# BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 

150 South Monroe Street
Room 400
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(404) 335-0710

April 10, 2003

Mrs. Blanca S. Bayó<br>Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services<br>Florida Public Service Commission<br>2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard<br>Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

## Re: Docket No. 000121A-TP (OSS)

Dear Ms. Bayó:
In a previous conference call, the Staff requested that BellSouth provide details as to how remedy calculations might be performed from the point of parity. The enclosed documents are in response to that request. Enclosed is an original and 15 copies of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Response to the above-described request, which we ask that you file in the referenced docket.

A copy of this letter is enclosed. Please mark it to indicate that the original was filed and return the copy to me. Copies have been served to the parties shown on the attached Certificate of Service.

Sincerely,


## Enclosures

cc: All parties of record Marshall M. Criser, III Nancy B. White R. Douglas Lackey

$$
\begin{aligned}
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\end{aligned}
$$

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE <br> Docket No. 000121A-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via
U. S. Mail this 10 th day of April 2003 to the following:

Jason K. Fudge
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Staff Counsel
Florida Public Service
Commission
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Tallahássee, FL 32399-0850
Tel. No. (850) 413-6181
Fax. No. (850) 413-6250
ifudge@psc.state.fl.us
AT\&T
Virginia C. Tate
Senior Attorney
1200 Peachtree Street
Suite 8100
Atlanta, GA 30309
Tel. No. (404) 810-4922
vtate@att.com
Verizon, Inc.
Kimberly Caswell
P.O. Box 110, FLTC0007

Tampa, FL 33601-0110
Tel. No. (813) 483-2617
Fax. No. (813) 223-4888
kimberly.caswell@verizon.com
Nanette Edwards (+)
Regulatory Attorney
ITC^DeltaCom
4092 S. Memorial Parkway
Huntsville, Alabama 35802
Tel. No. (256) 382-3856
Fax. No. (256) 382-3936
nedwards@itcdeltacom.com

Scott A. Sapperstein
Intermedia Communications, Inc.
One Intermedia Way
M.C. FLT-HQ3

Tampa, Florida 33647-1752
Tel. No. (813) 829-4093
Fax. No. (813) 829-4923
sasapperstein@intermedia.com
Charles J. Pellegrini
Katz, Kutter, Haigler, Alderman, Bryant \&
Yon, P.A.
106 East College Avenue
Suite 1200
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Counsel for Intermedia
Tel. No. (850) 577-6755
Fax No. (850) 222-0103
ipellegrini@katzlaw.com
Counsel for Intermedia
charlesp@katzlaw.com
Peter M. Dunbar, Esquire
Karen M. Camechis, Esquire
Pennington, Moore, Wilkinson,
Bell \& Dunbar, P.A.
Post Office Box 10095 (32302)
215 South Monroe Street, 2nd Floor
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tel. No. (850) 222-3533
Fax. No. (850) 222-2126
pete@penningtonlawfirm.com

Brian Chaiken
Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc.
2620 S. W. $27^{\text {Sh }}$ Avenue
Miami, FL 33133
Tel. No. (305) 476-4248
Fax. No. (305) 443-1078
bchaiken@stis.com
Michael A. Gross
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
\& Regulatory Counsel
Florida Cable Telecomm. Assoc.
246 East 6th Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32303
Tel. No. (850) 681-1990
Fax. No. (850) 681-9676
mgross@fcta.com
Susan Masterton
Charles J. Rehwinkel
Sprint
Post Office Box 2214
MS: FLTLHO0107
Tallahassee, Florida 32316-2214
Tel. No. (850) 599-1560
Fax. No. (850) 878-0777
susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com
Donna Canzano McNulty ( + )
MCI WorldCom, Inc.
325 John Knox Road
The Atrium, Suite 105
Tallahassee, FL 32303
Tel. No. (850) 422-1254
Fax. No. (850) 422-2586
donna.mcnulty@wcom.com
Brian Sulmonetti
MCI WorldCom, Inc.
6 Concourse Parkway, Suite 3200
Atlanta, GA 30328
Tel. No. (770) 284-5493
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William Weber, Senior Counsel
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John Rubino
George S. Ford
Z-Tel Communications, Inc.
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## BellSouth's comments regarding calculation of penalties: parity gap versus the aggregate test statistic.

In several conference calls with the FL PSC Staff regarding the SEEM plan, Staff relayed a concern of the ALECs: When Truncated Z statistical testing with error probability balancing was used on a measurement with a retail analog, the ALECs believed the calculation of SEEM payments based on the difference between the aggregate test statistic and the balancing critical value was inappropriate. It is BellSouth's understanding that the ALECs believe the SEEM payment should be based on only the aggregate test statistic (or the point of disparity in the ALEC terms) rather than the difference between the aggregate test statistic and the balancing critical value. This difference is commonly referred to as the parity gap or, alternatively, the 'detection point' of disparity.

BellSouth does not share this belief. The purpose of the balancing critical value is to balance the probability of Type I and Type II errors. Eliminating the balancing critical value from the calculation of SEEM payments will essentially create an increased probability of Type I errors which means that BellSouth will be generating SEEM payments on transactions where there was, in fact, no disparate treatment.

BellSouth was asked for an alternative calculation where the balancing critical value would be eliminated from the payment calculation (as the ALECs desired) and the fee schedule would be adjusted to take into account the fact that the revised calculation increased the probability that penalties would be paid on transactions that received parity treatment. After Staff conferred with the ALECs, Staff asked BellSouth to provide a written example of the revised calculation methodology showing how it might work. That methodology follows. BeliSouth is offering this as an illustration only, and as a part of discussions to settle this issue. It is not a formal proposal.

The following information is an explanation of how the elimination of the balancing critical value could be accomplished when calculating the SEEM payments for measurements with retail analogs. This language could be incorporated into Appendix E of the SEEM Administrative Plan, specifically in the sections of Appendix E pertaining to Calculation for Retail Analogs ${ }^{1}$. An example is attached.

1) BellSouth has agreed to implement a transaction-based plan that would replace the current measure-based plan.
2) As a result of the discussion involving whether the SEEM payment should be calculated from the "point of disparity" (the aggregate test statistic) or from the "detection point" (the Truncated Z - the Balancing Critical Value), BellSouth provides for illustration only an example using the aggregate test statistic as the Parity Gap and has eliminated the use of the Balancing Critical Value. In other words, this modification effectively calculates the SEEM payment from the point of the disparity.
3) The illustration also reflects a modification in the fee schedule to compensate for the increased probability of Type I error - where payments are calculated on transactions that were, in fact, at parity.

## Partially Revised Fee Schedule

For illustrative purposes only

| Measure Category | Current | Revised |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MeTRK | $\$ 100.00$ | $\$ 95.00$ |
| MR | $\$ 100.00$ | $\$ 80.00$ |
| MR-UNE | $\$ 400.00$ | $\$ 330.00$ |
| PR | $\$ 100.00$ | $\$ 85.00$ |
|  | ALL ORDERING NO CHANGE |  |

[^0]
## E: BST SEEM Remedy Calculation Procedures

## E. 1 Tier-1 Calculation For Retail Analogs

1. Calculate the overall test statistic for each ALEC; $z^{T}{ }_{\text {ALEC-1 }}$ (Per Statistical Methodology - by Dr. Mulrow)
2. Calculate the balancing critical value ( ${ }^{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{B}_{\text {ALEC-1 }}$ ) that is associated with the alternative hypothesis (for fixed parameters $\delta, \Psi$, or $\varepsilon$ )
3. If the overall test statistic is equal to or above the balancing critical value, stop here. That is, if ${ }^{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{B}_{\text {ALEC-1 }}<\mathrm{z}^{\mathrm{T}}{ }_{\text {ALEC-1 }}$, stop here. Otherwise, go to step 4.
4. Caleulate $\ddagger$ The Parity Gap by subtracting is the value of step 2 from that of step 1. ABS ( $\mathrm{z}_{\mathrm{ALEC}-1}{ }^{\left.-{ }^{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{B}_{\text {ALEC }-1} \text { ) }\right) ~}$
5. Calculate the Volume Proportion using a linear distribution with slope of $1 / 4$. This can be accomplished by taking the absolute value of the Parity Gap from step 4 divided by 4 ; $\mathrm{ABS}\left(\left(\mathrm{z}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{ALEC}-1{ }^{e} \mathrm{~B}_{\text {ALEC- }}\right) / 4\right)$. All parity gaps equal or greater to 4 will result in a volume proportion of $100 \%$.
6. Calculate the Affected Volume by multiplying the Volume Proportion from step 5 by the Total Impacted ALEC- -1 Volume ( $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ) in the negatively affected cell; where the cell value is negative.
7. Calculate the payment to ALEC-1 by multiplying the result of step 6 by the appropriate dollar amount from the fee schedule.
8. Then, ALEC-1 payment $=$ Affected Volume ALEC1 $^{*} \$ \$$ from Fee Schedule

## E.1.1 Example: ALEC-1 Missed Installation Appointments (MIA) for Resale POTS

Note: the statistical results are only illustrative. They are not a result of a statistical test of this data.

|  | $\mathrm{n}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{C}}$ | $I_{c}$ | MIA ${ }_{1}$ | $\mathrm{MIA}_{C}$ | $z^{\mathbf{T}}$ ALEC-1 | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{B}}$ | Parity Gap | Volume Proportion | Affected Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | 50000 | 600 | 96 | 9\% | 16\% | -1.92 | -0.21 | 4.741 .92 | $0.4275 \underline{0.48}$ |  |
| Cell |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{z}_{\text {ALEC-1 }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  | 150 | 17 | 0.091 | 0.113 | -1.994 |  |  |  | 89 |
| 2 |  | 75 | 8 | 0.176 | 0.107 | 0.734 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  | 10 | 4 | 0.128 | 0.400 | -2.619 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 4 |  | 50 | 17 | 0.158 | 0.340 | -2.878 |  |  |  | 89 |
| 5 |  | 15 | 2 | 0.245 | 0.133 | 1.345 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  | 200 | 26 | 0.156 | 0.130 | 0.021 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  | 30 | 7 | 0.166 | 0.233 | -0.600 |  |  |  | 34 |
| 8 |  | 20 | 3 | 0.106 | 0.150 | -0.065 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 9 |  | 40 | 9 | 0.193 | 0.225 | -0.918 |  |  |  | $4 \underline{5}$ |
| 10 |  | 10 | 3 | 0.160 | 0.300 | -0.660 |  |  |  | 2 |

where $n_{I}=$ ILEC observations and $n_{C}=$ ALEC- 1 observations
Payout for ALEC-1 is $(29 \underline{33}$ units $) *(\$ 100 \underline{85} /$ unit $)=\$ 2,900 \underline{2.805}$
E.1.2 Example: ALEC-1 Order Completion Interval (OCI) for Resale POTS

where $n_{I}=$ ILEC observations and $n_{C}=$ ALEC- 1 observations
Payout for ALEC-1 is ( $-133 \underline{151}$ units) $)(\$ 100 \underline{85} / \mathrm{unit})=\$ 13,300 \underline{12,835}$


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The attachment, which is provided for illustration only, is only for Tier 1 and only that portion of Tier 1 that relates to retail analog measurements. Tier 2 for retail analog measurements, which is not provided in the attachment, could be similarly modified.

