

Appendix G

Commercial Data Study

This page is intentionally left blank.

Commercial Data Review (Appendix G)

1.0 Description

The Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) requested that KPMG Consulting conduct a Commercial Data Review using the latest three months of commercial data. The objective of the review was to compare BellSouth collected commercial data with Florida Service Quality Measurement (SQM) standards. The commercial data review included January through March 2002 commercial results, as shown in the BellSouth published Monthly State Summary (MSS) reports.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Evaluation and Analysis Methods

KPMG Consulting calculated the ALEC aggregate weighted average for the months of January through March 2002 by SQM and level of disaggregation, and compared the weighted average to the benchmark or retail analog, as appropriate. The weighted average was derived from the values BellSouth reported for the ALEC aggregate in the MSS report for January through March 2002.

The FPSC also requested KPMG Consulting to identify any instances where the MSS report values and PMAP report values for the ALEC aggregate/BellSouth retail are different.

3.0 Results

KPMG Consulting compared the weighted average to the FPSC-mandated benchmark or retail analog, as appropriate. The classification by domain is as follows:

- ◆ Operations Support Systems – 96 total SQMs
 - ◆ 79 – Met Standard⁴²⁹
 - ◆ 8 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 1 – Cannot Determine⁴³⁰
 - ◆ 4 – Diagnostic
 - ◆ 4 – Not Applicable
- ◆ Ordering – 463 total SQMs
 - ◆ 202 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 77 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 105 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 79 – Diagnostic

⁴²⁹ In 28 cases, because volume data was not available, no weighted average could be calculated. However, because the standard was met or exceeded in all three months evaluated, the overall result is “Met Standard”. The specific OSS 2 & OSS 3 metrics that this applies to are identified on the Aggregate January through March 2002 spreadsheet by an “*”.

⁴³⁰ For benchmark comparisons, an item was labeled as “Cannot Determine” if the ALEC volume was zero. For parity with retail comparisons, an item was labeled as “Cannot Determine” if the BellSouth standard deviation was zero or if the ALEC volume was zero.

- ◆ Provisioning – 1,530 total SQMs
 - ◆ 261 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 67 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 367 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 835 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Maintenance & Repair – 192 total SQMs
 - ◆ 131 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 33 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 28 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Billing – 16 total SQMs
 - ◆ 11 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 4 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 1 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Operator Services and Directory Assistance – 4 total SQMs
 - ◆ 0 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 0 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 4 – Parity by Design – No Determination
 - ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Database Update Information – 7 total SQMs
 - ◆ 3 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 1 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 3 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ E911 – 3 total SQMs
 - ◆ 0 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 0 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 3 – Parity by Design – No Determination
 - ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Trunk Group Performance – 1 total SQM
 - ◆ 0 – Met Standard

- ◆ 0 – Failed Standard
- ◆ 1 – Cannot Determine
- ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Collocation – 14 total SQMs
 - ◆ 13 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 0 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 1 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Change Management – 5 total SQMs
 - ◆ 2 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 3 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 0 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Bona Fide/New Business Request Process – 4 total SQMs
 - ◆ 2 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 0 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 2 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 0 – Diagnostic
- ◆ Total – 2,335 total SQMs
 - ◆ 676 – Met Standard
 - ◆ 193 – Failed Standard
 - ◆ 537 – Cannot Determine
 - ◆ 918 – Diagnostic
 - ◆ 4 – Not Applicable
 - ◆ 7 - Parity by Design – No Determination

The MSS report values and PMAP report values for the ALEC aggregate/BellSouth retail are different. The classification by domain is as follows:

- ◆ Operations Support Systems – 6 total SQMs
 - ◆ 6 – No Differences
- ◆ Ordering – 17 total SQMs
 - ◆ 9 – No Differences

- ◆ 4 – Differences
- ◆ 3 – Not Applicable (LNP SQMs)
- ◆ 1 – Structure (see above)
- ◆ Provisioning – 21 total SQMs
 - ◆ 8 – No Differences
 - ◆ 8 – Differences
 - ◆ 2 – Not Applicable (LNP SQMs)
 - ◆ 3 – Structure (see above)
- ◆ Maintenance & Repair – 7 total SQMs
 - ◆ 2 – No Differences
 - ◆ 5 – Differences
- ◆ Billing – 8 total SQMs
 - ◆ 8 – No Differences
- ◆ Operator Services and Directory Assistance – 4 total SQMs
 - ◆ 4 – No Differences
- ◆ Database Update Information – 3 total SQMs
 - ◆ 1 – No Difference
 - ◆ 2 - Differences
- ◆ E911 – 3 total SQMs
 - ◆ 3 – No Differences
- ◆ Trunk Group Performance – 1 total SQM
 - ◆ 1 – No Difference
- ◆ Collocation – 3 total SQMs
 - ◆ 3 – No Differences
- ◆ Change Management – 5 total SQMs
 - ◆ 5 – No Differences
- ◆ Bona Fide/New Business Request Process – 2 total SQMs
 - ◆ 2 – No Differences

Specific data comparisons are included in the attached spreadsheet on the following pages. Individual discrepancies between the MSS reported value and the PMAP reported values are highlighted in the spreadsheet.

4.0 Final Summary

KPMG Consulting was directed by the FPSC to present the information and provide the analysis involved in the following tables. However, the results are based on data produced by BellSouth's metrics systems, the accuracy of which KPMG Consulting has not been able to validate, as indicated in Section VIII (Performance Metrics Domain Results and Analysis Section, Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review [PMR4]) of the final report. Furthermore, at the direction of the FPSC, KPMG Consulting used the same statistical analysis as used in the MSS report. This statistical analysis is based, in part, on methods that, particularly for sample sizes below 200, KPMG Consulting does not believe are appropriate. As described in the main body of this report and in Appendix A, Statistical Analysis, different techniques were used in the analysis of the data generated in the KPMG Consulting transaction tests. For benchmarks, KPMG Consulting believes statistical tests are appropriate, as described in Appendix A, Statistical Analysis. However, these tests were not performed in the MSS reports.

The Commercial Data Analysis detailed results are presented in the attached spreadsheets.

5.0 Summary of Findings

For the reasons stated above, KPMG Consulting cannot and does not verify the accuracy of the Aggregate ALEC results presented in these tables or the validity of the statistical tests comparing them to the Florida SQM standards.

The FPSC requested that KPMG Consulting conduct an analysis of commercial data. A summary of the weighted average of BellSouth's commercial results, organized by SQM category, for the months of January through March 2002 is provided in the table below:

Table ES-1 BellSouth Commercial Result Summary

	Parity by Design-No Determination	Not Applicable	Diagnostic	Cannot Determine	Failed Standard	Met Standard	Percentage Meeting Standard
OSS							
OSS1		4	4			24	100%
OSS2				1		18	100%
OSS3						10	100%
OSS4					8	25	76%
PO1						1	100%
PO2						1	100%
OSS Total		4	4	1	8	79	91%
Ordering							
O1						2	100%
O2						2	100%
O3			9		3	2	40%

	Parity by Design- No Determination	Not Applicable	Diagnostic	Cannot Determine	Failed Standard	Met Standard	Percentage Meeting Standard
O4							NA
O5							NA
O6							NA
O7			61				NA
O8				17	16	28	64%
O9				19	4	38	90%
O10						2	100%
O11				68	52	112	68%
O12				1			NA
O13			9				NA
O14					2	7	78%
O15						9	100%
Ordering Total			79	105	77	202	72%
Provisioning							
P1				134	1	16	94%
P2			75	27	10	40	80%
P3				50	11	32	74%
P4				48	15	44	75%
P5			104	54	6	45	88%
P6			52				NA
P7						2	100%
P7A						12	100%
P7B			2				NA
P7C						4	100%
P8				1		1	100%
P9				46	14	45	76%
P10			530				NA
P11				2	7	15	68%
P12				5	2	5	71%
P13					1		0%

	Parity by Design- No Determination	Not Applicable	Diagnostic	Cannot Determine	Failed Standard	Met Standard	Percentage Meeting Standard
P14			72				NA
Prov Total			835	367	67	261	80%
M&R							
M&R1				6	8	24	75%
M&R2				5	13	20	61%
M&R3				4	4	30	88%
M&R4				5	3	30	91%
M&R5				6	5	27	84%
M&R6				1			NA
M&R7				1			NA
M&R Total				28	33	131	80%
Billing							
B1						3	100%
B2					1	2	67%
B3					1		0%
B4						1	100%
B5					1		0%
B6				1			NA
B7						3	100%
B8					1	2	67%
Billing Total				1	4	11	73%
OSDA							
OS1	1						NA
OS2	1						NA
DA1	1						NA
DA2	1						NA
OSDA Total	4						NA
Database Update information							

	Parity by Design- No Determination	Not Applicable	Diagnostic	Cannot Determine	Failed Standard	Met Standard	Percentage Meeting Standard
D1				3			NA
D2						3	100%
D3					1		0%
DUI Total				3	1	3	75%
E911							
E1	1						NA
E2	1						NA
E3	1						NA
E911 Total	3						NA
Trunk group Performance							
TGP1				1			NA
TGP Total				1			NA
Collocation							
C1						3	100%
C2				1		8	100%
C3						2	100%
Collo Total				1		13	100%
Change Management							
CM1					1		0%
CM2						1	100%
CM3					1		0%
CM4					1		0%
CM5						1	100%
CM Total					3	2	40%
Bona Fide/New Business Request Process							
BFR1						1	100%
BFR2A						1	100%
BFR2B				1			NA

	Parity by Design- No Determination	Not Applicable	Diagnostic	Cannot Determine	Failed Standard	Met Standard	Percentage Meeting Standard
BFR2C				1			NA
BFR Total				2		2	100%
Overall Total	7	4	918	509	193	704	78%

This page is intentionally left blank.