	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	25.42%	0.00%	23.33%	0.00%	21.05%	0.00%	29.55%	n/a	27.42%	
53 - 06	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.00%	n/a	25.93%	
53 - 07	% Repeat Reports - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	16.06%	0.00%	17.28%	0.00%	14.45%	0.00%	18.24%	n/a	15.73%	
53 - 08	% Repeat Reports - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.00%	n/a	25.93%	
54 - 01	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00	1.47	0.00	1.60	0.00	1.81	0.00	1.72	0.00	1.92	abcde
54 - 02	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00	2.37	0.00	2.11	0.00	2.68	0.00	2.84	16.67	3.42	abcde
54 - 03	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.25	n/a	0.42	
54 - 04	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	2.20	0.40	1.10	0.35	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.54	
54 - 05	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00	3.23	0.00	1.66	0.00	4.26	0.00	2.50	0.00	3.55	
54 - 06	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.93	
54 - 07	Failure Frequency - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00	1.59	0.00	1.35	0.00	1.46	0.00	1.36	n/a	1.55	
54 - 08	Failure Frequency - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.87	n/a	0.93	
54.1 - 01	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DDS	0.00	1.37	0.00	1.13	0.00	1.52	0.00	1.53	0.00	1.44	abcde
54.1 - 02	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DS1	0.00	1.98	0.00	1.62	0.00	2.14	0.00	2.28	16.67	2.73	abcde
54.1 - 03	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DS3	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.15	n/a	0.31	
54.1 - 04	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-VGPL	1.10	0.33	1.10	0.27	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.44	
54.1 - 05	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-ISDN BRI	0.00	2.36	0.00	1.22	0.00	3.37	0.00	1.76	0.00	2.58	
54.1 - 06	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-ISDN PRI	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.62	
54.1 - 07	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN BRI	0.00	1.16	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.17	0.00	1.02	n/a	1.20	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
54.1 - 08	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.70	n/a	0.62	
65 - 01	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.70	abcde
65 - 02	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65 - 03	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.22	0.28	0.14	0.24	0.21	0.33	0.33	0.24	0.45	0.34	
65 - 04	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	0.42	3.00	0.69	3.00	0.49	3.00	0.45	3.00	0.70	3.00	
65 - 05	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	0.64	0.77	0.66	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.74	0.00	1.01	1.01	
65 - 06	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	1.18	1.66	1.21	1.24	0.99	1.64	1.45	1.35	0.68	1.57	
65 - 07	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00	3.23	0.00	1.66	0.00	4.26	0.00	2.50	n/a	3.55	
65 - 08	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	4.35	1.91	2.30	1.81	2.20	2.20	2.42	2.28	3.22	2.71	
65 - 09	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00	2.37	0.00	2.11	0.00	2.68	0.00	2.84	0.00	3.42	abcde
65 - 12	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.45	n/a	0.54	
65 - 13	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65 - 14	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.25	0.00	0.42	
65 - 15	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.25	n/a	0.42	
65 - 16	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Interconnection Trunks	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
65.1 - 01	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports-Broadband DSL-Line Sharing	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.42	abcde
65.1 - 02	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports-Broadband DSL-No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65.1 - 03	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.22	0.28	0.14	0.24	0.07	0.18	0.13	0.09	0.26	0.16	
65.1 - 04	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports- DSL Loops - No line Sharing	0.36	3.00	0.45	3.00	0.31	3.00	0.27	3.00	0.38	3.00	
65.1 - 05	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - 8.0 dB Loop W/out Test Access	0.56	0.60	0.55	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.66	0.00	0.85	0.81	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
65.1 - 06	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - BRI Loop with Test Access	1.10	1.24	1.07	0.91	0.71	1.31	1.31	1.01	0.55	1.20	
65.1 - 07	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - ISDN BRI Port	0.00	2.36	0.00	1.22	0.00	3.37	0.00	1.76	n/a	2.58	
65.1 - 08	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS1 Loop with Test Access	3.32	1.58	1.84	1.43	1.85	1.79	2.17	1.83	2.99	2.13	
65.1 - 09	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00	1.98	0.00	1.62	0.00	2.14	0.00	2.28	0.00	2.73	abcde
65.1 - 12	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Analog Trunk Port	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.39	n/a	0.44	
65.1 - 14	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.15	0.00	0.31	
65.1 - 15	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.15	n/a	0.31	
65.1 - 16	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Interconnection Trunks	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
66 - 01	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	12.82%	0.00%	4.69%	0.00%	8.33%	n/a	2.75%	
66 - 02	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
66 - 03	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - DSL - Line Sharing	33.33%	5.00%	0.00%	8.11%	0.00%	7.62%	0.00%	10.98%	14.29%	9.68%	abcde
66 - 04	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - 2 Wire Analog 8db Loop	1.26%	5.38%	6.36%	5.52%	3.08%	5.91%	7.48%	6.40%	7.99%	7.26%	
67 - 01	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (Hrs)	0.00	11.01	0.00	22.85	0.00	13.07	0.00	15.20	n/a	10.49	
67 - 02	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (Hrs)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 03	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	29.93	14.86	4.17	14.66	13.90	15.80	2.38	15.28	17.21	13.67	abcde
67 - 04	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	3.94	9.00	6.61	9.00	3.79	9.00	6.24	9.00	3.37	9.00	
67 - 05	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	6.33	20.14	8.20	20.24	8.99	20.59	10.24	17.82	10.79	29.11	
67 - 06	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	8.56	13.26	8.12	30.08	8.15	16.15	5.87	19.84	2.12	23.56	e
67 - 07	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	9.59	0.00	12.31	0.00	8.39	0.00	11.52	n/a	12.03	
67 - 08	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	4.44	6.54	4.24	8.04	4.54	7.34	6.69	8.94	6.26	7.23	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
67 - 09	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	6.54	0.00	8.08	0.00	7.46	0.00	9.02	n/a	7.29	
67 - 12	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	7.93	0.00	5.70	0.00	6.21	0.00	7.37	n/a	8.77	
67 - 14	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.00	2.78	0.00	3.74	0.00	4.14	n/a	4.20	
67 - 15	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (Hrs)-Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.00	2.78	0.00	3.74	0.00	4.14	n/a	4.20	
67 - 16	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (Hrs)	0.00	1.76	0.00	0.77	0.00	1.45	0.00	1.90	n/a	2.67	
67 - 17	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (Hrs)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 18	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	1.65	2.95	2.00	2.18	1.72	1.94	2.52	1.81	6.77	2.98	abcde
67 - 19	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.70	9.00	0.60	9.00	0.38	9.00	1.11	9.00	bcde
67 - 20	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.22	5.04	1.32	4.71	2.71	4.74	1.40	5.00	2.20	8.69	
67 - 21	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.75	3.43	1.10	6.40	0.98	3.00	2.18	4.80	1.42	5.28	abcde
67 - 22	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	1.96	0.00	1.99	0.00	1.96	0.00	1.57	n/a	2.76	
67 - 23	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.94	1.77	0.78	1.74	1.42	1.81	1.76	1.93	1.30	2.00	bcde
67 - 24	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	1.66	0.00	1.84	0.00	1.67	0.00	1.85	n/a	1.90	
67 - 25	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (Hrs)-No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 27	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	2.14	0.00	2.30	0.00	1.87	0.00	1.65	n/a	3.27	
67 - 29	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	0.80	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	1.46	n/a	n/a	
67 - 30	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (Hrs)-No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	1.46	n/a	n/a	
69 - 01	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	6.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%	n/a	9.17%	
69 - 02	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
69 - 03	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.00%	1.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	3.66%	14.29%	4.84%	abcde

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
69 - 04	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	14.29%	12.00%	7.41%	12.00%	8.70%	12.00%	13.33%	12.00%	5.88%	12.00%	
69 - 05	% Repeat Reports - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	5.25%	10.21%	5.09%	10.36%	4.57%	10.93%	4.68%	10.72%	7.17%	11.40%	
69 - 06	% Repeat Reports - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	6.25%	18.10%	5.88%	18.13%	0.00%	15.70%	0.00%	20.44%	10.00%	18.27%	
69 - 07	% Repeat Reports - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00%	25.42%	0.00%	23.33%	0.00%	21.05%	0.00%	29.55%	n/a	27.42%	
69 - 08	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	11.90%	14.16%	4.00%	17.65%	4.00%	17.27%	6.90%	16.16%	0.00%	17.45%	
69 - 09	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	14.43%	0.00%	19.77%	0.00%	19.03%	0.00%	17.16%	n/a	16.53%	
69 - 12	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	21.21%	0.00%	11.30%	0.00%	10.48%	n/a	14.00%	
69 - 14	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	n/a	25.00%	
69 - 15	% Repeat Reportss - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	n/a	25.00%	
69 - 16	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Interconnection Trunks	0.00%	57.97%	0.00%	7.41%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	ae
	OS/DA											
80 - 01	Directory Assistance Avg Speed of Answer (Sec)	5.45	7.70	7.04	7.70	7.76	7.70	7.37	7.70	7.23	20.00	
82 - 01	Operator Services Speed of Answer (Sec)	2.84	3.30	4.55	3.30	4.50	3.30	4.50	3.30	4.49	20.00	
110 - 01	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database w/in 72 Hrs for Facility-Based CLECs	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
112 - 01	% DA Database Accuracy for Manual Updates for Facility-Based CLECs	100%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	
113 - 01	% of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process w/out Manual Intervention	100%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	
	Collocation											
70 - 01	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech End Office to CLEC End Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
70 - 02	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech Tandem to CLEC End Office	0.07%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.01%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
70.2 - 01	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech Tandem to CLEC End Office	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.35%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.36%	n/a	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
70.2 - 02	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech End Office to CLEC End Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 01	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-911	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 02	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-OS/DA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 03	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-SS7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 04	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-Non-Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
73 - 05	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
78 - 01	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.00	20.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
78 - 02	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	n/a	n/a	10.00	20.00	0.00	20.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	b
78 - 03	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20.00	
78 - 04	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	13.68	20.00	12.36	20.00	14.50	20.00	13.47	20.00	12.79	20.00	c
107 - 01	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Caged	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
107 - 02	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Shared Caged	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 03	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Caged Common	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 04	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Cageless	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	abc
107 - 05	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Adjacent On-Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 06	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Adjacent Off-Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 07	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Virtual	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	
107 - 08	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Augments to Physical Collocation	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	ac
107 - 09	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Augments to Virtual	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	n/a	c
108 - 01	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Physical	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
108 - 02	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Virtual	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	n/a	6.00	
108 - 03	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Additions	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
108 - 04	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Cageless	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	n/a	6.00	
109 - 01	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Physical	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
109 - 02	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Virtual	0.00%	90.00%	0.00%	90.00%	0.00%	90.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
109 - 03	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Additions	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	ade
109 - 04	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Cageless	0.00%	90.00%	0.00%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	n/a	n/a	cd
MI 4 - 01	Avg Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement - Physical Collocation (Days)	39.40	n/a	69.00	n/a	74.00	n/a	0.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	abc
	Miscellaneous											
96 - 01	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP Only	0.32%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
96 - 02	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP w/ Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
MI 14 - 01	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-Resale Manual-Next Day	89.46%	95.00%	98.18%	95.00%	96.71%	95.00%	84.34%	95.00%	97.29%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 02	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	b
MI 14 - 03	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-UNE Loops Manual-Next Day	96.72%	95.00%	99.52%	95.00%	89.24%	95.00%	85.04%	95.00%	79.91%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 04	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic	91.18%	95.00%	87.84%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	99.81%	95.00%	99.52%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 05	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-UNE P Manual-Next Day	91.00%	95.00%	96.81%	95.00%	96.77%	95.00%	88.05%	95.00%	97.26%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 06	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic	100%	95.00%	98.86%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.96%	95.00%	99.87%	95.00%	
MI 15 - 01	Change Management - Changes to Existing Interfaces (days) - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
MI 15 - 02	Change Management - Changes to Existing Interfaces (days) - GUI	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	95.00%	bcd
MI 15 - 03	Change Management - Introductions of New Interfaces (days) - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

INDIANA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
MI 15 - 04	Change Management - Introductions of New Interfaces (days) - GUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 05	Change Management - Retirements of Existing Interfaces (days) - Wholesale Interfaces - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 06	Change Management - Retirements of Existing Interfaces (days) - Wholesale Interfaces - GUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Abbreviations:

n/a = No Activity.

Notes: a = Sample Size under 10 for March.
b = Sample Size under 10 for April.
c = Sample Size under 10 for May.
d = Sample Size under 10 for June.
e = Sample Size under 10 for July.

Appendix D

Ohio Performance Metrics

All data included here are taken from the Ohio Carrier-to-Carrier Reports. This table is provided as a reference tool for the convenience of the reader. No conclusions are to be drawn from the raw data contained in this table. Our analysis is based on the totality of the circumstances, such that we may use non-metric evidence, and may rely more heavily on some metrics more than others, in making our determination. The inclusion of these particular metrics in this table does not necessarily mean that we relied on all of these metrics nor that other metrics may not also be important in our analysis. Some metrics that we have relied on in the past and may rely on for a future application were not included here because there was no data provided for them (usually either because there was no activity, or because the metrics are still under development). Metrics with no retail analog provided are usually compared with a benchmark. Note that for some metrics during the period provided, there may be changes in the metric definition, or changes in the retail analog applied, making it difficult to compare the data over time.

PERFORMANCE METRICS CATAGORIES

Metric Number	Metric Name
	Pre-Ordering
1.1	Avg Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information
1.2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders
4	OSS Interface Availability
	Billing
14	Billing Accuracy
15	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills
16	% Usage Records Transmitted Correctly
17	Billing Completeness
19	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness
	Ordering
5	% FOCs Returned w/in x Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req
7.1	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion
9	% Rejects
10	% Rejects Returned w/in x Hour
10.1	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned w/in 5 Hrs
10.3	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned w/in 5 Hrs
10.4	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects
11.1	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (Hrs)
11.2	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (Hrs)
12	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy

Metric Number	Metric Name
13	Order Process % Flow Through
MI 13	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 13.1	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications
MI 9	% Missing FOCs
	Provisioning
27	Mean Installation Interval - POTS
28	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date
29	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
35	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install
43	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials
44	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials
45	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials
46	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials
55	Avg Installation Interval
55.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP
56	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD
56.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD
59	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) Inst
114	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval
115	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers

PERFORMANCE METRICS CATAGORIES

Metric Number	Metric Name
115.1	% Provisioning Trouble Reports
IN 1	% Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date - DSL Loops w/out Line Sharing
MI 3	Coordination Conversions Started w/in 1 Hour of Scheduled Time
	Maintenance
37	Trouble Report Rate
37.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports
38	% Missed Repair Commitments
39	Rcpt to Clear Duration
40	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs
41	% Repeat Reports
53	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials
54	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials
54.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials
65	Trouble Report Rate
65.1	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports
66	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE
67	Mean Time to Restore
69	% Repeat Reports

Metric Number	Metric Name
	OS/DA
80	Directory Assistance Avg Speed of Answer (Sec)
82	Operator Services Speed of Answer (Sec)
112	% Directory Assistance Database Accuracy for Manual Updates
113	% of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process w/out Manual Intervention
	Collocation
70	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech
70.2	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech
73	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks
78	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval
107	% Missed Collocation Due Dates
108	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates
109	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines
MI 4	Avg Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement - Physical
	Miscellaneous
96	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders
MI 14	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt
MI 15	Change Management

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
	Pre-Ordering											
1.1 - 01	Avg Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information	0.59	0.57	0.60	0.59	0.52	0.82	0.48	0.51	0.53	0.47	
1.2 - 01	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
1.2 - 02	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
2 - 34	% Response Received w/in 10 Sec--OSS Interface--Address Verification	98.77%	95.00%	98.98%	95.00%	99.11%	95.00%	97.23%	95.00%	98.42%	95.00%	
2 - 35	% Response Received w/in 10 Sec--OSS Interface--Telephone Number Assignment	97.96%	95.00%	98.14%	95.00%	99.41%	95.00%	97.12%	95.00%	98.28%	95.00%	
2 - 36	% Response Received w/in 15 Sec-OSS Interface-Customer Service Inquiries < or = 30 WTNs/lines	97.41%	95.00%	98.40%	95.00%	99.17%	95.00%	97.18%	95.00%	98.76%	95.00%	
2 - 37	% Response Received w/in 60 Sec--OSS Interface--Customer Service Inquiries > 30 WTNs/lines	85.34%	n/a	93.31%	n/a	89.39%	n/a	89.97%	n/a	94.00%	95.00%	
2 - 38	% Response Received w/in 13 Sec--OSS Interface--Service Availability	100%	95.00%	99.89%	95.00%	99.87%	95.00%	99.91%	95.00%	99.30%	95.00%	
2 - 39	% Response Received w/in 5 Sec--OSS Interface--Service Appointment Scheduling (Due Date)	99.01%	95.00%	99.39%	95.00%	99.79%	95.00%	99.21%	95.00%	99.31%	95.00%	
2 - 40	% Response Received w/in 19 Sec--OSS Interface--Dispatch Required	99.61%	95.00%	99.85%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.93%	95.00%	99.87%	95.00%	
2 - 41	% Response Received w/in 25 Sec--OSS Interface--PIC	98.94%	95.00%	99.58%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	98.17%	95.00%	99.10%	95.00%	
2 - 42	%Response Recd w/in 30 Sec-OSS Interface-Actual LMU Information requested (5 or less loops searched)	77.38%	95.00%	87.10%	95.00%	92.53%	95.00%	97.81%	95.00%	96.93%	95.00%	
2 - 43	%Resp Recd w/in 60Sec-OSS Interface-Actual LMU Information requested (greater than 5 loops searched)	n/a	n/a	72.86%	95.00%	63.08%	95.00%	59.23%	95.00%	53.56%	95.00%	
2 - 44	% Resp Recd w/in 15 Sec-OSS Interface-Design LMU Information requested (incl Pre-Qual transactions)	99.34%	95.00%	99.12%	95.00%	99.52%	95.00%	98.04%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
2 - 45	% Response Received w/in 4 Sec-OSS Interface-Protocol Translation Time-EDI (input & output)	98.88%	95.00%	98.89%	95.00%	72.46%	95.00%	96.61%	95.00%	91.33%	95.00%	
2 - 46	% Response Received w/in 1 Sec-OSS Interface-Protocol Translation Time-CORBA (input & output)	99.51%	95.00%	99.73%	95.00%	99.59%	95.00%	99.83%	95.00%	99.69%	95.00%	
2 - 47	% Response Received w/in 1 Sec-OSS Interfac--Protocol Translation Time-Web Verigate (input & output)	99.88%	n/a	99.86%	n/a	99.87%	n/a	99.87%	n/a	99.87%	n/a	
4 - 01	OSS Interface Availability - TCNET	100%	99.50%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 02	OSS Interface Availability - AEMS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
4 - 04	OSS Interface Availablity - EB/TA	99.91%	99.50%	99.98%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	99.99%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	
4 - 05	OSS Interface Availability - EB/TA - GUI	100%	99.50%	99.97%	99.50%	99.80%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.64%	99.50%	
4 - 06	OSS Interface Availability - ARIS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 07	OSS Interface Availability - BOP - GUI	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 08	OSS Interface Availability - Web Verigate	99.83%	99.50%	99.57%	99.50%	99.93%	99.50%	99.68%	99.50%	99.71%	99.50%	
4 - 09	OSS Interface Availability -- Web LEX	99.83%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.92%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 10	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI LSOG 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 11	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (Van)	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 12	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (SSL3)	99.98%	99.50%	99.87%	99.50%	99.99%	99.50%	99.98%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 13	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (NDM)	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 14	OSS Interface Availability -- Web Toolbar	99.89%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.94%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 15	OSS Interface Availability -- ARAF	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 16	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Pre-Order	99.86%	99.50%	99.07%	99.50%	99.95%	99.50%	99.44%	99.50%	99.75%	99.50%	
4 - 17	OSS Interface Availability -- CORBA Pre-Order	99.84%	99.50%	99.07%	99.50%	99.95%	99.50%	99.44%	99.50%	99.71%	99.50%	
4 - 18	OSS Interface Availability -- AEMS LSOG 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Billing											
14 - 01	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring / Non-recurring	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.92%	0.08%	0.00%	0.06%	
14 - 02	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	0.00%	3.52%	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	
14 - 03	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.95%	0.00%	0.79%	0.00%	1.97%	0.00%	
15 - 01	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills--EDI	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
15 - 02	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills--BDT	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	
16 - 01	% Usage Records Transmitted Correctly	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.97%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
17 - 02	Billing Completeness--Lineshare	98.55%	98.20%	96.89%	96.86%	98.40%	96.68%	99.23%	97.83%	99.07%	97.33%	
17 - 03	Billing Completeness--UNE-P	99.42%	98.79%	99.34%	99.16%	99.21%	99.07%	99.52%	97.20%	99.19%	98.46%	
17 - 04	Billing Completeness--Resale	97.73%	100%	99.15%	99.16%	99.57%	99.07%	98.60%	97.20%	99.26%	98.46%	
17 - 05	Billing Completeness--All Other Products (UNE, EOI, ULT, EELs)	99.63%	100%	97.76%	99.16%	99.15%	99.07%	99.79%	97.20%	99.70%	98.46%	
18 - 03	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)-Electronic	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
18 - 04	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)-Paper	100%	95.00%	99.88%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
19 - 01	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	99.94%	95.00%	99.97%	95.00%	99.96%	95.00%	99.96%	95.00%	99.95%	95.00%	
	Ordering											
5 - 01	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus	98.61%	95.00%	98.47%	95.00%	97.88%	95.00%	98.80%	95.00%	99.07%	95.00%	
5 - 02	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus	99.54%	95.00%	99.28%	95.00%	97.45%	95.00%	92.96%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 03	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	95.74%	94.00%	98.48%	94.00%	98.75%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 04	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 05	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops)	99.73%	95.00%	99.14%	95.00%	97.90%	95.00%	96.82%	95.00%	99.10%	95.00%	
5 - 06	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops)	97.13%	95.00%	98.92%	95.00%	98.29%	95.00%	99.72%	95.00%	99.55%	95.00%	
5 - 07	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>49 Loops)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a
5 - 08	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	e
5 - 09	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	d
5 - 10	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	ac

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 11	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	abcd
5 - 12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	bcde
5 - 13	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 14	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus	92.96%	95.00%	96.76%	95.00%	77.02%	95.00%	95.21%	95.00%	99.36%	95.00%	
5 - 15	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus	98.29%	95.00%	98.75%	95.00%	98.12%	95.00%	96.49%	95.00%	99.84%	95.00%	
5 - 16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 18	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 Hrs	99.38%	95.00%	99.47%	95.00%	98.56%	95.00%	99.16%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 19	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 20	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps)	99.21%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.11%	95.00%	99.69%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 21	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 22	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines)	99.39%	95.00%	98.10%	95.00%	98.33%	95.00%	91.35%	95.00%	72.73%	95.00%	
5 - 23	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	98.23%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 24	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	95.81%	95.00%	91.37%	95.00%	99.42%	95.00%	
5 - 25	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	98.29%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	96.09%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 26	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (>19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	acde
5 - 27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (>19 Loops)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	acde
5 - 28	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines)	100%	94.00%	98.70%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 29	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (>19 Lines)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 30	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 31	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus	96.77%	95.00%	######	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	bce
5 - 32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines)	80.00%	94.00%	85.71%	94.00%	50.00%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	abcde
5 - 33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops)	83.33%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	93.33%	95.00%	80.00%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	a
5 - 35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 49 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 36	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 37	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	d
5 - 38	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 39	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus	98.07%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.25%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	0.00%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	60.00%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	abc
5 - 41	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 42	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	b
5 - 43	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 44	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps)	75.00%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	94.00%	abe
5 - 45	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 46	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 47	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a
5 - 48	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 49	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (>19 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 50	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 51	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 52	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 53	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	de
5 - 54	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
7.1 - 01	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - Resale	99.18%	97.00%	99.49%	97.00%	99.27%	97.00%	99.24%	97.00%	99.16%	97.00%	
7.1 - 02	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - UNE	99.64%	97.00%	98.82%	97.00%	98.82%	97.00%	99.47%	97.00%	99.10%	97.00%	
7.1 - 03	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - UNE-P	99.54%	97.00%	99.79%	97.00%	99.56%	97.00%	99.70%	97.00%	99.36%	97.00%	
7.1 - 04	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - LNP Only	97.98%	97.00%	96.63%	97.00%	96.85%	97.00%	91.02%	97.00%	93.98%	97.00%	
9 - 01	% Rejects - CLEC Caused Rejects	12.93%	n/a	14.03%	n/a	16.44%	n/a	15.28%	n/a	13.30%	n/a	
9 - 02	% Rejects - SBC/Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders)	0.20%	n/a	0.21%	n/a	0.19%	n/a	0.11%	n/a	0.12%	n/a	
10 - 01	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	99.91%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10 - 03	% Rejects Returned Within 8 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Electronically (A/M)	n/a	n/a	98.58%	95.00%	99.35%	95.00%	99.37%	95.00%	99.46%	95.00%	
10 - 04	% Rejects Returned Within 24 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Manually (M/M)	n/a	n/a	99.07%	95.00%	97.64%	95.00%	95.92%	95.00%	98.69%	95.00%	
10.1 - 01	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Order	94.04%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.2 - 01	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned w/in 5 Hrs	93.38%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.3 - 01	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned w/in 5 Hrs	59.42%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 01	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Res - FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 02	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Res - No FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 03	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Bus - FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 04	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Bus - No FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
10.4 - 05	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Specials - FW	0.00%	5.00%	1.19%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	
10.4 - 06	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Specials - No FW	3.03%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	19.35%	5.00%	3.23%	5.00%	3.70%	5.00%	
10.4 - 07	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loops with LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 08	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loops without LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 09	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 10	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-Ps	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11 - 01	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (Hrs)	0.18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11.1 - 01	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (Hrs)	3.37	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11.2 - 01	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (Hrs)	4.48	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
12 - 01	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	98.61%	100%	98.49%	99.59%	98.13%	100%	98.31%	96.87%	97.94%	97.56%	
13 - 01	Order Process % Flow Through - UNE Loops	87.85%	95.00%	87.21%	95.00%	89.58%	95.00%	85.93%	95.00%	97.36%	95.00%	
13 - 02	Order Process % Flow Through - Resale	93.91%	97.37%	97.14%	96.07%	91.95%	96.84%	96.20%	97.72%	97.51%	98.15%	
13 - 03	Order Process % Flow Through - UNE-P	96.14%	97.37%	94.79%	96.07%	91.62%	96.84%	96.06%	97.72%	96.48%	98.15%	
13 - 04	Order Process % Flow Through - LNP	92.31%	97.37%	96.77%	96.07%	93.36%	96.84%	94.03%	97.72%	87.21%	98.15%	
13 - 05	Order Process % Flow Through - LSNP	95.90%	97.37%	81.13%	96.07%	87.97%	96.84%	97.23%	97.72%	88.69%	98.15%	
13 - 06	Order Process % Flow Through - Line Sharing	97.68%	97.37%	98.57%	96.07%	90.52%	96.84%	93.58%	97.72%	94.34%	98.15%	
MI 9 - 01	% Missing FOCs - Resale	0.36%	n/a	0.06%	n/a	0.15%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 9 - 02	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, & LSNP)	0.00%	n/a	0.11%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.03%	n/a	
MI 9 - 03	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P	0.29%	n/a	0.37%	n/a	0.03%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 13 - 01	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
MI 13 - 02	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 03	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 04	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 05	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--All	99.25%	97.00%	99.40%	97.00%	99.36%	97.00%	99.43%	97.00%	99.44%	97.00%	
MI 13 - 06	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--SBC Winback	99.49%	97.00%	99.84%	97.00%	99.77%	97.00%	99.76%	97.00%	99.83%	97.00%	
MI 13 - 07	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--CLEC-to-CLEC	98.87%	97.00%	98.53%	97.00%	98.72%	97.00%	98.82%	97.00%	98.77%	97.00%	
MI 13.1 - 01	Average Delays Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--All	7.07	n/a	8.47	n/a	4.84	n/a	7.74	n/a	4.41	n/a	
MI 13.1 - 02	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--SBC Winback	9.61	n/a	17.12	n/a	13.91	n/a	14.08	n/a	9.69	n/a	
MI 13.1 - 03	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--CLEC-to-CLEC	5.24	n/a	6.64	n/a	2.48	n/a	5.35	n/a	3.14	n/a	
	Provisioning											
27 - 01	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res - FW (Days)	1.35	2.31	1.48	2.34	1.61	2.58	1.68	2.84	2.01	3.30	
27 - 02	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res - No FW (Days)	0.24	0.84	0.29	0.86	0.32	0.96	0.16	0.99	0.15	0.98	
27 - 03	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus - FW (Days)	2.50	2.71	2.29	2.72	1.64	2.96	2.88	3.17	2.85	3.41	
27 - 04	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus - No FW (Days)	0.10	0.76	0.21	0.75	0.18	0.68	0.29	0.69	0.20	0.60	
27 - 05	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Res - FW (Days)	2.08	2.31	2.41	2.34	2.94	2.58	2.67	2.84	2.73	3.30	
27 - 06	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Res - No FW (Days)	0.38	0.84	0.40	0.86	0.32	0.96	0.19	0.99	0.43	0.98	
27 - 07	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Bus - FW (Days)	2.40	2.71	2.30	2.72	2.41	2.96	2.29	3.17	1.98	3.41	
27 - 08	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Bus - No FW (Days)	0.26	0.76	0.33	0.75	0.26	0.68	0.24	0.69	0.16	0.60	
27 - 09	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex - FW (Days)	0.00	2.79	0.00	3.06	0.00	2.84	0.00	3.34	n/a	3.34	
27 - 10	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex - No FW (Days)	0.75	4.00	1.30	4.00	0.75	4.00	n/a	n/a	0.00	4.00	ace

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
28 - 01	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res - FW	100%	97.73%	99.74%	97.29%	100%	97.41%	99.55%	97.20%	99.32%	96.35%	
28 - 02	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res - No FW	98.45%	97.00%	97.12%	97.00%	99.05%	97.00%	97.78%	97.00%	98.01%	97.00%	
28 - 03	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus - FW	100%	98.11%	92.86%	97.66%	92.86%	98.25%	100%	97.33%	100%	96.88%	
28 - 04	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus - No FW	95.52%	97.00%	95.22%	97.00%	92.73%	97.00%	86.18%	97.00%	95.80%	97.00%	
28 - 05	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Res - FW	99.45%	97.73%	99.56%	97.29%	99.50%	97.41%	99.06%	97.20%	99.21%	96.35%	
28 - 06	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Res - No FW	98.14%	97.00%	98.62%	97.00%	98.66%	97.00%	98.95%	97.00%	98.54%	97.00%	
28 - 07	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Bus - FW	100%	98.11%	98.66%	97.66%	98.49%	98.25%	98.50%	97.33%	98.50%	96.88%	
28 - 08	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Bus - No FW	96.08%	97.00%	96.77%	97.00%	94.86%	97.00%	96.00%	97.00%	98.16%	97.00%	
28 - 09	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex - FW	0.00%	97.91%	100%	94.58%	0.00%	98.98%	0.00%	96.04%	n/a	96.36%	b
28 - 10	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex - No FW	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	ace
28 - 11	% Installs Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	abd
29 - 01	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res - FW	0.00%	2.00%	0.22%	2.36%	0.00%	2.25%	0.40%	2.43%	0.62%	3.18%	
29 - 02	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res - No FW	0.06%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	
29 - 03	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus - FW	0.00%	1.76%	5.88%	2.07%	4.35%	1.59%	0.00%	2.20%	0.00%	3.13%	
29 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus - No FW	0.41%	3.00%	0.77%	3.00%	0.55%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	
29 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Res - FW	0.37%	2.00%	0.34%	2.36%	0.33%	2.25%	0.65%	2.43%	0.81%	3.18%	
29 - 06	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Res - No FW	0.03%	3.00%	0.03%	3.00%	0.04%	3.00%	0.04%	3.00%	0.04%	3.00%	
29 - 07	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Bus - FW	0.00%	1.76%	1.47%	2.07%	1.26%	1.59%	0.93%	2.20%	1.52%	3.13%	
29 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Bus - No FW	0.18%	3.00%	0.12%	3.00%	0.13%	3.00%	0.14%	3.00%	0.16%	3.00%	
35 - 01	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	5.11%	10.74%	7.81%	11.05%	7.14%	11.29%	6.02%	12.25%	5.61%	15.32%	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
35 - 02	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	3.22%	5.26%	2.02%	5.22%	1.58%	5.97%	3.69%	6.28%	2.43%	7.01%	
35 - 03	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	5.26%	9.55%	23.53%	9.95%	4.35%	10.05%	13.64%	10.61%	12.50%	11.90%	
35 - 04	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	2.47%	4.45%	1.03%	4.39%	4.40%	4.40%	3.94%	5.31%	5.19%	6.36%	
35 - 05	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	10.02%	10.74%	10.13%	11.05%	8.41%	11.29%	8.46%	12.25%	9.08%	15.32%	
35 - 06	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	2.03%	5.26%	1.98%	5.22%	1.99%	5.97%	1.85%	6.28%	2.74%	7.01%	
35 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	8.74%	9.55%	13.60%	9.95%	11.99%	10.05%	6.50%	10.61%	10.13%	11.90%	
35 - 08	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	2.46%	4.45%	1.98%	4.39%	2.07%	4.40%	2.03%	5.31%	2.85%	6.36%	
43 - 01	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DDS (days)	0.00	6.94	0.00	8.05	0.00	5.55	0.00	6.33	n/a	7.50	
43 - 02	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DS1 (days)	13.79	10.31	14.53	10.00	8.50	10.05	0.00	10.62	n/a	10.16	c
43 - 03	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DS3 (days)	0.00	17.38	0.00	12.79	0.00	13.50	0.00	11.95	n/a	12.15	
43 - 04	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL (days)	0.00	8.57	0.00	8.59	4.00	5.62	7.00	8.72	4.88	7.59	d
43 - 05	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI (days)	0.00	12.33	0.00	11.50	0.00	13.88	0.00	11.40	n/a	13.57	
43 - 06	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI (days)	5.00	12.04	14.08	13.88	2.00	13.88	0.00	12.05	n/a	12.26	ac
43 - 07	Avg Installation Interval - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI (days)	0.00	4.53	0.00	4.55	0.00	4.31	0.00	4.19	n/a	3.57	
43 - 08	Avg Installation Interval-Design-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI (days)	4.00	12.04	12.00	13.88	0.00	13.88	13.00	12.05	14.50	12.26	abde
43 - 09	Avg Installation Interval - Design - UNE Loop & Port - Other Combinations (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
43 - 10	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - Other Services Avail for Resale (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
44 - 01	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	
44 - 02	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	14.29%	99.53%	100%	98.68%	0.00%	99.16%	0.00%	99.09%	n/a	98.56%	ac
44 - 03	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
44 - 04	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	100%	0.00%	95.58%	0.00%	99.47%	0.00%	99.63%	100%	96.33%	
44 - 05	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	
44 - 06	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	100%	93.55%	100%	95.24%	100%	94.00%	0.00%	71.43%	n/a	72.57%	ac
44 - 07	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN BRI	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	98.28%	0.00%	100%	n/a	97.10%	
44 - 08	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	100%	93.55%	100%	95.24%	0.00%	94.00%	33.33%	71.43%	50.00%	72.57%	abde
44 - 09	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - UNE Loop & Port - Other Combinations	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
44 - 10	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - Other Svcs Avail for Resale	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
45 - 01	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 02	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	75.00%	0.69%	0.00%	1.44%	0.00%	1.24%	0.00%	1.14%	n/a	2.50%	abc
45 - 03	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	0.77%	0.00%	4.56%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	0.56%	0.00%	1.93%	d
45 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 06	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	2.02%	0.00%	2.42%	0.00%	4.08%	0.00%	22.76%	n/a	22.14%	bc
45 - 07	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	0.95%	0.00%	0.68%	0.00%	0.75%	0.00%	1.28%	n/a	1.15%	
45 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates-Design-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00%	2.02%	0.00%	2.42%	0.00%	4.08%	66.67%	22.76%	33.33%	22.14%	abcde
46 - 01	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	27.27%	0.00%	45.45%	n/a	14.29%	
46 - 02	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	5.15%	0.00%	5.62%	100%	14.42%	0.00%	9.88%	n/a	9.30%	abc
46 - 03	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	2.50%	0.00%	4.08%	0.00%	7.27%	0.00%	3.45%	n/a	16.67%	
46 - 04	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	5.75%	0.00%	4.36%	0.00%	1.73%	0.00%	2.26%	0.00%	4.35%	d
46 - 05	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
46 - 06	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	3.23%	0.00%	3.25%	0.00%	4.79%	0.00%	0.88%	n/a	0.00%	bc
46 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	5.43%	0.00%	5.82%	0.00%	5.26%	0.00%	4.70%	n/a	6.54%	
46 - 08	% Trbl Rpts w/in 30 Days of Install - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00%	3.23%	0.00%	3.25%	0.00%	4.79%	0.00%	0.88%	0.00%	0.00%	abcde
55 - 01.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (1-10) (days)	3.07	3.00	2.86	3.00	3.07	3.00	2.79	3.00	2.71	3.00	
55 - 01.2	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) (days)	6.88	7.00	8.02	7.00	6.76	7.00	7.45	7.00	4.65	7.00	
55 - 01.3	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (20+) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6.00	10.00	
55 - 02.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (1-10) (days)	2.69	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.88	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	bcde
55 - 02.2	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (11-20) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 02.3	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (20+) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 03	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - DS1 loop (includes PRI) (days)	4.60	3.00	4.11	3.00	4.42	3.00	4.13	3.00	6.27	3.00	
55 - 09.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Dedicated Transport - DS1 (1-10) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 10.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Dedicated Transport - DS3 (1-10) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 12	Avg Installation Interval - DSL Loops Requiring No Conditioning-Line Sharing	3.63	2.96	3.67	2.96	2.96	2.95	2.90	2.96	2.90	2.95	
55.2 - 01.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (1-10)	5.15	n/a	4.96	n/a	4.88	n/a	4.81	n/a	4.71	n/a	
55.2 - 01.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (11-20)	5.91	n/a	6.11	n/a	6.08	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.00	n/a	
55.2 - 01.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 02.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (1-10)	3.59	n/a	3.83	n/a	2.20	n/a	3.67	n/a	3.00	n/a	bcde
55.2 - 02.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (11-20)	n/a	n/a	7.00	n/a	7.30	n/a	7.86	n/a	9.06	n/a	
55.2 - 02.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (21+)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 03.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP (1-10)	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
55.2 - 03.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP(11-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 03.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 01.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-2 Wire Analog (1-10)-3 Days	99.15%	95.00%	98.71%	95.00%	99.35%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56 - 01.2	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE -2 Wire Analog (11-20)-7 Days	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	
56 - 01.3	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD- UNE - 2 Wire Analog (20+)-10 Days	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 02.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-Digital (1-10)-3 Days	98.57%	95.00%	97.06%	95.00%	98.72%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56 - 03	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-DS1 Loop (includes PRI)-3 Days	95.94%	95.00%	99.05%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	95.71%	95.00%	96.34%	95.00%	
56 - 10.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-Dedicated Transport-DS3 (1-10)-3 Days	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	b
56 - 11	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	a
56 - 12.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/No Line Share-Conditioned -10 days	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	bcde
56 - 12.2	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/No Line Share-Non Conditioned-5 Days	99.42%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.55%	95.00%	98.49%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56 - 13	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/Line Sharing-Parity w/ASI	99.51%	99.87%	100%	99.95%	100%	99.99%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 01.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)	99.66%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56.1 - 01.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56.1 - 01.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (>20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 02.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 02.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 02.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 03.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	bd
56.1 - 03.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
56.1 - 03.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 04	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Projects Loop w/LNP (>100)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
58 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	0.50%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.36%	5.00%	0.77%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	
58 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	0.83%	5.58%	0.00%	2.29%	0.22%	2.08%	0.00%	2.37%	0.00%	3.17%	
58 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	3.88%	1.03%	0.00%	1.66%	0.00%	2.13%	1.98%	6.77%	2.44%	8.00%	
59 - 01	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) Inst - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	1.88%	0.00%	1.44%	0.00%	1.41%	0.00%	1.15%	n/a	2.18%	a
59 - 02	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
59 - 03	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	5.26%	1.39%	2.18%	1.49%	1.06%	1.30%	1.05%	1.51%	0.49%	1.94%	
59 - 04	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Install - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	5.67%	6.00%	4.47%	6.00%	5.86%	6.00%	2.62%	6.00%	2.17%	6.00%	
59 - 05	% Installation Trb Reports W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop W/out Test Access	6.92%	11.84%	5.47%	12.28%	8.18%	12.49%	6.00%	13.10%	7.27%	12.55%	
59 - 06	% Installation Trouble Reports W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	3.80%	8.04%	3.88%	11.25%	6.02%	12.59%	9.88%	7.44%	5.80%	11.89%	
59 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
59 - 08	% Installation Trble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	5.06%	4.66%	3.42%	5.08%	4.79%	11.40%	3.51%	7.59%	6.25%	6.69%	
59 - 09	% Installation Trb Rpts W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	5.15%	0.00%	5.62%	0.00%	14.42%	0.00%	9.88%	n/a	9.30%	
59 - 12	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00%	5.75%	0.00%	4.36%	0.00%	1.73%	0.00%	2.26%	n/a	4.35%	
59 - 13	% Trb Rpts W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
59 - 14	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	2.50%	0.00%	4.08%	0.00%	7.27%	0.00%	3.45%	n/a	16.67%	bc
59 - 15	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00%	4.08%	0.00%	7.27%	0.00%	3.45%	n/a	16.67%	
114 - 01	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)-FDT-LNP W/Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	33.33%	2.00%	abde
114 - 02	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)-CHC- LNP W/Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.84%	2.00%	0.42%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
114.1 - 01	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - FDT - LNP with Loop (< 10 Lines)	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	90.00%	70.00%	90.00%	ab
114.1 - 02	CHC/FDT LNP w/Loop Provisioning Interval - FDT - LNP with Loop (10-24 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
114.1 - 03	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - CHC - LNP with Loop (<10 lines)	96.51%	90.00%	99.13%	90.00%	98.74%	90.00%	98.74%	90.00%	98.15%	90.00%	
114.1 - 04	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - CHC - LNP with Loop (10-24 Lines)	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	86.67%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	
115 - 01	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	1.00%	33.33%	2.00%	
115 - 01.1	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop (>30 Min)	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	8.00%	33.33%	8.00%	abde
115 - 01.2	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop (>60 Min)	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	33.33%	2.00%	abde
115 - 01.3	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT- LNP W/Loop (>120 Min)	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	abde
115 - 02	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC- LNP W/Loop	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.42%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115 - 02.1	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>30 Min)	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.84%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	
115 - 02.2	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>60 Min)	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.42%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
115 - 02.3	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>120 Min)	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.42%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115.1 - 01	% Provisioning Trouble Reports -- FDT	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	ab
115.1 - 02	% Provisioning Trouble Reports - CHC	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
IN 1 - 01	% Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date - DSL Loops w/out Line Sharing	97.37%	90.00%	97.56%	90.00%	94.87%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	
MI 3 - 01	Coordination Conversions Started w/in 1 Hour of Scheduled Time	100%	n/a	99.27%	n/a	97.47%	n/a	98.86%	n/a	98.24%	n/a	
	Maintenance											
37 - 01	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	1.88	2.34	1.95	2.43	2.19	2.88	1.93	2.75	2.51	3.58	
37 - 02	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	0.66	0.86	0.58	0.85	0.64	0.90	0.60	0.85	0.88	1.05	
37 - 03	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	1.75	2.34	1.60	2.43	1.82	2.88	1.76	2.75	2.39	3.58	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
37 - 04	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	1.08	0.86	1.02	0.85	1.02	0.90	1.00	0.85	1.22	1.05	
37.1 - 01	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-POTS-Res	1.24	2.36	1.37	2.41	1.62	2.90	1.25	2.86	1.98	3.93	
37.1 - 02	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-POTS-Bus	0.57	0.89	0.53	0.87	0.57	0.93	0.59	0.90	0.87	1.17	
37.1 - 03	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-UNE-P-Res	1.24	2.36	1.17	2.41	1.43	2.90	1.27	2.86	1.90	3.93	
37.1 - 04	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-UNE-P Bus	0.94	0.89	0.87	0.87	0.85	0.93	0.88	0.90	1.07	1.17	
38 - 01	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch	1.64%	7.73%	1.06%	7.01%	4.81%	7.10%	1.48%	8.86%	0.61%	9.65%	
38 - 02	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	0.00%	0.78%	0.00%	0.84%	0.00%	0.63%	0.00%	1.04%	4.76%	1.60%	
38 - 03	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch	9.80%	10.28%	9.30%	9.06%	0.00%	9.07%	10.00%	10.38%	4.55%	11.76%	
38 - 04	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch	0.00%	2.21%	0.00%	1.55%	0.00%	1.63%	0.00%	1.44%	0.00%	1.84%	abce
38 - 05	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	4.12%	7.73%	3.25%	7.01%	2.99%	7.10%	3.68%	8.86%	5.58%	9.65%	
38 - 06	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch	1.33%	0.78%	1.02%	0.84%	0.91%	0.63%	1.48%	1.04%	1.89%	1.60%	
38 - 07	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch	5.75%	10.28%	5.75%	9.06%	2.62%	9.07%	4.45%	10.38%	4.81%	11.76%	
38 - 08	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch	1.32%	2.21%	1.56%	1.55%	1.47%	1.63%	0.00%	1.44%	1.14%	1.84%	
39 - 01	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	17.10	26.05	15.21	27.25	21.83	34.82	14.25	49.19	25.36	78.60	
39 - 02	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	12.63	16.89	10.52	15.49	11.42	16.86	12.77	18.72	16.98	25.00	
39 - 03	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	0.85	3.43	0.26	3.50	0.49	4.05	1.66	10.40	2.13	15.52	
39 - 04	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	1.74	3.67	2.32	3.66	3.25	4.12	1.36	4.93	32.76	7.98	cde
39 - 05	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS-Bus-Dispatch-Affecting Service (Hrs)	26.19	16.58	5.82	18.72	9.84	16.80	14.59	23.43	25.86	36.65	b
39 - 06	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	15.63	13.04	21.76	13.31	15.27	14.27	15.75	15.59	18.44	24.36	
39 - 07	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.28	2.76	0.50	4.42	0.35	2.44	0.29	4.72	0.08	9.30	abcde

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
39 - 08	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	2.54	1.98	0.88	2.36	1.14	2.99	1.09	3.52	2.41	4.93	abcde
39 - 09	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	13.73	26.05	14.90	27.25	15.76	34.82	21.59	49.19	36.79	78.60	
39 - 10	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	12.78	16.89	12.34	15.49	12.17	16.86	13.44	18.72	20.11	25.00	
39 - 11	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.50	3.43	1.56	3.50	2.75	4.05	3.54	10.40	3.83	15.52	
39 - 12	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	3.92	3.67	3.57	3.66	3.61	4.12	5.25	4.93	6.96	7.98	
39 - 13	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	15.09	16.58	13.32	18.72	17.34	16.80	24.86	23.43	31.26	36.65	
39 - 14	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	12.94	13.04	12.17	13.31	11.94	14.27	12.79	15.59	20.55	24.36	
39 - 15	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.63	2.76	0.43	4.42	2.13	2.44	1.61	4.72	3.78	9.30	
39 - 16	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	3.14	1.98	3.13	2.36	3.11	2.99	2.39	3.52	3.70	4.93	
40 - 01	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - POTS - Residence	96.25%	90.11%	98.01%	91.91%	97.21%	90.35%	95.59%	87.55%	89.92%	80.21%	
40 - 02	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - POTS - Business	94.74%	93.50%	89.36%	93.36%	93.10%	92.33%	92.59%	90.29%	90.10%	80.80%	
40 - 03	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - UNE-P Res	96.07%	90.11%	96.46%	91.91%	96.68%	90.35%	94.99%	87.55%	86.83%	80.21%	
40 - 04	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - UNE-P Bus	94.74%	93.50%	95.62%	93.36%	95.99%	92.33%	96.37%	90.29%	86.87%	80.80%	
41 - 01	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	6.52%	12.18%	3.65%	11.86%	9.52%	11.62%	7.59%	11.63%	7.53%	11.70%	
41 - 02	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	13.33%	11.36%	0.00%	11.01%	5.56%	10.22%	7.84%	10.67%	9.46%	10.74%	
41 - 03	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	6.73%	12.18%	6.71%	11.86%	6.40%	11.62%	6.78%	11.63%	7.62%	11.70%	
41 - 04	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	7.51%	11.36%	7.14%	11.01%	6.55%	10.22%	7.27%	10.67%	6.29%	10.74%	
53 - 01	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	19.66%	0.00%	17.21%	0.00%	19.61%	0.00%	14.58%	0.00%	13.14%	cde
53 - 02	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	46.15%	15.08%	0.00%	13.39%	0.00%	18.16%	33.33%	18.68%	6.67%	19.44%	bcd
53 - 03	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	n/a	0.00%	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
53 - 04	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	13.34%	0.00%	14.70%	0.00%	12.79%	40.00%	12.78%	n/a	10.85%	acd
53 - 05	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	12.90%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	11.90%	n/a	15.91%	b
53 - 06	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	3.45%	c
53 - 07	% Repeat Reports - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	15.12%	0.00%	16.07%	0.00%	17.53%	0.00%	16.52%	n/a	15.72%	
53 - 08	% Repeat Reports - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	3.45%	
54 - 01	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00	2.40	0.00	2.56	2.63	2.16	5.88	2.06	2.94	3.81	
54 - 02	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	11.50	2.34	5.45	2.77	4.67	2.90	5.71	2.76	14.71	4.03	
54 - 03	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00	0.58	0.00	1.17	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.68	n/a	0.59	
54 - 04	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.06	0.71	0.00	0.68	0.12	0.69	0.30	0.58	0.00	0.71	
54 - 05	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00	1.30	5.56	0.98	0.00	1.60	0.00	1.34	0.00	1.42	
54 - 06	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.44	0.85	0.67	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.42	
54 - 07	Failure Frequency - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00	1.05	0.00	0.92	0.00	1.21	0.00	0.97	0.00	1.26	abcde
54 - 08	Failure Frequency - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.42	abcde
54.1 - 01	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DDS	0.00	1.89	0.00	2.07	2.63	1.67	5.88	1.63	2.94	3.27	
54.1 - 02	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DS1	6.19	1.94	5.45	2.31	3.74	2.20	3.81	2.11	13.73	3.12	
54.1 - 03	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DS3	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.10	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.56	n/a	0.47	
54.1 - 04	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-VGPL	0.06	0.60	0.00	0.57	0.12	0.59	0.18	0.50	0.00	0.61	
54.1 - 05	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-ISDN BRI	0.00	1.09	5.56	0.82	0.00	1.31	0.00	1.18	0.00	1.19	
54.1 - 06	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-ISDN PRI	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.38	0.85	0.57	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.40	
54.1 - 07	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN BRI	0.00	0.82	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.99	abcde

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
54.1 - 08	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.40	abcde
65 - 01	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.35	n/a	0.62	
65 - 02	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65 - 03	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.47	0.26	0.28	0.24	0.15	0.25	0.28	0.32	0.13	0.42	
65 - 04	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	0.75	3.00	0.68	3.00	0.71	3.00	0.62	3.00	0.89	3.00	
65 - 05	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	0.87	0.86	0.85	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.75	0.00	1.04	0.00	
65 - 06	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	1.59	1.02	1.22	0.84	0.91	1.19	0.81	0.95	1.07	1.22	
65 - 07	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00	1.30	0.00	0.98	0.00	1.60	0.00	1.34	n/a	1.42	
65 - 08	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	3.51	1.97	2.73	2.30	2.61	2.44	3.11	2.22	3.87	3.23	
65 - 09	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00	2.34	0.43	2.77	0.00	2.90	0.43	2.76	0.00	4.03	
65 - 12	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00	0.71	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.58	n/a	0.71	
65 - 13	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65 - 14	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.47	0.58	0.00	1.17	0.48	0.56	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.59	
65 - 15	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00	1.17	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.68	n/a	0.59	
65 - 16	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Interconnection Trunks	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	
65.1 - 01	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports-Broadband DSL-Line Sharing	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.17	n/a	0.26	
65.1 - 02	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports-Broadband DSL-No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65.1 - 03	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.45	0.25	0.28	0.24	0.08	0.14	0.11	0.14	0.09	0.19	
65.1 - 04	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports- DSL Loops - No line Sharing	0.55	3.00	0.55	3.00	0.40	3.00	0.40	3.00	0.72	3.00	
65.1 - 05	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - 8.0 dB Loop W/out Test Access	0.68	0.66	0.70	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.84	0.00	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
65.1 - 06	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - BRI Loop with Test Access	1.20	0.81	0.78	0.65	0.61	0.93	0.43	0.76	0.72	0.96	
65.1 - 07	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - ISDN BRI Port	0.00	1.09	0.00	0.82	0.00	1.31	0.00	1.18	n/a	1.19	
65.1 - 08	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS1 Loop with Test Access	2.69	1.64	1.89	1.92	1.91	1.87	2.21	1.71	2.88	2.52	
65.1 - 09	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00	1.94	0.43	2.31	0.00	2.20	0.43	2.11	0.00	3.12	
65.1 - 12	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Analog Trunk Port	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.59	0.00	0.50	n/a	0.61	
65.1 - 14	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.47	0.50	0.00	1.10	0.48	0.42	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.47	
65.1 - 15	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00	1.10	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.56	n/a	0.47	
65.1 - 16	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Interconnection Trunks	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	
66 - 01	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	7.41%	0.00%	9.71%	0.00%	4.72%	0.00%	5.65%	n/a	7.79%	
66 - 02	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
66 - 03	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - DSL - Line Sharing	12.50%	9.96%	21.43%	5.39%	0.00%	7.69%	6.67%	9.33%	14.29%	11.75%	ce
66 - 04	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - 2 Wire Analog 8db Loop	5.74%	8.37%	3.80%	7.46%	5.58%	7.09%	3.92%	8.65%	4.90%	9.80%	
67 - 01	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (Hrs)	0.00	10.99	0.00	12.19	0.00	10.76	0.00	11.28	n/a	11.43	
67 - 02	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (Hrs)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 03	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	12.47	11.83	17.65	11.04	8.55	12.84	9.57	11.53	49.31	13.62	cde
67 - 04	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	5.29	9.00	6.28	9.00	3.78	9.00	4.28	9.00	5.31	9.00	
67 - 05	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	7.66	17.26	7.12	17.06	8.51	19.73	7.01	24.33	6.78	35.21	
67 - 06	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	11.46	16.57	13.00	21.82	12.24	13.47	4.82	21.10	8.71	23.24	
67 - 07	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	9.31	0.00	9.65	0.00	6.01	0.00	10.22	n/a	14.53	
67 - 08	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	4.40	6.55	5.34	6.51	5.04	6.29	5.71	7.33	5.75	7.76	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
67 - 09	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	6.55	0.00	6.51	0.00	6.29	0.00	7.33	n/a	7.76	
67 - 12	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	6.14	0.00	6.60	0.00	5.73	0.00	6.70	n/a	7.49	
67 - 14	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	2.69	0.00	1.37	1.07	4.69	0.00	4.72	n/a	2.73	c
67 - 15	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (Hrs)-Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.00	1.37	0.00	4.69	0.00	4.72	n/a	2.73	
67 - 16	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (Hrs)	0.00	2.01	0.00	0.85	0.00	1.33	0.00	2.42	n/a	2.07	
67 - 17	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (Hrs)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 18	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	5.57	1.52	8.80	1.81	2.77	1.78	6.14	2.75	n/a	2.62	bcd
67 - 19	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	0.99	9.00	1.34	9.00	0.85	9.00	0.66	9.00	0.76	9.00	abe
67 - 20	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.91	3.88	0.87	4.27	1.64	4.60	1.51	9.11	2.25	13.32	
67 - 21	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.05	3.86	1.29	3.36	1.84	2.63	1.41	3.84	3.96	3.64	abcde
67 - 22	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	1.98	0.00	2.85	0.00	1.14	0.00	3.71	n/a	1.74	
67 - 23	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.14	1.71	1.58	1.41	1.23	1.37	1.57	1.61	2.35	1.62	
67 - 24	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	1.69	0.02	1.28	0.00	1.30	0.18	1.60	n/a	1.49	bd
67 - 25	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (Hrs)-No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 27	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	3.31	0.00	2.01	0.00	2.18	0.00	2.49	n/a	2.65	
67 - 29	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.07	1.07	0.00	1.20	0.00	1.01	0.00	1.07	n/a	3.34	a
67 - 30	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (Hrs)-No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.00	1.20	0.00	1.01	0.00	1.07	n/a	3.34	
69 - 01	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.30%	0.00%	6.45%	n/a	8.23%	
69 - 02	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
69 - 03	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	4.17%	2.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.08%	13.33%	5.25%	0.00%	4.49%	ce

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
69 - 04	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	4.17%	12.00%	0.00%	12.00%	9.62%	12.00%	9.62%	12.00%	10.98%	12.00%	
69 - 05	% Repeat Reports - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	7.23%	12.40%	7.21%	11.65%	9.24%	11.41%	7.40%	11.39%	7.82%	11.47%	
69 - 06	% Repeat Reports - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	16.67%	14.79%	21.43%	15.09%	9.52%	16.10%	5.26%	16.34%	16.00%	16.21%	
69 - 07	% Repeat Reports - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	12.90%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	11.90%	n/a	15.91%	
69 - 08	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	15.33%	14.20%	26.77%	12.87%	21.31%	17.15%	23.49%	18.09%	21.28%	18.98%	
69 - 09	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	15.08%	0.00%	13.39%	0.00%	18.16%	0.00%	18.68%	n/a	19.44%	bd
69 - 12	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00%	13.34%	0.00%	14.70%	0.00%	12.79%	0.00%	12.78%	n/a	10.85%	
69 - 14	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	n/a	0.00%	ac
69 - 15	% Repeat Reportss - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	n/a	0.00%	
69 - 16	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Interconnection Trunks	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	8.79%	cde
	OS/DA											
80 - 01	Directory Assistance Avg Speed of Answer (Sec)	5.67	20.00	6.94	20.00	6.68	20.00	6.95	20.00	6.83	20.00	
82 - 01	Operator Services Speed of Answer (Sec)	5.83	20.00	7.51	20.00	7.69	20.00	7.34	20.00	6.72	20.00	
110 - 01	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database w/in 72 Hrs for Facility-Based CLECs	99.86%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.97%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
112 - 01	% DA Database Accuracy for Manual Updates for Facility-Based CLECs	99.61%	97.00%	99.76%	97.00%	99.87%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	99.84%	97.00%	
113 - 01	% of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process w/out Manual Intervention	97.40%	97.00%	99.27%	97.00%	98.32%	97.00%	98.79%	97.00%	99.15%	97.00%	
	Collocation											
70 - 01	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech End Office to CLEC End Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
70 - 02	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech Tandem to CLEC End Office	0.00%	1.00%	0.02%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.01%	1.00%	
70.2 - 01	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech Tandem to CLEC End Office	0.00%	n/a	0.59%	n/a	0.59%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.60%	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
70.2 - 02	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech End Office to CLEC End Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 01	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-911	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 02	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-OS/DA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 03	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-SS7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 04	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-Non-Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
73 - 05	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-Projects	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
78 - 01	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	n/a	n/a	16.67	20.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	b
78 - 02	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
78 - 03	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
78 - 04	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	11.95	20.00	14.30	20.00	15.46	20.00	13.00	20.00	15.00	20.00	e
107 - 01	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Caged	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
107 - 02	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Shared Caged	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 03	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Caged Common	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 04	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Cageless	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	5.00%	e
107 - 05	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Adjacent On-Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 06	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Adjacent Off-Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 07	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Virtual	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	
107 - 08	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Augments to Physical Collocation	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	n/a	abcd
107 - 09	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Augments to Virtual	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	
108 - 01	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Physical	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
108 - 02	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Virtual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
108 - 03	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Additions	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
108 - 04	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Cageless	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
109 - 01	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Physical	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
109 - 02	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Virtual	0.00%	90.00%	0.00%	90.00%	0.00%	90.00%	0.00%	90.00%	n/a	90.00%	
109 - 03	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Additions	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	a
109 - 04	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Cageless	n/a	n/a	0.00%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	n/a	n/a	cd
MI 4 - 01	Avg Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement - Physical Collocation (Days)	58.75	n/a	49.00	n/a	69.00	n/a	59.00	n/a	59.00	n/a	abcde
	Miscellaneous											
96 - 01	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP Only	0.00%	2.00%	3.13%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
96 - 02	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP w/ Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
MI 14 - 01	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-Resale Manual-Next Day	89.24%	95.00%	95.98%	95.00%	98.00%	95.00%	84.13%	95.00%	98.98%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 02	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic	97.92%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	97.95%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 03	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-UNE Loops Manual-Next Day	99.22%	95.00%	98.43%	95.00%	98.80%	95.00%	98.82%	95.00%	94.91%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 04	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic	92.00%	95.00%	96.80%	95.00%	94.44%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	98.07%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 05	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-UNE P Manual-Next Day	88.17%	95.00%	96.57%	95.00%	96.43%	95.00%	85.66%	95.00%	98.38%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 06	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic	98.31%	95.00%	98.36%	95.00%	98.33%	95.00%	98.14%	95.00%	99.86%	95.00%	
MI 15 - 01	Change Management - Changes to Existing Interfaces (days) - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
MI 15 - 02	Change Management - Changes to Existing Interfaces (days) - GUI	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	bcd
MI 15 - 03	Change Management - Introductions of New Interfaces (days) - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

OHIO PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
MI 15 - 04	Change Management - Introductions of New Interfaces (days) - GUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 05	Change Management - Retirements of Existing Interfaces (days) - Wholesale Interfaces - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 06	Change Management - Retirements of Existing Interfaces (days) - Wholesale Interfaces - GUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Abbreviations:

n/a = No Activity.

Notes: a = Sample Size under 10 for March.
b = Sample Size under 10 for April.
c = Sample Size under 10 for May.
d = Sample Size under 10 for June.
e = Sample Size under 10 for July.

Appendix E

Wisconsin Performance Metrics

All data included here are taken from the Wisconsin Carrier-to-Carrier Reports. This table is provided as a reference tool for the convenience of the reader. No conclusions are to be drawn from the raw data contained in this table. Our analysis is based on the totality of the circumstances, such that we may use non-metric evidence, and may rely more heavily on some metrics more than others, in making our determination. The inclusion of these particular metrics in this table does not necessarily mean that we relied on all of these metrics nor that other metrics may not also be important in our analysis. Some metrics that we have relied on in the past and may rely on for a future application were not included here because there was no data provided for them (usually either because there was no activity, or because the metrics are still under development). Metrics with no retail analog provided are usually compared with a benchmark. Note that for some metrics during the period provided, there may be changes in the metric definition, or changes in the retail analog applied, making it difficult to compare the data over time.

PERFORMANCE METRICS CATAGORIES

Metric Number	Metric Name
	Pre-Ordering
1.1	Avg Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information
1.2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders
4	OSS Interface Availability
	Billing
14	Billing Accuracy
15	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills
16	% Usage Records Transmitted Correctly
17	Billing Completeness
19	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness
	Ordering
5	% FOCs Returned w/in x Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req
7.1	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion
9	% Rejects
10	% Rejects Returned w/in x Hour
10.1	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned w/in 5 Hrs
10.3	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned w/in 5 Hrs
10.4	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects
11.1	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (Hrs)
11.2	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (Hrs)
12	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy

Metric Number	Metric Name
13	Order Process % Flow Through
MI 13	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 13.1	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications
MI 9	% Missing FOCs
	Provisioning
27	Mean Installation Interval - POTS
28	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date
29	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
35	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install
43	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials
44	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials
45	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials
46	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials
55	Avg Installation Interval
55.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP
56	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD
56.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD
59	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) Inst
114	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval
115	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers

PERFORMANCE METRICS CATAGORIES

Metric Number	Metric Name
115.1	% Provisioning Trouble Reports
IN 1	% Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date - DSL Loops w/out Line Sharing
MI 3	Coordination Conversions Started w/in 1 Hour of Scheduled Time
	Maintenance
37	Trouble Report Rate
37.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports
38	% Missed Repair Commitments
39	Rcpt to Clear Duration
40	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs
41	% Repeat Reports
53	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials
54	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials
54.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials
65	Trouble Report Rate
65.1	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports
66	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE
67	Mean Time to Restore
69	% Repeat Reports

Metric Number	Metric Name
	OS/DA
80	Directory Assistance Avg Speed of Answer (Sec)
82	Operator Services Speed of Answer (Sec)
112	% Directory Assistance Database Accuracy for Manual Updates
113	% of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process w/out Manual Intervention
	Collocation
70	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech
70.2	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech
73	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks
78	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval
107	% Missed Collocation Due Dates
108	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates
109	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines
MI 4	Avg Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement - Physical
	Miscellaneous
96	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders
MI 14	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt
MI 15	Change Management

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
	Pre-Ordering											
1.1 - 01	Avg Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information	0.46	0.60	0.54	0.37	0.66	0.42	0.53	0.58	0.67	0.51	
1.2 - 01	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
1.2 - 02	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
2 - 34	% Response Received w/in 10 Sec--OSS Interface--Address Verification	99.52%	95.00%	99.51%	95.00%	99.06%	95.00%	97.10%	95.00%	98.30%	95.00%	
2 - 35	% Response Received w/in 10 Sec--OSS Interface--Telephone Number Assignment	97.35%	95.00%	97.68%	95.00%	99.13%	95.00%	96.55%	95.00%	98.42%	95.00%	
2 - 36	% Response Received w/in 15 Sec-OSS Interface-Customer Service Inquiries < or = 30 WTNs/lines	96.74%	95.00%	97.83%	95.00%	98.78%	95.00%	96.76%	95.00%	98.30%	95.00%	
2 - 37	% Response Received w/in 60 Sec--OSS Interface--Customer Service Inquiries > 30 WTNs/lines	34.25%	n/a	78.95%	n/a	93.81%	n/a	68.48%	n/a	76.85%	95.00%	
2 - 38	% Response Received w/in 13 Sec--OSS Interface--Service Availability	99.87%	95.00%	99.67%	95.00%	99.69%	95.00%	99.10%	95.00%	99.61%	95.00%	
2 - 39	% Response Received w/in 5 Sec--OSS Interface--Service Appointment Scheduling (Due Date)	99.52%	95.00%	99.25%	95.00%	99.83%	95.00%	99.26%	95.00%	99.40%	95.00%	
2 - 40	% Response Received w/in 19 Sec--OSS Interface--Dispatch Required	99.35%	95.00%	99.50%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.73%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
2 - 41	% Response Received w/in 25 Sec--OSS Interface--PIC	97.26%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	98.25%	95.00%	99.51%	95.00%	
2 - 42	%Response Recd w/in 30 Sec-OSS Interface-Actual LMU Information requested (5 or less loops searched)	81.11%	95.00%	89.43%	95.00%	92.88%	95.00%	98.56%	95.00%	99.70%	95.00%	
2 - 43	%Resp Recd w/in 60Sec-OSS Interface-Actual LMU Information requested (greater than 5 loops searched)	n/a	n/a	71.05%	95.00%	75.96%	95.00%	73.66%	95.00%	80.54%	95.00%	
2 - 44	% Resp Recd w/in 15 Sec-OSS Interface-Design LMU Information requested (incl Pre-Qual transactions)	97.63%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.50%	95.00%	98.25%	95.00%	99.37%	95.00%	
2 - 45	% Response Received w/in 4 Sec-OSS Interface-Protocol Translation Time-EDI (input & output)	98.79%	95.00%	98.83%	95.00%	71.23%	95.00%	96.56%	95.00%	91.33%	95.00%	
2 - 46	% Response Received w/in 1 Sec-OSS Interface-Protocol Translation Time-CORBA (input & output)	99.22%	95.00%	99.53%	95.00%	99.38%	95.00%	99.83%	95.00%	99.69%	95.00%	
2 - 47	% Response Received w/in 1 Sec-OSS Interfac--Protocol Translation Time-Web Verigate (input & output)	99.86%	n/a	99.84%	n/a	99.86%	n/a	99.86%	n/a	99.87%	n/a	
4 - 01	OSS Interface Availability - TCNET	100%	99.50%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 02	OSS Interface Availability - AEMS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
4 - 04	OSS Interface Availablity - EB/TA	99.91%	99.50%	99.98%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	99.99%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	
4 - 05	OSS Interface Availability - EB/TA - GUI	100%	99.50%	99.97%	99.50%	99.80%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.64%	99.50%	
4 - 06	OSS Interface Availability - ARIS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 07	OSS Interface Availability - BOP - GUI	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 08	OSS Interface Availability - Web Verigate	99.83%	99.50%	99.57%	99.50%	99.93%	99.50%	99.68%	99.50%	99.71%	99.50%	
4 - 09	OSS Interface Availability -- Web LEX	99.83%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.92%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 10	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI LSOG 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4 - 11	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (Van)	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 12	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (SSL3)	99.98%	99.50%	99.87%	99.50%	99.99%	99.50%	99.98%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 13	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Protocol (NDM)	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 14	OSS Interface Availability -- Web Toolbar	99.89%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	99.94%	99.50%	99.79%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 15	OSS Interface Availability -- ARAF	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	100%	99.50%	
4 - 16	OSS Interface Availability -- EDI Pre-Order	99.86%	99.50%	99.07%	99.50%	99.95%	99.50%	99.44%	99.50%	99.75%	99.50%	
4 - 17	OSS Interface Availability -- CORBA Pre-Order	99.84%	99.50%	99.07%	99.50%	99.95%	99.50%	99.44%	99.50%	99.71%	99.50%	
4 - 18	OSS Interface Availability -- AEMS LSOG 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Billing											
14 - 01	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring / Non-recurring	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	4.92%	0.08%	0.00%	0.06%	
14 - 02	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	0.00%	0.82%	0.21%	0.00%	3.52%	0.06%	0.00%	0.06%	0.00%	0.12%	
14 - 03	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.95%	0.00%	0.79%	0.00%	1.97%	0.00%	
15 - 01	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills--EDI	98.57%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
15 - 02	% Accurate & Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills--BDT	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	
16 - 01	% Usage Records Transmitted Correctly	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	98.34%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
17 - 02	Billing Completeness--Lineshare	99.38%	97.26%	97.58%	96.26%	97.35%	97.24%	97.57%	97.71%	99.05%	98.67%	
17 - 03	Billing Completeness--UNE-P	99.29%	96.81%	98.75%	98.19%	99.11%	97.89%	99.35%	98.17%	98.94%	98.71%	
17 - 04	Billing Completeness--Resale	97.87%	96.81%	98.98%	98.19%	97.69%	97.89%	98.50%	98.17%	98.95%	98.71%	
17 - 05	Billing Completeness--All Other Products (UNE, EOI, ULT, EELs)	99.81%	######	99.21%	98.19%	99.98%	97.89%	99.02%	98.17%	99.83%	98.71%	
18 - 03	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)-Electronic	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
18 - 04	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)-Paper	100%	95.00%	98.24%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
19 - 01	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	94.04%	95.00%	99.93%	95.00%	99.91%	95.00%	99.89%	95.00%	99.89%	95.00%	
	Ordering											
5 - 01	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus	96.97%	95.00%	97.87%	95.00%	96.67%	95.00%	98.77%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 02	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus	100%	95.00%	99.79%	95.00%	99.25%	95.00%	98.29%	95.00%	99.53%	95.00%	
5 - 03	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	96.55%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 04	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 05	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops)	99.60%	95.00%	99.42%	95.00%	97.70%	95.00%	96.42%	95.00%	99.67%	95.00%	
5 - 06	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops)	99.60%	95.00%	99.30%	95.00%	98.91%	95.00%	99.37%	95.00%	99.71%	95.00%	
5 - 07	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>49 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 08	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 09	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	e
5 - 10	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	acde

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 11	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	abcde
5 - 12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines)	97.97%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.33%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 13	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 14	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus	89.61%	95.00%	96.60%	95.00%	75.44%	95.00%	96.12%	95.00%	99.58%	95.00%	
5 - 15	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus	97.19%	95.00%	97.85%	95.00%	98.25%	95.00%	97.66%	95.00%	99.83%	95.00%	
5 - 16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	15.79%	94.00%	40.00%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	abde
5 - 17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 18	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 Hrs	99.84%	95.00%	99.63%	95.00%	99.24%	95.00%	98.30%	95.00%	99.85%	95.00%	
5 - 19	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 20	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.20%	95.00%	99.10%	95.00%	
5 - 21	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 22	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines)	99.32%	95.00%	98.54%	95.00%	97.40%	95.00%	95.01%	95.00%	98.40%	95.00%	
5 - 23	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	97.37%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 24	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	99.50%	95.00%	99.49%	95.00%	98.04%	95.00%	92.34%	95.00%	99.62%	95.00%	
5 - 25	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	99.79%	95.00%	98.88%	95.00%	97.32%	95.00%	99.42%	95.00%	99.24%	95.00%	
5 - 26	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (>19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	abcde
5 - 27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (>19 Loops)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
5 - 28	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines)	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	
5 - 29	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (>19 Lines)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 30	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 31	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus	94.12%	95.00%	93.75%	95.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	e
5 - 32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines)	100%	94.00%	######	94.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	abde
5 - 33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	bcde
5 - 35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 49 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 36	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 37	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines)	100%	95.00%	75.00%	95.00%	87.50%	95.00%	94.12%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	abe
5 - 38	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 39	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
5 - 40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 41	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 42	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps)	100%	94.00%	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	b
5 - 43	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 44	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps)	100%	94.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a
5 - 45	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (>49 Lps)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 46	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	ad
5 - 47	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops)	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	ac
5 - 48	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 49	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (>19 Loops)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 50	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
5 - 51	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (>19 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 52	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines)*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 - 53	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	abcd
5 - 54	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
7.1 - 01	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - Resale	98.86%	97.00%	99.45%	97.00%	98.88%	97.00%	98.99%	97.00%	99.64%	97.00%	
7.1 - 02	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - UNE	98.79%	97.00%	99.27%	97.00%	98.66%	97.00%	99.61%	97.00%	99.54%	97.00%	
7.1 - 03	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - UNE-P	99.84%	97.00%	99.83%	97.00%	99.58%	97.00%	99.80%	97.00%	99.66%	97.00%	
7.1 - 04	% Mechanized Completions Returned w/in One Day Of Work Completion - LNP Only	96.04%	97.00%	98.61%	97.00%	100%	97.00%	95.87%	97.00%	92.94%	97.00%	
9 - 01	% Rejects - CLEC Caused Rejects	18.49%	n/a	18.20%	n/a	23.46%	n/a	16.02%	n/a	14.67%	n/a	
9 - 02	% Rejects - SBC/Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders)	0.43%	n/a	0.34%	n/a	0.20%	n/a	0.14%	n/a	0.18%	n/a	
10 - 01	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	99.96%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10 - 03	% Rejects Returned Within 8 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Electronically (A/M)	n/a	n/a	94.70%	95.00%	98.96%	95.00%	99.07%	95.00%	99.72%	95.00%	
10 - 04	% Rejects Returned Within 24 Hrs-Manual Rejects Received Manually (M/M)	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	96.30%	95.00%	99.82%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
10.1 - 01	% Mechanized Rejects Returned w/in 1 Hour of Receipt of Order	95.28%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.2 - 01	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned w/in 5 Hrs	94.53%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.3 - 01	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned w/in 5 Hrs	80.39%	97.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 01	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Res - FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 02	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Res - No FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 03	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Bus - FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 04	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS - Bus - No FW	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
10.4 - 05	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Specials - FW	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	33.33%	5.00%	ade
10.4 - 06	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Specials - No FW	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	de
10.4 - 07	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loops with LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 08	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loops without LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 09	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
10.4 - 10	% of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-Ps	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11 - 01	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (Hrs)	0.14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11.1 - 01	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (Hrs)	2.60	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
11.2 - 01	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (Hrs)	4.18	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
12 - 01	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	96.87%	99.76%	97.93%	100%	97.62%	95.81%	97.51%	94.94%	97.45%	95.99%	
13 - 01	Order Process % Flow Through - UNE Loops	99.87%	95.00%	99.23%	95.00%	98.26%	95.00%	98.24%	95.00%	98.17%	95.00%	
13 - 02	Order Process % Flow Through - Resale	89.20%	97.03%	92.04%	95.03%	91.76%	95.81%	92.47%	97.07%	92.97%	97.64%	
13 - 03	Order Process % Flow Through - UNE-P	96.16%	97.03%	97.56%	95.03%	96.50%	95.81%	95.96%	97.07%	92.93%	97.64%	
13 - 04	Order Process % Flow Through - LNP	83.33%	97.03%	92.11%	95.03%	97.14%	95.81%	88.16%	97.07%	90.18%	97.64%	
13 - 05	Order Process % Flow Through - LSNP	97.70%	97.03%	83.84%	95.03%	91.99%	95.81%	97.99%	97.07%	94.74%	97.64%	
13 - 06	Order Process % Flow Through - Line Sharing	98.33%	97.03%	98.36%	95.03%	95.71%	95.81%	97.62%	97.07%	89.86%	97.64%	
MI 9 - 01	% Missing FOCs - Resale	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 9 - 02	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, & LSNP)	0.09%	n/a	0.06%	n/a	0.03%	n/a	0.06%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 9 - 03	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P	0.43%	n/a	0.39%	n/a	0.04%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	
MI 13 - 01	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
MI 13 - 02	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 03	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 04	% Loss Notifications w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 13 - 05	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--All	99.57%	97.00%	99.58%	97.00%	97.05%	97.00%	98.53%	97.00%	98.49%	97.00%	
MI 13 - 06	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--SBC Winback	99.68%	97.00%	99.81%	97.00%	99.69%	97.00%	99.74%	97.00%	99.78%	97.00%	
MI 13 - 07	% Mechanized Line Loss Notifications Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion--CLEC-to-CLEC	99.42%	97.00%	99.32%	97.00%	93.71%	97.00%	96.60%	97.00%	97.19%	97.00%	
MI 13.1 - 01	Average Delays Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--All	2.47	n/a	7.16	n/a	2.64	n/a	3.49	n/a	24.73	n/a	
MI 13.1 - 02	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--SBC Winback	2.13	n/a	6.67	n/a	9.50	n/a	5.30	n/a	1.33	n/a	ab
MI 13.1 - 03	Average Delay Days for Mechanized Line Loss Notifications--CLEC-to-CLEC	2.73	n/a	7.32	n/a	2.24	n/a	3.36	n/a	26.62	n/a	
	Provisioning											
27 - 01	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res - FW (Days)	1.09	2.25	1.15	2.25	1.49	2.37	1.67	2.58	1.44	2.48	
27 - 02	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res - No FW (Days)	0.23	0.95	0.15	0.94	0.20	0.99	0.27	0.97	0.18	0.92	
27 - 03	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus - FW (Days)	2.14	2.97	2.21	2.78	2.26	2.97	2.39	2.93	1.83	2.75	
27 - 04	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus - No FW (Days)	0.14	0.79	0.18	0.76	0.23	0.86	0.08	0.75	0.25	0.72	
27 - 05	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Res - FW (Days)	2.67	2.25	2.84	2.25	2.97	2.37	2.87	2.58	2.59	2.48	
27 - 06	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Res - No FW (Days)	0.61	0.95	0.56	0.94	0.36	0.99	0.28	0.97	0.27	0.92	
27 - 07	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Bus - FW (Days)	2.73	2.97	2.92	2.78	2.93	2.97	2.72	2.93	2.25	2.75	
27 - 08	Mean Installation Interval - UNE-P - Bus - No FW (Days)	0.28	0.79	0.29	0.76	0.21	0.86	0.25	0.75	0.18	0.72	
27 - 09	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex - FW (Days)	2.15	3.07	2.20	2.91	1.64	2.57	2.71	2.69	2.00	2.71	de
27 - 10	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex - No FW (Days)	2.13	4.00	1.73	4.00	2.50	4.00	3.36	4.00	2.91	4.00	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
28 - 01	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res - FW	99.78%	98.09%	99.82%	98.86%	99.45%	98.30%	99.70%	98.16%	99.36%	98.50%	
28 - 02	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res - No FW	97.50%	97.00%	97.22%	97.00%	97.64%	97.00%	95.39%	97.00%	96.77%	97.00%	
28 - 03	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus - FW	100%	97.70%	100%	99.33%	100%	98.89%	100%	98.46%	100%	98.41%	
28 - 04	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus - No FW	98.51%	97.00%	96.15%	97.00%	92.17%	97.00%	92.77%	97.00%	95.65%	97.00%	
28 - 05	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Res - FW	99.56%	98.09%	99.60%	98.86%	99.61%	98.30%	99.23%	98.16%	99.51%	98.50%	
28 - 06	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Res - No FW	99.53%	97.00%	99.60%	97.00%	99.59%	97.00%	99.70%	97.00%	99.75%	97.00%	
28 - 07	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Bus - FW	95.00%	97.70%	97.56%	99.33%	97.92%	98.89%	96.36%	98.46%	96.08%	98.41%	
28 - 08	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Bus - No FW	94.36%	97.00%	96.43%	97.00%	95.23%	97.00%	96.75%	97.00%	98.65%	97.00%	
28 - 09	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex - FW	100%	98.67%	100%	100%	100%	99.13%	100%	97.80%	100%	98.39%	de
28 - 10	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex - No FW	95.06%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
28 - 11	% Installs Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Date - UNE-P - Projects	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	99.81%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
29 - 01	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res - FW	0.20%	1.73%	0.15%	0.98%	0.47%	1.51%	0.25%	1.62%	0.58%	1.29%	
29 - 02	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res - No FW	0.11%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.12%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	
29 - 03	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus - FW	0.00%	1.82%	0.00%	0.62%	0.00%	1.06%	0.00%	1.51%	0.00%	1.53%	
29 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus - No FW	0.00%	3.00%	0.16%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.09%	3.00%	0.46%	3.00%	
29 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Res - FW	0.60%	1.73%	0.35%	0.98%	0.60%	1.51%	0.65%	1.62%	0.58%	1.29%	
29 - 06	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Res - No FW	0.02%	3.00%	0.02%	3.00%	0.02%	3.00%	0.02%	3.00%	0.03%	3.00%	
29 - 07	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Bus - FW	4.44%	1.82%	2.27%	0.62%	4.11%	1.06%	2.35%	1.51%	2.56%	1.53%	
29 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE-P - Bus - No FW	0.00%	3.00%	0.25%	3.00%	0.10%	3.00%	0.16%	3.00%	0.06%	3.00%	
35 - 01	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	3.63%	7.30%	4.17%	7.53%	1.88%	6.66%	2.72%	7.62%	4.61%	10.27%	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
35 - 02	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	3.92%	3.47%	3.81%	3.57%	4.10%	3.80%	3.62%	3.97%	5.41%	4.34%	
35 - 03	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	3.13%	8.15%	17.14%	9.44%	4.08%	6.83%	5.56%	7.53%	4.35%	9.19%	
35 - 04	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	0.93%	3.67%	1.57%	3.70%	0.67%	3.96%	0.47%	4.24%	0.69%	4.23%	
35 - 05	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	3.98%	7.30%	7.61%	7.53%	6.95%	6.66%	5.17%	7.62%	7.34%	10.27%	
35 - 06	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	1.18%	3.47%	1.02%	3.57%	0.88%	3.80%	0.89%	3.97%	1.25%	4.34%	
35 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	4.44%	8.15%	4.55%	9.44%	5.48%	6.83%	2.35%	7.53%	3.85%	9.19%	
35 - 08	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	2.07%	3.67%	2.66%	3.70%	3.10%	3.96%	2.73%	4.24%	2.64%	4.23%	
43 - 01	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DDS (days)	0.00	7.40	0.00	5.00	0.00	7.84	0.00	8.71	n/a	8.25	
43 - 02	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DS1 (days)	10.50	9.36	5.00	9.54	0.00	9.47	0.00	11.18	n/a	10.37	ab
43 - 03	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - DS3 (days)	0.00	21.21	0.00	15.58	0.00	15.09	0.00	16.64	n/a	13.00	
43 - 04	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL (days)	5.00	5.82	16.67	8.92	10.17	7.62	0.00	4.76	8.08	8.07	a
43 - 05	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI (days)	n/a	n/a	0.00	12.73	0.00	10.75	0.00	14.33	n/a	11.00	
43 - 06	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI (days)	5.00	8.29	5.00	4.30	11.00	9.22	0.00	13.67	n/a	10.38	abc
43 - 07	Avg Installation Interval - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI (days)	0.00	4.41	0.00	4.29	0.00	4.07	0.00	3.59	n/a	3.54	
43 - 08	Avg Installation Interval-Design-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI (days)	0.00	8.29	0.00	4.30	0.00	9.22	0.00	13.67	n/a	10.38	
43 - 09	Avg Installation Interval - Design - UNE Loop & Port - Other Combinations (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
43 - 10	Avg Installation Interval - Design - Resold Specials - Other Services Avail for Resale (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
44 - 01	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	
44 - 02	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	100%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	98.29%	0.00%	100%	n/a	99.27%	a
44 - 03	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	100%	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
44 - 04	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	100%	100%	94.59%	100%	100%	0.00%	100%	100%	100%	
44 - 05	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	n/a	n/a	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	50.00%	
44 - 06	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0.00%	80.00%	n/a	100%	abc
44 - 07	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN BRI	0.00%	95.05%	0.00%	97.14%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	n/a	98.31%	
44 - 08	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	80.00%	n/a	100%	
44 - 09	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - UNE Loop & Port - Other Combinations	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
44 - 10	% Installs Completed w/in Cust Req DD - Design - Resold Specials - Other Svcs Avail for Resale	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
45 - 01	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 02	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.00%	0.76%	0.00%	1.32%	n/a	1.33%	a
45 - 03	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
45 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.95%	0.00%	5.41%	0.00%	2.68%	0.00%	0.69%	ade
45 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	16.67%	
45 - 06	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.39%	n/a	0.00%	a
45 - 07	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	3.09%	0.00%	1.75%	0.00%	3.21%	0.00%	0.54%	n/a	0.53%	
45 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates-Design-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.39%	n/a	0.00%	
46 - 01	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	10.34%	0.00%	27.27%	0.00%	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
46 - 02	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	7.21%	0.00%	4.84%	0.00%	6.15%	0.00%	4.73%	n/a	5.71%	a
46 - 03	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
46 - 04	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	0.72%	0.00%	11.32%	0.00%	2.38%	0.00%	3.64%	0.00%	4.96%	ade
46 - 05	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	n/a	0.00%	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
46 - 06	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	0.00%	9.80%	0.00%	1.56%	0.00%	2.13%	0.00%	1.43%	n/a	2.38%	a
46 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days of Installation - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	3.09%	0.00%	2.92%	0.00%	0.94%	0.00%	3.26%	n/a	4.76%	
46 - 08	% Trbl Rpts w/in 30 Days of Install - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00%	9.80%	0.00%	1.56%	0.00%	2.13%	0.00%	1.43%	n/a	2.38%	
55 - 01.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (1-10) (days)	3.06	3.00	3.10	3.00	2.97	3.00	2.96	3.00	2.82	3.00	
55 - 01.2	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) (days)	3.13	7.00	4.56	7.00	10.68	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	
55 - 01.3	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - 2 Wire Analog (20+) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 02.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (1-10) (days)	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.92	3.00	2.25	3.00	4.13	3.00	abde
55 - 02.2	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (11-20) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 02.3	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Digital (20+) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 03	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - DS1 loop (includes PRI) (days)	2.80	3.00	2.63	3.00	3.18	3.00	3.03	3.00	3.71	3.00	
55 - 09.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Dedicated Transport - DS1 (1-10) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 10.1	Avg Installation Interval - UNE - Dedicated Transport - DS3 (1-10) (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55 - 12	Avg Installation Interval - DSL Loops Requiring No Conditioning-Line Sharing	3.40	2.97	3.76	2.97	3.16	2.96	2.94	2.97	2.89	2.96	
55.2 - 01.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (1-10)	5.09	n/a	5.22	n/a	5.05	n/a	4.76	n/a	4.93	n/a	
55.2 - 01.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (11-20)	6.50	n/a	6.19	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.50	n/a	7.00	n/a	
55.2 - 01.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - CHC - Loop with LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 02.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (1-10)	3.39	n/a	3.49	n/a	3.66	n/a	3.46	n/a	3.42	n/a	
55.2 - 02.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (11-20)	9.08	n/a	5.78	n/a	5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	6.00	n/a	
55.2 - 02.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - Non CHC - Loop with LNP (21+)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 03.1	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP (1-10)	5.28	n/a	5.08	n/a	4.53	n/a	4.25	n/a	4.43	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
55.2 - 03.2	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP(11-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
55.2 - 03.3	Avg Installation Interval for Loop with LNP - FDT - Loop with LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 01.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-2 Wire Analog (1-10)-3 Days	99.61%	95.00%	99.96%	95.00%	99.81%	95.00%	99.80%	95.00%	99.87%	95.00%	
56 - 01.2	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE -2 Wire Analog (11-20)-7 Days	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56 - 01.3	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD- UNE - 2 Wire Analog (20+)-10 Days	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 02.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-Digital (1-10)-3 Days	98.41%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	97.62%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56 - 03	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-DS1 Loop (includes PRI)-3 Days	99.16%	95.00%	98.91%	95.00%	98.16%	95.00%	98.60%	95.00%	92.81%	95.00%	
56 - 10.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE-Dedicated Transport-DS3 (1-10)-3 Days	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56 - 11	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-UNE Loop Projects	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	de
56 - 12.1	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/No Line Share-Conditioned -10 days	100%	95.00%	75.00%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	abcd
56 - 12.2	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/No Line Share-Non Conditioned-5 Days	99.23%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.74%	95.00%	99.63%	95.00%	99.44%	95.00%	
56 - 13	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD-DSL w/Line Sharing-Parity w/ASI	100%	99.95%	100%	99.67%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 01.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.77%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	99.75%	95.00%	
56.1 - 01.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
56.1 - 01.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Aggregate Loop w/LNP (>20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 02.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 02.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 02.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-CHC Loop w/LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 03.1	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	
56.1 - 03.2	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
56.1 - 03.3	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-FDT Loop w/LNP (21-24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
56.1 - 04	% (UNE) Installs Cmptd w/in Cust Rqstd DD-Projects Loop w/LNP (>100)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	c
58 - 04	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	0.61%	5.00%	0.15%	5.00%	0.20%	5.00%	0.26%	5.00%	0.58%	5.00%	
58 - 05	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	0.15%	2.62%	0.04%	0.90%	0.14%	1.41%	0.04%	1.60%	0.10%	1.35%	
58 - 08	% SBC/Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	0.88%	0.00%	1.01%	0.50%	1.83%	0.56%	0.00%	1.34%	4.47%	0.85%	
59 - 01	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) Inst - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	1.32%	0.00%	1.63%	0.00%	0.76%	0.00%	0.59%	n/a	1.26%	
59 - 02	% Installation Trble Rpts w/in 30 Days (I-30) - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
59 - 03	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	4.00%	1.12%	2.86%	0.86%	1.72%	0.97%	1.43%	0.74%	1.59%	1.19%	
59 - 04	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Install - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	3.51%	6.00%	1.26%	6.00%	3.05%	6.00%	2.16%	6.00%	1.53%	6.00%	
59 - 05	% Installation Trb Reports W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop W/out Test Access	2.49%	8.26%	2.63%	8.81%	3.07%	7.40%	2.45%	8.08%	2.97%	7.84%	
59 - 06	% Installation Trouble Reports W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	6.25%	5.45%	15.91%	3.70%	8.33%	2.00%	4.26%	6.74%	10.00%	7.41%	
59 - 07	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	n/a	0.00%	
59 - 08	% Installation Trble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	0.81%	8.02%	1.92%	3.72%	5.33%	5.08%	5.88%	3.67%	5.13%	4.46%	
59 - 09	% Installation Trb Rpts W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	7.21%	0.00%	4.84%	0.00%	6.15%	0.00%	4.73%	n/a	5.71%	
59 - 12	% Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00%	0.72%	0.00%	11.32%	0.00%	2.38%	0.00%	3.64%	n/a	4.96%	
59 - 13	% Trb Rpts W/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
59 - 14	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
59 - 15	% Installation Trouble Reports w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Installation - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
114 - 01	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)-FDT-LNP W/Loop	0.63%	2.00%	0.35%	2.00%	0.41%	2.00%	0.48%	2.00%	0.11%	2.00%	
114 - 02	% Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)-CHC- LNP W/Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
114.1 - 01	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - FDT - LNP with Loop (< 10 Lines)	99.27%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	99.43%	90.00%	99.89%	90.00%	99.89%	90.00%	
114.1 - 02	CHC/FDT LNP w/Loop Provisioning Interval - FDT - LNP with Loop (10-24 Lines)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
114.1 - 03	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - CHC - LNP with Loop (<10 lines)	99.66%	90.00%	99.46%	90.00%	99.26%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	98.78%	90.00%	
114.1 - 04	CHC/FDT LNP w/ Loop Provisioning Interval - CHC - LNP with Loop (10-24 Lines)	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	
115 - 01	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.61%	1.00%	0.12%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115 - 01.1	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop (>30 Min)	0.21%	8.00%	0.35%	8.00%	0.81%	8.00%	0.12%	8.00%	0.45%	8.00%	
115 - 01.2	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT-LNP W/Loop (>60 Min)	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.61%	2.00%	0.12%	2.00%	0.11%	2.00%	
115 - 01.3	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-FDT- LNP W/Loop (>120 Min)	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.61%	1.00%	0.12%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115 - 02	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC- LNP W/Loop	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115 - 02.1	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>30 Min)	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%	
115 - 02.2	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>60 Min)	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
115 - 02.3	% of SBC/Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers-CHC-LNP W/Loop (>120 Min)	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
115.1 - 01	% Provisioning Trouble Reports -- FDT	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
115.1 - 02	% Provisioning Trouble Reports - CHC	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.11%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
IN 1 - 01	% Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date - DSL Loops w/out Line Sharing	86.67%	90.00%	62.50%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	80.00%	90.00%	92.86%	90.00%	c
MI 3 - 01	Coordination Conversions Started w/in 1 Hour of Scheduled Time	100%	n/a	99.54%	n/a	99.33%	n/a	100%	n/a	98.90%	n/a	
	Maintenance											
37 - 01	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	1.19	1.36	1.47	1.50	1.74	1.69	1.49	1.53	1.93	1.82	
37 - 02	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	0.40	0.55	0.50	0.54	0.46	0.59	0.49	0.51	0.56	0.59	
37 - 03	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	1.01	1.36	0.95	1.50	0.98	1.69	0.90	1.53	1.07	1.82	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
37 - 04	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	0.60	0.55	0.74	0.54	0.77	0.59	0.61	0.51	0.76	0.59	
37.1 - 01	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-POTS-Res	0.82	1.39	1.05	1.51	1.14	1.69	0.98	1.52	1.23	1.85	
37.1 - 02	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-POTS-Bus	0.37	0.56	0.39	0.54	0.41	0.61	0.45	0.52	0.56	0.61	
37.1 - 03	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-UNE-P-Res	0.71	1.39	0.66	1.51	0.75	1.69	0.55	1.52	0.80	1.85	
37.1 - 04	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports-UNE-P Bus	0.53	0.56	0.50	0.54	0.45	0.61	0.44	0.52	0.65	0.61	
38 - 01	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch	0.51%	3.96%	2.01%	4.31%	4.27%	3.79%	1.06%	4.35%	3.74%	4.99%	
38 - 02	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	0.00%	0.66%	4.76%	0.59%	5.88%	0.57%	0.00%	0.29%	0.00%	0.44%	e
38 - 03	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch	2.60%	5.60%	2.41%	4.21%	3.23%	4.37%	8.70%	5.45%	1.67%	6.47%	
38 - 04	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch	0.00%	2.19%	0.00%	1.31%	0.00%	2.69%	0.00%	2.08%	0.00%	2.28%	
38 - 05	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	1.94%	3.96%	2.76%	4.31%	2.18%	3.79%	2.92%	4.35%	3.31%	4.99%	
38 - 06	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch	2.56%	0.66%	0.65%	0.59%	0.68%	0.57%	0.00%	0.29%	1.37%	0.44%	
38 - 07	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch	1.45%	5.60%	8.22%	4.21%	0.00%	4.37%	9.80%	5.45%	7.43%	6.47%	
38 - 08	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch	0.00%	2.19%	0.00%	1.31%	0.00%	2.69%	3.45%	2.08%	6.25%	2.28%	a
39 - 01	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	14.76	19.75	9.48	20.14	11.10	19.74	11.05	20.74	15.75	23.03	
39 - 02	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	10.01	13.33	11.55	13.40	9.18	13.32	10.68	13.91	11.47	14.15	
39 - 03	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	0.83	2.47	0.32	2.02	3.71	2.49	2.37	1.83	0.38	2.39	de
39 - 04	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	4.44	2.57	4.31	2.49	11.12	2.89	4.26	2.35	0.20	3.17	bcde
39 - 05	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS-Bus-Dispatch-Affecting Service (Hrs)	7.36	12.80	21.33	15.34	4.97	13.52	8.70	13.03	11.75	18.58	
39 - 06	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	9.16	12.16	10.07	10.79	8.51	10.59	11.20	11.49	18.18	12.70	
39 - 07	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	0.51	3.63	0.69	4.15	0.80	2.24	0.71	3.51	3.38	5.15	a

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
39 - 08	Rcpt to Clear Duration-POTS- Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	1.23	1.94	1.28	2.85	3.52	3.64	1.96	2.09	1.90	2.57	abcde
39 - 09	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	13.50	19.75	12.57	20.14	13.00	19.74	15.09	20.74	13.74	23.03	
39 - 10	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	11.16	13.33	11.06	13.40	10.92	13.32	11.28	13.91	11.75	14.15	
39 - 11	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	3.08	2.47	1.40	2.02	1.56	2.49	1.20	1.83	1.28	2.39	
39 - 12	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	3.78	2.57	12.13	2.49	2.94	2.89	2.99	2.35	4.04	3.17	
39 - 13	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	7.85	12.80	8.73	15.34	14.91	13.52	13.60	13.03	11.21	18.58	
39 - 14	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	8.05	12.16	12.00	10.79	8.17	10.59	11.39	11.49	11.29	12.70	
39 - 15	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (Hrs)	1.01	3.63	1.40	4.15	1.17	2.24	6.37	3.51	2.28	5.15	a
39 - 16	Rcpt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (Hrs)	1.08	1.94	0.82	2.85	2.92	3.64	0.85	2.09	6.38	2.57	ab
40 - 01	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - POTS - Residence	99.40%	97.17%	98.85%	97.17%	97.83%	97.37%	100%	96.47%	98.95%	96.25%	
40 - 02	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - POTS - Business	96.92%	96.70%	98.28%	97.68%	100%	97.72%	91.67%	96.19%	100%	96.48%	
40 - 03	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - UNE-P Res	98.68%	97.17%	98.67%	97.17%	98.98%	97.37%	97.75%	96.47%	98.09%	96.25%	
40 - 04	% Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hrs - UNE-P Bus	94.23%	96.70%	######	97.68%	100%	97.72%	96.63%	96.19%	95.16%	96.48%	
41 - 01	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	4.05%	9.41%	2.73%	9.05%	5.97%	9.31%	4.63%	8.70%	1.79%	9.26%	
41 - 02	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	4.35%	7.89%	19.63%	9.62%	6.02%	9.44%	4.23%	8.46%	4.00%	9.27%	
41 - 03	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	4.27%	9.41%	6.14%	9.05%	4.97%	9.31%	4.10%	8.70%	4.43%	9.26%	
41 - 04	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	3.85%	7.89%	8.41%	9.62%	3.65%	9.44%	2.29%	8.46%	6.11%	9.27%	
53 - 01	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00%	13.04%	0.00%	7.43%	0.00%	13.24%	0.00%	11.11%	n/a	11.03%	
53 - 02	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00%	11.40%	0.00%	13.68%	0.00%	18.50%	0.00%	19.67%	0.00%	17.39%	bcde
53 - 03	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
53 - 04	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.00%	7.93%	0.00%	6.76%	0.00%	10.20%	0.00%	8.61%	n/a	7.28%	ab
53 - 05	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	0.00%	25.81%	0.00%	25.00%	n/a	47.22%	
53 - 06	% Repeat Reports - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	50.00%	7.69%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	7.41%	0.00%	8.00%	n/a	3.45%	ab
53 - 07	% Repeat Reports - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00%	8.49%	0.00%	13.89%	0.00%	14.73%	0.00%	16.82%	n/a	8.66%	
53 - 08	% Repeat Reports - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	7.41%	0.00%	8.00%	n/a	3.45%	
54 - 01	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DDS	0.00	1.69	0.00	1.83	0.00	1.68	0.00	1.57	0.00	1.70	
54 - 02	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DS1	0.00	1.46	8.33	1.61	4.17	1.76	4.17	1.60	4.76	1.80	
54 - 03	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - DS3	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.62	n/a	0.52	
54 - 04	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - VGPL	0.10	0.24	0.20	0.31	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.23	
54 - 05	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN BRI	0.00	0.86	0.00	1.42	0.00	1.58	0.00	1.44	0.00	1.87	
54 - 06	Failure Frequency - Design - Resold Specials - ISDN PRI	3.45	0.55	3.33	0.85	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.65	
54 - 07	Failure Frequency - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.63	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.64	n/a	0.76	
54 - 08	Failure Frequency - Design - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.85	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.57	n/a	0.65	
54.1 - 01	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DDS	0.00	1.42	0.00	1.65	0.00	1.44	0.00	1.39	0.00	1.51	
54.1 - 02	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DS1	0.00	1.23	8.33	1.34	4.17	1.38	4.17	1.22	4.76	1.42	
54.1 - 03	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-DS3	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.62	n/a	0.52	
54.1 - 04	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-VGPL	0.10	0.22	0.20	0.28	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.20	
54.1 - 05	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-ISDN BRI	0.00	0.86	0.00	1.11	0.00	1.17	0.00	1.03	0.00	0.99	
54.1 - 06	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-Resold Specials-ISDN PRI	1.72	0.40	3.33	0.77	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.59	
54.1 - 07	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN BRI	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.64	0.00	0.49	n/a	0.64	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
54.1 - 08	Trouble Report Rate Net of Instal & Repeat Rpts-UNE Loop & Port-ISDN PRI	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.77	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.50	n/a	0.59	
65 - 01	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.37	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.40	n/a	0.43	
65 - 02	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65 - 03	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.37	0.20	0.39	0.20	0.37	0.22	0.12	0.18	0.46	0.29	
65 - 04	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	0.48	3.00	0.53	3.00	0.66	3.00	0.57	3.00	0.60	3.00	
65 - 05	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	0.53	0.55	0.58	0.54	0.58	0.59	0.52	0.51	0.68	0.59	
65 - 06	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	0.63	0.62	0.98	0.67	1.31	0.76	0.34	0.68	0.67	0.83	
65 - 07	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00	0.86	0.00	1.42	0.00	1.58	0.00	1.44	n/a	1.87	
65 - 08	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	1.42	1.22	1.53	1.41	1.41	1.47	2.06	1.31	1.94	1.48	
65 - 09	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	1.61	1.46	4.84	1.61	0.00	1.76	0.00	1.60	0.00	1.80	
65 - 12	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.23	n/a	0.23	
65 - 13	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65 - 14	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.69	1.15	0.20	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.52	
65 - 15	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.62	n/a	0.52	
65 - 16	Trouble Report Rate - UNE - Interconnection Trunks	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	
65.1 - 01	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports-Broadband DSL-Line Sharing	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.37	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.29	n/a	0.22	
65.1 - 02	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports-Broadband DSL-No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
65.1 - 03	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.37	0.20	0.39	0.20	0.25	0.12	0.00	0.08	0.23	0.12	
65.1 - 04	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports- DSL Loops - No line Sharing	0.34	3.00	0.45	3.00	0.54	3.00	0.44	3.00	0.45	3.00	
65.1 - 05	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - 8.0 dB Loop W/out Test Access	0.45	0.44	0.49	0.42	0.49	0.46	0.43	0.40	0.56	0.46	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
65.1 - 06	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - BRI Loop with Test Access	0.28	0.54	0.49	0.54	0.96	0.61	0.14	0.52	0.20	0.64	
65.1 - 07	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - ISDN BRI Port	0.00	0.86	0.00	1.11	0.00	1.17	0.00	1.03	n/a	0.99	
65.1 - 08	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS1 Loop with Test Access	1.22	1.01	1.28	1.19	0.88	1.17	1.49	1.02	1.62	1.19	
65.1 - 09	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS1 Dedicated Transport	1.61	1.23	4.84	1.34	0.00	1.38	0.00	1.22	0.00	1.42	
65.1 - 12	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Analog Trunk Port	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.20	n/a	0.20	
65.1 - 14	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.69	1.15	0.20	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.52	
65.1 - 15	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.62	n/a	0.52	
65.1 - 16	Trb Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Reports - Interconnection Trunks	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	
66 - 01	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	3.13%	0.00%	11.90%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.77%	n/a	1.67%	
66 - 02	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
66 - 03	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	10.29%	33.33%	5.80%	0.00%	4.88%	0.00%	8.70%	25.00%	5.79%	abcde
66 - 04	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE - 2 Wire Analog 8db Loop	4.15%	5.12%	3.57%	3.34%	3.71%	3.65%	3.98%	4.21%	6.46%	5.74%	
67 - 01	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (Hrs)	0.00	7.20	0.00	12.67	0.00	13.61	0.00	13.70	n/a	6.91	
67 - 02	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (Hrs)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 03	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	22.83	12.33	16.70	11.36	2.68	11.28	0.00	10.75	13.78	11.32	abce
67 - 04	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	10.28	9.00	8.54	9.00	8.23	9.00	8.56	9.00	9.45	9.00	
67 - 05	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	8.43	12.95	7.91	12.69	10.32	12.74	9.50	13.49	13.06	14.31	
67 - 06	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	7.66	16.69	15.38	15.46	7.30	16.32	3.85	16.95	4.98	15.05	ade
67 - 07	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	6.98	0.00	9.01	0.00	9.05	0.00	8.96	n/a	10.94	
67 - 08	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-Dispatch	6.58	5.63	3.91	6.13	4.28	6.73	4.19	5.69	5.38	7.33	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
67 - 09	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	5.79	7.33	6.33	0.00	6.72	0.00	5.73	n/a	7.22	b
67 - 12	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	4.71	0.00	6.28	0.00	9.59	0.00	8.69	n/a	6.82	
67 - 14	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-Dispatch	0.00	3.71	0.00	3.68	0.00	5.53	0.00	6.41	n/a	3.41	
67 - 15	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (Hrs)-Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.00	3.68	0.00	5.53	0.00	6.41	n/a	3.41	
67 - 16	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (Hrs)	0.00	1.69	0.00	1.24	0.00	1.05	0.00	0.95	n/a	1.69	
67 - 17	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (Hrs)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 18	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	0.60	1.19	0.00	1.85	0.00	1.71	1.53	1.85	0.95	2.23	ade
67 - 19	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (Hrs) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	1.14	9.00	1.24	9.00	1.49	9.00	2.31	9.00	1.17	9.00	c
67 - 20	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.05	2.70	1.42	2.70	1.37	2.99	1.94	2.58	1.68	3.66	
67 - 21	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	3.21	0.00	6.30	0.00	3.06	0.62	2.36	0.71	3.75	de
67 - 22	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	1.52	0.00	2.26	0.00	1.82	0.00	1.41	n/a	2.27	
67 - 23	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (Hrs)-No Dispatch	1.90	1.67	0.60	2.12	1.93	1.89	1.27	1.66	2.27	1.31	ab
67 - 24	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.12	1.74	0.00	2.06	0.00	2.05	0.00	1.75	n/a	1.24	a
67 - 25	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (Hrs)-No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
67 - 27	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	2.25	0.00	2.32	0.00	2.71	0.00	2.09	n/a	1.78	
67 - 29	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (Hrs)-No Dispatch	0.00	0.83	0.00	1.59	0.82	0.23	0.00	0.17	n/a	0.92	c
67 - 30	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (Hrs)-No Dispatch	n/a	n/a	0.00	1.59	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.17	n/a	0.92	
69 - 01	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing	0.00%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.50%	0.00%	1.92%	n/a	3.33%	
69 - 02	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
69 - 03	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - Line Sharing	0.00%	1.47%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.88%	0.00%	2.90%	0.00%	5.79%	abcde

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
69 - 04	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	4.35%	12.00%	3.30%	12.00%	2.78%	12.00%	4.12%	12.00%	4.96%	12.00%	
69 - 05	% Repeat Reports - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop Without Test Access	3.79%	9.06%	5.77%	9.11%	5.97%	9.34%	5.28%	8.75%	4.84%	9.30%	
69 - 06	% Repeat Reports - UNE - BRI Loop With Test Access	11.11%	7.50%	0.00%	16.41%	5.26%	18.06%	20.00%	18.75%	10.00%	17.42%	ad
69 - 07	% Repeat Reports - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	0.00%	25.81%	0.00%	25.00%	n/a	47.22%	
69 - 08	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS1 Loop With Test Access	11.11%	10.96%	11.90%	12.75%	15.00%	17.32%	13.11%	18.27%	0.00%	15.68%	
69 - 09	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	11.40%	0.00%	13.68%	0.00%	18.50%	0.00%	19.67%	n/a	17.39%	ab
69 - 12	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	0.00%	7.93%	0.00%	6.76%	0.00%	10.20%	0.00%	8.61%	n/a	7.28%	
69 - 14	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	c
69 - 15	% Repeat Reportss - UNE - Dark Fiber	n/a	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	
69 - 16	% Repeat Reports - UNE - Interconnection Trunks	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	25.00%	ac
	OS/DA											
80 - 01	Directory Assistance Avg Speed of Answer (Sec)	4.29	6.30	5.61	6.30	5.44	6.30	5.60	6.30	5.14	6.30	
82 - 01	Operator Services Speed of Answer (Sec)	1.32	2.70	2.22	2.70	2.24	2.70	2.16	2.70	2.02	2.70	
110 - 01	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database w/in 72 Hrs for Facility-Based CLECs	99.91%	95.00%	99.86%	95.00%	99.95%	95.00%	99.98%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
112 - 01	% DA Database Accuracy for Manual Updates for Facility-Based CLECs	98.70%	97.00%	98.92%	97.00%	98.98%	97.00%	98.74%	97.00%	97.05%	97.00%	
113 - 01	% of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process w/out Manual Intervention	99.41%	97.00%	99.45%	97.00%	99.52%	97.00%	99.57%	97.00%	99.61%	97.00%	
	Collocation											
70 - 01	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech End Office to CLEC End Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
70 - 02	% Trunk Blockage-SBC/Ameritech Tandem to CLEC End Office	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.01%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
70.2 - 01	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech Tandem to CLEC End Office	0.61%	n/a	0.62%	n/a	0.63%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
70.2 - 02	% of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)-SBC/Ameritech End Office to CLEC End Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 01	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-911	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a
73 - 02	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-OS/DA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 03	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-SS7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
73 - 04	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-Non-Projects	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
73 - 05	% Installations Completed w/in Customer Requested Due Dates-Interconnection Trunks-Projects	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
78 - 01	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	16.00	20.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20.00	a
78 - 02	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	20.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
78 - 03	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	0.00	20.00	0.00	20.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
78 - 04	Avg Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	12.90	20.00	11.64	20.00	13.59	20.00	13.73	20.00	12.75	20.00	
107 - 01	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Caged	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	cde
107 - 02	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Shared Caged	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 03	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Caged Common	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 04	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Cageless	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	n/a	d
107 - 05	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Adjacent On-Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 06	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Adjacent Off-Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
107 - 07	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Virtual	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	
107 - 08	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Augments to Physical Collocation	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	abcde
107 - 09	% Missed Collocation Due Dates - Augments to Virtual	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%	n/a	5.00%	c
108 - 01	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Physical	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
108 - 02	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Virtual	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	n/a	6.00	
108 - 03	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Additions	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
108 - 04	Avg Delay Days for SBC/Ameritech Missed Due Dates - Cageless	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	6.00	n/a	n/a	
109 - 01	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Physical	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	abc
109 - 02	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Virtual	n/a	n/a	0.00%	90.00%	0.00%	90.00%	0.00%	90.00%	n/a	90.00%	
109 - 03	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Additions	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	abcde
109 - 04	% of Requests Processed w/in the Established Timelines - Cageless	n/a	n/a	0.00%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	100%	90.00%	n/a	n/a	cd
MI 4 - 01	Avg Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement - Physical Collocation (Days)	57.00	n/a	59.00	n/a	66.00	n/a	63.63	n/a	79.00	n/a	abcde
	Miscellaneous											
96 - 01	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP Only	0.15%	2.00%	0.29%	2.00%	0.11%	2.00%	0.02%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
96 - 02	% Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP w/ Loop	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.11%	2.00%	
MI 14 - 01	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-Resale Manual-Next Day	87.03%	95.00%	97.65%	95.00%	96.02%	95.00%	83.49%	95.00%	98.44%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 02	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic	99.15%	95.00%	98.94%	95.00%	98.04%	95.00%	98.33%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 03	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-UNE Loops Manual-Next Day	99.28%	95.00%	99.05%	95.00%	98.96%	95.00%	98.20%	95.00%	96.67%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 04	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic	90.91%	95.00%	97.84%	95.00%	94.29%	95.00%	98.98%	95.00%	99.79%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 05	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in "X" Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt-UNE P Manual-Next Day	88.13%	95.00%	94.16%	95.00%	97.59%	95.00%	85.94%	95.00%	98.16%	95.00%	
MI 14 - 06	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd w/in 2 Hrs of Cmpltion of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic	98.82%	95.00%	98.80%	95.00%	97.56%	95.00%	97.03%	95.00%	99.82%	95.00%	
MI 15 - 01	Change Management - Changes to Existing Interfaces (days) - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	c
MI 15 - 02	Change Management - Changes to Existing Interfaces (days) - GUI	n/a	n/a	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	100%	95.00%	n/a	95.00%	bcd
MI 15 - 03	Change Management - Introductions of New Interfaces (days) - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

WISCONSIN PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	March		April		May		June		July		Notes
		CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	CLEC	SBC	
MI 15 - 04	Change Management - Introductions of New Interfaces (days) - GUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 05	Change Management - Retirements of Existing Interfaces (days) - Wholesale Interfaces - Gateway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MI 15 - 06	Change Management - Retirements of Existing Interfaces (days) - Wholesale Interfaces - GUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Abbreviations:

n/a = No Activity.

Notes: a = Sample Size under 10 for March.
b = Sample Size under 10 for April.
c = Sample Size under 10 for May.
d = Sample Size under 10 for June.
e = Sample Size under 10 for July.

Appendix F
Statutory Requirements

I. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

1. The 1996 Act conditions BOC entry into the market for provision of in-region interLATA services on compliance with certain provisions of section 271.[1] BOCs must apply to the Federal Communications Commission (Commission or FCC) for authorization to provide interLATA services originating in any in-region state.[2] The Commission must issue a written determination on each application no later than 90 days after receiving such application.[3] Section 271(d)(2)(A) requires the Commission to consult with the Attorney General before making any determination approving or denying a section 271 application. The Attorney General is entitled to evaluate the application "using any standard the Attorney General considers appropriate," and the Commission is required to "give substantial weight to the Attorney General's evaluation."[4]

2. In addition, the Commission must consult with the relevant state commission to verify that the BOC has one or more state-approved interconnection agreements with a facilities-based competitor, or a Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions (SGAT), and that either the agreement(s) or general statement satisfy the "competitive checklist."[5] Because the Act does not prescribe any standard for the consideration of a state commission's verification under section 271(d)(2)(B), the Commission has discretion in each section 271 proceeding to

---

[1] For purposes of section 271 proceedings, the Commission uses the definition of the term "Bell Operating Company" contained in 47 U.S.C. § 153(4).

[2] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(1). For purposes of section 271 proceedings, the Commission utilizes the definition of the term "in-region state" that is contained in 47 U.S.C. § 271(i)(1). Section 271(j) provides that a BOC's in-region services include 800 service, private line service, or their equivalents that terminate in an in-region state of that BOC and that allow the called party to determine the interLATA carrier, even if such services originate out-of-region. *Id.* § 271(j). The 1996 Act defines "interLATA services" as "telecommunications between a point located in a local access and transport area and a point located outside such area." *Id.* § 153(21). Under the 1996 Act, a "local access and transport area" (LATA) is "a contiguous geographic area (A) established before the date of enactment of the [1996 Act] by a [BOC] such that no exchange area includes points within more than 1 metropolitan statistical area, consolidated metropolitan statistical area, or State, except as expressly permitted under the AT&T Consent Decree; or (B) established or modified by a [BOC] after such date of enactment and approved by the Commission." *Id.* § 153(25). LATAs were created as part of the Modification of Final Judgment's (MFJ) "plan of reorganization." *United States v. Western Elec. Co.*, 569 F. Supp. 1057 (D.D.C. 1983), *aff'd sub nom. California v. United States*, 464 U.S. 1013 (1983). Pursuant to the MFJ, "all [BOC] territory in the continental United States [was] divided into LATAs, generally centering upon a city or other identifiable community of interest." *United States v. Western Elec. Co.*, 569 F. Supp. 990, 993-94 (D.D.C. 1983).

[3] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3).

[4] *Id*. § 271(d)(2)(A).

[5] *Id*. § 271(d)(2)(B).

determine the amount of weight to accord the state commission's verification.[6] The Commission has held that, although it will consider carefully state determinations of fact that are supported by a detailed and extensive record, it is the FCC's role to determine whether the factual record supports the conclusion that particular requirements of section 271 have been met.[7]

3. Section 271 requires the Commission to make various findings before approving BOC entry. In order for the Commission to approve a BOC's application to provide in-region, interLATA services, a BOC must first demonstrate, with respect to each state for which it seeks authorization, that it satisfies the requirements of either section 271(c)(1)(A) (Track A) or 271(c)(1)(B) (Track B).[8] In order to obtain authorization under section 271, the BOC must also show that: (1) it has "fully implemented the competitive checklist" contained in section 271(c)(2)(B);[9] (2) the requested authorization will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of section 272;[10] and (3) the BOC's entry into the in-region interLATA market is "consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity."[11] The statute specifies that, unless the Commission finds that these criteria have been satisfied, the Commission "shall not approve" the requested authorization.[12]

II. PROCEDURAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

4. To determine whether a BOC applicant has met the prerequisites for entry into the long distance market, the Commission evaluates its compliance with the competitive checklist,

---

[6] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3962, para. 20; *Application of Ameritech Michigan Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, CC Docket No. 97-137, 12 FCC Rcd 20543, 20559-60 (1997) (*Ameritech Michigan Order*). As the D.C. Circuit has held, "[a]lthough the Commission must consult with the state commissions, the statute does not require the Commission to give State Commissions' views any particular weight." *SBC Communications Inc. v. FCC*, 138 F.3d 410, 416 (D.C. Cir. 1998).

[7] *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20560; *SBC Communications v. FCC*, 138 F.3d at 416-17.

[8] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(A). *See* Section III, *infra*, for a complete discussion of Track A and Track B requirements.

[9] *Id.* §§ 271(c)(2)(B), 271(d)(3)(A)(i).

[10] *Id.* § 272; *see Implementation of the Non-Accounting Safeguards of Sections 271 and 272 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, CC Docket No. 96-149, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 21905 (1996) (*Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*), *recon.*, Order on Reconsideration, 12 FCC Rcd 2297 (1997), *review pending sub nom.*, *SBC Communications v. FCC*, No. 97-1118 (D.C. Cir., filed Mar. 6, 1997) (held in abeyance pursuant to court order filed May 7, 1997), *remanded in part sub nom.*, *Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies v. FCC*, No. 97-1067 (D.C. Cir., filed Mar. 31, 1997), *on remand*, Second Order on Reconsideration, FCC 97-222 (rel. June 24, 1997), *petition for review denied sub nom. Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies v. FCC*, 113 F.3d 1044 (D.C. Cir. 1997); *Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Accounting Safeguards Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 17539 (1996).

[11] 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(C).

[12] *Id.* § 271(d)(3); *see SBC Communications, Inc. v. FCC*, 138 F.3d at 416.

as developed in the FCC's local competition rules and orders in effect at the time the application was filed. Despite the comprehensiveness of these rules, there will inevitably be, in any section 271 proceeding, disputes over an incumbent LEC's precise obligations to its competitors that FCC rules have not addressed and that do not involve *per se* violations of self-executing requirements of the Act. As explained in prior orders, the section 271 process simply could not function as Congress intended if the Commission were required to resolve all such disputes as a precondition to granting a section 271 application.[13] In the context of section 271's adjudicatory framework, the Commission has established certain procedural rules governing BOC section 271 applications.[14] The Commission has explained in prior orders the procedural rules it has developed to facilitate the review process.[15] Here we describe how the Commission considers the evidence of compliance that the BOC presents in its application.

5. As part of the determination that a BOC has satisfied the requirements of section 271, the Commission considers whether the BOC has fully implemented the competitive checklist in subsection (c)(2)(B). The BOC at all times bears the burden of proof of compliance with section 271, even if no party challenges its compliance with a particular requirement.[16] In demonstrating its compliance, a BOC must show that it has a concrete and specific legal obligation to furnish the item upon request pursuant to state-approved interconnection agreements that set forth prices and other terms and conditions for each checklist item, and that it is currently furnishing, or is ready to furnish, the checklist items in quantities that competitors may reasonably demand and at an acceptable level of quality.[17] In particular, the BOC must demonstrate that it is offering interconnection and access to network elements on a nondiscriminatory basis.[18] Previous Commission orders addressing section 271 applications

---

[13] *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6246, para. 19; *see also American Tel. & Tel. Co. v. FCC*, 220 F.3d 607, 631 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

[14] *See Procedures for Bell Operating Company Applications Under New Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, 11 FCC Rcd 19708, 19711 (1996); *Revised Comment Schedule For Ameritech Michigan Application, as amended, for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in the State of Michigan*, Public Notice, DA 97-127 (rel. Jan. 17, 1997); *Revised Procedures for Bell Operating Company Applications Under Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, 13 FCC Rcd 17457 (1997); *Updated Filing Requirements for Bell Operating Company Applications Under Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, DA 99-1994 (rel. Sept. 28, 1999); *Updated Filing Requirements for Bell Operating Company Applications Under Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, DA 01-734 (CCB rel. Mar. 23, 2001) (collectively "271 Procedural Public Notices").

[15] *See, e.g.*, *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order* 16 FCC Rcd at 6247-50, paras. 21-27; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18370-73, paras. 34-42; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3968-71, paras. 32-42.

[16] *See SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18374, para. 46; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3972, para. 46.

[17] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3973-74, para. 52.

[18] *See* 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(i), (ii).

have elaborated on this statutory standard.[19] First, for those functions the BOC provides to competing carriers that are analogous to the functions a BOC provides to itself in connection with its own retail service offerings, the BOC must provide access to competing carriers in "substantially the same time and manner" as it provides to itself.[20] Thus, where a retail analogue exists, a BOC must provide access that is equal to (i.e., substantially the same as) the level of access that the BOC provides itself, its customers, or its affiliates, in terms of quality, accuracy, and timeliness.[21] For those functions that have no retail analogue, the BOC must demonstrate that the access it provides to competing carriers would offer an efficient carrier a "meaningful opportunity to compete."[22]

6. The determination of whether the statutory standard is met is ultimately a judgment the Commission must make based on its expertise in promoting competition in local markets and in telecommunications regulation generally.[23] The Commission has not established, nor does it believe it appropriate to establish, specific objective criteria for what constitutes "substantially the same time and manner" or a "meaningful opportunity to compete."[24] Whether this legal standard is met can only be decided based on an analysis of specific facts and circumstances. Therefore, the Commission looks at each application on a case-by-case basis and considers the totality of the circumstances, including the origin and quality of the information in the record, to determine whether the nondiscrimination requirements of the Act are met.

A. Performance Data

7. As established in prior section 271 orders, the Commission has found that performance measurements provide valuable evidence regarding a BOC's compliance or noncompliance with individual checklist items. The Commission expects that, in its *prima facie* case in the initial application, a BOC relying on performance data will:

a) provide sufficient performance data to support its contention that the statutory requirements are satisfied;

b) identify the facial disparities between the applicant's performance for itself and its performance for competitors;

---

[19] *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6250-51, paras. 28-29; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3971-72, paras. 44-46.

[20] *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18373, para. 44; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3971, para. 44.

[21] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3971, para. 44; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20618-19.

[22] *Id.*

[23] *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18374, para. 46; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3972, para. 46.

[24] *Id.*

c) explain why those facial disparities are anomalous, caused by forces beyond the applicant's control (e.g., competing carrier-caused errors), or have no meaningful adverse impact on a competing carrier's ability to obtain and serve customers; and

d) provide the underlying data, analysis, and methodologies necessary to enable the Commission and commenters meaningfully to evaluate and contest the validity of the applicant's explanations for performance disparities, including, for example, carrier specific carrier-to-carrier performance data.

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.[25] 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.[26] 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 are 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

[25] *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6252, para. 31; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18377, para. 55 & n.102.

[26] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3970, para. 59.

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.

10. In sum, the Commission does not use performance measurements as a substitute for the 14-point competitive checklist. Rather, it uses performance measurements as valuable evidence with which to inform the judgment as to whether a BOC has complied with the checklist requirements. Although performance measurements add necessary objectivity and predictability to the review, they cannot wholly replace the Commission's own judgment as to whether a BOC has complied with the competitive checklist.

B. Relevance of Previous Section 271 Approvals

11. In some section 271 applications, the volumes of the BOC's commercial orders may be significantly lower than they were in prior proceedings. In certain instances, volumes may be so low as to render the performance data inconsistent and inconclusive.[27] Performance data based on low volumes of orders or other transactions are not as reliable an indicator of checklist compliance as performance based on larger numbers of observations. Indeed, where performance data are based on a low number of observations, small variations in performance may produce wide swings in the reported performance data. It is thus not possible to place the same evidentiary weight upon – and to draw the same types of conclusions from – performance data where volumes are low, as for data based on more robust activity.

12. In such cases, findings in prior, related section 271 proceedings may be a relevant factor in the Commission's analysis. Where a BOC provides evidence that a particular system reviewed and approved in a prior section 271 proceeding is also used in the proceeding at hand, the Commission's review of the same system in the current proceeding will be informed by the findings in the prior one. Indeed, to the extent that issues have already been briefed, reviewed and resolved in a prior section 271 proceeding, and absent new evidence or changed circumstances, an application for a related state should not be a forum for re-litigating and reconsidering those issues. Appropriately employed, such a practice can give us a fuller picture of the BOC's compliance with the section 271 requirements while avoiding, for all parties involved in the section 271 process, the delay and expense associated with redundant and unnecessary proceedings and submissions.

13. However, the statute requires the Commission to make a separate determination of checklist compliance for each state and, accordingly, we do not consider any finding from previous section 271 orders to be dispositive of checklist compliance in current proceedings. While the Commission's review may be informed by prior findings, the Commission will

[27] The Commission has never required, however, an applicant to demonstrate that it processes and provisions a substantial commercial volume of orders, or has achieved a specific market share in its service area, as a prerequisite for satisfying the competitive checklist. *See Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20585, para. 77 (explaining that Congress had considered and rejected language that would have imposed a "market share" requirement in section 271(c)(1)(A)).

consider all relevant evidence in the record, including state-specific factors identified by commenting parties, the states, the Department of Justice. However, the Commission has always held that an applicant's performance towards competing carriers in an actual commercial environment is the best evidence of nondiscriminatory access to OSS and other network elements.[28] Thus, the BOC's actual performance in the applicant state may be relevant to the analysis and determinations with respect to the 14 checklist items. Evidence of satisfactory performance in another state cannot trump convincing evidence that an applicant fails to provide nondiscriminatory access to a network element in the applicant state.

14. Moreover, because the Commission's review of a section 271 application must be based on a snapshot of a BOC's recent performance at the time an application is filed, the Commission cannot simply rely on findings relating to an applicant's performance in an anchor state at the time it issued the determination for that state. The performance in that state could change due to a multitude of factors, such as increased order volumes or shifts in the mix of the types of services or UNEs requested by competing carriers. Thus, even when the applicant makes a convincing showing of the relevance of anchor state data, the Commission must examine how recent performance in that state compares to performance at the time it approved that state's section 271 application, in order to determine if the systems and processes continue to perform at acceptable levels.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH ENTRY REQUIREMENTS – SECTIONS 271(c)(1)(A) & 271(c)(1)(B)

15. As noted above, in order for the Commission to approve a BOC's application to provide in-region, interLATA services, a BOC must first demonstrate that it satisfies the requirements of either section 271(c)(1)(A) (Track A) or 271(c)(1)(B) (Track B).[29] To qualify for Track A, a BOC must have interconnection agreements with one or more competing providers of "telephone exchange service . . . to residential and business subscribers."[30] The Act states that "such telephone service may be offered . . . either exclusively over [the competitor's] own telephone exchange service facilities or predominantly over [the competitor's] own telephone exchange facilities in combination with the resale of the telecommunications services of another carrier."[31] The Commission concluded in the *Ameritech Michigan Order* that section 271(c)(1)(A) is satisfied if one or more competing providers collectively serve residential and business subscribers.[32]

---

[28] *See SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18376, para. 53; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3974, para. 53.

[29] *See* 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(A).

[30] *Id*.

[31] *Id*.

[32] *See Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20589, para. 85; *see also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20633-35, paras. 46-48.

16. As an alternative to Track A, Section 271(c)(1)(B) permits BOCs to obtain authority to provide in-region, interLATA services if, after 10 months from the date of enactment, no facilities-based provider, as described in subparagraph (A), has requested the access and interconnection arrangements described therein (referencing one or more binding agreements approved under Section 252), but the state has approved an SGAT that satisfies the competitive checklist of subsection (c)(2)(B). Under section 271(d)(3)(A)(ii), the Commission shall not approve such a request for in-region, interLATA service unless the BOC demonstrates that, "with respect to access and interconnection generally offered pursuant to [an SGAT], such statement offers all of the items included in the competitive checklist."[33] Track B, however, is not available to a BOC if it has already received a request for access and interconnection from a prospective competing provider of telephone exchange service.[34]

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMPETITIVE CHECKLIST – SECTION 271(c)(2)(B)

A. Checklist Item 1 – Interconnection

17. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Act requires a section 271 applicant to provide "[i]nterconnection in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(2) and 252(d)(1)."[35] Section 251(c)(2) imposes a duty on incumbent LECs "to provide, for the facilities and equipment of any requesting telecommunications carrier, interconnection with the local exchange carrier's network . . . for the transmission and routing of telephone exchange service and exchange access."[36] In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission concluded that interconnection referred "only to the physical linking of two networks for the mutual exchange of traffic."[37] Section 251 contains three requirements for the provision of interconnection. First, an incumbent LEC must provide interconnection "at any technically feasible point within the carrier's network."[38] Second, an incumbent LEC must provide interconnection that is "at least equal in quality to that provided by the local exchange carrier to

---

33 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(A)(ii).

34 *See Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20561-62, para. 34. Nevertheless, the above-mentioned foreclosure of Track B as an option is subject to limited exceptions. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(1)(B); *see also Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20563-64, paras. 37-38.

35 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(i); *see Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3977-78, para. 63; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20640, para. 61; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20662, para. 222.

36 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(2)(A).

37 *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, First Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 15499, 15590, para. 176 (1996) (*Local Competition First Report and Order*). Transport and termination of traffic are therefore excluded from the Commission's definition of interconnection. *See id.*

38 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(2)(B). In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission identified a minimum set of technically feasible points of interconnection. *See Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15607-09, paras. 204-11.

itself."[39] Finally, the incumbent LEC must provide interconnection "on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory, in accordance with the terms of the agreement and the requirements of [section 251] and section 252."[40]

18. To implement the equal-in-quality requirement in section 251, the Commission's rules require an incumbent LEC to design and operate its interconnection facilities to meet "the same technical criteria and service standards" that are used for the interoffice trunks within the incumbent LEC's network.[41] In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission identified trunk group blockage and transmission standards as indicators of an incumbent LEC's technical criteria and service standards.[42] In prior section 271 applications, the Commission concluded that disparities in trunk group blockage indicated a failure to provide interconnection to competing carriers equal-in-quality to the interconnection the BOC provided to its own retail operations.[43]

19. In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission concluded that the requirement to provide interconnection on terms and conditions that are "just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory" means that an incumbent LEC must provide interconnection to a competitor in a manner no less efficient than the way in which the incumbent LEC provides the comparable function to its own retail operations.[44] The Commission's rules interpret this obligation to include, among other things, the incumbent LEC's installation time for interconnection service[45] and its provisioning of two-way trunking arrangements.[46] Similarly, repair time for troubles affecting interconnection trunks is useful for determining whether a BOC

---

[39] 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(2)(C).

[40] *Id*. § 251(c)(2)(D).

[41] *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15613-15, paras. 221-225; *see Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3978, para. 64; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20641-42, paras. 63-64.

[42] *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15614-15, paras. 224-25.

[43] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3978, para. 64; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20648-50, paras. 74-77; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20671-74, paras. 240-45. The Commission has relied on trunk blockage data to evaluate a BOC's interconnection performance. Trunk group blockage indicates that end users are experiencing difficulty completing or receiving calls, which may have a direct impact on the customer's perception of a competitive LEC's service quality.

[44] *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15612, para. 218; *see also Bell Atlantic New York* Order, 15 FCC Rcd at 3978, para. 65; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20642, para. 65.

[45] 47 C.F.R. § 51.305(a)(5).

[46] The Commission's rules require an incumbent LEC to provide two-way trunking upon request, wherever two-way trunking arrangements are technically feasible. 47 C.F.R. § 51.305(f); *see also Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3978-79, para. 65; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20642, para. 65; *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 15612-13, paras. 219-20.

provides interconnection service under "terms and conditions that are no less favorable than the terms and conditions" the BOC provides to its own retail operations.[47]

20. Competing carriers may choose any method of technically feasible interconnection at a particular point on the incumbent LEC's network.[48] Incumbent LEC provision of interconnection trunking is one common means of interconnection. Technically feasible methods also include, but are not limited to, physical and virtual collocation and meet point arrangements.[49] The provision of collocation is an essential prerequisite to demonstrating compliance with item 1 of the competitive checklist.[50] In the *Advanced Services First Report and Order*, the Commission revised its collocation rules to require incumbent LECs to include shared cage and cageless collocation arrangements as part of their physical collocation offerings.[51] In response to a remand from the D.C. Circuit, the Commission adopted the *Collocation Remand Order*, establishing revised criteria for equipment for which incumbent LECs must permit collocation, requiring incumbent LECs to provide cross-connects between collocated carriers, and establishing principles for physical collocation space and configuration.[52] To show compliance with its collocation obligations, a BOC must have processes and procedures in place to ensure that all applicable collocation arrangements are available on terms and conditions that are "just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory" in accordance with section 251(c)(6) and the FCC's implementing rules.[53] Data showing the quality of procedures for processing applications for collocation space, as well as the timeliness and efficiency of provisioning collocation space, help the Commission evaluate a BOC's compliance with its collocation obligations.[54]

---

47 47 C.F.R. § 51.305(a)(5).

48 *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15779, paras. 549-50; *see Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3979, para. 66; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20640-41, para. 61.

49 47 C.F.R. § 51.321(b); *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15779-82, paras. 549-50; *see also Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3979, para. 66; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20640-41, para. 62.

50 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(6) (requiring incumbent LECs to provide physical collocation); *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3979, para. 66; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20640-41, paras. 61-62.

51 *Deployment of Wireline Services offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability*, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 14 FCC Rcd 4761, 4784-86, paras. 41-43 (1999), *aff'd in part and vacated and remanded in part sub nom. GTE Service Corp. v. FCC*, 205 F.3d 416 (D.C. Cir. 2000), *on recon.*, *Collocation Reconsideration Order*, 15 FCC Rcd 17806 (2000); *on remand*, *Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability*, Fourth Report and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 15435 (2001) (*Collocation Remand Order*), *petition for recon. pending*.

52 *See Collocation Remand Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 15441-42, para. 12.

53 *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3979, para. 66; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20643, para. 66; *BellSouth Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 649-51, para. 62.

54 *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3979, para. 66; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20640-41, paras. 61-62.

21. As stated above, checklist item 1 requires a BOC to provide "interconnection in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(2) *and* 252(d)(1)."[55] Section 252(d)(1) requires state determinations regarding the rates, terms, and conditions of interconnection to be based on cost and to be nondiscriminatory, and allows the rates to include a reasonable profit.[56] The Commission's pricing rules require, among other things, that in order to comply with its collocation obligations, an incumbent LEC provide collocation based on TELRIC.[57]

22. To the extent pricing disputes arise, the Commission will not duplicate the work of the state commissions. As noted in the *SWBT Texas Order*, the Act authorizes the state commissions to resolve specific carrier-to-carrier disputes arising under the local competition provisions, and it authorizes the federal district courts to ensure that the results of the state arbitration process are consistent with federal law.[58] Although the Commission has an independent statutory obligation to ensure compliance with the checklist, section 271 does not compel us to preempt the orderly disposition of intercarrier disputes by the state commissions, particularly now that the Supreme Court has restored the Commission's pricing jurisdiction and has thereby directed the state commissions to follow FCC pricing rules in their disposition of those disputes.[59]

23. Consistent with the Commission's precedent, the mere presence of interim rates will not generally threaten a section 271 application so long as: (1) an interim solution to a particular rate dispute is reasonable under the circumstances; (2) the state commission has demonstrated its commitment to the Commission's pricing rules; and (3) provision is made for refunds or true-ups once permanent rates are set.[60] In addition, the Commission has determined that rates contained within an approved section 271 application, including those that are interim, are reasonable starting points for interim rates for the same carrier in an adjoining state.[61]

24. Although the Commission has been willing to grant a section 271 application with a limited number of interim rates where the above-mentioned three-part test is met, it is clearly preferable to analyze a section 271 application on the basis of rates derived from a permanent rate proceeding.[62] At some point, states will have had sufficient time to complete these

---

[55] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(i) (emphasis added).

[56] *Id*. § 252(d)(1).

[57] *See* 47 C.F.R. §§ 51.501-07, 51.509(g); *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15812-16, 15844-61, 15874-76, 15912, paras. 618-29, 674-712, 743-51, 826.

[58] *See SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18394, para. 88; *see also* 47 U.S.C. §§ 252(c), (e)(6); *American Tel. & Tel Co. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999) (*AT&T v. Iowa Utils. Bd*.).

[59] *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18394, para. 88; *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd*., 525 U.S. at 377-86.

[60] *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18394, para. 88; *see also Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4091, para. 258 (explaining the Commission's case-by-case review of interim prices).

[61] *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6359-60, para. 239.

[62] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4091, para. 260.

proceedings. The Commission will, therefore, become more reluctant to continue approving section 271 applications containing interim rates. It would not be sound policy for interim rates to become a substitute for completing these significant proceedings.

B. Checklist Item 2 – Unbundled Network Elements[63]

1. Access to Operations Support Systems

25. Incumbent LECs use a variety of systems, databases, and personnel (collectively referred to as OSS) to provide service to their customers.[64] The Commission consistently has found that nondiscriminatory access to OSS is a prerequisite to the development of meaningful local competition.[65] For example, new entrants must have access to the functions performed by the incumbent's OSS in order to formulate and place orders for network elements or resale services, to install service to their customers, to maintain and repair network facilities, and to bill customers.[66] The Commission has determined that without nondiscriminatory access to the

[63] We note that the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit recently opined on two relevant Commission decisions, *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 15 FCC Rcd 3696 (1999) (*UNE Remand Order*) and *Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Third Report and Order* in CC Doc. No. 98-147 and Fourth Report and Order in CC Doc. No. 96-98, 14 FCC Rcd 20912 (1999) (*Line Sharing Order*). *USTA v. FCC*, 290 F.3d 415 (D. C. Cir. 2002), *cert. denied sub nom WorldCom, Inc., et al. v. United States Telecom Ass'n, et al., 2003 WL 1448388, 71 USLW 3416 (March 24, 2003)*. The court's decision addressed both our UNE rules and our line sharing rules. Further, the court stated that "the *Line Sharing Order* must be vacated and remanded." USTA v. FCC, 290 F.3d at 429. The court also stated that it "grant[ed] the petitions for review[] and remand[ed] the *Line Sharing Order* and the *Local Competition Order* to the Commission for further consideration in accordance with the principles outlined." *Id.* at 430. On September 4, 2002, the D.C. Circuit denied petitions for rehearing filed by the Commission and others. *See Order*, Nos. 00-1012 and 00-1015 (D.C. Circuit, filed Sept. 4, 2002). On February 20, 2003, the Commission took action to revise its rules concerning incumbent LECs' obligations to make available elements of their networks on an unbundled basis to requesting carriers, and released its Order on August 21, 2003. *See Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (CC Docket No. 01-338), Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (CC Docket No. 96-98), and Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability (CC Docket No. 98-147),* Report and Order and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 03-36 (rel. Aug. 21, 2003) (*Triennial Review Order); see also FCC Adopts New Rules For Network Unbundling Obligations Of Incumbent Local Phone Carriers*, News Release, (rel. Feb. 20, 2003) (announcing adoption of an Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 01-338, *Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*) (*Triennial Review News Release*). We note, however, that, in determining whether a BOC applicant has satisfied the requirements of section 271, the Commission evaluates an applicant's compliance with the competitive checklist as developed in the Commission's local competition rules and orders in effect at the time the application was filed.

[64] *Id*. at 3989-90, para. 83; *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 585.

[65] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3990, para. 83; *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 547-48, 585; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20653.

[66] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3990, para. 83.

BOC's OSS, a competing carrier "will be severely disadvantaged, if not precluded altogether, from fairly competing" in the local exchange market.[67]

26. Section 271 requires the Commission to determine whether a BOC offers nondiscriminatory access to OSS functions. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ii) requires a BOC to provide "nondiscriminatory access to network elements in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1)."[68] The Commission has determined that access to OSS functions falls squarely within an incumbent LEC's duty under section 251(c)(3) to provide unbundled network elements (UNEs) under terms and conditions that are nondiscriminatory and just and reasonable, and its duty under section 251(c)(4) to offer resale services without imposing any limitations or conditions that are discriminatory or unreasonable.[69] The Commission must therefore examine a BOC's OSS performance to evaluate compliance with section 271(c)(2)(B)(ii) and (xiv).[70] In addition, the Commission has also concluded that the duty to provide nondiscriminatory access to OSS functions is embodied in other terms of the competitive checklist as well.[71] Consistent with prior orders, the Commission examines a BOC's OSS performance directly under checklist items 2 and 14, as well as other checklist terms.[72]

27. As part of its statutory obligation to provide nondiscriminatory access to OSS functions, a BOC must provide access that sufficiently supports each of the three modes of competitive entry envisioned by the 1996 Act – competitor-owned facilities, UNEs, and resale.[73] For OSS functions that are analogous to those that a BOC provides to itself, its customers or its affiliates, the nondiscrimination standard requires the BOC to offer requesting carriers access that is equivalent in terms of quality, accuracy, and timeliness.[74] The BOC must provide access that permits competing carriers to perform these functions in "substantially the same time and manner" as the BOC.[75] The Commission has recognized in prior orders that there may be

---

[67] *Id.*

[68] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ii).

[69] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3990, para. 84.

[70] *Id.*

[71] *Id.* As part of a BOC's demonstration that it is "providing" a checklist item (*e.g.*, unbundled loops, unbundled local switching, resale services), it must demonstrate that it is providing nondiscriminatory access to the systems, information, and personnel that support that element or service. An examination of a BOC's OSS performance is therefore integral to the determination of whether a BOC is offering all of the items contained in the competitive checklist. *Id*.

[72] *Id.* at 3990-91, para. 84.

[73] *Id.* at 3991, para. 85.

[74] *Id.*

[75] *Id.* For example, the Commission would not deem an incumbent LEC to be providing nondiscriminatory access to OSS if limitations on the processing of information between the interface and the back office systems (continued….)

situations in which a BOC contends that, although equivalent access has not been achieved for an analogous function, the access that it provides is nonetheless nondiscriminatory within the meaning of the statute.[76]

28. For OSS functions that have no retail analogue, the BOC must offer access "sufficient to allow an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete."[77] In assessing whether the quality of access affords an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete, the Commission will examine, in the first instance, whether specific performance standards exist for those functions.[78] In particular, the Commission will consider whether appropriate standards for measuring OSS performance have been adopted by the relevant state commission or agreed upon by the BOC in an interconnection agreement or during the implementation of such an agreement.[79] If such performance standards exist, the Commission will evaluate whether the BOC's performance is sufficient to allow an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete.[80]

29. The Commission analyzes whether a BOC has met the nondiscrimination standard for each OSS function using a two-step approach. First, the Commission determines "whether the BOC has deployed the necessary systems and personnel to provide sufficient access to each of the necessary OSS functions and whether the BOC is adequately assisting competing carriers to understand how to implement and use all of the OSS functions available to them."[81] The Commission next assesses "whether the OSS functions that the BOC has deployed are operationally ready, as a practical matter."[82]

(Continued from previous page)
prevented a competitor from performing a specific function in substantially the same time and manner as the incumbent performs that function for itself.

[76] *See id.*

[77] *Id.* at 3991, para. 86.

[78] *Id.*

[79] *Id.* As a general proposition, specific performance standards adopted by a state commission in an arbitration decision would be more persuasive evidence of commercial reasonableness than a standard unilaterally adopted by the BOC outside of its interconnection agreement. *Id*. at 20619-20.

[80] *See id.* at 3991-92, para. 86.

[81] *Id.* at 3992, para. 87; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20616; s*ee also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20654; *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 592-93. In making this determination, the Commission "consider[s] all of the automated and manual processes a BOC has undertaken to provide access to OSS functions," including the interface (or gateway) that connects the competing carrier's own operations support systems to the BOC; any electronic or manual processing link between that interface and the BOC's OSS (including all necessary back office systems and personnel); and all of the OSS that a BOC uses in providing network elements and resale services to a competing carrier. *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20615; s*ee also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20654 n.241.

[82] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3992, para. 88.

30. Under the first inquiry, a BOC must demonstrate that it has developed sufficient electronic (for functions that the BOC accesses electronically) and manual interfaces to allow competing carriers equivalent access to all of the necessary OSS functions.[83] For example, a BOC must provide competing carriers with the specifications necessary for carriers to design or modify their systems in a manner that will enable them to communicate with the BOC's systems and any relevant interfaces.[84] In addition, a BOC must disclose to competing carriers any internal business rules[85] and other formatting information necessary to ensure that a carrier's requests and orders are processed efficiently.[86] Finally, a BOC must demonstrate that its OSS is designed to accommodate both current demand and projected demand for competing carriers' access to OSS functions.[87] Although not a prerequisite, the Commission continues to encourage the use of industry standards as an appropriate means of meeting the needs of a competitive local exchange market.[88]

31. Under the second inquiry, the Commission examines performance measurements and other evidence of commercial readiness to ascertain whether the BOC's OSS is handling current demand and will be able to handle reasonably foreseeable future volumes.[89] The most probative evidence that OSS functions are operationally ready is actual commercial usage.[90] Absent sufficient and reliable data on commercial usage, the Commission will consider the results of carrier-to-carrier testing, independent third-party testing, and internal testing in assessing the commercial readiness of a BOC's OSS.[91] Although the Commission does not require OSS testing, a persuasive test will provide us with an objective means by which to evaluate a BOC's OSS readiness where there is little to no evidence of commercial usage, or may otherwise strengthen an application where the BOC's evidence of actual commercial usage is weak or is otherwise challenged by competitors. The persuasiveness of a third-party review,

---

[83] *Id*. at 3992, para. 87; *see also Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20616, para. 136 (The Commission determines "whether the BOC has deployed the necessary systems and personnel to provide sufficient access to each of the necessary OSS functions and whether the BOC is adequately assisting competing carriers to understand how to implement and use all of the OSS functions available to them."). For example, a BOC must provide competing carriers the specifications necessary to design their systems interfaces and business rules necessary to format orders, and demonstrate that systems are scalable to handle current and projected demand. *Id.*

[84] *Id.*

[85] Business rules refer to the protocols that a BOC uses to ensure uniformity in the format of orders and include information concerning ordering codes such as universal service ordering codes (USOCs) and field identifiers (FIDs). *Id.*; *see also Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20617 n.335.

[86] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3992, para. 88.

[87] *Id.*

[88] *See id.*

[89] *Id.* at 3993, para. 89.

[90] *Id.*

[91] *Id.*

however, is dependent upon the qualifications, experience and independence of the third party and the conditions and scope of the review itself.[92] If the review is limited in scope or depth or is not independent and blind, the Commission will give it minimal weight. As noted above, to the extent the Commission reviews performance data, it looks at the totality of the circumstances and generally does not view individual performance disparities, particularly if they are isolated and slight, as dispositive of whether a BOC has satisfied its checklist obligations.[93] Individual performance disparities may, nevertheless, result in a finding of checklist 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.

a. Relevance of a BOC's Prior Section 271 Orders

32. The *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order* specifically outlined a non-exhaustive evidentiary showing that must be made in the initial application when a BOC seeks to rely on evidence presented in another application.[94] First, a BOC's application must explain the extent to which the OSS are "the same" – that is, whether it employs the shared use of a single OSS, or the use of systems that are identical, but separate.[95] To satisfy this inquiry, the Commission looks to whether the relevant states utilize a common set of processes, business rules, interfaces, systems and, in many instances, even personnel.[96] The Commission will also carefully examine third party reports that demonstrate that the BOC's OSS are the same in each of the relevant states.[97] Finally, where a BOC has discernibly separate OSS, it must demonstrate that its OSS reasonably can be expected to behave in the same manner.[98] Second, unless an applicant seeks to establish only that certain discrete components of its OSS are the same, an applicant must submit evidence relating to *all* aspects of its OSS, including those OSS functions performed by BOC personnel.

---

92 *See id.*; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20659 (emphasizing that a third-party review should encompass the entire obligation of the incumbent LEC to provide nondiscriminatory access, and, where applicable, should consider the ability of actual competing carriers in the market to operate using the incumbent's OSS access).

93 *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6301-02, para. 138.

94 *See id*. at 6286-91, paras. 107-18

95 *See id*. at 6288, para. 111.

96 The Commission has consistently held that a BOC's OSS includes both mechanized systems and manual processes, and thus the OSS functions performed by BOC personnel have been part of the FCC's OSS functionality and commercial readiness reviews.

97 *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, *id*. at 6287, para. 108.

98 *See id*. at 6288, para. 111.

b. Pre-Ordering

33. A BOC must demonstrate that: (i) it offers nondiscriminatory access to OSS pre-ordering functions associated with determining whether a loop is capable of supporting xDSL advanced technologies; (ii) competing carriers successfully have built and are using application-to-application interfaces to perform pre-ordering functions and are able to integrate pre-ordering and ordering interfaces; [99] and (iii) its pre-ordering systems provide reasonably prompt response times and are consistently available in a manner that affords competitors a meaningful opportunity to compete.[100]

34. The pre-ordering phase of OSS generally includes those activities that a carrier undertakes to gather and verify the information necessary to place an order.[101] Given that pre-ordering represents the first exposure that a prospective customer has to a competing carrier, it is critical that a competing carrier is able to accomplish pre-ordering activities in a manner no less efficient and responsive than the incumbent.[102] Most of the pre-ordering activities that must be undertaken by a competing carrier to order resale services and UNEs from the incumbent are analogous to the activities a BOC must accomplish to furnish service to its own customers. For these pre-ordering functions, a BOC must demonstrate that it provides requesting carriers access that enables them to perform pre-ordering functions in substantially the same time and manner as its retail operations.[103] For those pre-ordering functions that lack a retail analogue, a BOC must provide access that affords an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete.[104] In prior orders, the Commission has emphasized that providing pre-ordering functionality through

---

[99] In prior orders, the Commission has emphasized that providing pre-ordering functionality through an application-to-application interface is essential in enabling carriers to conduct real-time processing and to integrate pre-ordering and ordering functions in the same manner as the BOC. *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18426, para. 148.

[100] The Commission has held previously that an interface that provides responses in a prompt timeframe and is stable and reliable, is necessary for competing carriers to market their services and serve their customers as efficiently and at the same level of quality as a BOC serves its own customers. *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4025 and 4029, paras. 145 and 154.

[101] *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4014, para. 129; *see also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20660, para. 94 (referring to "pre-ordering and ordering" collectively as "the exchange of information between telecommunications carriers about current or proposed customer products and services or unbundled network elements or some combination thereof"). In prior orders, the Commission has identified the following five pre-order functions: (1) customer service record (CSR) information; (2) address validation; (3) telephone number information; (4) due date information; (5) services and feature information. *See Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4015, para. 132; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20660, para. 94; *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 619, para. 147.

[102] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4014, para. 129.

[103] *Id.*; *see also BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 623-29 (concluding that failure to deploy an application-to-application interface denies competing carriers equivalent access to pre-ordering OSS functions).

[104] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4014, para. 129.

an application-to-application interface is essential in enabling carriers to conduct real-time processing and to integrate pre-ordering and ordering functions in the same manner as the BOC.[105]

(i) Access to Loop Qualification Information

35. In accordance with the *UNE Remand Order*,[106] the Commission requires incumbent carriers to provide competitors with access to all of the same detailed information about the loop that is available to the incumbents,[107] and in the same time frame, so that a competing carrier can make an independent judgment at the pre-ordering stage about whether an end user loop is capable of supporting the advanced services equipment the competing carrier intends to install.[108] Under the *UNE Remand Order*, the relevant inquiry is not whether a BOC's retail arm accesses such underlying information but whether such information exists anywhere in a BOC's back office and can be accessed by any of a BOC's personnel.[109] Moreover, a BOC may not "filter or digest" the underlying information and may not provide only information that is useful in provisioning of a particular type of xDSL that a BOC offers.[110] A BOC must also provide loop qualification information based, for example, on an individual address or zip code of the end users in a particular wire center, NXX code or on any other basis that the BOC provides such information to itself. Moreover, a BOC must also provide access for competing carriers to the loop qualifying information that the BOC can itself access manually or electronically. Finally, a BOC must provide access to loop qualification information to competitors within the same time intervals it is provided to the BOC's retail operations or its

---

[105] *See id.* at 4014, para. 130; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20661-67, para. 105.

[106] *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3885, para. 426 (determining "that the pre-ordering function includes access to loop qualification information").

[107] *See id.* At a minimum, a BOC must provide (1) the composition of the loop material, including both fiber and copper; (2) the existence, location and type of any electronic or other equipment on the loop, including but not limited to, digital loop carrier or other remote concentration devices, feeder/distribution interfaces, bridge taps, load coils, pair-gain devices, disturbers in the same or adjacent binder groups; (3) the loop length, including the length and location of each type of transmission media; (4) the wire gauge(s) of the loop; and (5) the electrical parameters of the loop, which may determine the suitability of the loop for various technologies. *Id.*

[108] As the Commission has explained in prior proceedings, because characteristics of a loop, such as its length and the presence of various impediments to digital transmission, can hinder certain advanced services technologies, carriers often seek to "pre-qualify" a loop by accessing basic loop makeup information that will assist carriers in ascertaining whether the loop, either with or without the removal of the impediments, can support a particular advanced service. *See id.*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4021, para. 140.

[109] *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3885-3887, paras. 427-431 (noting that "to the extent such information is not normally provided to the incumbent's retail personnel, but can be obtained by contacting back office personnel, it must be provided to requesting carriers within the same time frame that any incumbent personnel are able to obtain such information.").

[110] *See SWBT Kansas Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6292-93, para. 121.

advanced services affiliate.[111] As the Commission determined in the *UNE Remand Order*, however, "to the extent such information is not normally provided to the incumbent's retail personnel, but can be obtained by contacting back office personnel, it must be provided to requesting carriers within the same time frame that any incumbent personnel are able to obtain such information."[112]

c. Ordering

36. Consistent with section 271(c)(2)(B)(ii), a BOC must demonstrate its ability to provide competing carriers with access to the OSS functions necessary for placing wholesale orders. For those functions of the ordering systems for which there is a retail analogue, a BOC must demonstrate, with performance data and other evidence, that it provides competing carriers with access to its OSS in substantially the same time and manner as it provides to its retail operations. For those ordering functions that lack a direct retail analogue, a BOC must demonstrate that its systems and performance allow an efficient carrier a meaningful opportunity to compete. As in prior section 271 orders, the Commission looks primarily at the applicant's ability to return order confirmation notices, order reject notices, order completion notices and jeopardies, and at its order flow-through rate.[113]

d. Provisioning

37. A BOC must provision competing carriers' orders for resale and UNE-P services in substantially the same time and manner as it provisions orders for its own retail customers.[114] Consistent with the approach in prior section 271 orders, the Commission examines a BOC's provisioning processes, as well as its performance with respect to provisioning timeliness (i.e., missed due dates and average installation intervals) and provisioning quality (i.e., service problems experienced at the provisioning stage).[115]

e. Maintenance and Repair

38. A competing carrier that provides service through resale or UNEs remains dependent upon the incumbent LEC for maintenance and repair. Thus, as part of its obligation to

---

111 *Id.*

112 *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3885-3887, paras. 427-31.

113 *See SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18438, para. 170; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4035-39, paras. 163-66. The Commission examines (i) order flow-through rates, (ii) jeopardy notices and (iii) order completion notices using the "same time and manner" standard. The Commission examines order confirmation notices and order rejection notices using the "meaningful opportunity to compete" standard.

114 *See Bell Atlantic New York*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4058, para. 196. For provisioning timeliness, the Commission looks to missed due dates and average installation intervals; for provisioning quality, the Commission looks to service problems experienced at the provisioning stage.

115 *Id.*

provide nondiscriminatory access to OSS functions, a BOC must provide requesting carriers with nondiscriminatory access to its maintenance and repair systems.[116] To the extent a BOC performs analogous maintenance and repair functions for its retail operations, it must provide competing carriers access that enables them to perform maintenance and repair functions "in substantially the same time and manner" as a BOC provides its retail customers.[117] Equivalent access ensures that competing carriers can assist customers experiencing service disruptions using the same network information and diagnostic tools that are available to BOC personnel.[118] Without equivalent access, a competing carrier would be placed at a significant competitive disadvantage, as its customer would perceive a problem with a BOC's network as a problem with the competing carrier's own network.[119]

f. Billing

39. A BOC must provide nondiscriminatory access to its billing functions, which is necessary to enable competing carriers to provide accurate and timely bills to their customers.[120] In making this determination, the Commission assesses a BOC's billing processes and systems, and its performance data. Consistent with prior section 271 orders, a BOC must demonstrate that it provides competing carriers with complete and accurate reports on the service usage of competing carriers' customers in substantially the same time and manner that a BOC provides such information to itself, and with wholesale bills in a manner that gives competing carriers a meaningful opportunity to compete.[121]

g. Change Management Process

40. Competing carriers need information about, and specifications for, an incumbent's systems and interfaces to develop and modify their systems and procedures to access the incumbent's OSS functions.[122] Thus, in order to demonstrate that it is providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS, a BOC must first demonstrate that it "has deployed the necessary systems and personnel to provide sufficient access to each of the necessary OSS functions and . . . is adequately assisting competing carriers to understand how to implement and

---

[116] *Id*. at 4067, para. 212; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20692; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20613, 20660-61.

[117] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4058, para. 196; *see also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20692-93.

[118] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4058, para. 196.

[119] *Id*.

[120] *See SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18461, para. 210.

[121] *See id.*; *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6316-17, at para. 163.

[122] *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3999-4000, para. 102; *First BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 6279 n.197; *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 625 n.467; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20617 n.334; *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19742.

use all of the OSS functions available to them."[123] By showing that it adequately assists competing carriers to use available OSS functions, a BOC provides evidence that it offers an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete.[124] As part of this demonstration, the Commission will give substantial consideration to the existence of an adequate change management process and evidence that the BOC has adhered to this process over time.[125]

41. The change management process refers to the methods and procedures that the BOC employs to communicate with competing carriers regarding the performance of, and changes in, the BOC's OSS.[126] Such changes may include updates to existing functions that impact competing carrier interface(s) upon a BOC's release of new interface software; technology changes that require competing carriers to meet new technical requirements upon a BOC's software release date; additional functionality changes that may be used at the competing carrier's option, on or after a BOC's release date for new interface software; and changes that may be mandated by regulatory authorities.[127] Without a change management process in place, a BOC can impose substantial costs on competing carriers simply by making changes to its systems and interfaces without providing adequate testing opportunities and accurate and timely notice and documentation of the changes.[128] Change management problems can impair a competing carrier's ability to obtain nondiscriminatory access to UNEs, and hence a BOC's compliance with section 271(2)(B)(ii).[129]

42. In evaluating whether a BOC's change management plan affords an efficient competitor a meaningful opportunity to compete, the Commission first assesses whether the plan is adequate. In making this determination, it assesses whether the evidence demonstrates: (1) that information relating to the change management process is clearly organized and readily accessible to competing carriers;[130] (2) that competing carriers had substantial input in the design and continued operation of the change management process;[131] (3) that the change management plan defines a procedure for the timely resolution of change management disputes;[132] (4) the

123 *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3999, para. 102.

124 *Id.* at 3999-4000, para. 102

125 *Id.* at 4000, para. 102.

126 *Id.* at 4000, para. 103.

127 *Id.*

128 *Id.* at 4000, para. 103.

129 *Id.*

130 *Id.* at 4002, para. 107.

131 *Id.* at 4000, para. 104.

132 *Id.* at 4002, para. 108.

availability of a stable testing environment that mirrors production;[133] and (5) the efficacy of the documentation the BOC makes available for the purpose of building an electronic gateway.[134] After determining whether the BOC's change management plan is adequate, the Commission evaluates whether the BOC has demonstrated a pattern of compliance with this plan.[135]

2. UNE Combinations

43. In order to comply with the requirements of checklist item 2, a BOC must show that it is offering "[n]ondiscriminatory access to network elements in accordance with the requirements of section 251(c)(3)."[136] Section 251(c)(3) requires an incumbent LEC to "provide, to any requesting telecommunications carrier . . . nondiscriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point on rates, terms and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory."[137] Section 251(c)(3) of the Act also requires incumbent LECs to provide UNEs in a manner that allows requesting carriers to combine such elements in order to provide a telecommunications service.[138]

44. In the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, the Commission emphasized that the ability of requesting carriers to use UNEs, as well as combinations of UNEs, is integral to achieving Congress' objective of promoting competition in local telecommunications markets.[139] Using combinations of UNEs provides a competitor with the incentive and ability to package and market services in ways that differ from the BOCs' existing service offerings in order to compete in the local telecommunications market.[140] Moreover, combining the incumbent's UNEs with their own facilities encourages facilities-based competition and allows competing providers to provide a wide array of competitive choices.[141] Because the use of combinations of UNEs is an important strategy for entry into the local telecommunications market, as well as an obligation under the requirements of section 271, the Commission examines section 271 applications to

---

133 *Id.* at 4002-03, paras. 109-10.

134 *Id.* at 4003-04, para. 110. In the *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, the Commission used these factors in determining whether Bell Atlantic had an adequate change management process in place. *See id.* at 4004, para. 111. The Commission left open the possibility, however, that a change management plan different from the one implemented by Bell Atlantic may be sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of section 271. *Id.*

135 *Id.* at 3999, para. 101, 4004-05, para. 112.

136 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ii).

137 *Id*. § 251(c)(3).

138 *Id.*

139 *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20718-19; *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 646.

140 *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 646; *see also Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15666-68.

141 *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4077-78, para. 230.

determine whether competitive carriers are able to combine network elements as required by the Act and the Commission's regulations.[142]

3. Pricing of Network Elements

45. Checklist item 2 of section 271 states that a BOC must provide "nondiscriminatory access to network elements in accordance with sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1)" of the Act.[143] Section 251(c)(3) requires incumbent LECs to provide "nondiscriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory."[144] Section 252(d)(1) requires that a state commission's determination of the just and reasonable rates for network elements shall be based on the cost of providing the network elements, shall be nondiscriminatory, and may include a reasonable profit.[145] Pursuant to this statutory mandate, the Commission has determined that prices for UNEs must be based on the total element long run incremental cost (TELRIC) of providing those elements.[146] The Commission also promulgated rule 51.315(b), which prohibits incumbent LECs from separating already combined elements before providing them to competing carriers, except on request.[147] The Commission has previously held that it will not conduct a *de novo* review of a state's pricing determinations and will reject an application only if "basic TELRIC principles are violated or the state commission

---

142 *Id. In Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC*, 219 F.3d 744 (8th Cir. 2000), the Eighth Circuit had vacated the Commission's "additional combinations" rules (47 C.F.R. Sections 51-315(c)-(f)). However, on May 13, 2002, the Supreme Court reversed the Eighth Circuit with respect to those rules and remanded the case to the court of appeals "for further proceedings consistent with this opinion." *Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC*, 535 U.S. 467, 539. *See also id*. at 1683-87. In response, the Eighth Circuit, on August 21, 2002, vacated its prior opinion insofar as it had vacated the pertinent combinations rules and denied the petitions for review with respect to those rules. *Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC*, 8th Circuit Nos. 96-3321, *et al*., Judgment, filed August 21, 2002.). *See also Competitive Telecommunications Association v. FCC*, 309 F. 3d 8 (2002) (affirming the Commission's interim decision to limit the ability of competitive local exchange carriers to gain access to a network element combination known as the enhanced extended link).

143 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ii).

144 *Id*. § 251(c)(3).

145 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(1).

146 *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15844-46, paras. 674-79; 47 C.F.R. §§ 51.501 *et seq*.; *see also Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket No. 98-147, and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98*, Third Report and Order and Fourth Report and Order, 14 FCC Rcd 20912, 20974, para. 135 (*Line Sharing Order*) (concluding that states should set the prices for line sharing as a new network element in the same manner as the state sets prices for other UNEs).

147 *See* 47 C.F.R. § 51.315(b).

makes clear errors in factual findings on matters so substantial that the end result falls outside the range that the reasonable application of TELRIC principles would produce."[148]

46. Although the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit stayed the Commission's pricing rules in 1996,[149] the Supreme Court restored the Commission's pricing authority on January 25, 1999, and remanded to the Eighth Circuit for consideration of the merits of the challenged rules.[150] On remand from the Supreme Court, the Eighth Circuit concluded that while TELRIC is an acceptable method for determining costs, certain specific requirements contained within the Commission's pricing rules were contrary to Congressional intent.[151] The Eighth Circuit stayed the issuance of its mandate pending review by the Supreme Court.[152] The Supreme Court, on May 13, 2002, upheld the Commission's forward-looking pricing methodology in determining costs of UNEs and "reverse[d] the Eighth Circuit's judgment insofar as it invalidated TELRIC as a method for setting rates under the Act."[153] Accordingly, the Commission's pricing rules remain in effect.

C. Checklist Item 3 – Poles, Ducts, Conduits and Rights of Way

47. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iii) requires BOCs to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the [BOC] at just and reasonable rates in accordance with the requirements of section 224."[154] Section 224(f)(1) states

---

148 *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4084, para. 244; *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6266, para. 59.

149 *Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, 120 F.3d 753, 800, 804, 805-06 (8th Cir. 1997).

150 *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999). In reaching its decision, the Court acknowledged that section 201(b) "explicitly grants the FCC jurisdiction to make rules governing matters to which the 1996 Act applies." *Id.* at 380. Furthermore, the Court determined that section 251(d) also provides evidence of an express jurisdictional grant by requiring that "the Commission [shall] complete all actions necessary to establish regulations to implement the requirements of this section." *Id.* at 382. The Court also held that the pricing provisions implemented under the Commission's rulemaking authority do not inhibit the establishment of rates by the states. The Court concluded that the Commission has jurisdiction to design a pricing methodology to facilitate local competition under the 1996 Act, including pricing for interconnection and unbundled access, as "it is the States that will apply those standards and implement that methodology, determining the concrete result." *Id*.

151 *Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, 219 F.3d 744 (8th Cir. 2000), *petition for cert. granted sub nom. Verizon Communications v. FCC*, 121 S. Ct. 877 (2001).

152 *Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, No. 96-3321 *et al.* (8th Cir. Sept. 25, 2000).

153 *Verizon v. FCC,* 535 U.S. 467, 523. On August 21, 2002, the Eighth Circuit implemented the Supreme Court's mandate with respect to the Commission's TELRIC pricing rule by vacating its prior opinion insofar as it had invalidated that rule and by denying the petitions for review of that rule. *Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC*, 8th Circuit Nos. 96-3321, et al., Judgment, filed August 21, 2002.

154 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(iii). As originally enacted, section 224 was intended to address obstacles that cable operators encountered in obtaining access to poles, ducts, conduits, or rights-of-way owned or controlled by utilities. The 1996 Act amended section 224 in several important respects to ensure that telecommunications carriers (continued….)

that "[a] utility shall provide a cable television system or any telecommunications carrier with nondiscriminatory access to any pole, duct, conduit, or right-of-way owned or controlled by it."[155] Notwithstanding this requirement, section 224(f)(2) permits a utility providing electric service to deny access to its poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way, on a nondiscriminatory basis, "where there is insufficient capacity and for reasons of safety, reliability and generally applicable engineering purposes."[156] Section 224 also contains two separate provisions governing the maximum rates that a utility may charge for "pole attachments."[157] Section 224(b)(1) states that the Commission shall regulate the rates, terms, and conditions governing pole attachments to ensure that they are "just and reasonable."[158] Notwithstanding this general grant of authority, section 224(c)(1) states that "[n]othing in [section 224] shall be construed to apply to, or to give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to the rates, terms, and conditions, or access to poles, ducts, conduits and rights-of-way as provided in [section 224(f)], for pole attachments in any case where such matters are regulated by a State."[159] As of 1992, nineteen states, including Connecticut, had certified to the Commission that they regulated the rates, terms, and conditions for pole attachments.[160]

(Continued from previous page)
as well as cable operators have access to poles, ducts, conduits, or rights-of-way owned or controlled by utility companies, including LECs. *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20706, n.574.

[155] 47 U.S.C. § 224(f)(1). Section 224(a)(1) defines "utility" to include any entity, including a LEC, that controls "poles, ducts, conduits, or rights-of-way used, in whole or in part, for any wire communications." 47 U.S.C. § 224(a)(1).

[156] 47 U.S.C. § 224(f)(2). In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission concluded that, although the statutory exception enunciated in section 224(f)(2) appears to be limited to utilities providing electrical service, LECs should also be permitted to deny access to their poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way because of insufficient capacity and for reasons of safety, reliability and generally applicable engineering purposes, provided the assessment of such factors is done in a nondiscriminatory manner. *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 16080-81, paras. 1175-77.

[157] Section 224(a)(4) defines "pole attachment" as "any attachment by a cable television system or provider of telecommunications service to a pole, duct, conduit, or right-of-way owned or controlled by a utility." 47 U.S.C. § 224(a)(4).

[158] 47 U.S.C. § 224(b)(1).

[159] *Id*. § 224(c)(1). The 1996 Act extended the Commission's authority to include not just rates, terms, and conditions, but also the authority to regulate nondiscriminatory access to poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way. *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 16104, para. 1232; 47 U.S.C. § 224(f). Absent state regulation of terms and conditions of nondiscriminatory attachment access, the Commission retains jurisdiction. *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 16104, para. 1232; 47 U.S.C. § 224(c)(1); *see also Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4093, para. 264.

[160] *See States That Have Certified That They Regulate Pole Attachments*, Public Notice, 7 FCC Rcd 1498 (1992); 47 U.S.C. § 224(f).

D. Checklist Item 4 – Unbundled Local Loops

48. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act, item 4 of the competitive checklist, requires that a BOC provide "[l]ocal loop transmission from the central office to the customer's premises, unbundled from local switching or other services."[161] The Commission has defined the loop as a transmission facility between a distribution frame, or its equivalent, in an incumbent LEC central office, and the demarcation point at the customer premises. This definition includes different types of loops, including two-wire and four-wire analog voice-grade loops, and two-wire and four-wire loops that are conditioned to transmit the digital signals needed to provide service such as ISDN, ADSL, HDSL, and DS1-level signals.[162]

49. In order to establish that it is "providing" unbundled local loops in compliance with checklist item 4, a BOC must demonstrate that it has a concrete and specific legal obligation to furnish loops and that it is currently doing so in the quantities that competitors demand and at an acceptable level of quality. A BOC must also demonstrate that it provides nondiscriminatory access to unbundled loops.[163] Specifically, the BOC must provide access to any functionality of the loop requested by a competing carrier unless it is not technically feasible to condition the loop facility to support the particular functionality requested. In order to provide the requested loop functionality, such as the ability to deliver xDSL services, the BOC may be required to take affirmative steps to condition existing loop facilities to enable competing carriers to provide services not currently provided over the facilities. The BOC must provide competitors with access to unbundled loops regardless of whether the BOC uses digital loop carrier (DLC) technology or similar remote concentration devices for the particular loops sought by the competitor.

50. On December 9, 1999, the Commission released the *Line Sharing Order*, which introduced new rules requiring BOCs to offer requesting carriers unbundled access to the high-frequency portion of local loops (HFPL).[164] HFPL is defined as "the frequency above the voiceband on a copper loop facility that is being used to carry traditional POTS analog circuit-switched voiceband transmissions." This definition applies whether a BOC's voice customers are served by cooper or by digital loop carrier equipment. Competing carriers should have

---

[161] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(iv).

[162] *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15691, para. 380; *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3772-73, paras. 166-67, n.301 (retaining definition of the local loop from the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, but replacing the phrase "network interconnection device" with "demarcation point," and making explicit that dark fiber and loop conditioning are among the features, functions and capabilities of the loop).

[163] *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18481-81, para. 248; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4095, para. 269; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20637, para. 185.

[164] *See Line Sharing Order*, 14 FCC Rcd at 20924-27, paras. 20-27; *see also* n.63 at C-12 *supra*.

access to the HFPL at either a central office or at a remote terminal. However, the HFPL network element is *only* available on a copper loop facility.[165]

51. To determine whether a BOC makes line sharing available consistent with Commission rules set out in the *Line Sharing Order*, the Commission examines categories of performance measurements identified in the *Bell Atlantic New York* and *SWBT Texas Orders*. Specifically, a successful BOC applicant could provide evidence of BOC-caused missed installation due dates, average installation intervals, trouble reports within 30 days of installation, mean time to repair, trouble report rates, and repeat trouble report rates. In addition, a successful BOC applicant should provide evidence that its central offices are operationally ready to handle commercial volumes of line sharing and that it provides competing carriers with nondiscriminatory access to the pre-ordering and ordering OSS functions associated with the provision of line shared loops, including access to loop qualification information and databases.

52. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iv) also requires that a BOC demonstrate that it makes line splitting available to competing carriers so that competing carriers may provide voice and data service over a single loop.[166] In addition, a BOC must demonstrate that a competing carrier, either alone or in conjunction with another carrier, is able to replace an existing UNE-P configuration used to provide voice service with an arrangement that enables it to provide voice and data service to a customer. To make such a showing, a BOC must show that it has a legal obligation to provide line splitting through rates, terms, and conditions in interconnection agreements and that it offers competing carriers the ability to order an unbundled xDSL-capable loop terminated to a collocated splitter and DSLAM equipment, and combine it with unbundled switching and shared transport.[167]

E. Checklist Item 5 – Unbundled Local Transport

53. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(v) of the competitive checklist requires a BOC to provide "[l]ocal transport from the trunk side of a wireline local exchange carrier switch unbundled from switching or other services."[168] The Commission has required that BOCs provide both dedicated and shared transport to requesting carriers.[169] Dedicated transport consists of BOC transmission

---

165 *See Deployment of Wireline Services offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Third Report and Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 98-147, Fourth Report and Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-98, 16 FCC Rcd 2101, 2106-07, para. 10 (2001).

166 *See generally SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18515-17, paras. 323-329 (describing line splitting); 47 C.F.R. § 51.703(c) (requiring that incumbent LECs provide competing carriers with access to unbundled loops in a manner that allows competing carriers "to provide any telecommunications service that can be offered by means of that network element").

167 *See SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6348, para. 220.

168 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(v).

169 *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20719, para. 201.

facilities dedicated to a particular customer or carrier that provide telecommunications between wire centers owned by BOCs or requesting telecommunications carriers, or between switches owned by BOCs or requesting telecommunications carriers.[170] Shared transport consists of transmission facilities shared by more than one carrier, including the BOC, between end office switches, between end office switches and tandem switches, and between tandem switches, in the BOC's network.[171]

F. Checklist Item 6 – Unbundled Local Switching

54. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vi) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to provide "[l]ocal switching unbundled from transport, local loop transmission, or other services."[172] In the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission required BellSouth to provide unbundled local switching that included line-side and trunk-side facilities, plus the features, functions, and capabilities of the switch.[173] The features, functions, and capabilities of the switch include the basic switching function as well as the same basic capabilities that are available to the incumbent LEC's customers.[174] Additionally, local switching includes all vertical features that the switch is capable of providing, as well as any technically feasible customized routing functions.[175]

---

[170] *Id.* A BOC has the following obligations with respect to dedicated transport: (a) provide unbundled access to dedicated transmission facilities between BOC central offices or between such offices and serving wire centers (SWCs); between SWCs and interexchange carriers points of presence (POPs); between tandem switches and SWCs, end offices or tandems of the BOC, and the wire centers of BOCs and requesting carriers; (b) provide all technically feasible transmission capabilities such as DS1, DS3, and Optical Carrier levels that the competing carrier could use to provide telecommunications; (c) not limit the facilities to which dedicated interoffice transport facilities are connected, provided such interconnections are technically feasible, or restrict the use of unbundled transport facilities; and (d) to the extent technically feasible, provide requesting carriers with access to digital cross-connect system functionality in the same manner that the BOC offers such capabilities to interexchange carriers that purchase transport services. *Id.* at 20719.

[171] *Id.* at 20719, n.650. The Commission also found that a BOC has the following obligations with respect to shared transport: (a) provide shared transport in a way that enables the traffic of requesting carriers to be carried on the same transport facilities that a BOC uses for its own traffic; (b) provide shared transport transmission facilities between end office switches, between its end office and tandem switches, and between tandem switches in its network; (c) permit requesting carriers that purchase unbundled shared transport and unbundled switching to use the same routing table that is resident in the BOC's switch; and (d) permit requesting carriers to use shared (or dedicated) transport as an unbundled element to carry originating access traffic from, and terminating traffic to, customers to whom the requesting carrier is also providing local exchange service. *Id.* at 20720, n.652.

[172] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vi); *see also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20722. A switch connects end user lines to other end user lines, and connects end user lines to trunks used for transporting a call to another central office or to a long-distance carrier. Switches can also provide end users with "vertical features" such as call waiting, call forwarding, and caller ID, and can direct a call to a specific trunk, such as to a competing carrier's operator services.

[173] *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20722, para. 207.

[174] *Id*.

[175] *Id.* at 20722-23, para. 207.

55. Moreover, in the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission required BellSouth to permit competing carriers to purchase UNEs, including unbundled switching, in a manner that permits a competing carrier to offer, and bill for, exchange access and the termination of local traffic.[176] The Commission also stated that measuring daily customer usage for billing purposes requires essentially the same OSS functions for both competing carriers and incumbent LECs, and that a BOC must demonstrate that it is providing equivalent access to billing information.[177] Therefore, the ability of a BOC to provide billing information necessary for a competitive LEC to bill for exchange access and termination of local traffic is an aspect of unbundled local switching.[178] Thus, there is an overlap between the provision of unbundled local switching and the provision of the OSS billing function.[179]

56. To comply with the requirements of unbundled local switching, a BOC must also make available trunk ports on a shared basis and routing tables resident in the BOC's switch, as necessary to provide access to shared transport functionality.[180] In addition, a BOC may not limit the ability of competitors to use unbundled local switching to provide exchange access by requiring competing carriers to purchase a dedicated trunk from an interexchange carrier's point of presence to a dedicated trunk port on the local switch.[181]

G. Checklist Item 7 – 911/E911 Access and Directory Assistance/Operator Services

57. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii) of the Act requires a BOC to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to – (I) 911 and E911 services."[182] In the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, the Commission found that "section 271 requires a BOC to provide competitors access to its 911 and E911 services in the same manner that a BOC obtains such access, *i.e.*, at parity."[183] Specifically, the Commission found that a BOC "must maintain the 911 database entries for competing LECs with the same accuracy and reliability that it maintains the database entries for its own customers."[184] For facilities-based carriers, the BOC must provide "unbundled access to

176 *Id.* at 20723, para. 208.

177 *Id.* at 20723, para. 208 (citing *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20619, para. 140).

178 *Id.*

179 *Id.*

180 *Id.* at 20723, para. 209 (citing the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20705, para. 306).

181 *Id.* (citing the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20714-15, paras. 324-25).

182 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vii). 911 and E911 services transmit calls from end users to emergency personnel. It is critical that a BOC provide competing carriers with accurate and nondiscriminatory access to 911/E911 services so that these carriers' customers are able to reach emergency assistance. Customers use directory assistance and operator services to obtain customer listing information and other call completion services.

183 *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20679, para. 256.

184 *Id.*

[its] 911 database and 911 interconnection, including the provision of dedicated trunks from the requesting carrier's switching facilities to the 911 control office at parity with what [the BOC] provides to itself."[185] Section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II) and section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III) require a BOC to provide nondiscriminatory access to "directory assistance services to allow the other carrier's customers to obtain telephone numbers" and "operator call completion services," respectively.[186] Section 251(b)(3) of the Act imposes on each LEC "the duty to permit all [competing providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service] to have nondiscriminatory access to . . . operator services, directory assistance, and directory listing, with no unreasonable dialing delays."[187] The Commission concluded in the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order* that a BOC must be in compliance with the regulations implementing section 251(b)(3) to satisfy the requirements of sections 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II) and 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III).[188] In the *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, the Commission held that the phrase "nondiscriminatory access to directory assistance and directory listings" means that "the customers of all telecommunications service providers should be able to access each LEC's directory assistance service and obtain a directory listing on a nondiscriminatory basis, notwithstanding: (1) the identity of a requesting customer's local telephone service provider; or (2) the identity of the telephone service provider for a customer whose directory

---

185 *Id.*

186 47 U.S.C. §§ 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II), (III).

187 *Id*. § 251(b)(3). The Commission implemented section 251(b)(3) in the *Local Competition Second Report and Order*. 47 C.F.R. § 51.217; *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Second Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 19392 (1996) (*Local Competition Second Report and Order*) *vacated in part sub nom. People of the State of California v. FCC*, 124 F.3d 934 (8th Cir. 1997), *overruled in part*, *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999); *see also Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Provision of Directory Listings Information under the Telecommunications Act of 1934*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 14 FCC Rcd 15550 (1999) (*Directory Listings Information NPRM*).

188 While both sections 251(b)(3) and 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(II) refer to nondiscriminatory access to "directory assistance," section 251(b)(3) refers to nondiscriminatory access to "operator services," while section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III) refers to nondiscriminatory access to "operator call completion services." 47 U.S.C. §§ 251(b)(3), 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)(III). The term "operator call completion services" is not defined in the Act, nor has the Commission previously defined the term. However, for section 251(b)(3) purposes, the term "operator services" was defined as meaning "any automatic or live assistance to a consumer to arrange for billing or completion, or both, of a telephone call." *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19448, para. 110. In the same order the Commission concluded that busy line verification, emergency interrupt, and operator-assisted directory assistance are forms of "operator services," because they assist customers in arranging for the billing or completion (or both) of a telephone call. *Id.* at 19449, para. 111. All of these services may be needed or used to place a call. For example, if a customer tries to direct dial a telephone number and constantly receives a busy signal, the customer may contact the operator to attempt to complete the call. Since billing is a necessary part of call completion, and busy line verification, emergency interrupt, and operator-assisted directory assistance can all be used when an operator completes a call, the Commission concluded in the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order* that for checklist compliance purposes, "operator call completion services" is a subset of or equivalent to "operator service." *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20740, n.763. As a result, the Commission uses the nondiscriminatory standards established for operator services to determine whether nondiscriminatory access is provided.

listing is requested."[189] The Commission concluded that nondiscriminatory access to the dialing patterns of 4-1-1 and 5-5-5-1-2-1-2 to access directory assistance were technically feasible, and would continue.[190] The Commission specifically held that the phrase "nondiscriminatory access to operator services" means that "a telephone service customer, regardless of the identity of his or her local telephone service provider, must be able to connect to a local operator by dialing '0,' or '0 plus' the desired telephone number."[191]

58. Competing carriers may provide operator services and directory assistance by reselling the BOC's services, outsourcing service provision to a third-party provider, or using their own personnel and facilities. The Commission's rules require BOCs to permit competitive LECs wishing to resell the BOC's operator services and directory assistance to request the BOC to brand their calls.[192] Competing carriers wishing to provide operator services or directory assistance using their own or a third party provider's facilities and personnel must be able to obtain directory listings either by obtaining directory information on a "read only" or "per dip" basis from the BOC's directory assistance database, or by creating their own directory assistance database by obtaining the subscriber listing information in the BOC's database.[193] Although the Commission originally concluded that BOCs must provide directory assistance and operator

---

[189] 47 C.F.R. § 51.217(c)(3); *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19456-58, paras. 130-35. The *Local Competition Second Report and Order's* interpretation of section 251(b)(3) is limited "to access to each LEC's directory assistance service." *Id.* at 19456, para. 135. However, section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii) is not limited to the LEC's systems but requires "nondiscriminatory access to . . . directory assistance to allow the other carrier's customers to obtain telephone numbers." 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(vii). Combined with the Commission's conclusion that "incumbent LECs must unbundle the facilities and functionalities providing operator services and directory assistance from resold services and other unbundled network elements to the extent technically feasible," *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15772-73, paras. 535-37, section 271(c)(2)(B)(vii)'s requirement should be understood to require the BOCs to provide nondiscriminatory access to the directory assistance service provider selected by the customer's local service provider, regardless of whether the competitor; provides such services itself; selects the BOC to provide such services; or chooses a third party to provide such services. *See Directory Listings Information NPRM*.

[190] *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19464, para. 151.

[191] *Id*. at 19464, para. 151.

[192] 47 C.F.R. § 51.217(d); *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19463, para. 148. For example, when customers call the operator or calls for directory assistance, they typically hear a message, such as "thank you for using XYZ Telephone Company." Competing carriers may use the BOC's brand, request the BOC to brand the call with the competitive carriers name or request that the BOC not brand the call at all. 47 C.F.R. § 51.217(d).

[193] 47 C.F.R. § 51.217(C)(3)(ii); *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19460-61, paras. 141-44; *Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary Network Information and Other Customer Information, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Provision of Directory Listing Information Under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, Third Report and Order, Second Order on Reconsideration, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 14 FCC Rcd 15550, 15630-31, paras. 152-54 (1999); *Provision of Directory Listing Information Under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, First Report and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 2736, 2743-51 (2001).

services on an unbundled basis pursuant to sections 251 and 252, the Commission removed directory assistance and operator services from the list of required UNEs in the *UNE Remand Order*.[194] Checklist item obligations that do not fall within a BOC's obligations under section 251(c)(3) are not subject to the requirements of sections 251 and 252 that rates be based on forward-looking economic costs.[195] Checklist item obligations that do not fall within a BOC's UNE obligations, however, still must be provided in accordance with sections 201(b) and 202(a), which require that rates and conditions be just and reasonable, and not unreasonably discriminatory.[196]

H. Checklist Item 8 – White Pages Directory Listings

59. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(viii) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to provide "[w]hite pages directory listings for customers of the other carrier's telephone exchange service."[197] Section 251(b)(3) of the 1996 Act obligates all LECs to permit competitive providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service to have nondiscriminatory access to directory listing.[198]

60. In the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission concluded that, "consistent with the Commission's interpretation of 'directory listing' as used in section 251(b)(3), the term 'white pages' in section 271(c)(2)(B)(viii) refers to the local alphabetical directory that includes the residential and business listings of the customers of the local exchange provider."[199] The Commission further concluded, "the term 'directory listing,' as used in this section, includes, at a minimum, the subscriber's name, address, telephone number, or any combination thereof."[200] The Commission's *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order* also held that a

---

194 *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3891-92, paras. 441-42.

195 *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3905, para. 470; *see generally* 47 U.S.C. §§ 251-52; *see also* 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(1)(A)(i) (requiring UNE rates to be "based on the cost (determined without reference to a rate-of-return or other rate-based proceeding) of providing the … network element").

196 *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3905-06, paras. 470-73; *see also* 47 U.S.C. §§ 201(b), 202(a).

197 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(viii).

198 *Id*. § 251(b)(3).

199 *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20748, para. 255.

200 *Id*. In the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission stated that the definition of "directory listing" was synonymous with the definition of "subscriber list information." *Id.* at 20747 (citing the *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19458-59). However, the Commission's decision in a later proceeding obviates this comparison, and supports the definition of directory listing delineated above. *See Implementation of the Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary Network Information and Other Customer Information*, CC Docket No. 96-115, Third Report and Order; *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, CC Docket No. 96-98, Second Order on Reconsideration; *Provision of Directory Listing Information under the Telecommunications Act of 1934, As Amended*, CC Docket No. 99-273, FCC 99-227, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, para. 160 (rel. Sept. 9, 1999).

BOC satisfies the requirements of checklist item 8 by demonstrating that it: (1) provided nondiscriminatory appearance and integration of white page directory listings to competitive LECs' customers; and (2) provided white page listings for competitors' customers with the same accuracy and reliability that it provides its own customers.[201]

I. Checklist Item 9 – Numbering Administration

61. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ix) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to provide "nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers for assignment to the other carrier's telephone exchange service customers," until "the date by which telecommunications numbering administration, guidelines, plan, or rules are established."[202] The checklist mandates compliance with "such guidelines, plan, or rules" after they have been established.[203] A BOC must demonstrate that it adheres to industry numbering administration guidelines and Commission rules.[204]

J. Checklist Item 10 – Databases and Associated Signaling

62. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(x) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to provide "nondiscriminatory access to databases and associated signaling necessary for call routing and completion."[205] In the *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, the Commission required BellSouth to demonstrate that it provided requesting carriers with nondiscriminatory access to: "(1) signaling networks, including signaling links and signaling transfer points; (2) certain call-related databases necessary for call routing and completion, or in the alternative, a means of physical access to the signaling transfer point linked to the unbundled database; and (3) Service Management Systems (SMS)."[206] The Commission also required BellSouth to design, create, test, and deploy Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN) based services at the SMS through a Service Creation Environment (SCE).[207] In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission defined call-related databases as databases, other than operations support systems, that are used in signaling networks for billing and collection or the transmission, routing, or

---

201 *Id.*

202 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(ix).

203 *Id.*

204 *See Second Bell South Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20752; *see also Numbering Resource Optimization*, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 15 FCC Rcd 7574 (2000); *Numbering Resource Optimization*, Second Report and Order, Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 99-200 and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 99-200, CC Docket Nos. 96-98; 99-200 (rel. Dec. 29, 2000); *Numbering Resource Optimization*, Third Report and Order and Second Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-98 and CC Docket No. 99-200 (rel. Dec. 28, 2001).

205 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(x).

206 *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20753, para. 267.

207 *Id.* at 20755-56, para. 272.

other provision of telecommunications service.[208] At that time the Commission required incumbent LECs to provide unbundled access to their call-related databases, including but not limited to: the Line Information Database (LIDB), the Toll Free Calling database, the Local Number Portability database, and Advanced Intelligent Network databases.[209] In the *UNE Remand Order*, the Commission clarified that the definition of call-related databases "includes, but is not limited to, the calling name (CNAM) database, as well as the 911 and E911 databases."[210]

K. Checklist Item 11 – Number Portability

63. Section 271(c)(2)(B) of the 1996 Act requires a BOC to comply with the number portability regulations adopted by the Commission pursuant to section 251.[211] Section 251(b)(2) requires all LECs "to provide, to the extent technically feasible, number portability in accordance with requirements prescribed by the Commission."[212] The 1996 Act defines number portability as "the ability of users of telecommunications services to retain, at the same location, existing telecommunications numbers without impairment of quality, reliability, or convenience when switching from one telecommunications carrier to another."[213] In order to prevent the cost of number portability from thwarting local competition, Congress enacted section 251(e)(2), which requires that "[t]he cost of establishing telecommunications numbering administration arrangements and number portability shall be borne by all telecommunications carriers on a competitively neutral basis as determined by the Commission."[214] Pursuant to these statutory provisions, the Commission requires LECs to offer interim number portability "to the extent technically feasible."[215] The Commission also requires LECs to gradually replace interim number portability with permanent number portability.[216] The Commission has established

---

208 *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15741, n.1126; *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3875, para. 403.

209 *Id*. at 15741-42, para. 484.

210 *UNE Remand Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3875, para. 403.

211 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xii).

212 *Id.* at § 251(b)(2).

213 *Id.* at § 153(30).

214 *Id.* at § 251(e)(2); *see also Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20757, para. 274; *In the Matter of Telephone Number Portability*, Third Report and Order, 13 FCC Rcd 11701, 11702-04 (1998) (*Third Number Portability Order*); *In the Matter of Telephone Number Portability*, Fourth Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration, 15 FCC Rcd 16459, 16460, 16462-65, paras. 1, 6-9 (1999) (*Fourth Number Portability Order*).

215 *Fourth Number Portability Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 16465, para. 10; *Telephone Number Portability*, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 8352, 8409-12, paras. 110-16 (1996) (*First Number Portability Order*); *see also* 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(2).

216 *See* 47 C.F.R. §§ 52.3(b)-(f); *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20758, para. 275; *First Number Portability Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 8355, 8399-8404, paras. 3, 91; *Third Number Portability Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 11708-12, paras. 12-16.

guidelines for states to follow in mandating a competitively neutral cost-recovery mechanism for interim number portability,[217] and created a competitively neural cost-recovery mechanism for long-term number portability.[218]

L. Checklist Item 12 – Local Dialing Parity

64. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xii) requires a BOC to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to such services or information as are necessary to allow the requesting carrier to implement local dialing parity in accordance with the requirements of section 251(b)(3)."[219] Section 251(b)(3) imposes upon all LECs "[t]he duty to provide dialing parity to competing providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service with no unreasonable dialing delays."[220] Section 153(15) of the Act defines "dialing parity" as follows:

> [A] person that is not an affiliate of a local exchange carrier is able to provide telecommunications services in such a manner that customers have the ability to route automatically, without the use of any access code, their telecommunications to the telecommunications services provider of the customer's designation.[221]

65. The rules implementing section 251(b)(3) provide that customers of competing carriers must be able to dial the same number of digits the BOC's customers dial to complete a local telephone call.[222] Moreover, customers of competing carriers must not otherwise suffer inferior quality service, such as unreasonable dialing delays, compared to the BOC's customers.[223]

---

217 *See* 47 C.F.R. § 52.29; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20758, para. 275; *First Number Portability Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 8417-24, paras. 127-40.

218 *See* 47 C.F.R. §§ 52.32, 52.33; *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20758, para. 275; *Third Number Portability Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 11706-07, para. 8; *Fourth Number Portability Order* at 16464-65, para. 9.

219 Based on the Commission's view that section 251(b)(3) does not limit the duty to provide dialing parity to any particular form of dialing parity (*i.e.*, international, interstate, intrastate, or local), the Commission adopted rules in August 1996 to implement broad guidelines and minimum nationwide standards for dialing parity. *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19407; *Interconnection Between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers*, CC Docket No. 95-185, Further Order On Reconsideration, FCC 99-170 (rel. July 19, 1999).

220 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(3).

221 *Id.* § 153(15).

222 47 C.F.R §§ 51.205, 51.207.

223 *See* 47 C.F.R. § 51.207 (requiring same number of digits to be dialed); *Local Competition Second Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 19400, 19403.

M. Checklist Item 13 – Reciprocal Compensation

66. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii) of the Act requires that a BOC enter into "[r]eciprocal compensation arrangements in accordance with the requirements of section 252(d)(2)."[224] In turn, pursuant to section 252(d)(2)(A), "a state commission shall not consider the terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation to be just and reasonable unless (i) such terms and conditions provide for the mutual and reciprocal recovery by each carrier of costs associated with the transport and termination on each carrier's network facilities of calls that originate on the network facilities of the other carrier; and (ii) such terms and conditions determine such costs on the basis of a reasonable approximation of the additional costs of terminating such calls."[225]

N. Checklist Item 14 – Resale

67. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv) of the Act requires a BOC to make "telecommunications services . . . available for resale in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(4) and 252(d)(3)."[226] Section 251(c)(4)(A) requires incumbent LECs "to offer for resale at wholesale rates any telecommunications service that the carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not telecommunications carriers."[227] Section 252(d)(3) requires state commissions to "determine wholesale rates on the basis of retail rates charged to subscribers for the telecommunications service requested, excluding the portion thereof attributable to any marketing, billing, collection, and other costs that will be avoided by the local exchange carrier."[228] Section 251(c)(4)(B) prohibits "unreasonable or discriminatory conditions or limitations" on service resold under section 251(c)(4)(A).[229] Consequently, the Commission concluded in the *Local Competition First Report and Order* that resale restrictions are presumed to be unreasonable unless the LEC proves to the state commission that the restriction is reasonable and nondiscriminatory.[230] If an incumbent LEC makes a service available only to a specific category of retail subscribers, however, a state commission may prohibit a carrier that obtains the service pursuant to section 251(c)(4)(A) from offering the service to a different category of subscribers.[231] If a state creates such a limitation, it must do so consistent with

---

224 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xiii).

225 *Id*. § 252(d)(2)(A).

226 *Id*. § 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv).

227 *Id*. § 251(c)(4)(A).

228 *Id*. § 252(d)(3).

229 *Id*. § 251(c)(4)(B).

230 *Local Competition First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 15966, para. 939; 47 C.F.R. § 51.613(b). The Eighth Circuit acknowledged the Commission's authority to promulgate such rules, and specifically upheld the sections of the Commission's rules concerning resale of promotions and discounts in *Iowa Utilities Board*. *Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC*, 120 F.3d at 818-19, *aff'd in part and remanded on other grounds*, *AT&T v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999). *See also* 47 C.F.R. §§ 51.613-51.617.

231 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(4)(B).

requirements established by the Federal Communications Commission.[232] In accordance with sections 271(c)(2)(B)(ii) and 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv), a BOC must also demonstrate that it provides nondiscriminatory access to operations support systems for the resale of its retail telecommunications services.[233] The obligations of section 251(c)(4) apply to the retail telecommunications services offered by a BOC's advanced services affiliate.[234]

V. COMPLIANCE WITH SEPARATE AFFILIATE REQUIREMENTS – SECTION 272

68. Section 271(d)(3)(B) requires that the Commission shall not approve a BOC's application to provide interLATA services unless the BOC demonstrates that the "requested authorization will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of section 272."[235] The Commission set standards for compliance with section 272 in the *Accounting Safeguards Order* and the *Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*.[236] Together, these safeguards discourage and facilitate the detection of improper cost allocation and cross-subsidization between the BOC and its section 272 affiliate.[237] In addition, these safeguards ensure that BOCs do not discriminate in favor of their section 272 affiliates.[238]

69. As the Commission stated in the *Ameritech Michigan Order*, compliance with section 272 is "of crucial importance" because the structural, transactional, and nondiscrimination safeguards of section 272 seek to ensure that BOCs compete on a level

---

232 *Id.*

233 *See, e.g.*, *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4046-48, paras. 178-81 (Bell Atlantic provides nondiscriminatory access to its OSS ordering functions for resale services and therefore provides efficient competitors a meaningful opportunity to compete).

234 *See Verizon Connecticut Order*, 16 FCC Rcd 14147, 14160-63, paras. 27-33 (2001); *Association of Communications Enterprises v. FCC*, 235 F.3d 662 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

235 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(B).

236 *See Implementation of the Accounting Safeguards Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, CC Docket No. 96-150, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 17539 (1996) (*Accounting Safeguards Order*), Second Order On Reconsideration, FCC 00-9 (rel. Jan. 18, 2000); *Implementation of the Non-Accounting Safeguards of Sections 271 and 272 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, CC Docket No. 96-149, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 21905 (1996) (*Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*), *petition for review pending sub nom. SBC Communications v. FCC*, No. 97-1118 (filed D.C. Cir. Mar. 6, 1997) (held in abeyance May 7, 1997), First Order on Reconsideration, 12 FCC Rcd 2297 (1997) (*First Order on Reconsideration*), Second Order on Reconsideration, 12 FCC Rcd 8653 (1997) (*Second Order on Reconsideration*), *aff'd sub nom. Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies v. FCC*, 131 F.3d 1044 (D.C. Cir. 1997), Third Order on Reconsideration, FCC 99-242 (rel. Oct. 4, 1999) (*Third Order on Reconsideration*).

237 *Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 21914; *Accounting Safeguards Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 17550; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20725.

238 *Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 21914, paras. 15-16; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20725, para. 346.

playing field.[239] The Commission's findings regarding section 272 compliance constitute independent grounds for denying an application.[240] Past and present behavior of the BOC applicant provides "the best indicator of whether [the applicant] will carry out the requested authorization in compliance with section 272."[241]

VI. COMPLIANCE WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST – SECTION 271(D)(3)(C)

70. In addition to determining whether a BOC satisfies the competitive checklist and will comply with section 272, Congress directed the Commission to assess whether the requested authorization would be consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.[242] Compliance with the competitive checklist is itself a strong indicator that long distance entry is consistent with the public interest. This approach reflects the Commission's many years of experience with the consumer benefits that flow from competition in telecommunications markets.

71. Nonetheless, the public interest analysis is an independent element of the statutory checklist and, under normal canons of statutory construction, requires an independent determination.[243] Thus, the Commission views the public interest requirement as an opportunity to review the circumstances presented by the application to ensure that no other relevant factors exist that would frustrate the congressional intent that markets be open, as required by the competitive checklist, and that entry will therefore serve the public interest as Congress expected. Among other things, the Commission may review the local and long distance markets to ensure that there are not unusual circumstances that would make entry contrary to the public interest under the particular circumstances of the application at issue.[244] Another factor that could be relevant to the analysis is whether the Commission has sufficient assurance that markets will remain open after grant of the application. While no one factor is dispositive in this analysis, the overriding goal is to ensure that nothing undermines the conclusion, based on the Commission's analysis of checklist compliance, that markets are open to competition.

---

239 *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20725, para. 346; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4153, para. 402.

240 *Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20785-86, para. 322; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4153, para. 402.

241 *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 4153, para. 402.

242 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(C).

243 In addition, Congress specifically rejected an amendment that would have stipulated that full implementation of the checklist necessarily satisfies the public interest criterion. *See Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20747 at para. 360-66; *see also* 141 Cong. Rec. S7971, S8043 (June. 8, 1995).

244 *See Second BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20805-06, para. 360 (the public interest analysis may include consideration of "whether approval . . . will foster competition in all relevant telecommunications markets").

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL J. COPPS

Re: *Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Indiana Bell Telephone Company Incorporated, the Ohio Bell Telephone Company, Wisconsin Bell, Inc., and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin*

With today's grant of its application to provide long-distance service in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin, SBC has received long-distance authorization for all its States. I commend the company for this achievement. I also commend the Illinois Commerce Commission, Indiana Regulatory Utility Commission, Ohio Public Utilities Commission and Wisconsin Public Service Commission. Without the hard work of these four State Commissions to ensure that their markets are open to local competition, SBC would not be able to cross this threshold in the Section 271 process.

The real challenge lies ahead. The intense efforts leading up to today's decision are merely a prologue to our actions to ensure continued compliance. We will fail our statutory charge and render today's milestone meaningless unless we put in place a rigorous and sustained monitoring and enforcement process following the grant of long-distance authority. Through such a process, we can ensure that consumers can continue to reap the benefits of competition envisioned by Congress in the 1996 Act—greater choice, lower prices and better services. I look forward to working cooperatively with our counterparts in the States to ensure that this happens.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER KEVIN J. MARTIN

Re: Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Indiana Bell Telephone Company Incorporated, the Ohio Bell Telephone Company, Wisconsin Bell, Inc., and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin

Today's decision accepts SBC's late-filed, revised collocation power rates. We note that we approved this rate in the Order granting SBC's Michigan 271 application.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER JONATHAN S. ADELSTEIN

Re: Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Indiana Bell Telephone Company Incorporated, the Ohio bell Telephone Company, Wisconsin Bell, Inc. and Southwestern Bell Communications Services Inc. for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin

Today, we grant SBC authority to provide in-region, interLATA service originating in the states of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin. With this achievement, SBC has now received authorization to provide long distance services throughout its entire region. I congratulate SBC for opening its operations to competition and also extend my appreciation to my colleagues at the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Indiana Regulatory Utility Commission, the Ohio Public Utilities Commission and the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. I would also like to thank the Wireline Competition Bureau for its hard work and guidance in moving this item to a successful resolution.

The satisfaction of today's achievement comes with a continuing commitment to keep local markets open to competition. Indeed, Congress has made clear through Section 271(d)(6) that the market-opening provisions of Section 271 are an on-going obligation. To that end, I shared concerns raised by commenters during the course of the Michigan Section 271 proceeding about SBC's provision of wholesale billing to its competitive LEC customers and line splitting, a method by which competitive carriers may offer both voice and DSL services over the same local loop. I based my support for the Michigan Section 271 Order in part on the commitment of SBC and my state commission colleagues to continue to develop and enhance the billing and line splitting processes. Thus, I was particularly pleased to see that the Michigan Public Service Commission announced on September 30, 2003 that they will restart their line sharing/line splitting collaborative process. The Order that we adopt today addresses these issues in a similar manner and so I once again encourage my state commission colleagues in the Ameritech region to continue their diligent efforts to ensure that Congress' high standard continues to be met.