BOULT ▪ CUMMINGS
CONNERS ▪ BERRY PLC

Jon E Hastings
(615) 252-2306
Fax (615) 252-6306
Email jhastings@boultcummings com

March 12, 2004

Honorable Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243-0505

In Re. Implementation of the Federal Communications Commission's Triennial Review Order (Nine-month Proceeding) (Hot Cuts)
Docket No. 03-00526

Dear Chairman Tate:

Enclosed please find the original and fourteen (14) copies of Sherry Lichtenberg's rebuttal testimony filed on behalf of MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc. and Brooks Fiber Communications of Tennessee, Inc. (collectively "MCI") in the above-referenced docket Copies have been served on all parties of record.

Very truly yours,

BOULT, CUMMINGS, CONNERS & BERRY, PLC

By: Jon Hastings
Jon E. Hastings

JEH/th

Enclosures

LAW OFFICES
414 UNION STREET - SUITE 1600 - PO BOX 198062 - NASHVILLE - TN - 37219
TELEPHONE 615 244 2582 FACSIMILE 615 252 6380 www boultcummings com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on Mach 12, 2004 a copy of the foregoing document was served on the parties of record, via electronically, US mail or hand delivery:

Guy Hicks
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
333 Commerce St , Suite 2101
Nashville, TN 37201

Charles B Welch
Farris, Mathews, et. Al
618 Church St., #300
Nashville, TN 37219

Joe Shirley
Office of Tennessee Attorney General
P. O. Box 20207
Nashville, Tennessee 37202

H. LaDon Baltimore
Farrar & Bates
211 Seventh Ave., N. #320
Nashville, TN 37219-1823

James Wright
United Telephone – Southeast
14111 Capital Blvd.
Wake Forest, NC 27587

Martha M. Ross-Bain
AT&T Communications of the
South Central States, LLC
1200 Peachtree Street, Suite 8100
Atlanta, GA 30309

Ms. Carol Kuhnow
Qwest Communications, Inc.
4250 N. Fairfax Dr.
Arlington, VA 33303

Henry Walker
Boult, Cummings, et al.
P. O. Box 198062
Nashville, TN 37219-8062

Dale Grimes
Bass, Berry & Sims
315 Deaderick St., #2700
Nashville, TN 37238-3001

Mark, W. Smith
Strang, Fletcher, et al.
One Union Square, #400
Chattanooga, TN 37402

Nanette S. Edwards
ITC^DeltaCom
4092 South Memorial Pkwy
Huntsville, AL 35802

Guilford F. Thornton, Jr.
Stokes & Bartholomew
424 Church St., Suite 2800
Nashville, TN 37219-2386

Jon E. Hastings

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE:

Implementation of the Federal	)	
Communication's Commission's	)	**DOCKET NO.**
Triennial Review Order – 9 MONTH	)	**03-00526**
PROCEEDING – HOT CUTS	)	

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF SHERRY LICHTENBERG

on behalf of

MCIMETRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES LLC

and

BROOKS FIBER COMMUNICATIONS OF TENNESSEE, INC.

March 12, 2004

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, EMPLOYER AND TITLE.

A. My name is Sherry Lichtenberg. I am currently employed by MCI as Senior Manager, Operational Support Systems Interfaces and Facilities Development.

Q. ARE YOU THE SAME SHERRY LICHTENBERG WHO PROVIDED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET?

A. Yes.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to rebut the Direct Testimony of BellSouth witnesses Kenneth L. Ainsworth, Ronald M. Pate, Alfred A. Heartley, and Alphonso J. Varner

Scalability of BellSouth's Systems

Q. WHY IS SCALABILITY AN ISSUE?

A BellSouth's testimony makes clear that its UNE-L provisioning processes are intensively manual As explained below, moving from UNE-P to UNE-L would involve an exponential increase in UNE-L provisioning volumes. Manual processing of such volumes would give rise to concern even if they were to take place for a single project over a relatively short period, but in fact the manual handling would have to take place day in and day out, month in and month out in every affected Tennessee wire center.

Q. WHAT IS THE RISK OF REQUIRING CLECS TO USE A PROVISIONING PROCESS THAT MAY FAIL TO WORK PROPERLY AT HIGH VOLUMES?

A. The immediate risk is there would be a large increase in human errors that would cause provisioning delays, customer outages and other service problems. Over the longer term, negative customer experience would harm CLECs and ultimately undermine local competition.

Q. BELLSOUTH'S WITNESSES EMPHASIZE ITS 271 APPROVALS IN 2002 IN SUPPORT OF ITS UNE-L PROVISIONING PROCESSES. IS THIS A VALID POINT?

A No. In its Triennial Review Order, the FCC rejected the argument that the 271 approvals demonstrated that CLECs were not impaired without access to unbundled local switching. The FCC emphasized that UNE-L volumes would increase to levels much higher than were evaluated during the 271 process:

> While incumbent LECs reference the Commission's determination in multiple section 271 orders that BOCs provision hot cuts at a level of quality that offers efficient competitors a meaningful opportunity to compete, and argue that performance data show that current hot cut performance is satisfactory, even as the number of hot cuts has increased, we find that the number of hot cuts performed by BOCs in connection with the section 271 process is not comparable to the number that incumbent LECs would need to perform if unbundled switching were not available for all customer locations served with voice-grade loops. In the states where section 271 authorization has been granted, unbundled local circuit switching has been available and, accordingly, the BOCs' hot cut performance has generally been limited. Moreover, ***we find that the issue is not how well the process works currently with limited hot cut volumes, rather the issue identified by the record is an inherent limitation in the number of manual cut overs that can be performed, which poses a barrier to entry that is likely to make entry into a market uneconomic. . . . For those reasons, the***

Commission's prior findings in section 271 orders do not support a finding here that competitive carriers would not be impaired if they were required to rely on the hot cut process to serve all mass market customers.

(*Triennial Review Order*, ¶ 469 (footnotes omitted, emphasis added).)

Q. DOES BELLSOUTH PRESENT EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATING THAT ITS SYSTEMS CAN HANDLE MASS MARKET VOLUMES OF UNE-L ORDERS?

A No. BellSouth for the most part simply promises that it can scale its systems to handle higher volumes if called upon to do so. Such promises were unacceptable to the FCC and should be to the Authority as well. As the FCC stated: "We find . . . incumbent LECs' promises of future hot cut performance insufficient to support [an FCC] finding that the hot cut process does not impair the ability of a requesting carrier to provide the service it seeks to offer without at least some sort of unbundled circuit switching." (*Triennial Review Order*, ¶ 469 n.1437.)

Q. DOES MR. VARNER'S TESTIMONY CONCERNING BELLSOUTH'S PERFORMANCE METRICS SUPPORT BELLSOUTH'S CLAIM THAT ITS SYSTEMS ARE SCALABLE?

A. No. At best, Mr. Varner's testimony addresses BellSouth's performance with respect to the current low level of UNE-L orders. Moreover, the hot cut metrics Mr. Varner refers to do not provide data on non-coordinated cutovers that MCI would use for residential customers, and in any event only provide a small window into the overall process, focusing on the hot cut itself and provisioning troubles within seven days after the cutover. To make matters worse, his testimony with regard to performance metrics, which is divided between this

proceeding and docket No. 03-00491, does not give a clear picture of BellSouth's actual performance on UNE-L orders. For example, at page 18 of his Direct Testimony in docket No. 03-00491, he states that 85.92% of the "UNE Other" (non-UNE-P) LSRs met the flow through standard over a certain period. In fact, however, most UNE-L LSRs do not flow through BellSouth's systems, when LSRs that fall out for manual processing by design are taken into account. Indeed, BellSouth recently acknowledged that for purposes of its force model, it assumed that only 37% of UNE-L LSRs would flow through its systems. In contrast, the percentage of fully mechanized UNE-P migration orders in Tennessee from July 2002 to August 2003 ranged from 82 0% to 91.2%. (BellSouth response to AT&T First Interrogatory No. 32.)

Q. WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LOW FLOW THROUGH OF UNE-L ORDERS WITH REGARD TO HOT CUTS?

A. Low flow through means that a significant number of UNE-L orders will fall out of the systems and must be processed manually by BellSouth's Local Carrier Service Center. Thus, not only are BellSouth's physical UNE-L hot cut processes (including the processes used to notify CLECs of the status of a cut) intensively manual, but its ordering processes are largely manual as well. Manual ordering processes compound the problems introduced by the manual provisioning processes, increasing still more the chances for human error and customer service outages and other problems.

Q. HOW DO CURRENT UNE-L INSTALLATION INTERVALS COMPARE TO UNE-P INTERVALS?

A. Regional installation intervals for 2 wire analog loops with LNP were 5.06 days for non-design loops and 5.32 days for design loops in October 2003. During that same period, comparable UNE-P installation intervals were 0.36 days for non-dispatch orders and 1.52 days where dispatch was required. (See October 2003 report entitled "FOCI UNE and Non-Design Fully Mech Non-Dispatch SQM (Region).") Thus, even at current volumes UNE-L migrations take substantially longer than UNE-P migrations.

Q. BELLSOUTH WITNESSES AINSWORTH AND PATE POINT TO THIRD PARTY TESTING AS EVIDENCE THAT BELLSOUTH'S SYSTEMS SUPPORTING UNE-L ARE ADEQUATE. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. Mr. Ainsworth refers to process and transaction testing of hot cuts (PPR-9 and TVV-4) at page 17 of his Direct Testimony, but both of the tests he refers to involved low volumes of orders, either issued by BearingPoint or a CLEC. In addition, the tests did not evaluate the ancillary processes necessary in a UNE-L environment, such as LNP, E911, and CLEC-to-CLEC migrations. At page 15 of his Direct Testimony, Mr. Pate refers to another test (TVV-2) done for normal, peak and stress volumes, but fails to note that the orders tested did not go through the physical provisioning process, meaning there were no actual hot cuts performed Moreover, TVV-2 involved mostly orders that flowed through BellSouth's order processing systems without human intervention, and thus involved an order mix quite different from one with just UNE-L orders. The

bottom line is that BearingPoint never did volume testing of BellSouth's physical hot cut process, nor for that matter was there any volume testing that focused exclusively on UNE-L orders. Third party testing provides no evidence of how BellSouth's systems could be expected to perform with mass market volumes.

Q. BELLSOUTH WITNESSES AINSWORTH AND HEARTLEY DISCUSS A FORCE MODEL THEY SAY PREDICTS THE NUMBER OF PERSONNEL THAT WOULD NEED TO BE ADDED TO HANDLE ADDITIONAL VOLUMES OF HOT CUTS. DOES THIS MODEL ESTABLISH WHETHER BELLSOUTH CAN SEAMLESSLY PROCESS HIGH VOLUMES OF UNE-L ORDERS?

A. No To the contrary, this testimony demonstrates how intensively manual BellSouth's processes are because BellSouth's only proposed way to address much higher volumes of hot cuts is to hire more people. The problem that BellSouth fails to acknowledge is that mass market volumes are of a different order of magnitude than BellSouth's manual processes currently encounter. From July 2002 to August 2003, CLECs submitted between 133 to 342 total UNE-L migration orders per month in Tennessee, whereas they submitted between 11,529 to 23,249 total UNE-P migration orders per month during the same period. (BellSouth responses to AT&T First Interrogatory Nos. 28 and 32.) Using a mathematical model to calculate the number of additional people that would be necessary in theory to handle such increased volumes fails to address the fundamental question of whether simply staffing up can address the problem In the end, BellSouth just says "trust me." The Authority should not accept that

paper promise since every hot cut that fails will directly impact a Tennessee consumer

Ability of BellSouth's Systems to Process All Types of UNE-L Orders

Q. DOES BELLSOUTH ADDRESS ALL THE ORDERING SCENARIOS YOU ADDRESSED IN YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A No. BellSouth focuses on migrations from BellSouth to CLECs and ignores other kinds of transactions, such as CLEC-to-CLEC migrations. Although BellSouth does not deny that problems exist in CLEC-to-CLEC migrations, for example, BellSouth's position has been that problems arising from carriers other than itself are irrelevant to the impairment analysis, however real those problems may be to the carriers involved and their customers. In a fully competitive market, customers must be able to move from carrier to carrier seamlessly as they do today in the long distance market and, to a more limited degree, with UNE-P in the local market. This case is not just about BellSouth's performance, but about all carriers' –and their customers' – experience.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT IS INVOLVED IN MIGRATING A CUSTOMER FROM ONE CLEC TO ANOTHER.

A. Of course, the loop needs to be moved from the losing CLEC's circuit appearance (CFA) to the winning CLEC's CFA, but that process will not provide the customer with the service that he has ordered. A CLEC-to-CLEC migration requires the losing CLEC to make the loop available to the winning CLEC for re-use, which requires providing the correct circuit ID (the physical identifier for the

circuit being used to provide the customer's service) and channel and pair assignment information to the winning CLEC. In addition, the losing CLEC must initiate the 10-digit LNP trigger in its switch and unlock the E911 database. While BellSouth is not directly involved in this process, the customer will not have the service he has requested until that process is complete. The Authority should not force CLECs to move to UNE-L until the CLEC-to-CLEC migration process is in place and tested, since the only "winner" in the chaos that will ensue if customers are "stranded" on one CLEC's platform will be BellSouth.

Q. WHAT SHOULD BE DONE TO DEAL WITH THE REALITY THAT IMPAIRMENT ARISES NOT JUST FROM BELLSOUTH'S SYSTEMS, BUT FROM OTHER INDUSTRY PLAYERS AS WELL?

A As I discussed in my Direct Testimony, operational issues should be addressed in an Authority-sponsored industry workshop.

Batch Hot Cut Process

Q. HAS BELLSOUTH DEVELOPED AN ADEQUATE BATCH HOT CUT PROCESS?

A. No. BellSouth has developed a manually intensive batch ordering process that does not provide a seamless method for transitioning existing UNE-P customers to UNE-L. BellSouth's batch ordering process requires additional steps (a manual spreadsheet, negotiation for due dates and a new batch LSR) to the process. In addition, the process allows BellSouth to set due dates individually for each of the

orders in the batch. These additional steps seem to be contrary to the FCC's recommendation that a batch process could simplify, streamline, and shorten the UNE-P to UNE-L migration process.

Q. HAS BELLSOUTH STATED THAT IT WILL MAKE IMPROVEMENTS TO ITS PROCESS?

A. Yes, BellSouth recently stated in its Florida surrebuttal testimony in the mass markets switching impairment case that it intends to make certain improvements. I will address BellSouth's proposal after discussing the problems with the existing process.

Q. ARE THERE REASONS TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT THE EXISTING BATCH ORDERING PROCESS?

A. Yes. The existing batch ordering process starts with the requirement that the CLEC provide its Account Manager with a manual spreadsheet listing the lines to be moved. The Account Manager has 4 business days to review the spreadsheet and assign due dates to each of the 99 separate accounts that can be listed. (For a carrier providing residential service, the 99 accounts will translate to 99 individual customers.) The Account Manager then will return the spreadsheet to the CLEC. Unlike all other ILECs, BellSouth does not necessarily assign the same due date to each of the lines on the spreadsheet. BellSouth's apparently random date selection will not allow CLECs to plan for the transition of their customers and will create more work for all involved. Once the CLEC receives the spreadsheet with the listing of lines and proposed completion dates, the CLEC must create the batch ordering LSR – only then can the orders be submitted electronically to

BellSouth's OSS. BellSouth's internal systems will "explode" a single batch LSR into multiple LSRs This process did not exist and therefore was not tested during the 271 proceedings and BellSouth has not provided detailed documentation on how the process works, only the brief documentation available on the BellSouth CLEC web site. I am concerned that once CLECs begin to use this process, it will result in more orders falling to manual handling and more errors. At the very least, the batch ordering process adds steps to a process that should simplify the UNE-L ordering process. And because BellSouth's systems must issue multiple internal orders for each LSR, problems such as the premature disconnects, which were a problem with UNE-P until BellSouth removed its two order process, would likely recur.

Q. HOW WOULD BELLSOUTH'S BATCH ORDERING PROCESS AFFECT CLECS?

A. CLECs would need to develop new software to develop and send the batch LSR. Additional software may also be necessary to accept the notifiers issued for the individual LSRs created by the BellSouth internal systems, since the current ordering processes for both UNE-P and UNE-L include a one-to-one correlation between orders issued and FOCs and other notifiers received. Thus, if a CLEC submitted a batch LSR via EDI, it would expect to receive an FOC for this submission, rather than FOCs for each of the orders included in the batch LSR. MCI believes that the process can be enhanced very easily by removing the requirement for a spreadsheet, a negotiation process, or the single "batch LSR." MCI would prefer a process that provides standard due dates and allows the

issuance of individual LSRs, but BellSouth continues to refuse to collaborate with CLECs to develop a true batch hot cut process. BellSouth is the only RBOC that has not established collaboratives to develop a batch hot cut process, preferring instead to simply tell CLECs and the Authority that the existing process is "good enough."

Q. IS BELLSOUTH'S BATCH ORDERING PROCESS EFFICIENT?

A. No. The four business days BellSouth requires for initial negotiation is far too long; the entire process from start to finish should take five business days. CLECs should not be forced to perform additional steps. Due dates should be decided in advance using a scheduling tool such as the one that SBC and Qwest are proposing. Communications between the ILEC and the CLEC should be electronic, using a system similar to the Verizon WPTS hot cut tool, the Status Tool recently proposed by Qwest, or the SBC-proposed PWS system. Adding these tools would greatly improve BellSouth's process.

Q. HOW DOES THE BATCH ORDERING PROCESS ADDRESS LINE SPLIT LINES?

A. My understanding is that when a customer is served by a UNE-P voice CLEC and a data CLEC over a line splitting configuration where BellSouth provides the splitter and the customer is being migrated to a UNE-L loop, BellSouth will disconnect the CLEC line from the splitter and thus take down the customer's data service. The line would then be migrated to UNE-L. Theoretically, the CLEC could then order that the line splitting be re-installed using its own splitter, but BellSouth has yet to provide information on how this process will be

accomplished, particularly if the CLEC is teaming with a data CLEC to provide line splitting via a second collocation arrangement (one for data). In addition, BellSouth has provided no information on how a line splitting customer served by a CLEC-provided splitter can be migrated to a UNE-L with line splitting arrangement. A process that does not allow the customer to retain his or her data provider when he moves to UNE-L is not acceptable and harms customers directly. This process must change so the customer's line splitting arrangement is not taken down.

Q. WHAT PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS HAS BELLSOUTH STATED IT WILL MAKE?

A. BellSouth has stated that it will include CLEC-to-CLEC migrations in its batch process; guarantee that an all the lines of an end user's account will be cut on the same day; include after-hours and Saturday cuts; guarantee a four-hour window for coordinated hot cuts; include a timely restoral process if there is a problem with the cut; implement a web-based communication system for non-coordinated cuts; reduce the provisioning interval to 8 days; implement a scheduling tool; and include DS0 EELs in the batch process.

Q. WILL THESE PROBLEMS ADDRESS ALL OF MCI'S CONCERNS?

A No. Although BellSouth's proposal appears to be a step in the right direction, there are a number of problems with it. As an initial matter, BellSouth has provided little detail with its proposal and it appears that much of the proposal would be implemented after the Authority's ruling in this proceeding, so neither the Authority nor the parties will be able to evaluate the effectiveness of the new

process for purposes of this case. BellSouth does not state whether the due date negotiation process will continue to be required, whether CLECs will continue to be required to submit a spreadsheet listing its proposed migration orders as a prerequisite to negotiations with the project manager, and what systems will be used to update the "automated status tool." The limited level of detail BellSouth has provided does not allow the Authority or CLECs to determine whether it meets their needs.

Q. HAVE CLECS SUBMITTED CHANGES TO THE BELLSOUTH BATCH HOT CUT PROCESS THROUGH THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS?

A. Yes. CLECs have jointly submitted seven change requests to BellSouth in an attempt to "jump start" the discussions on this process. BellSouth has yet to respond to these proposals.

Q. MUST CHANGES BE MADE TO BELLSOUTH'S METRICS TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF ITS NEW BATCH PROCESS?

A. Yes. Once the new process is developed and approved, metrics will need to be created to measure its effectiveness.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers Attestation

Q. MR. MCELROY DESCRIBES AN ATTESTATION BY PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS ("PwC") FOR BELLSOUTH. DO YOU HAVE ANY INITIAL CONCERNS ABOUT HOW THE TEST WAS DONE?

A. Yes. The test was performed without participation by CLECs or a public service commission, which casts doubt on its objectivity, completeness and conclusions. Because BellSouth has provided only limited information about the test, it is impossible at this juncture for CLECs to evaluate fully the test methodology or results.

Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON THE SCOPE OF THE ATTESTATION.

A Only the lift and lay process was tested. Although PwC states that it issued orders and reviewed the ordering process, there appears to be no data provided with respect to the ordering process. Aspects of UNE-L migration such as LNP, directory listings, trouble handling and 911 were not tested.

Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON PWC'S METHODOLOGY.

A. Without a test plan, it is difficult to know what PwC did or how it was done. Based on what is provided in Mr. McElroy's testimony, it appears that the test bed consisted of 750 lines that BellSouth wired to its frames in three central offices. These lines were translated in the BellSouth switches, but did not go to a CLEC collocation cage or switch. When the "migration order" was worked, the lines were re-terminated on the CLEC portion of the BellSouth main distributing frames and then run back to the switches According to BellSouth, most of the orders were issued using BellSouth bulk ordering process.

Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON THE EXCEPTIONS NOTED BY PWC.

A. For 22 lines, no dial tone was detected prior to the cut, but the cuts were done anyway. If this problem existed for a live customer, and the trouble was on the loop, the customer would have continued to have problems after the cut. If

customer were suspended or had had dial tone removed for some reason, the CLEC would not have wanted the cut to proceed.

For 3 lines, there was no dial tone for longer than 20-40 minutes, with no explanation given. The result for a real customer would be the inability to make calls during this period.

Two lines were cut on the wrong due date (one early and one late). In the case of an early cut, the CLEC might not have completed translations, leaving the customer with no dial tone. Or the CLEC might not be ready to activate the LNP transaction, leaving the customer unable to receive calls. The customer would call for service, the CLEC would report to it to BellSouth as a UNE-P line, and BellSouth would show no record of the customer existing, which could take considerable time to resolve. A similar problem could occur if the cut were late. The CLEC would assume the order was rejected and would pull its translations from the switch and submit a new order to BellSouth. Indeed, a late cut is potentially more disruptive than an early cut.

One line was cut even though the telephone number was wrong. In such a case the wrong customer would have been migrated. The losing CLEC would receive a loss notice and stop billing the customer. The gaining CLEC would not bill the new customer since no order was placed for that migration. If the customer reported trouble to the losing CLEC, it would not be able to resolve it, since according to BellSouth, it would no longer own the customer. If trouble were reported to the new CLEC, it would turn the customer away, since the customer would not be in its database. BellSouth provides no explanation of why

this problem happened. It simply says it was "resolved" by working with the pseudo CLEC.

For six lines, CLEC dial tone was not tested prior to the cut. If CLEC dial tone had not been present, the customer would have been migrated with no dial tone.

For 47 (according to BellSouth) or 49 (according to PwC) lines, no cutover notification was given. In a non-coordinated cut (which MCI will use for residential customers), BellSouth notifies CLECs of the cut via a fax or email apparently generated by the EnDI system. Testing showed that this system failed on at least one day and presumably more, causing 47 (or 49) notifications to be "misplaced" and not sent. CLECs would have assumed that the customer was not cut over and thus would not have activated the LNP transaction. The customer would have been unable to receive calls. The CLEC would not be aware of the problem until the customer called to complain. The CLEC would then have to work with BellSouth to figure out what the problem was, a process that would take time and cause customer dissatisfaction.

Q. IS THIS A SMALL NUMBER OF PROBLEMS?

A. No. Out of the 724 orders observed, 81 problems were noted, or 11% of the total. Just based on the limited information made available to CLECs about the test, therefore, it is clear that BellSouth's batch hot cut process is flawed and that its use would result in significant harm to consumers.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.