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I am the same Christopher J. Viveros who provided an affidavit discussing Pacific Bell’s (“Pacific”) Operations Support Systems (“OSS”) functionality, which was filed with Pacific’s California Section 271 application.

PURPOSE OF AFFIDAVIT

1. The purpose of this reply affidavit is to respond to CLECs’ comments regarding access to Pacific’s OSS functions. This affidavit will demonstrate that the CLECs’ allegations and accusations are without merit. All the issues to which Pacific takes exception are not addressed, because many of the CLECS’ allegations were overbroad and lacked specificity. However, Pacific addresses detailed allegations where new issues were raised, or to clarify Pacific’s compliance with the Commission’s December 1998 Final Order.

OSS DEVELOPMENT, SUPPORT AND TRAINING

2. Pacific’s efforts to ensure open competition in the local market by, among other things, offering a number and variety of interfaces to CLECs for OSS access cannot seriously be questioned. As detailed in my opening affidavit, Pacific has provided wholesale customers numerous choices for non-discriminatory access to our OSS. Wholesale customers, large and small, committed to entering the local exchange market do in fact have access to Pacific’s OSS through both proprietary interfaces and industry-based interfaces, and through both GUIs and application-to-application solutions.
3. Pacific’s compliance has been questioned by certain CLECs for being based, in part, on OSS interfaces that will eventually be retired. Any interface that is retired by Pacific is replaced with an equivalent system, and in most cases, with improved levels of functionality. Such improvements and upgrades should be viewed by the Commission as efforts to implement more capable, efficient, and robust systems, based on the best available standards and guidelines.

**August Release**

4. Some competitors have expressed concerns regarding Pacific’s commitment to implementing scheduled releases. For instance, one CLEC questioned Pacific’s commitment to the August 21, 1999 Release, calling it mere “paper promises of things to come.”\(^1\) The August 21, 1999 Release included such enhancements as E911 and directory listing request integration into the Local Service Request (“LSR”), flow through enhancements, and changes to eliminate manual jeopardy notifications. All these enhancements were implemented on August 21, 1999, and are now available in production.

5. Certain CLECs expressed concern that the rescheduling of Pacific’s June 26, 1999 release to August 21, 1999 would prevent Pacific from meeting its critical OSS compliance requirements.\(^2\) This release was rescheduled to ensure code

---

\(^1\) NextLink Brief, p. 5-8.
\(^2\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶¶ 10, 22, 23, 39; NextLink Brief, p. 6, 7, 12, 51; MCI, App. I, p. 2.
stability prior to initiation of joint testing and to resolve concerns of several facilities-based CLECs to include return of the ECCKT on the FOC when the CLEC does not populate ECCKT on the incoming LSR. In addition, the rescheduling allowed Pacific to increase the CLEC testing window from 5 days to 14 days. On August 21, Pacific implemented the EDI/LEX LSR release which included the following:

- Integration of the E911 information into the LSR for port and loop combinations and stand-alone port orders.
- Integration of ordering UNE combinations, stand alone UNEs, or LNP with the processing of directory listings, including “as is” migration.
- Implementation of an electronic jeopardy notice process for any order that involves a UNE or resold service.
- Implementation of flow through for disconnects of loops with and without LNP, including xDSL capable loops and DS1.
- Implementation of flow through for stand-alone directory requests.
• Implementation of programming designed to ensure accurate ECCKT return, including cases where the CLEC does not populate the ECCKT field on "non flow-through eligible" LSRs.

6. As part of the E911/Listings Integration ("ELI") project, Pacific also implemented the following in the August 21, 1999 Release:

• Edits for listing errors on the LSR that will reject errors back to the CLEC at the front-end of the process.

• The ability for the CLEC to choose, on a per order basis, whether to use the LSR or the gateways (Listings and MS Gateway for E911) for submitting information.

The August 21, 1999 Release has been implemented and Pacific met all of its commitments and obligations. As a result of this cutover, CLECs have more options and enhancements for OSS access.

Change Management

7. The CLECs do not appear to have any concerns around the substance of the Change Management Process. The only concern seems to be around the adoption of a 7-state process. MCI’s concern in this regard is confusing. MCI’s position appears to vary between criticizing Pacific for endeavoring to move to a uniform 7-state process, and insisting that, unless
Pacific moves to a 7-state process, the Change Management Process is meaningless.

8. For example, the title of MCI’s discussion on Change Management issues warns that “Pacific Cannot be Allowed to Erode the California CMP by Subjecting it to a '7-State Process.’”\(^3\) In this vein, MCI proceeds to claim that the “7-state process proposed by SBC/Pacific . . . appears to be undermining the CMP.”\(^4\) However, MCI appears to change its tune at the end of its statement on Change Management, by claiming that the CMP “cannot be relied upon to certify Pacific’s ability to provide consistent change management unless it is adopted in the 7-state region . . . .”\(^5\) Thus, it is not clear whether MCI supports a move to a 7-state CMP, or not.

9. In any event, the California CMP is not being undermined. SBC/Pacific’s collaborative efforts to establish a change management process region-wide are based upon the process established in California. In the Final Minutes of the April 28, 1999 Quarterly Change Management Process (“QCMP”) meeting (CLECC99-191, issued on May 25, 1999, Viveros Attachment O), it was agreed that a joint “Drafting Team” would be brought together in June 1999 for two meetings, one in San Francisco and another in Dallas, to discuss the possibility of a

---

\(^3\) MCI, App. I, p. 62.
region-wide change management process. This Drafting Team was to assess the various options for adopting a region-wide process and "make a recommendation in the next QCMP (July 28, 1999) regarding a path forward." Participants in the April QCMP, including MCI, concurred that they wanted to move to a 7-State plan as quickly as possible.

10. The process agreed upon for the June 1999 meeting in San Francisco was designed to take the Change Management Process document for California and review it line-by-line to determine whether it could apply to a region-wide effort. The parties involved in the meeting worked collaboratively for a day-and-a-half, going over the 26-page California CMP document. Very few changes were made to the document, although there was discussion around the need to revisit certain items, such as the voting protocol in the CMP Outstanding Issue Solution ("OIS") process, the handling of systems available only in one region, and the logistics of future QCMP region-wide meetings. However, far from retracting support for the California CMP, the parties, including representatives from SBC/Pacific and representatives from MCI, supported using the California CMP as the foundation for the region-wide effort.

11. Further meetings on the subject of a region-wide Change Management Process are scheduled for September 14-16, 1999 in Richardson, Texas. These meetings are being hosted by MCI. It has been agreed by all parties that the California CMP
will be used as the starting point or foundation for a region-wide Change Management process. CLEC members of the drafting team operating in California, regardless of their size or customer base, will be invited to play a major role in the effort to develop a region-wide CMP. With the experience of California upon which to draw, and the collaborative and cooperative spirit so evident in that environment, SBC/Pacific is encouraged that a successful region-wide change management process is achievable with its local wholesale customers.

12. ORA alleges that the Commission has not yet adopted “complete and final CMP regulations” and that “there remain unresolved issues between Pacific and the CLECs regarding CMP.” Pacific and the CLECs signed the Joint Settlement Agreement in January 1999, and again upon its modification in July 1999. Furthermore, the Telecommunications Division Staff has given no indication that they hold any reservations regarding the document. The CMP is designed to evolve along with the needs of all parties, and will be modified from time to time, as appropriate. Any issues between the CLECs and Pacific will be handled collaboratively and cooperatively within that framework.

---

6 ORA Brief, p. 17.
Versioning

13. AT&T complains about Pacific’s approach to versioning of interfaces.\(^7\) Pacific began versioning discussions with CLECs at the first QCMP on October 28, 1998, which included a proposal by MCI and a status of the issues at OBF. Viveros Attachment AAAA (CLECCS98-082, dated December 2, 1998). Versioning discussions continued in the January 1999 QCMP where the following OBF status and comments were documented in the minutes of the meeting:

   Pacific presented insights as to previous OBF discussions on versioning and plans to present a proposal at the 2/8 OBF meeting to set up a full committee to work on versioning issues. SBC will also present the findings of the current subcommittee on versioning. It was agreed that at this point it was premature to have a side bar meeting to discuss versioning. Pacific stated the Texas PUC had ordered versioning for SWBT. Pacific indicated system configuration might default versioning to the 2-state region. Viveros Attachment R.

14. A subsequent discussion on versioning took place when Pacific again included it as an agenda item for the July 28, 1999 QCMP. In that meeting, AT&T proposed to have the CMP address versioning, citing that the industry is not moving forward with guidelines as quickly as all of the parties had anticipated. At that point, AT&T asked for clarification of SBC’s position in OBF because it had heard we were advocating flash cut. SBC clarified that its position at OBF was to support versioning, with an option of flash cut. SBC maintains there is a need for flexibility and it is
reasonable to support both versioning and flash cut, depending on the specific situation. To that end, Pacific is surprised that AT&T would contend in its comments, only weeks after the July CMP meeting, that “it is impossible to say with any confidence what Pacific’s position is with respect to versioning.”

15. The parties also discussed the timing of a final decision from OBF and the consensus of the participants was not to wait for final resolution from OBF. Pacific proposed to have sidebar meetings to discuss versioning on the afternoon of August 9 and August 10, 1999, at which time, AT&T proposed that the 7-state drafting team create language for systems or interfaces that support versioning.

16. A 7-state meeting was held on August 9, 1999, during which CLECs made a proposal to Pacific to adopt a plan to support two versions of software for Pacific’s EDI ordering, including dot releases. Pacific agreed to review the proposal and get back to the CLECs. On August 18, 1999, Pacific distributed Accessible Letter CLECC99-278, announcing a special CMP meeting to continue discussions on versioning. Viveros Attachment BBBB. The letter also stated that upon reviewing the CLEC plan, Pacific would be willing to adopt

---

7 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶¶ 57-60.
8 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 60.
9 A “dot release” is a release that enhances the system without moving to a new version of industry guidelines.
the versioning plan as presented by the CLECs in the August 9 meeting – committing Pacific to support two versions, including dot releases. Pacific also asked for further discussion on three points: 1) sunset procedures for the oldest release, including discussion of migration requirements for CLECs utilizing the “sunsetting” version, 2) exemptions for emergency fixes and legally required modifications, and 3) consideration that certain changes to the interface requirements may be so significant that in some instances it will make sense not to maintain an older version.

17. SBC/Pacific and the CLECs held a subsequent conference call on August 24, 1999 to discuss those open issues. The August 24 call resulted in: 1) agreement that Pacific would accept the CLECs’ proposal for supporting two versions, including dot releases, and 2) arranging the three-day meeting of the CMP drafting team, scheduled for September 14-16, 1999, to be hosted by MCI, to address language supporting versioning of EDI for ordering in Pacific. Announcement of the upcoming meeting was communicated via email to drafting team members. Viveros Attachment KKKK. Pacific fully expects the parties to come to agreement and draft language on the remaining details of versioning at that meeting. Once the draft has been reviewed and accepted by all change management participating companies, it will be incorporated into the CMP document and Pacific will implement versioning using the
agreed upon approach. Contrary to AT&T’s allegations, Pacific’s approach to versioning has been mutually agreed to every step of the way as described above.

**Interface Development**

18. MCI and AT&T claim Pacific’s reliance on CESAR and RMI does not demonstrate equivalent access to OSS, since those interfaces are scheduled to be retired.\(^\text{10}\) Both CESAR and RMI were developed in advance of national standards and offered to CLECs to facilitate their entry into the local market. After national guidelines were established, Pacific elected to retire CESAR and RMI interfaces and reallocate resources to interfaces that will be more efficient and more widely used by CLECs.

19. CESAR and RMI will be retired with 18 months notice, in accordance with the CMP guidelines. Indeed, the functionality in CESAR and RMI is already available in other OSS interfaces offered by Pacific, as required by the CMP guidelines on interface retirement. Verigate, DataGate, and EDI/CORBA offer the pre-order functions available in CESAR. LEX and EDI offer the order functions available in both CESAR ISR and RMI.

20. AT&T also complains that DataGate is being retired by Pacific.\(^\text{11}\) Although Pacific has discussed with CLECs the eventuality that the functions under development in EDI/CORBA will over time displace DataGate, Pacific has no definitive

---

\(^{10}\) MCI, App. I, p.53; AT&T, DeYoung Affid., §§ 73-77, 80.
or immediate plans to retire DataGate. In fact, under the terms of the CMP, DataGate cannot be considered for retirement until EDI/CORBA has all the current functionality in DataGate, which as Sprint points out, will not be until EDI/CORBA supports loop pre-qualification information (no earlier than 2000). In addition, Pacific will provide 18 months prior notice under the terms of the CMP prior to the retirement of DataGate. Thus, it is very unlikely DataGate will be retired before 2002. In fact, AT&T just announced that it would start developing DataGate, apparently relying on the fact that it will not be retired for some time yet.

21. AT&T further complains that “Starwriter can accommodate only the most basic orders—namely resale orders for single-line residential customers.” AT&T claims that, “Starwriter is of no use in supporting AT&T’s current market entry strategies.” Of course, Starwriter does not support AT&T’s current market strategies, because AT&T has no residential resale market strategies. AT&T’s decision to abandon the resale market nearly two years ago has no bearing on the usefulness of Starwriter as an OSS interface. Starwriter is a proven system used everyday by Pacific’s own retail service

---

11 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 75.
12 Sprint Brief, p. 5.
13 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 84.
14 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 83.
representatives. It is available to any CLEC serving the single-line residential markets, and is currently being utilized by one CLEC for single-line residential orders.

22. AT&T similarly claims that SORD does not provide nondiscriminatory access because it is a Pacific proprietary system and cannot directly connect to AT&T's systems. Rather than giving Pacific credit for making many options available for OSS access, particularly for the smaller CLECs that do not have AT&T's resources, it appears AT&T would prefer that the Commission consider only the interfaces that the larger carriers intend to use. In AT&T's view, Pacific's attempts to accommodate the smaller CLECs' entry into the local market, with other interface options, should not be considered by this Commission as furthering local competition. Regardless of AT&T's criticisms, Pacific is committed to supporting all CLECs within its service area, regardless of size or market strategy. Any wholesale customer's market strategy can be accommodated by a combination of Verigate or DataGate for preordering, and EDI or LEX for ordering. For certain customers, Starwriter and/or SORD may be preferable or more economical ordering solutions, as in the case of Momentum who went into production on SORD this week.

15 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 86.
Training

23. AT&T complains that GUI training is unavailable to a CLEC until well after each new release is in production.\(^{16}\)

Pacific provides CLECs with ample opportunity to prepare their representatives for new releases. Pacific provides complete and adequate documentation preceding any given GUI release so that a CLEC can advise its employees of upcoming enhancements. Pacific provides advance notification to CLECs of upcoming changes to GUIs in several ways: by Accessible Letter announcing the content of an upcoming release in advance of the 21-day timeline under the CMP, by posting the updated User Guide to the CLEC website with changes identified, and as appropriate, by distributing any revised pages of the LSOR that reflect the upcoming changes. In addition, as the new GUI version is deployed, a CLEC logging on for the first time after the release will be notified online that a new version has been deployed. Following the download of the new version, users are then presented with a screen detailing the changes in this release. From the revised documentation, CLEC training on a GUI is upgraded to include the changes and the upgraded training becomes available at the time that the release goes into production. It is not realistic to expect CLECs using a GUI interface to send their trainers back for hands-on "train the trainer"

\(^{16}\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 48.
training every time a GUI is enhanced.

24. This process tracks with Pacific’s introduction and notification to our internal Pacific Service Representatives in our retail environment of any such changes. When an enhancement or change is developed for systems such as, SORD and Starwriter, Pacific’s M&P group will create a “flash” or “desk drop” advising service representatives of the change(s) they can expect to see following the release. For any large changes, Managers of Service Representatives will review the material for understanding and then do desk side training of their group. Pacific does not conduct formal hands-on training, pre-implementation, when changes are made to an existing system, as those changes will only be available in the system post-implementation.

25. AT&T alleges that GUI training with respect to the integration of E911 and Directory Listings into the UNE LSR ordering process was delayed.\textsuperscript{17} Pacific implemented the integration of E911 and Directory Listings on the LSR with the August 21, 1999 Release. Changes to the existing Directory Listings Resale Workshop to include ordering of UNE listings were made available with the first scheduled workshop after the release, on September 2, 1999. Moreover, the changes in the Workshop as they relate to the training previously available for Directory Listings in support of

\textsuperscript{17} AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 48.
resale can be characterized as minor. Accordingly, many CLECs may choose to forego additional formal training.

26. AT&T alleges that Pacific’s scheduling of training is flawed because of scheduling changes.\textsuperscript{18} Pacific’s scheduling adjustments are reasonable. Additional training sessions are added as CLEC demand for reservations warrants. In addition, classes are cancelled on occasion when CLECs do not register. Because class availability is subject to change, each published schedule on the CLEC website includes the recommendation, “Please contact your Account Manager to confirm class availability.” Pacific diligently strives to update training schedules in a timely manner to reflect what is currently available. In the example cited by AT&T, two CESAR classes, ATI and MISC, were published on the training schedule as “Options.” “Options” refers to the CLECs’ ability to choose between two variations offered. When the first CLEC responds, the option chosen forms the basis for the class, and the other option is dropped. In the instance cited by AT&T, the first CLEC to respond with a Memorandum of Agreement (“MOA”) selected the CESAR MISC training, and thus Pacific cancelled the second option, CESAR ATI. Later, AT&T enrollment forms were received requesting the CESAR ATI course. Unfortunately, due to a clerical error, Pacific processed the AT&T enrollment forms.

\textsuperscript{18} AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 49.
27. Following the February 22 class, AT&T’s Pacific Account Manager received an electronic message from an AT&T employee explaining that the class taught was different than the class for which AT&T had registered. AT&T also requested that: (1) the fee for the February 22, 1999 class be credited or that fees be waived for the CESAR-ATI course AT&T would soon take, (2) Pacific confirm when the next CESAR-ATI course was scheduled, and (3) confirm whether or not AT&T could get a class that is customized or suitcased to address ISR’s instead of ASR’s. Pacific’s Account Manager apologized to AT&T for any inconvenience caused by Pacific’s error. In addition, Pacific took the following actions in response to AT&T’s requests: Pacific (1) changed the method of scheduling the CESAR ATI and CESAR MISC classes, (2) did not bill AT&T for the CESAR MISC class, and (3) developed a new class, CESAR-ISR, as requested by AT&T (six months later, AT&T has still not registered for this class).

28. Despite the clerical error in processing AT&T’s enrollment forms, AT&T appears to have benefited from the class it actually attended. The February 1999 electronic message from AT&T described above contains favorable comments about the CESAR MISC class that the AT&T representatives attended, “(i.e. the 4 types of SUPPS and the useful address verification via the use of MAPS-Mechanized Address Pre-validation System)”. In addition, two AT&T students who attended that class indicated that they were satisfied with
the training and gave favorable ratings on their Customer Satisfaction Surveys ("CSS").

29. AT&T also complains that the class descriptions on the March 1999 schedule were unclear.\(^{19}\) The CLEC training schedule is not designed to contain complete class descriptions. Complete class descriptions are located on the CLEC website in the Customer Education section of the Handbook. In addition, designated Account Teams are available to address any CLEC questions on training.

30. AT&T further complains that a Pacific representative had confirmed that a CESAR ATI class would include LSR training for the ordering of UNE Loops with LNP.\(^{20}\) Pacific is unable to substantiate this allegation for lack of specifics, such as the representative’s name. Therefore Pacific can only respond that the CESAR ATI training was never designed to cover LSR training for the ordering of UNE Loops with LNP. AT&T also claims that Pacific had not arranged necessary password access so that AT&T representatives could actually use the CESAR system.\(^{21}\) Pacific finds this allegation difficult to believe. On those occasions where a customer comes to class without a password, Pacific instructors provide temporary system access for training.

\(^{19}\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 49.  
\(^{20}\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 49.  
\(^{21}\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 49.
31. AT&T alleges that additional training problems have negatively affected its plans to move the ordering of UNE loops with LNP from CESAR to LEX.\(^\text{22}\) Without specificity on these additional training problems, Pacific can only respond to a similar allegation in which AT&T points to two issues that, according to AT&T, have prevented AT&T’s move from CESAR to LEX.\(^\text{23}\) Namely, AT&T raises the following two issues: the unavailability of Listings in LEX for UNEs, and a problem with the Supplemental Due Date field on UNE Loop FOCs. In response to the Listings-in-LEX issue as a barrier to AT&T’s move from CESAR to LEX, Pacific responds that CESAR does not support Listings. Therefore, AT&T would not have lost that functionality by moving to LEX. Moreover, with Pacific’s August 21, release of E911 and Listings Integration (“ELI”) project, LEX now has listings for UNE ordering. As to AT&T’s second issue regarding supplemental Due Dates on FOCs, Pacific acknowledges that this issue was raised by AT&T, to which Pacific responded by developing the required fix, and implementing that fix in the August 21, 1999 Release.

32. AT&T also alleges that the November 20, 1998 Training Focus Group missed the mark in terms of overall effectiveness.\(^\text{24}\) The November 20, 1998 meeting was Pacific’s first CLEC

\(^{22}\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 50.  
\(^{23}\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 39.  
\(^{24}\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 51.
Education meeting following the CLECs’ request for these forums in the 271 Collaborative Workshops. The first meeting was designed to set the stage for further discussion. Following introductions, Pacific began the meeting with a review of each workshop and class offered by Pacific to its CLEC customers and the processes to sign up for coursework. The list of CLEC specific workshops and classes offered by Pacific has grown from two courses to twenty-nine courses since 1997. Since most of the CLEC meeting participants were not familiar with the expanded range and scope of the coursework, attendees expressed appreciation for Pacific’s review and for providing additional information on how to access training schedules and related information by using the CLEC Handbook on the CLEC website. Several additional topics were discussed at the November 1998 meeting, including new courses under development and their approximate deployment date.

33. A second CLEC Education Meeting was held in San Francisco on May 13, 1999. Several action items were developed during that meeting with a commitment to provide a progress report on each item at the next meeting. Contrary to AT&T’s assertion that Pacific was resistant to or defensive of CLEC feedback during these meetings, Pacific’s willingness to document action items requested by CLECs,

---

25 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 52.
investigate internally, provide status of each item at subsequent meetings, and to implement those items as agreed upon demonstrates Pacific’s openness to feedback and change. The next CLEC Education Meeting will be held in San Francisco, September 22, 1999. Attached is a copy of the Accessible Letter notifying CLECs of this meeting, including a list of the action items to be discussed. Viveros Attachment CCCC, CLECC99-281.

34. AT&T complains that Pacific’s trainers “guess at answers” and often those answers are incorrect.\(^\text{26}\) Pacific’s instructors do not “guess” but are diligent in finding the correct answers to questions whenever they do not already know the answer.

35. MCI claims that training schedules are made available on the website only one month in advance.\(^\text{27}\) During each of the CLEC Education Meetings hosted by Pacific, action items that Pacific agreed to implement were boarded. One such item was a recommendation for a 90-day calendar for training. In the Accessible Letter distributed August 24 announcing the next meeting for September 22, 1999, all action items were listed, including “Publish a quarterly schedule or a rolling 90-day schedule.” Viveros Attachment CCCC, CLECC99-281. At the upcoming September 22, 1999 meeting, Pacific will announce

\(^\text{26}\) AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 52.
\(^\text{27}\) MCI, App. I , p. 11-12.
that the action item regarding the 90-day schedule has been completed. Thus, based on the CLECs’ input, CLEC training schedules are posted to the website at CLEC Education for a three-month period.

36. MCI alleges that in early 1999 it requested SBC/Pacific to make on-line registration for training available, and that this request was denied.\textsuperscript{28} MCI’s request was not denied, and in fact, it became a documented action item from the November 1998 CLEC education meeting. Viveros Attachment CCCC, CLEC99-281. CLECs were advised in November 1998 and again in May 1999, that on-line registration is a complex project and is currently under development. Specifically during the May 1999 meeting, SBC/Pacific representatives reported that on-line registration continues to be a long-term project but work is in progress and remains an action item – “Work Toward On-Line Registration.” Another progress report will be made at the September 22, 1999 CLEC Education Meeting.

37. MCI states that even though LEX became operational in 1998, LEX courses were not offered to CLECs until the spring of 1999.\textsuperscript{29} Contrary to MCI’s assertions, the first CLEC training class for LEX was offered on March 20, 1998. In fact, the first CLEC to attend training on that date was Brooks Fiber (now part of MCI WorldCom). Viveros Attachment B (filed March 31, 1998).

\textsuperscript{29} MCI, App. I, p. 12-13.
Firewall

38. MCI urges the Commission to investigate Pacific’s internal systems, procedures, and training processes to ensure that an appropriate firewall is erected and maintained between Pacific retail and wholesale operations. As outlined in detail in my previous affidavit, Pacific has implemented an effective firewall between wholesale and retail information, including an automated audit trial as well as employee training. See Viveros Affid., ¶¶ 47-53.

39. ORA also claims that Pacific has failed to demonstrate the existence of a rigorous internal monitoring process. Pacific has a very strict internal monitoring process in place. Employees involved in customer acquisition and employees who access another carrier’s account information in the course of day to day business, e.g., “winback” representatives, are rigorously monitored. Each time an employee reviews another carrier’s customer account information, the occurrence is recorded and stored in a database repository. This information is retrieved and scrutinized quarterly. Additionally, supervisory personnel directly monitor employees through deskside and remote observations.

Interface Accessibility

40. MCI claims that in June 1999, it contacted the LSC because it was experiencing busy signals when attempting to interface

---

30 MCI, App. VI, p. 7-8.
with CESAR through the designated 800 number.\textsuperscript{32} MCI has never complained about this issue to its Pacific account team, perhaps because MCI has a direct connection (through a T-1) and therefore has no need to dial-up for access to CESAR. Moreover, MCI, as a CLEC, should not be accessing CESAR through the “toll free” 800 number in any event, because that number is designated for IECs. MCI should use its dedicated T-1 or the 707 number designated for CLECs; there is no reason why MCI should be using the 800 number established for IECs. Unfortunately, many CLECs have elected to continue using the toll-free 800 dial-access to CESAR, rather than the PRAF or the 707 number established for CLECs. Indeed, Pacific has seen 800 calls quadruple in a 12-month period.

**OSS Appendix**

41. MCI complains Pacific’s request to re-negotiate the OSS Appendix to include EXACT, a newly offered interface, is anti-competitive.\textsuperscript{33} When a new OSS interface is introduced, Pacific does not require a re-negotiation of the entire OSS Appendix. Pacific only requires an amendment to the OSS Appendix to the extent necessary to remove the retired OSS and identify the new interface. This is consistent with the legal requirement that UNEs be specified in the contract.

\textsuperscript{31} ORA Brief, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{32} MCI, App. I, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{33} MCI, App. I, p. 56-57.
42. AT&T alleges Pacific does not afford smaller CLECs the opportunity to negotiate an OSS Appendix using the Commission approved template.\textsuperscript{34} The approved OSS Appendix template is currently utilized for all of the Pacific's OSS Appendices (Resale only, Standalone, Resale & UNE) currently available to Pacific negotiators. In fact, two of the four OSS Appendices attached to the DeYoung affidavit as Exhibit 12 use the approved template. A third Exhibit 12 OSS Appendix attached to the DeYoung affidavit shows a version date prior to the collaborative workshops, however, template-like language is nonetheless reflected in this appendix as well.

\textsuperscript{34} AT&T, DeYoung Aff. ¶ 56.
OSS FUNCTIONS

Integration

43. MCI alleges that it is not possible to “integrate” pre-ordering information provided by an application-to-application system (e.g., DataGate) to EDI for ordering. According to MCI, “EDI is the only integrated pre-ordering/ordering solution.” Id. Contrary to MCI’s allegation, two CLECs in the Pacific region, in addition to three CLECs in the Southwestern region, have demonstrated and proven that an independent entity can create an integrated preordering and ordering interface based on relevant business rules. Two additional CLECs are also developing DataGate preordering and EDI ordering.

Joint Testing

44. MCI complains that Pacific is not sharing “key learnings” from its joint EDI testing with CLECs. This simply is not true: Pacific distributed its first accessible letter containing key learnings on February 19, 1999, for the 4Q98. See Viveros Aff. 107, and Attch. KK. At that time, Pacific advised CLECs that Pacific would send subsequent letters updating key learnings quarterly as activity warrants. Due to the lack of CLEC testing in the 1Q99, Pacific did not issue an Accessible Letter regarding Key Learnings, as was noted in the February 19, 1999 letter:

---

35 MCI, App. I, p. 56.
There will not be a 1st Quarter 1999 Key Learnings Letter, as there have not been any CLECs testing in our EDI test environment this quarter. Id.

Pacific continues to fulfill its collaborative workshop commitment. The 2Q99 EDI Testing Quarterly Key Learnings Letter has been prepared in draft and will be available to the CLECs within the next week. Further, Pacific always recommends that CLECs contact their account managers with any issues around testing and development.

45. MCI also asserts that Pacific’s EDI Joint Test Plan does not set forth a timetable for implementation of modifications that result from testing. Section 7 of the EDI Joint Test Plan (“Plan”) clearly sets forth the process for identifying a discrepancy/defect and opening a Modification Request (“MR”). Viveros Attachment U. Resolving an MR is highly dependent upon the severity and scope of the problem, making a standardized timetable impractical. Due to this variability, the process detailed in Section 7 of the Plan provides the flexibility to tailor a solution to the problem at hand. Section 7 outlines five Severity Levels for testing problems, with Level 1 being the most severe and Level 5 being the least severe. A Severity Level 1 problem is one which must be fixed immediately as no workaround exists. These are usually resolved within one week. Severity Level 2-5 problems are communicated with the impacted CLEC and implementation of the fix is negotiated with the CLEC.
46. MCI also alleges that Pacific’s processing fees for test orders sent over LEX are unreasonable and disadvantage CLECs. However, in response to Pacific’s data request to MCI requesting the amount that MCI has spent on such testing charges, MCI declined to state the amount and instead responded that “MCI WorldCom does not contend that Pacific’s practice of charging CLCs for passing test orders for interface testing is a barrier to local market entry.”

38 MCI WorldCom Inc.’s Revised Response to Pacific Bell’s (U 1001 C) First Set of Data Requests, Response #16, p. 17.
Moreover, in the Commission’s Final Decision in December 1998, the Commission responded to the CLEC concern that Pacific should be “required to offer at least some carrier testing and evaluation of OSS for free,” by concluding “we do not find the CLC arguments . . . demanding a mandatory free period for OSS evaluation to be persuasive.”  

**PRE-ORDER**

**EDI/CORBA**

47. AT&T claims that Pacific’s EDI/CORBA fails to provide Customer Service Records (“CSR”), now known as a Customer Service Inquiry (“CSI”).  
48. Pacific’s EDI/CORBA is a standards based, non-proprietary solution and is supported by Pacific’s Local Service Pre Ordering Requirements (“LSPOR”).

The question of when CSI would be included in EDI/CORBA was initially raised by MCI in late 1998. When the final requirements for Pacific’s first EDI/CORBA release were announced on December 11, 1998 (scheduled for March 28, 1999), Pacific indicated that OBF and other industry forums had not decided and approved standards for CSI functionality. Accessible Letter CLECCS98-085, Viveros Attachment DDDD. In fact, industry approval was not anticipated until after June 1999, well after the March 28, 1999 release of EDI/CORBA.

48. Lacking industry guidelines for CSI, Pacific indicated that it would not incorporate CSI until such guidelines were established. Anticipating industry approval, however,

---

Pacific began making plans to offer CSI in its next release. After guidelines for CSI were approved, Pacific announced, via Accessible Letter CLECCS99-052, date April 23, 1999, that it would make CSI available in the 3rd quarter of 1999. Viveros Attachment EEEE. Pacific continues to be committed to including CSI as part of the EDI/CORBA release, scheduled for October 1999. Final notification and test date announcement of this release were sent to CLECs via Accessible Letter CLECCS99-079, dated June 25, 1999. Viveros Attachment FFFF.

Loop Qualification

49. MCI and Sprint claim that the use of RTZ loop length indicators provides inadequate access to on-line loop makeup qualification for DSL service. The RTZ indicator, available to CLECs via Verigate and DataGate, is the same tool used by Pacific’s retail operations for loop pre-qualification. It is intended as an initial qualification tool utilizing loop length only. RTZ has never been intended as a device to access on-line loop makeup, nor has it ever been described as such. Pacific has explained the use of the RTZ indicator to CLECs at various opportunities. At xDSL meetings hosted by Pacific on November 17, 1998 and May 4, 1999, the RTZ indicator as a pre-qualification tool was

40 AT&T Brief, p. 17.
41 MCI, App. I, p. 48; Sprint p. 6.
discussed at length with the CLECs. In addition, Pacific shared the decision-making process for utilizing RTZ information with CLECs in multiple forms: through an Accessible Letter (CLECC98-093, dated October 1, 1998); Handouts from May 4, 1999 meeting; and CLEC Handbook entries (UNE, Section 1.0 - Unbundled Loop, subsection 1.1.7 – xDSL Loop, subheading “Qualifying xDSL Service”). Viveros Attachments BB, GGGG, HHHH.

K1023 Process

50. CLECs have claimed that Pacific does not make equivalent access available to CLECs to crucial preordering and ordering information necessary for CLECs to order and provision unbundled Digital Subscriber Loops. Pacific has continued to upgrade its loop qualification processes to provide CLECs the most useful and timely qualification information currently available for DSL loops.

51. Pacific has developed qualification tools and processes that give CLECs the capability to pre-qualify at least certain potential DSL loops. Pacific has deployed the RTZ indicators and the DSL Planning Inquiry Web Site (formerly known as Geomap) for use by CLECs, as well as added an email alternative to phoned or faxed qualification requests. See Accessible Letters CLECC 99-277 and CLECC 99-284 dated August 18, and August 27, 1999, Viveros Attachment OOOO and PPPP. Pacific will continue to work toward system

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{42}} \text{MCI Brief, p.57; Northpoint Brief, p. 4.} \]
and process upgrades to allow CLECs the option of performing most of their own qualifications for DSL services. Pacific reiterates, however, that its retail service representatives do not have on-line access to LFACs either.

52. RTZ indicators divide potential loop lengths into three categories (12k, 17k and 18k) which give an initial look at length of the loop from the central office to the end user. CLECs may access RTZ loop length indicators in Verigate and DataGate or by phoning, faxing, or emailing a request to the Facilities Local Service Center (“FLSC”). The DSL Planning Inquiry (“DPI”) website invites the CLEC to input loop length and cable limitations specific for the intended DSL technology and use the end user’s zip code or address to determine if the address is qualified, using the CLEC’s parameters.

53. Sprint has raised a concern that the DSL Planning Inquiry Web Site only offers information for areas where Pacific is currently contemplating providing DSL services. In Accessible Letter CLECC99-258, Pacific made clear that it expects all current Pacific DSL and CLEC DSL committed Wire Centers in Pacific’s serving areas to be available in DPI by the end of September 1999. Viveros Attachment IIIII.

54. When CLECs want detailed information beyond RTZ indicators or the DSL Planning Inquiry Web Site, Pacific has made available

\[43\] Sprint Brief, p. 7.
K1023 qualification via phone, fax, and email. CLECs nonetheless have alleged that Pacific’s pre-qualification systems cannot provide parity.\textsuperscript{44} Pacific Bell Retail and Wholesale service representatives utilize the same K1023 qualification process for DSL products. By design, this process returns qualification information for wholesale customers in substantially the same time and manner. For RTZ 12, both CLECs and Retail customers can be given an immediate qualification. For service which does not immediately qualify (i.e., RTZ 17 or 18), both CLEC and Retail service representative must arrange a call back to the end user to further qualify the service. See Viveros Attachment AA for details.

55. CLECs also claim that the pre-qualification response does not give them critical information to determine speeds and types of xDSL technologies they may provision.\textsuperscript{45} In this regard, they also claim that Pacific discriminates in favor of its own DSL technology and neglects to provide information to support other DSL technologies.\textsuperscript{46} For RTZ 17 and 18, the CLEC pre-qualification response includes loop length and loop make up (including the presence of bridged tap), or for IDSL service, the dB loss and/or need for repeaters. The loop make-up information returned includes lengths of cable at

\textsuperscript{44} Northpoint Brief, p. 4-5; Sprint Brief, p.8; ACI Brief, p. 40-43; AT&T, Finnell (Redacted) Affid., ¶¶ 104-105.
\textsuperscript{45} Northpoint Brief, p. 5-10; ACI Brief, p. 40-43; MCI Brief, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{46} ACI Brief, p. 41; Sprint Brief, p. 38-40.
different gauges; amount of bridged tap; the presence of DLC; and the total loop length at 26-gauge equivalency. The presence of load coils and repeaters is not noted, because current ISDN/xDSL contracts require Pacific to remove them, known as “conditioning” the line. Just as the Pacific retail service representative utilizes this information to determine whether to accept or deny retail service, it is the CLEC’s decision whether to provision a given DSL technology using this loop make-up information.

56. Finally, CLECs allege that the nature of the pre-qualification process as it stands is unnecessarily cumbersome and inefficient.\(^{47}\) Pacific agrees that this first year of DSL service has been a time of intensive learning for both Pacific and CLECs. Pacific has put new processes into place to decrease pre-qualification and ordering times, adapt qualification information in response to CLEC requests, and reduce installation problems. Sheer volumes of orders on both the retail and wholesale sides have created improvement opportunities in qualification response times. Pacific has responded to these opportunities by creating a new Wholesale Digital Center responsible for assignment and plant control of CLEC DSL orders. Additionally, Pacific’s Wholesale Operations has spent much time working with all DSL impacting groups to assure time requirements are understood, methods

---

\(^{47}\) Northpoint Brief, p. 15.
and procedures are consistent, and communication is robust.

EUCL

57. Genesis asserts that Pacific’s current preordering systems do not provide the ability for a CLEC to ascertain the proper end user common line ("EUCL") charges that should be assessed on its subscribers.\(^\text{48}\) The Address Validation Screen on the Verigate, DataGate, and EDI/CORBA pre-ordering interfaces provide CLECs access to a Working Service On Prem ("WSOP") indicator of Y (Yes) or N (No). This WSOP indicator will identify for the CLEC if there is current working service at this address. With this information, a CLEC can then determine from the end user whether the line to be ordered is to be designated as “primary” or “non-primary,” and the appropriate EUCL charge can be assessed.

ORDERING/PROVISIONING

Flow Through

58. AT&T claims that it only “recently discovered” that the flow-through implemented for UNE Loop-with-Port combination conversion orders allows conversion only from Pacific retail service, and does not include conversion of CLEC resale customers. AT&T further claims Pacific did not discuss this “subtle distinction” with CLECs at the flow-through meetings.\(^\text{49}\) Contrary to AT&T’s claims, “conversions to loop and port combinations from existing resale service” has been listed in the Exceptions column of the flow through matrix

\(^{48}\) TRA Brief, (III)(C) p. 11.
since the matrix originally appeared at Page 35 of the Final Staff Report ("FSR"), October 5, 1998. The matrix at page 35 of the FSR was developed during the 271 Collaborative Workshops with CLECs and Staff present. Other CLECs have been aware of this distinction for some time and are already preparing to submit resale to UNE conversions as projects. For example, at the 3rd Quarter Change Management Process meeting on July 28, 1999 -- where AT&T raised concerns about converting resale accounts to UNE on an exception basis, and where Pacific indicated that coordination between the companies to handle these conversions as a project should resolve AT&T’s concerns -- MCI stated it was prepared to handle its conversions as projects. As Pacific has explained in the past, it would be economically inefficient to develop flow through for a particular type of activity based on a one-time spike. AT&T’s conversion of resale customers to UNE combinations should be a one-time spike, since AT&T has exited from the resale market.

59. MCI alleges that Pacific changed its flow through plans for xDSL to eliminate flow through of change orders. At the March 3, 1999 Special Change Management Process meeting on xDSL, CLECs were asked to provide Pacific with forecasts of estimated volumes and types of order activity for xDSL. Of

49 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 32.
the CLECs in attendance, MCI stated a majority of its orders (80%) will be to new installs; NextLink deferred; ICG stated 98% will be new connects; ACI responded that its orders will be primarily new connects; Cox stated 95% will be new connects; ELI -stated 90% will be new connects; AT&T stated a majority of its orders will be new connects; Northpoint stated 25% will be new connects, no other volumes stated; Sprint stated 90% will be new connects; and Allegiance stated it will be doing both new connects and conversions, but could not offer a forecast. Viveros Attachment FFF. Based on that information, Pacific developed its plan to implement flow through of xDSL new connects and conversions. Pacific also included xDSL loops in its loop disconnect flow through development because, although there was no significant volume forecasted, it was more efficient to include flow through than to exclude it. There is no loop change activity flow through planned, nor have CLECs identified a sizeable volume of change activity for xDSL, or any other type of loop for that matter, that could serve as a starting point for mutual development of a flow through plan.

60. Sprint also contends that Pacific has not “defined xDSL compatible loops in cooperation with CLECs, or according to industry standards” in accordance with D.98-12-069, Appendix B.\(^{51}\) Pacific has hosted a number of meetings with its

\(^{51}\) Sprint Brief, p. 11.
wholesale customers to define the ordering parameters of xDSL, as well as Pacific’s plans for flow through. The first meetings were held on September 22, 1998 and November 17, 1998. In those meetings Pacific and attending CLECs defined how a CLEC would order xDSL capable loops using the LSR. The resulting ordering requirements from those meetings were distributed in Accessible Letter CLECCS 98-061, dated October 22, 1998. Viveros Attachment NN. The requirements as defined allowed “the CLEC to connect a variety of DSL types including, but not limited to ADSL, HDSL, IDSL and SDSL as specified in individual Interconnection Agreements.”

61. Pacific also hosted Special Change Management meetings to define xDSL ordering and flow through on February 11, 1999 (Viveros Attachment EEE), March 3, 1999 (Viveros Attachment FFF), and March 24, 1999 (Viveros Attachment GGG). In these meetings, Pacific provided its wholesale customers with an xDSL ordering template and shared Pacific's Flow Through Plans which include xDSL. Lastly, on April 28, 1999 during the Quarterly Change Management Process meeting in San Francisco, Pacific collaboratively revised its plans with input from the CLECs. The "Final Meeting Minutes From April 28, 1999, Change Management Process Meeting", distributed on May 25, 1999 documents these discussions and records Pacific's plans. Viveros Attachment O.
Flow Through Exceptions

62. AT&T alleges that Pacific’s 271 filing failed to identify a number of exceptions that will continue to apply to each order type even when Pacific implements the additional flow through capability of its August release. During the 271 Collaborative Workshops, Pacific, CLECs, and CPUC staff members discussed at length the exceptions to flow through. Pacific lead the attendees through the development of a matrix, explaining how Pacific proposed to manage flow through on a continuing basis, accounting for known “exceptions” to the ability to flow through. The matrix, entitled “Pacific Flow Through Plans In Order of CLEC Priority/Forecasted Order Type Volumes,” was included as Page 35 of the Commission’s Final Staff Report.

63. In the Commission’s Final Staff Report (p. 36), exceptions as discussed during the workshops are characterized as follows:

Finally, after reviewing Pacific’s flow through plans, another problem emerged, namely that certain exceptions to the normal flow through process might affect the degree of flow through. While parties seem to recognize that some of these exceptions are technically inevitable, or sufficiently rare, others were troublesome and viewed as a barrier by CLECs. These exceptions included the project quantity for 2-wire basic and assured loops and stand alone Local Number Portability (LNP).

64. Following the publication of the Commission’s Final Staff Report, all interested parties were given the opportunity to

---

52 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 31.
comment. The Commission in issuing its final decision took those comments into consideration. The Commission’s Final Decision of December 17, 1998 directed Pacific to explore relaxing or eliminating each of the following exceptions: project quantity, supplemental orders, and partial account conversions. D.98-12-069, p. 99. Pacific opened the dialogue on flow through and exceptions at the next QCMP meeting held January 27, 1999. CLECC99-051, Viveros Attachment R. During that meeting, AT&T expressed its desire to discuss the following issues regarding Pacific’s flow through plans:

- Agree on a flow-through plan for the next 12-months;
- Identify areas where there is disagreement on flow-through priorities; and
- What has changed since the summer 271 workshops.

65. Pacific agreed to host a Special CMP meeting to focus on flow through on February 11, 1999. The February 11 meeting minutes reflect that:

   Pacific Bell indicated that it also wanted to solicit input from the CLECs on what they think still needs to be done regarding flow-through. In addition, as directed by the CPUC’s Final Decision, Appendix B, page 3, Pacific would address whether it would explore relaxing or eliminating each of the following exceptions to flow-through: supplemental orders, project quantity, and partial account conversion. CLECC99-082, Viveros Attachment EEE.

66. During these and subsequent discussions on flow through, CLECs did not raise issues on additional exceptions except in
the case of Virtual Telephone Exchange ("VTE"). Currently, a CLECs failure to provide VTE information would cause the LSR to exception to the LSC. Pacific has agreed to source this information for CLECs in the future, thus eliminating this exception. Pacific remains open to all CLEC requests regarding exceptions to flow through, but continues to maintain that most exceptions are technically inevitable or sufficiently rare.

67. AT&T expresses a concern that the on-going discussions with Pacific regarding the flow through of supplemental orders ("SUPPS") has "significant anti-competitive consequences," even though AT&T was the CLEC of record to most recently delay further discussion on SUPPS. Pacific began the dialogue on SUPPS, as eligible for flow through, in the October 1998 QCMP. The following discussion was captured in the minutes of that meeting:

Supplements: Per commitments during the prior 271 Collaborative Workshops, Kathy King of PB provided data regarding order volumes for Supplemental Change activity, to gain CLEC input regarding the 'supp' request types that might be top candidates for flow-through. The findings did not appear to support a high-priority need although CLECs were concerned the data reflected mass market volumes (resale) vs. UNE. Accessible Letter CLECCS98-082 dated December 2, 1998; Viveros Attachment AAAA.

68. Pacific agreed in the October 1998 meeting to include SUPPS as part of any flow through discussion. For this reason,

---

53 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 33.
SUPPS were on the agenda for the Special Change Management Process meeting held February 11, 1999. Viveros Attachment EEE. The outcome of that agenda item is summarized in the meeting minutes. In sum, the CLECs and Pacific agreed to revisit the subject of SUPPS again in six months.

69. At the July 28 QCMP, SUPPS were again an agenda item, as agreed by the parties. Viveros Attachment MMMM. That discussion was summarized as follows: "The action item on collection of data for SUPPS remains open. AT&T indicated it wanted 3 months of data after implementation of the August release. . . ." Based on AT&T’s latest response to Pacific’s request for SUPP data, Pacific will, once again, include an agenda item for the January 2000 QCMP.

70. In addition, it would appear that AT&T, in calculating its potential for sending orders requiring manual handling of exceptions as “25% to 60%” has inappropriately included supplements sent to correct errors.54 When a CLEC submits an original LSR (Version 1) and it rejects back to the CLEC due to an error in the information or format of the request, a CLEC will submit a corrected request (Version 2) for processing. If no errors are detected and the original request would have been eligible for flow through, then the subsequent request is also eligible for flow through and should not be counted in calculating the orders requiring

54 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 33.
manual handling of exceptions. Only supplemental requests submitted after the original request is FOC’d will exception to the LSC for processing.

Industry Guidelines

71. Sprint acknowledges that Pacific provides copies of the Telecommunications Industry Forum ("TCIF") EDI Guidelines when providing EDI requirements, but it claims that, in some instances, the field values supported by TCIF EDI do not match the field values documented as being supported in Pacific’s Local Service Ordering Requirements ("LSOR"). Sprint’s allegation does not paint an accurate picture of the relationship between the TCIF EDI field values and Pacific’s LSOR. Sprint may be under the false impression that TCIF EDI fields and values have a one-to-one relationship to Pacific’s LSOR fields and valid values.

72. In national forums, such as OBF, industry guidelines are developed and published in a periodic Local Service Ordering Guidelines ("LSOG") document. Pacific’s LSOR is the documented business rules to be implemented by Pacific from released LSOGs. Because the LSOG reflects national guidelines, Pacific and other ILECs will implement those guidelines as developed by TCIF, or adapt them, as appropriate, to internal business processes and systems. The EDI fields and valid values to be implemented by Pacific are

---

55 Sprint Brief, p. 9-10.
communicated to the CLECs in a number of publications, one of which is the LSOR. Pacific also distributes via Accessible Letter the "initial" requirements of an upcoming release (e.g., CLECCS99-018). Viveros Attachment MM. Pacific then allows for a CLEC comment period, and incorporates changes or opens discussions with CLEC based on their comments.

73. When all issues are finalized, Pacific then publishes "final" requirements (e.g., CLECCS99-046). Viveros Attachment MM. In addition, Pacific posts detailed requirements to the CLEC website, and participates in one-on-one daily, weekly, or monthly support calls as requested by a CLEC to assist in answering their questions during development and joint testing. The methods for implementing industry guidelines in EDI are documented in the Change Management Process for application-to-application changes where it states that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category One (Gateway) Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For interfaces based on industry guidelines, the parties presume that the guidelines developed at the industry forum (i.e. ATIS, OBF) will be the basis for managing change. PACIFIC anticipates using applicable OBF Guidelines; however the needs and constraints of PACIFIC’s legacy systems may limit use of all such Guidelines. Pacific Bell/Competitive Local Exchange Carrier: Interface Change Management Process, p. 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E911 Listings

Service Address Validation

74. Sprint alleges that “Pacific has continued to struggle with the OSS-related problems that plagued Sprint’s resale
efforts, including failure to provide CLECs with accurate service address validation, incorrect directory listings, and untimely and inaccurate E911 listings."  

Sprint has provided no supporting evidence or examples of untimely or inaccurate E911 listings. Sprint also has not approached Pacific’s E911 organization regarding any problems with the timeliness or accuracy of E911 database updates, nor has it even participated in Pacific’s E911 CLEC Database Forum. Pacific’s E911 unit currently performs a 100% data reconciliation on all Resale records weekly and these E911 data accuracy results are available to the CLECs upon request. No CLEC has requested these results since September 1998. If E911 accuracy is still a problem for Sprint, or any CLEC, for Resale Accounts, Pacific is prepared to receive requests for data accuracy reporting. Pacific has multiple avenues available for the wholesale customer to research and address E911 data accuracy concerns.

75. ORA alleges that Pacific has not satisfied the Commission’s directive to “demonstrate that its guidelines for address validation address the discrepancies between addresses that pass SORD, but not E911 validation processes.” Pacific’s E911 database must validate all records against the MSAG (Master Street Address Guide) to ensure the address is valid in the community. The MSAG is owned by the County Coordinator, a governmental position within each County (not

---

56 Sprint Brief, p. 52-53.
a Pacific employee). Pacific maintains the MSAG at the direction of the County Coordinator. The Job Aid distributed by Pacific to wholesale customers provides them the appropriate corrective actions for resolving service address discrepancies. Viveros Attachment RR. Pacific encounters these same challenges and utilizes the same job aid to resolve these discrepancies. With respect to Resale, Pacific processes all E911 data entry, correction and validation for the its wholesale customers. There is no wholesale customer involvement for E911 services on Resale.

Peer To Peer Interface For The Entry Of E911 Data.

76. AT&T contends Pacific provided “only a high level description for a ‘peer-to-peer’ replacement interface for the MS Gateway rather than the standards required by D.98-12-069, Appendix B at 1.”58 In a similar vein, ORA contends Pacific has not demonstrated “the ability to implement the required peer-to-peer interface for entry of E911 data until the introduction of a new EDI/CORBA interface in 2000.”59

77. In the 271 Workshops, Pacific made it clear that the peer-to-peer type interface could not be implemented until some time after the completion of Pacific’s implementation of the new E911 Database system, scheduled (at that time) to be completed in 10 to 14 months. The CLECs present at the workshops agreed that Pacific’s proposed schedule was

57 ORA Brief, p. 9; see, also, TRA Brief, p. 9.
58 AT&T, DeYoung Affid., ¶ 41.
59 ORA Brief, p. 10.
reasonable, and asked Pacific to develop standards in advance to assist in CLEC planning and development. Pacific committed to providing the standard for the development of a future peer-to-peer type of interface by October 1999. In the interest of assisting the CLECs, the development of the standards was accelerated to May 17, 1999. Viveros
Attachment CCC.

78. Pacific is surprised to learn of AT&T’s displeasure with the Enhanced File Transfer Standards distributed via Accessible Letter CLECC99-173 on May 17, 1999. Id. To date, Pacific has not received any comments, complaints, or claims that “no CLEC could possibly develop an interface based on the documentation provided.” The only communication regarding this issue has been a question from AT&T (4 contacts from 2 different AT&T managers each answered within 24 hours), asking if Pacific will continue to support the existing dial up interface and still accept the NENA 2 format once the Enhanced File Transfer is implemented. Pacific answered affirmatively. These communications occurred August 12, 16, and 20, 1999.

79. AT&T’s comments in this regulatory proceeding are the first feedback received from any CLEC regarding the adequacy of the Enhanced File Transfer Standards provided by Pacific. CLECs were invited to a Quarterly E911 CLEC Database Forum conducted June 22, 1999. The database replacement and all

---
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other E911 database issues were discussed at that meeting. CLECC99-259, Viveros Attachment NNNN. The Enhanced File Transfer and reference to the Standards document was presented by Pacific, and no CLEC voiced any concerns about the adequacy of the Enhanced File Transfer.

80. The Enhanced File Transfer is being developed to enable a more direct connection for the CLECs to the E911 Database for data entry and modification. Pacific's goal was to utilize the most simplistic product for development and rollout, in large part to avoid an extensive investment in resources (human and dollars) by the wholesale customers. By minimizing the complexity of this product, the wholesale customer will be able to utilize their programmers on staff. There is nothing out of the ordinary being developed that would require more detail than what has been provided.

81. Enhanced File Transfer, as outlined, will utilize:

- PRAF, the single access point developed specifically for CLEC use.
- PGP (Pretty Good Privacy), an industry standard that eliminates use of a "SecurID" card (the often cumbersome part of connectivity),
- FTP (File Transfer Protocol) identified as available on nearly all computers, and
- TCP-IP connectivity to the PRAF.
All of the aforementioned are standard protocol, standard security, and include the deployment of the most current national Emergency File Format without specificity.

82. With respect to ORA’s comments, the implementation of the E911 Enhanced File Transfer is not dependent on the EDI/CORBA interface. The only system prerequisite for the E911 Enhanced File Transfer is the successful implementation of the complete E911 database replacement. The Enhanced File Transfer has not yet been introduced, as Pacific is still in the process of identifying a targeted implementation date. The Change Management Process will be followed for the implementation of this enhancement.

**MS Gateway**

83. AT&T complains that, “[a]s with all issues involving E911 updates, forcing CLECs to rely on the archaic MS Gateway, for example to serve residential customers via UNE-P, has serious implications for the public health and safety of California consumers.” The MS Gateway was developed at the onset of local competition to serve the CLECs by providing direct access to enter their data into the E911 database. In addition to providing firewall security, the primary function of the MS Gateway was to provide the CLECs a means to enter E911 data utilizing the newly developed National Emergency Number Association (“NENA”) standard. This Standard was embraced to facilitate CLEC data entry.
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84. To characterize the MS Gateway – a 3-year old system, developed with newly adopted NENA data format standards – as "archaic" and state that it "has serious implications for the public health and safety of California consumers" is unjustified. AT&T has provided no evidence to support its allegation that the MS Gateway places California consumers at risk. Such a grave accusation, without supporting evidence, is irresponsible in light of the safety issues.

Notifications

85. NextLink argues the consistency and timeliness of Pacific’s FOC notifications are inadequate. Nextlink attributes this in part to Pacific’s alleged failure to implement a reliable mechanized FOC notification process. Pacific recognizes the timely return of the FOC as not only critical to Pacific’s customer, NextLink, but also to the customer’s ability to work efficiently and provide service to its end-user customers. Pacific provides electronic FOCs and SOCs

---
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for those LSRs submitted electronically. EDI and LEX process real-time for both the in-bound (receipt of LSR) as well as out-bound (return of FOC/SOC).

86. Because of the importance of FOCs and SOCs, Pacific has advised CLECs to contact the LOC or OSS Help Desk to report any delayed or missed FOCs. Pacific tracks these reports by assigning trouble ticket numbers and then facilitates the resolution of the trouble report. If a CLEC chooses, it can also contact its account manager to issue a complaint regarding delays in FOC or other notifications. The CLECs have operational support throughout Pacific, resources which include designated service managers, floor supervisors, and a direct line to their specific Account Manager and the OSS Customer Support Team.

87. Moreover, since July 6, 1999, Nextlink no longer receives manual FOCs. Prior to July 6, 1999, NextLink had received manual FOCs for certain orders that were submitted via LEX. In particular, Pacific’s records indicate that NextLink had opened four trouble tickets on FOC delays and lodged eight complaints via the Account Team, in contrast to 585 FOCs for LEX during the period of April 15 through August 31, 1999. The PONs involved were researched, then corrective action was taken by either Pacific or NextLink, as applicable. As of July 6, 1999, Pacific has deployed additional capabilities, by fully implementing LASR GUI in the LSC, so that all FOCs are now returned via LEX if the request is submitted via LEX.
This enhancement has eliminated any manual FOCs for LEX and EDI orders.

88. Sprint complains that although Pacific has made some progress on the jeopardy notice process, Pacific's jeopardy notifications should include more detail related to each field so that Sprint is able to successfully map fields back from Pacific. Sprint fails to identify what additional detail it believes it needs. Currently, Sprint submits only resale requests via RMI or by fax. When a request goes into a jeopardy situation the Resale LSC has designated personnel to provide Sprint with a jeopardy notification. That notification will be sent via the same method used to submit the order. The information contained on the notification includes: the CLEC’s PON number, Pacific’s order number, the name and telephone number of the end user contact, the jeopardy code and reason in English (e.g., 1G - NO ACCESS TO END USER PREM), and the estimated new due date. In addition, Pacific deployed a fully electronic jeopardy notification process on August 21, 1999 for CLECs submitting requests via LEX and EDI. The jeopardy notice, including the information appearing on the notice, was implemented using industry guidelines. Accessible Letter CLECCS99-018 notified CLECs on February 17, 1999. Viveros Attachment MM.
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89. In its July 15, 1999 filing, Pacific incorrectly noted 98% of all reject notifications were being returned automatically. While this figure was accurate in 1998, the rate has dropped in 1999, in large part due to a substantial increase in CLEC order accuracy. Based on May and June 1999 data, around 75% of rejects were being returned electronically at that time. However, even though the remainder of rejects were returned manually, 100% are returned electronically as of July 1999.

BILLING

90. MCI alleges that Pacific is not separately identifying Unbundled Network Elements (“UNE”) access traffic from all of the other access records for which Pacific bills MCI. Pacific distinguishes UNE access traffic from all other traffic by sending it in a separate uniquely identified file. Pacific sends a separate file for resale, UNEs and facilities traffic. Each file is identified by a unique file name. In the case of MCI, the file is sent daily via Network Data Mover (“NDM”). The resale file contains only end user billing records associated with accounts that are resold to MCI. The facilities file contains only access records for MCI facilities NPA/NXXs or numbers ported to MCI. The UNE file contains both end-user billable records and access
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records for accounts that are identified as UNE. However, there are different categories of records (end user records are category 10 and the access records are category 11), so there should not be any confusion.

91. In an attempt to support its claim that Pacific does not identify its UNE traffic from other access records, MCI alludes to an OBF recommendation that Pacific allegedly did not implement. The OBF issue is 1450, Issue Title: differentiate UNE from Total Services Resale ("TSR") closed on August 11, 1997. The issue is "There is a need to differentiate end user billing records in the resale environment; UNE vs. TSR." Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form - Issue #1450. This OBF issue does not relate to access records; it addresses only end user records. Nevertheless, access records can be differentiated currently by the file in which they are received and by the receiving company doing a look up in the Rate Point Master File ("RPM"), which identifies the company that owns the NPA/NXX.

92. MCI further alleges that Pacific continues to commingle billing at resale and retail rates on the same invoice, and that Pacific has "closed" this issue by indicating the requested change is not currently feasible. To get the recurring and non-recurring USOC charges to appear at retail rates with an associated discount section entry would require

major redesign of the bill and Pacific’s rating processes. Also, there have been no other requests for this change from any other CLEC. Pacific’s Billing Architects have reviewed the requested changes and have decided that they are not currently feasible. Nonetheless, this will be considered along with other future system upgrades to support OCN specific discounting.

93. MCI claims there is a billing problem with the discount applied to Pacific’s Classic Saver Pack. According to MCI, the net result of the billed charges, less the discount applied to the Classic Saver Pack, do not match up with the tariffed rate. A Billing Quality Report (“BQR”) was issued around June 24, 1999 for an outstanding billing problem brought to Pacific’s attention November 1998. 67

94. A BQR was opened by Pacific to investigate MCI’s claim of a billing problem with discounts associated with the Classic Saver Pack. BQRs are prioritized based on severity, which considers factors such as volume and revenue. MCI’s claim with the Classic Saver Pack amounts to an overbilling of $.01 per account per month. Problem Management will investigate this claim further and it will be resolved in a timely manner, consistent with Pacific’s policy of prioritizing billing issues by severity.

95. TRA alleges that Genesis has been unable to receive consolidated billing. The Resale Select Bill Date functionality was implemented with the June 1999 Billing release, and made available to CLECs on July 1, 1999, as listed in the tariff. Genesis submitted its request to its Account Manager on July 16, 1999. Its request has been processed and became effective August 8, 1999.

96. NextLink alleges that despite repeated requests for final processing of single-bill, single-tariff tapes, NextLink has yet to receive any money from Pacific for originating switched access traffic. NextLink had a single-bill, single-tariff arrangement with Pacific between July 1997 and December 1998, and had an outstanding dispute during that period with Pacific regarding the processing of originating switched access records on behalf of NextLink and remission to NextLink for such services. NextLink was not paid by Pacific because NextLink was unable to submit complete and accurate records that could be processed by Pacific.

97. In general, Pacific’s only proactive opportunity to ensure the CLECs data will pass and bill correctly is during the initial testing process. Once a CLEC is in production, no manual intervention is involved and the process becomes fully automated. For this reason, a CLEC must meet a quality and accuracy threshold in the initial testing prior to being put into production.
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98. In NextLink’s case, it submitted single-bill, single-tariff test tapes for the initial testing process and received a written explanation of the errors contained on each of the tapes. Replies were emailed and faxed with each submission of test tapes, and Pacific’s Subject Matter Experts (“SMEs”) discussed the results with the CLEC’s technical experts when they had any questions. In some cases, Nextlink’s records remained the same from one test tape to the next, indicating the errors were not corrected, resulting in the same errors appearing on successive tapes. The response sent to NextLink indicated that these were repeated errors.

99. Almost all the errors found on the test tapes sent by NextLink involved incorrect field entries made by NextLink within the EMI record. The most common error was populating a field within the record with a non-numeric value when the field is defined in the EMI manual as requiring a numeric entry. This type of error would occur at one of the initial validation points in our system. Therefore, these records would never make it to the CABS billing system. With every test tape, Pacific manually intervened to pass as many records on to CABS as possible so that Pacific could identify as many problems as possible. Therefore, Pacific’s inability to final-process NextLink’s single-bill, single-tariff bills is the direct result of NextLink’s failure to submit error-
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free data. In fact, Pacific was unable to collect revenues as a result of NextLink’s inability to send accurate data.

100. In March 1999, NextLink converted to the multiple-bill, single-tariff arrangement. All CLECs with existing single-bill, single-tariff arrangements, including NextLink, were sent letters in March 1999 requesting they contact Pacific immediately if they had any outstanding single-bill, single-tariff issues. There has been no response from any of the CLECs regarding this letter.

101. Sprint claims that since OBF issue #1779 was finalized in June 1999, Pacific has made no commitment to implement the change to properly bill for Directory Assistance Call Completion ("DACC") surcharges.\textsuperscript{70} There is a wide variance within the industry of how DACC is handled. A CLEC may receive up to 3 records when a DACC call is made: 1 record is created for the call to DA, 1 record is for the service charge for the call completion, and 1 record is for the call that was completed. Some companies send only 2 records: a 10-01-01, which includes both the DA call and the DACC, and a second record for the call that was completed. If the completed call was local, it is also possible that only 1 record would be sent.

102. OBF Issue #1779 recommends that indicator 24 on record types 10-01-01 and 10-01-32 should be populated with a 0. Pacific
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sends these records and has always done this. OBF Issue #1779 also recommends that if a 10-01-18 record is sent for the DACC service charge, Pacific should populate indicator 24 with a 3. Previously, Pacific added the special text “ECC service charge” (Express Call Completion) with the 10-01-18 record. With the August 1999 release, Pacific has implemented the OBF recommendation for the 10-01-18 record in addition to the special text.

103. Moreover, Sprint also claims it does not know when Pacific intends to correct Rate Class issues that cause Sprint customers to be overcharged the manual rate instead of the lower fully automated rate.\textsuperscript{71} The rate class field Pacific populates with the 10-01-18 record for DACC is “operator serviced dial rate applied” and category 10 records are sent out unrated. Therefore, Pacific does not understand what rating Sprint is referring to. Any rating of a call as a result of the 10-01-18 record is rated by the CLEC, not Pacific.

104. Sprint also claims that 10-01-31 records sent to Sprint exclude the called telephone number. As a result, Sprint claims it is billed by Pacific and expected to pay while making it impossible for Sprint to bill its customers.\textsuperscript{72} Pacific sends all recordings, if available. A 10-01-31 call detail record is sent to the CLEC for a local call whenever the end office does not record the terminating number. If
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the terminating number is recorded, a 10-01-01 record is sent instead.

105. While Pacific sends a record of any local calls that it records, Pacific would not bill a CLEC for the usage unless it originated from a class of service that is measured. Another example of a record that is sent to the CLEC, but not necessarily billed, would be DA calls. Pacific records and sends the CLEC a call record for all calls to DA even though there is a per line allowance of DA calls given to the CLEC on its bill. The CLEC may choose to bill its end user for all calls or pass the allowance on to its end user. Thus, Sprint’s allegations about billing concerns lack merit.

CONCLUSION

106. The CLECs have made many allegations that lack specificity, are misleading, or simply untrue. Pacific has made available access to OSS functions as required by the Commission’s December 1998 Final Order. In addition to capabilities that have been supporting both resale and UNEs, Pacific has made more options available to meet the needs of our diverse CLEC customers.

This concludes my affidavit.

[Signature Page Follows]
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