COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY

Investigation by the Department of Telecommunications and Energy upon its own motion pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 into the Compliance Filing of New England Telephone and Telegraph d/b/a Bell Atlantic – Massachusetts as part of its application to the Federal Communications Commission for entry into the in-region interLATA (long distance) telephone market	))))))))	D.T.E. 99-271

DECLARATION OF BOGDAN SZAFRANIEC AND JAMES KATZMAN
ON BEHALF OF COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY

1. My name is Bogdan Szafraniec, independent consultant for Covad Communications Company ("Covad"). In my role as consultant for Covad, I oversee CLEC to ILEC OSS gateway planning, development and implementation. I participate in OSS Change Management, review carrier merger conditions, participate in technical collaborative sessions, and define performance measurements for OSS Third Party Testing. Prior to working for Covad, I was a systems architecture consultant for Ameritech from September 1996 through March 1999. At Ameritech, I oversaw the design of pre-ordering, ordering, and trouble administration gateways; developed business continuity plans, participated in OBF, TCIF, ECIC, and T1 standard and guideline fora; designed order status and jeopardy notification applications; managed software vendors and reviewed proposals for OSS solutions; implemented OSS interface monitoring

applications for performance reporting purposes; and devised strategy for selection of Corba, EDI and CMIP technologies.

Prior to working for Ameritech, I was Director of Information Systems - AON Risk Corporation (2/1994 - 8/1996) where I was responsible for office automation in 13 remote offices; implementing of messaging gateways and LAN deployment; designing internet connectivity and firewall security; and contributing to development of AON corporate technology standards.

2. My name is James Katzman and I am Director of ILEC Relations at Covad. I am specifically responsible for escalating GUI and other OSS issues to Bell Atlantic for resolution. I attend weekly calls with Bell Atlantic to assure that Covad is receiving nondiscriminatory treatment from its sole wholesale supplier.

Prior to joining Covad, I was employed by Bell Atlantic for almost ten years, most recently as Director for ADSL Implementation from February 1999 through February 2000. In that role I was responsible for implementation of the ISP reseller program. I helped to create the system used to receive ISP orders. Prior to that I was the ISDN Product Manager from November 1997 to February,1999.

3. Covad's Service Delivery and Sales Support work in conjunction with one another to address the OSS problems that arise on loop orders. Service Delivery interacts directly with BA to resolve OSS issues. Sales Support interacts directly with Covad's ISP partners and customers to manage expectations on the ultimate delivery of service. Service Delivery works to

resolve the OSS problems so that a DSL line can be provisioned. Sales Support works the customer relationship before and after a line is provisioned.

Purpose of Testimony

4. The purpose of our testimony is to respond to Bell Atlantic's Supplemental 271 Filing dated May 20, 2000 as it relates to OSS issues. Specifically, we will address Covad's experience with the Graphical User Interface ("GUI") in preordering, ordering, provisioning, and maintenance and repair for loop orders. We will also address the loop qualification information that Covad needs to provide DSL to its customers. And we will describe Covad's efforts to obtain additional loop information from Bell Atlantic. Finally, we will discuss BA's Electronic Data Interface ("EDI") development as it relates to OSS necessary to support loops used for DSL service.

5. In summary, there are still serious OSS issues that need to be resolved before BA is permitted into the long distance market. Covad's OSS problems include at least the following:

- OSS – General:
  - BA's OSS do not allow CLECs to perform functions in substantially the same time and manner that BA does for itself;
  - BA's OSS for xDSL orders are not fully automated and require excessive manual intervention for all functions which makes the process prone to human error and delay;

- At any given point in time, there is a BA-caused backlog of orders attributable to missed due dates, systematic flow-through problems, facilities issues, and loops delivered that don't work;
- At any given point in time, hundreds of Covad's Massachusetts orders are without due dates.

➢ GUI outages occur frequently at inopportune times and cause Covad to lose orders in the system and create excessive backlogs in orders. BA does not give us sufficient information on the root cause of these frequent, sporadic outages; Preordering:

- Address validation is cumbersome and difficult to use because it requires exact duplication of the address as it appears in BA's records;
- Obtainable loop info is primarily based on Bell Atlantic's retail DSL offering. Loop information is incomplete, inadequate, and difficult to obtain and does not help Covad to inform its customers of whether it can offer DSL service, and, if so, what type of DSL can be provided;
- Loop information is not provided in a timely manner, sometimes take days, weeks, and months for BA to perform and complete a manual qualification on a loop order
- TISOC Availability is inconsistent and unreliable. Covad is often unable to obtain the status of orders or assistance with orders in a timely fashion. TISOC hours of operation are also not sufficient to

handle CLEC volume. In contrast, BA's retail DSL channel has significantly extended hours.

- Ordering:
  - xDSL orders do not flow through and require manual intervention. After an order is electronically received via the GUI from Covad, BA must manually enter the request into BA's Service Order Processor ("SOP"), a process that is replete with delay and human error;
  - Information on order errors (queries) is not complete, consistent, or provided in a timely fashion and is highly dependent on the BA representative who is handling the order;
  - Due dates or completion notifications are often delayed, frequently changed, or not at all received;
  - Response time on facility availability is delayed and requires multiple escalations per loop order;
  - Information on facilities issues is missing or inadequate which leaves Covad unable to inform its customers of the interval for service and the type of DSL that can be provided to the customer;
  - There is no resolution given for certain facilities issues, forcing Covad to cancel the order and deny service to the customer;
  - Lack of facilities and other loop information requires Covad to submit and resubmit orders for different types of loops. For example, if Covad orders a DSL loop and there are no copper facilities available, Covad must cancel its ADSL loop order,

resubmit a premium loop order, and await another interval to provide service to its customer;

- BA often sends queries months after Covad feels the order is complete. When we fail to respond to the queries, our end users are taken out of service for no apparent reason.

- Provisioning:
  - Provisioning involves manual processing to route each order to the appropriate back-end system for installation to Covad's customer;
  - Average interval completed is close to 40 days. BA frequently misses due dates by failing to complete central office wiring, failing to complete installation activities, failing to resolve facilities issues, and failing to deliver the loop to the right place;
  - BA's TISOC and RCCC are completely uncoordinated about "no access" situations, resulting in receipt of multiple new due dates for the same order BA fails to provide confirmation of completion of all of its orders.
- Maintenance and Repair:
  - Status of a trouble ticket is onerous to obtain if BA has failed to perform a provisioning activity;
  - BA technicians are not adequately trained to perform maintenance and repair functions for xDSL and, thus, often close trouble tickets without fixing the problem, requiring Covad to open another trouble ticket. BA-MA does not respond to maintenance and repair issues

in a timely manner, taking days, weeks, and months to resolve trouble tickets;

- BA's electronic RETAS system is substandard. Tickets are difficult to input and ticket status is difficult to interpret.
- Far too many tickets are closed out to "no trouble found" without adequate explanation.

Introduction

6. Covad uses the WEB Graphic User Interface ("GUI") system to order unbundled loops from Bell Atlantic. Covad is ordering both premium (ISDN) loops and ADSL loops from Bell Atlantic at this time. Covad began accepting orders for service in Massachusetts in November 1998. Through June 2000, Covad had ordered a total of approximately 3200 unbundled loops from BA-MA.

7. We would note that Covad is in the process of developing and testing its EDI interface with BA. Covad first approached Bell Atlantic about EDI development in August 1998. However, it was not until November 1998 that BA made itself available to meet with Covad toward the goal of developing, testing, and using the EDI interface. Obtaining BA's attention to Covad's EDI development efforts was challenging because BA was completely focussed on its New York 271 efforts and, in particular, on the KPMG test that was being conducted in New York. In sum, Covad experienced a number of difficulties in getting EDI development and testing started for Massachusetts.

8. In 1999, Covad committed a significant number of resources to implementing EDI with Bell Atlantic. Extensive efforts were applied to implementing a file transfer software to transmit EDI. Covad informed Bell Atlantic that BA's preferred software was unstable and difficult to implement. Bell Atlantic did not respond to Covad's concerns until the beginning of 2000 when it was ordered by the NY PSC to fix the problems. Thus, Covad wasted 9 months in its efforts to implement EDI with Bell Atlantic. Today, Covad has deployed EDI in limited production with every major ILEC except Bell South and Bell Atlantic, yet it has spent the most resources to implement with Bell Atlantic. Covad hopes to implement EDI at production levels in the Third Quarter of this year.

9. Covad deals with three centers or groups within BA on loop issues: the Telecom Industry Services Order Center ("TISOC") (where orders are placed), the Regional CLEC Control Center ("RCCC") (where orders are moved to provisioning), and the Regional CLEC Maintenance Center ("RCMC") (where trouble tickets are opened). BA has also established another center, CPLC that works with Covad on RCCC issues. This new center also does due date or firm order commitments reporting.

10. Assuming that the parties stay on schedule, Covad would like to begin using EDI commercially in Massachusetts by 3Q00. At this time, Covad is about to do production testing of BA's EDI.

11. Covad offers a number of "flavors" or speeds of Digital Subscriber Line ("DSL") service. Covad can provide any of its DSL services over a loop

facility unless the following factors are encountered: (1) a loop is provisioned on fiber and (2) the copper loop is longer than 18,000 feet. If these factors are encountered, a customer can obtain only Covad's lowest DSL service called IDSL.

12. Loops that are not end-to-end copper are served by Digital Loop Carrier ("DLC") systems. These are also called "pair gain" and Subscriber Loop Carrier ("SLC"). These loops are a mixture of copper and fiber facilities: fiber running from the central office to a remote terminal and copper running from the remote to the customer's premises. At this time, only Covad's IDSL service can run over the blended copper-fiber facilities because of the equipment that BA has collocated in its central offices and remote terminals. It is important to note that fiber is not inherently unable to support higher speeds of DSL. The service limitation on fiber-fed loops is primarily because of the equipment that BA deploys in the DLC and the type and cost of access that BA offers to CLECs. Remote terminal issues are addressed in Covad/Rhythms Joint Panel Testimony filed in DTE 98-57 Phase III. We have asked that this testimony be incorporated in this case.

13. At this time, copper loops that are longer than 18,000 feet can only support IDSL. Long copper loops cannot transmit DSL service across them without assistance. Assistance can take the form of a device called a repeater that can be attached to the copper wire. The repeater will push or boost the digital signal across the long distance.

14. In addition, long, copper loops are typically encumbered with load coils and bridged taps which impede the transmission of digital signals. Loops have to be cleaned of these electronics for digital service to work over them.

15. When we first began ordering loops in Massachusetts, Covad had only two types of loops available to it: 2-wire analog and 2-wire ISDN or premium loops. Although it is Covad's position that it should be able to obtain a DSL-capable loop by simply ordering an unbundled loop (and paying one price for an unbundled loop), Covad made a conscious decision to order premium loops. This is because these loops were supposedly guaranteed to support ISDN or IDSL service. An ISDN-capable loop is a loop that does not have load coils on it, does not have excess bridge taps on it, and, if the loop is long, has a repeater or loop extension electronics on it to assist the digital signal across the length of the loop. The same loop characteristics that are needed to support ISDN service support DSL service.

16. Thus, even though there are a significant number of loops that are less than 18,000 feet and that don't have encumbrances like load coils or excess bridge taps, Covad was willing to pay a premium price for unbundled loops in order to get a loop that was guaranteed to support its service. Unfortunately, as will be discussed below, we were not so guaranteed.

17. In May 1999, DSL loops became available in Massachusetts. BA's position is that DSL loops are different from premium loops because they guarantee that the facility will be copper and, thus, will not be provisioned on fiber. As we discuss later in this testimony, guaranteed copper was not to be.

General OSS Issues

18. BA's OSS does not allow Covad to perform functions in substantially the same time and manner as BA does for itself. We know this because of our experience with our customers who often complain or remark about our longer interval as compared to the interval they can obtain from BA.

19. Unlike Covad, BA has immediate access to the customer's record and only requires his/her telephone number to ascertain whether DSL is available. Unlike Covad, BA can immediately confirm that a customer's order has been received. Unlike Covad, BA can immediately inform the customer of the due date for service. BA quickly responds to service problems so their customers' service is not unduly delayed or interrupted. Our customers wait patiently for months for service to be turned up.

20. Every day, it seems, we hear about customers that are either promised service or given service from BA in a shorter interval than we can deliver it. This isn't because Covad is the inferior company but because BA -- our essential supplier and our competitor -- doesn't deliver the loops to us in a timely, nondiscriminatory fashion. This discrimination greatly affects us in the marketplace where customers grade companies based on customer

service. Unfortunately, we have no control over the service we get from BA and, hence, no ability to improve service to our customers. This advantages BA, our wholesale supplier *and* our competitor.

21. Further evidence that BA's OSS cannot handle volumes is the fact that there are always backlogged orders for Massachusetts at any given moment in time.

Preordering: General

22. Among the most important preordering functions needed by DSL companies are: (1) the ability to verify a customer's address to be able to ascertain the central office that serves the customer and (2) the ability to obtain loop information to be able to determine the type of DSL service that can be provided to the customer.

23. Covad presently uses several DSL technologies to provide the customer with optimal speed and price options based on the capabilities of the underlying facility. It is essential, therefore, that Covad have efficient access to accurate electronic information about relevant operational parameters regarding BA constructed and maintained loop facilities. Covad needs information on loop length, number and location of analog load coils, number and location of bridge taps, and the presence of a digital loop carrier ("DLC") (and the type of DLC) to be catalogued, inventoried, and made available directly to Covad through an automated database.

24. More simply stated, loop information helps Covad to sell the right DSL product to the right customer. Without this preordering information, Covad's customer has to put up with inordinate delay and frustration in obtaining service from us.

25. Today, Covad cannot even guarantee a customer the lowest speed of DSL that we offer because we do not know, head of time, whether a facility exists at all to serve a customer, that BA will provision a short, copper loop (capable of supporting our highest speed service), or a long, copper loop, or a DLC-fed loop (both of which would allow a customer only our lowest speed service). Further, Bell Atlantic's pre-qualification tool is designed to support BA's retail DSL offering and, therefore, does not fully support Covad's DSL service.

Preordering: Intervals

26. We are also unable to provide our customers with a reasonable interval for service. We typically tell our customers to expect service in thirty to forty-five days. If adequate loop information were obtainable before an order is placed, we would be able to better manage the customer's expectations because we would be able to identify the particular facilities issues presented and be able to estimate the amount of time it would take to resolve the issue. We will discuss facilities issues in more detail below.

Address Verification

27. Covad uses address validation to determine a customer's serving central office. By knowing the central office, Covad would be able to request information on loops that could serve the customer.

28. Validating a customer's address is no easy matter using BA's GUI. It is a clumsy and frustrating process because it requires exact duplication of the address as it appears in BA's records. The problem is that we do not have access to the customer's address that is already in BA's system, so it is often hit or miss to get the address exactly right to move the order forward to processing. For example, if Covad enters "Street" instead of "St." an order will be queried back to us for correction as "address not valid". To some extent, we have learned the tricks of the address validation trade through trial and much error, but some errors are too obscure to figure out without assistance, particularly given some odd numbering schemes within multi-tenant buildings in some of the major BA cities that Covad serves. On rare occasions, BA's reps correct some errors but many others are queried back to us to figure out on our own.

29. When we finally get the address just right, the GUI will provide us with an NPA/NXX for the customer. We then reference our own database to correlate the NPA/NXX to the serving central office.

30. Ideally, obtaining the serving central office through address validation should be an uneventful, flow-through event. However, with BA's OSS,

we are forced to engage in a time-consuming “guess the address” process just to place the order into the GUI.

Loop Qualification Information

31. Once we have finally identified the central office that serves the customer, we then need information on loops that serve the central office. The data we need is called loop qualification information.

32. The process of determining whether a loop can support DSL is called pre-qualification. In order to pre-qualify loops for DSL, BA must inventory its loops and ascertain whether each loop is capable of supporting digital service. If a loop does not qualify for DSL service, this could be because it has a load coil, excess bridged tap, or some other impediment to digital transmission that needs to be addressed before a loop can support DSL service. Loop conditioning is discussed in more detail in the Testimony of John Berard, Minda Cutcher, and Michael Clancy. In order to support its own retail digital services such as InfoSpeed, BA has performed pre-qualification on many but probably not all of the loops in its inventory.

33. BA states that it is providing CLECs with information about ADSL-capable loops in BA’s network. BA also claims that it is providing competing carriers with electronic access to all of the same loop qualification information that is available to its retail organization.

34. We have a couple of initial criticisms of BA’s pre-qualification database. The history of the prequal tool has been fraught with frustration and delay. This is because the prequal tool was initially developed to support BA’s

retail DSL service. CLECs were and continue to be an afterthought in the development of this database.

35. BA claims that it has cooperatively worked with CLECs in the New York DSL Collaborative to determine the type of information and access that Bell Atlantic will make available in response to the FCC's UNE Remand Order. BA claims that it is working with CLECs to enhance database access for the Loop Qualification process. This is a distortion of reality. In fact, BA has fought our attempts to gain an understanding of the various sources of loop information that reside in BA's systems *and* our efforts to obtain additional loop information.

36. BA mentions access to LFACS as an example of their cooperative spirit to improve the loop qualification process. This characterization could not be farther from the truth. CLECs like Covad began inquiring about LFACS as early as August 1999 when the NY DSL Collaborative began. Then, BA opposed CLEC requests for LFACS access, claiming that LFACS did not contain any pre-qualification information. Instead, BA promised to populate the existing database with additional information. When it became clear that the NY PSC would rule on this issue, BA agreed to provide information on LFACS but only if the CLECs first provided BA with the exact information they wanted.

37. When this position was no longer sustainable, BA claimed that it was prevented by Telcordia (the vendor that created LFACS) from disclosing the information in LFACS. On the eve of a Commission ruling on this

issue, BA relented and finally provided a list of information contained in LFACS. BA's next stall tactic was to provide CLECs with a hefty figure of $1.3 million to supplement the existing database with LFACS information. However, BA refuses to provide CLECs with any detail on how the connectivity to LFACS information will be achieved. For example, Bell Atlantic still has not provided a sample of the data stored in the databases. Thus, the saga continues in that CLECs still do not have access to all of the loop information that they need. Further, BA has other sources of loop information. The DTE should investigate those sources as well and assure that CLECs are getting access to this information as needed to sell and provide their advanced services.

38. BA also offers a manual look-up of loop information. But manual loop qualification takes an inordinate amount of time to obtain, if we get it at all. Clearly the BA reps don't understand why we need certain information nor do they seem to have ready access to this information. We will talk more about the manual loop qualification process in the ordering section of our Testimony.

Ordering

SBNs

39. The first problem that Covad encountered in ordering ADSL loops was that BA did not give Covad the appropriate Service Billing Numbers ("SBNs"). SBNs are codes that are assigned to Covad for ordering different loops. For BA-North, including Massachusetts, BA requires

different SBNs or codes for each central office and for each type of loop. This makes loop ordering excessively complicated and time-consuming. For Massachusetts, there are hundreds of SBNs that are assigned to Covad for ordering ADSL loops. There are also different SBNs assigned to Covad for ordering ISDN loops and for ordering HDSL loops for each central office. This SBN process is, for some reason, different for the BA-South where BA assigns one SBN per state.

40. Covad has experienced a lot of difficulty in obtaining the correct SBNs for Massachusetts loop ordering. BA has failed to give Covad SBNs in a timely manner and, when given, Covad has discovered that BA has given it the wrong SBNs. Covad continues to have problems with incorrect SBNs. Going forward, SBNs will continue to be a problem as we get into different COs. We have all the SBNs we need presently but we will need new SBNs as new offices are turned up. Ideally we should be able to obtain SBNs two weeks before Covad accepts a collocation site.

Manual Intervention

41. Once an order is completed and electronically sent to BA through the GUI, it is assigned to a BA rep for manual processing.

42. The BA representative reviews the order for errors and sends it to the Regional CLEC Control Center (RCCC) for validation of facilities. The BA representative contacts Covad's order entry personnel by sending through the GUI what is called a “query” if there are any errors in the order. Covad then has to correct the errors and resend the order. The rep then

manually inputs the order information into the Service Order system for provisioning.

43. Our first objection to this process is that it involves so much manual processing. Ideally, Covad's orders should flow through without manual intervention to the appropriate provisioning queues for dispatch to the customer. As it is now, an order is typed twice into BA's OSS: Covad types the order into the GUI, BA reps receive our orders electronically on one system and then retype the order information into another system for further processing. It is possible that even more manual processes are involved after the order leaves the TISOC and is routed to the other centers for provisioning. This is a time-consuming process and subjects the order to human errors.

44. Further, despite the fact that a lot of manual processing is needed to order premium and ADSL loops, BA has not adequately staffed up the TISOC to be able to handle volumes. Last year, BA admitted to us that they did not have adequate resources at the TISOC and increased staff at this center beginning in 3Q99. While this was a band-aid fix to TISOC problems at that point in time, as our volumes have markedly increased from 3Q99 to now in 2Q00, we are again seeing problems at the TISOC. BA's approach – implementing short-term, temporarily fixes -- is simply not scaleable. Additionally, the TISOC hours are not adequate to handle the volume of activity we are sending.

Error Notification

45. BA does not provide error information in a timely and consistent manner nor is the error information that is provided always complete. Depending on the BA representative, an error may be corrected for Covad and sent through for processing or rejected and sent back to Covad for correction.

46. There are at least two potential problems that arise if Covad has to correct the order. The first problem is that BA often will not describe the error in sufficient detail. For example, BA will note that there is a problem with the address but will not indicate the specific problem with the address. So, we have to spend unnecessary time finding the error. For example, BA will describe the order as “address not valid” but not indicate why it isn’t valid.

47. Secondly, even assuming that Covad can identify the specific error, Covad may not know how to correct the problem. This inconsistent practice makes ordering a loop unduly difficult and time-consuming because at any given point in time, BA may query an order numerous times before Covad obtains a due date. Additionally, the GUI only returns one error at a time. So, we may fix one query and then be queried again on the same order for another reason. This causes more delay.

48. Once the order is filled out correctly and sent to BA, it is assigned a due date or firm order commitment date (FOC) which is the date on which BA promises to install the loop.

49. Covad has had and continues to have much difficulty in getting due dates from BA. We are having basically three types of problems related to due dates. For one, there is a continual backlog of orders for which BA has

simply not given due dates. There is a continual backlog on manual loop qualifications of due dates that have not yet been received from BA. Secondly, it takes too long to get due dates from BA – on average, it takes four business days to receive a due date. Thirdly, due dates frequently change and not always with adequate notice to Covad or with no notice at all.

Manual Qualification

50. Since we have been ordering DSL loops, we have encountered more orders that require manual qualification. The ordering process is as follows. When Covad places an order for a DSL loop, BA is supposed to do a pre-qualification query on the loop order to see if the loop is capable of supporting DSL service. If BA determines that there is a facilities problem, it informs Covad that the loop is "not qualified" and requests that Covad cancel the order.

51. "Not qualified" could mean any of the following facilities problems: (1) no copper facility available; (2) defective facilities; (3) no spare copper available (presence of digital loop carrier or DLC); or (4) long loop (in excess of 18,000 feet).

52. But getting clarification on the facilities problem is highly dependent on the BA rep to which a Covad order is assigned. Some BA representatives inform us of the particular qualification issue that is presented but usually they do not. Sometimes the response takes 5 or more days to receive.

53. We request clarification on a loop that is not qualified both electronically (called a “supp”) and through telephone calls to the TISOC. Since the process to obtain additional information on the particular facilities issue presented may delay the order, we usually inform our customer that we are awaiting clarification from BA on a facilities issue.

54. There are at least three problems with BA’s treatment of “no facilities.” For one, we do not often receive sufficient information on the reason a loop is not qualified. Secondly, there is no way for Covad to verify that there is, in fact, a facilities issue. Thirdly, there is no defined process for dealing with the various facilities issues that arise.

55. Specific information on the facility problem would help Covad determine what kind of DSL service can be provided to a customer and how long it would take to turn up service to a customer. For example, if there is no spare copper available and a customer is served by DLC, we would know that only our lowest speed DSL – IDSL – can be provided to the customer. If there are defective copper facilities and the loop is short, we would know that we could provide any speed DSL to the customer assuming BA will commit to fixing the facilities.

56. Being unable to verify the existence of a facilities issue is customer-affecting. When BA informs us that no copper facilities are available (and that it has no plans to build or find new facilities), we assume that there aren’t suitable facilities and contact our customer to ascertain whether the customer is willing to accept a downgrade in service. Assuming the

customer accepts a downgrade in service, we resubmit the order as an ISDN or premium loop and have to await another loop interval for provisioning. Sometimes the customer cancels service with Covad. We have reason to question BA's "no facilities" response. We know of customers who were unable to get copper facilities from us but were able to obtain the appropriate facilities from BA. We have escalated some of these "no facilities" orders to BA management and had they eventually provisioned on copper. The Declaration of Keith Markley describes these instances of discrimination.

57. Typically if it's a defective pair, we find out about that once we go to install (Harris and truck roll).

Order Status

58. Getting the status of an order is an ordeal that usually requires escalation to a first level manager to obtain information on an order. TISOC reps do not return calls for status or don't give us any status information. BA has created a series of "FOC+" reports to help us obtain status. While better than nothing, often the information is incorrect or incomplete and a phone call to one of the under staffed and under trained centers is often necessary. When these calls are made, BA is often uncooperative and directs us to the FOC+ reports that did not meet our information needs in the first place.

Provisioning

59. Provisioning issues are discussed in more detail in the Testimony of Berard/Clancy/Cutcher. However, we would like to note a few concerns.

60. It takes, on average, over 40 days for our customer to get a loop from BA that works and this delay is because BA simply cannot meet its own due date. BA misses due dates by botching installations, forgetting to do the central office wiring, provisioning loops that don't work, by not acting on facility issues, or by simply not showing up as promised, among other things.

61. Although provisioning problems are also handled by Covad's Operations and ILEC Relations groups, our teams in Service Delivery and Customer Support are responsible for directly interacting with BA to clear the provisioning problems we encounter. To say the least, it is a very painful process to resolve provisioning problems. It takes many people and many hours of phone calls and GUI transactions to resolve each failed loop order.

62. The first time we know that there is loop problem is when we conduct our loop test called the Harris Test. At midnight on the due date, the Harris Test is automatically performed on all loops that are due. This test can ascertain, among other things, loop connectivity -- namely, whether our loops have been connected to our equipment in the central office and make it out of the central office to the customer's premises. The Harris Test can identify some but not all of the possible loop problems.

63. The next day ("due date + 1"), we send a list of loops that failed the Harris Test to BA's RCCC – the Center that handles loop provisioning -- in order to obtain an explanation on why these loops were not provisioned. We send this report to BA every day. We extract from this report to BA, to the extent possible, the loops that failed due to *other than* BA's fault such as no access (BA cannot access customer's premises) or management down (Harris Test connection not working). Because there are so many loops that aren't provisioned on time, it takes two to three days just to find out why these loops failed the Harris Test.

64. It is important to know that BA does not proactively work to address these provisioning problems. It takes our constant attention and escalation to get these problems on BA's radar screen and even more effort to keep them on the radar screen. Once BA tells us why a loop wasn't provisioned, we have to work each of these orders through individually to get BA to re-dispatch a technician to give us a working loop.

65. Working orders to resolution is a frightful experience that involves our orders being ping-ponged from one BA center to another, each pointing to the other for resolution. If we do not accept a loop because of a provisioning problem caused by BA, the loop falls into a black hole between the RCCC (provisioning center) and the RCMC (maintenance center). First of all, the RCCC won't allow us to open a trouble ticket within 24 hours of a due date. The RCCC directs us to the RCMC because it treats the order as having been completed. The RCMC directs

us to the RCCC because it treats the order as not having been provisioned. The only way we can get a re-dispatch on a bad loop is by accepting a bad loop or a loop that we didn't even get from the RCCC and opening a trouble ticket with the RCMC.

66. No-access issues are no less frustrating because, again, BA's internal processes are completely uncoordinated. This time the right hand is the TISOC and it isn't talking to the left hand, the RCCC. No access occurs when BA is allegedly unable to obtain access to the customer's premises to do the loop installation. When BA tells us that a loop wasn't provided due to no access, we immediately send the TISOC an electronic request for a new due date ("supp") and indicate in the remarks section that there was a no-access situation presented. The TISOC then delivers a new due date to us that is usually set for six business days later. In the meantime, the RCCC independently informs the TISOC of the no access situation to which the TISOC responds by giving the order another, new due date. This transaction between the RCCC and TISOC and the new due date are unknown to us. Once the first new due date comes and goes and we inquire about the status of the order, we find out that BA changed the due date. This delays the order another interval.

Maintenance and Repair

67. As mentioned in the provisioning section, we cannot open a trouble ticket with the RCMC until we have closed an order with the RCCC, even when we haven't received a working loop. Unfortunately, the troubles don't end

at the opening of a trouble ticket. As previously mentioned, Bell Atlantic's preferred method of receiving a trouble ticket – their RETAS system – is wrought with issues, not the least of which is the reliability of the GUI itself.

68. It is not unusual for us to have to open more than one trouble ticket per loop order to get a working loop. BA will dispatch a technician and he will often close the trouble ticket with "no trouble found."

69. The next opportunity we have to know if there is a loop problem is when we roll our truck and to do our installation. After a trouble ticket has been closed out by BA, we send out our technician only to find that the trouble wasn't cleared. We then have to open another trouble ticket with the RCMC. Incidentally, we pay for each trouble ticket even when it results in no loop we can use.

70. After two trouble tickets, we can request a vendor meet with BA which is when our technician meets BA's technician at the customer's premises. We also pay for the vendor meet regardless of whether it results in a working loop. Many times, BA doesn't even show up at the vendor meet and we have to reschedule the meet for another day and request our customer to be at home yet again.

71. In summary, it is our testimony that more work needs to be done to improve BA's OSS.

72. This concludes our testimony on OSS issues.