

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
Section III - Prospective Changes						
1	5	Certain data from one of the Company's source systems (EXACT) was improperly overlaying certain FOC data within a PM reporting system resulting in some orders being reported with longer FOC durations than actually occurred. This error impacted the trunk FOC only and was corrected in April 2002. Additionally, certain ULT orders contained inaccurate start and/or stop times, which have not been corrected as of the date of this report.	Trunk Issue: Initially implemented program code overlaid the original FOC date/time with a later FOC date/time in certain situations. Impact on results reported was calculation of a longer FOC interval than actually occurred, resulting in an understatement of actual performance level provided to CLECs. ULT Issue: Caused by a manual input error by a service representative.	Trunk Issue: Program code was updated to prevent the situation from recurring. ULT Issue: Training reinforced, and additional system edit checks are being investigated.	Trunk Issue: Addressed with April results reported in May ULT Issue: To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Additional coaching of service reps completed. E&Y to conduct additional transaction testing.</i>	Trunk Issue: None ULT Issue: Expected to be no material impact to reported performance <i>11-20-02 Update: Analysis of issue confirmed that June – August results were not impacted.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
2	5.2	Certain transactions were improperly excluded from reported results during the Evaluation Period. These transactions related to new products and an LSOG 5 jeopardy code that functioned like an unsolicited firm order confirmation. The transactions related to new products were included in the PM effective with August 2002 results. The other issue has not been corrected as of the date of this report.	LSOG5 Jeopardy Code Issue: Provider-Initiated Actions ("PIA"s) are the counterpart of unsolicited FOC in LSOG5. There is one PIA that is tracked and falls into Service Order Due Date Change. New Products Issue: Code was not updated in conjunction with new products being introduced.	LSOG 5 Jeopardy Code Issue: Add logic to measurement system to include PIAs in the PM. New Products Issue: Updated code to include unsolicited FOCs for new products.	LSOG 5 Jeopardy Code Issue: Enhancement scheduled for October reporting of September results. <i>Need for restatement TBD.</i> <i>11-20-02 Update: Enhancement implemented with September results; Code changes have been validated by E&Y.</i> New Products Issue: Updated code implemented with August results reported in September. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i>	LSOG 5 Jeopardy Issue: To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Analysis of detail data determined that missing unsolicited FOC records was not material; no restatement to be done.</i> New Products Issue: No material change in volume or performance results <i>11-20-02 Update; No restatement to be done.</i>
3	7 and 8	Certain orders contained an incorrect matching logic and therefore were improperly excluded from the results during the Evaluation Period or contained the wrong start time (i.e. if multiple service orders existed on a single LSR, the Company was utilizing the time the first order completed instead of the time the last order completed to determine the start time for the calculation). This error was corrected in May 2002.	Measurement program code initially implemented did not address situation where an alpha suffix could prevent a match.	Update to measurement program code implemented to address matching of orders with alpha suffix.	Updated code implemented with May results reported in June.	None

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
4	10	LSOG 5 auto/manual rejects were not reported during April and May 2002 due to the implementation of new systems and processes. Effective with August 2002 results, these rejects were included.	With implementation of LSOG5, measurement system code updates to process auto/manual rejects for LSRs submitted through the LSOG5 interface were not properly included in implementation of PM10.	Measurement system code was updated to properly include auto/manual rejects.	Implemented with August results reported in September. Restatement pending for June and July results <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes have been validated by E&Y. Analysis of data determined no material impact; no restatement planned for June and July.</i>	As this impacts only certain rejects for LSRs issued via the LSOG5 interface, impact on results is expected to be small. <i>11-20-02 Update: Analysis of data determined no material impact; no restatement planned.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
5	10.4 and MI 2	<p>During the Evaluation Period, the Company incorrectly reported certain UNE loop orders as UNE loops with LNP when they were not LNP orders. This issue was corrected prospectively effective with August 2002 results. Additionally, the Company did not properly report the percentage of orders given jeopardies when there were multiple due date changes by the CLEC. The correction of these issues has not been verified by E&Y as of the date of this report.</p>	<p>UNE Loop Issue: Inadequate identification of the related order relationship in a measurement reporting system resulted in bucketing of orders and jeopardy notices into the wrong disaggregation within the UNE Loop category.</p> <p>Multiple Due Date Change Issue: Reporting system does not capture the "interim" due dates if there were due date changes.</p>	<p>UNE Loop Issue: Affects only two of nine submeasures each for PMs MI-2 and 10.4. Measurement system code updated to properly identify and "bucket" these orders for reporting.</p> <p>Multiple Due Date Change Issue: Measurement system code to be updated to include jeopardies against "interim" due dates.</p>	<p>UNE Loop Issue: Code updates implemented for August results reported in September.</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes have been validated by E&Y.</i></p> <p>Multiple Due Date Change Issue: Code updated with August results reported in September</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes have been validated by E&Y.</i></p>	<p>UNE Loop Issue: No material change. August results show increased volume in UNE Loop without LNP, and performance that is not inconsistent with similar volume months.</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement targeted 1/6/03 to address June and July results.</i></p> <p>Multiple Due Date Change Issue: Increase in jeopardy counts expected</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement targeted 1/6/03 to address June and July results.</i></p>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
6	13 and 13.1	Certain line sharing orders were improperly excluded from reported results. A separate line sharing submeasure was added with June 2002 reporting.	Reporting of Lineshare LSR order flow-through began May 2002. Line Share LSR Supplements for Due Date and Cancellations became flow through eligible with the April 2002 OSS release – first full month of activity was May 2002. These are only designed to flow through when the LSR before the Supplemental LSR flowed through. <i>11-20-02 Update: This issue description was incorrect. The issue dealt specifically with addition of the Lineshare disaggregation which did not appear before May results reported in June.</i>	Updated measurement program code to include Lineshare supplements.	September and October results will be provided with November reporting. <i>11/20/02 Update: May 2002 results going forward for DSL line sharing were posted to the web. Initial notification that September and October would be provided in November was incorrect. Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i>	Volume not expected to be material – need for restatement to be determined. <i>11/20/02 Update: Restatement not needed – results were properly posted to the web.</i>
7	15	The Company did not have a process in place to accurately capture and report when a totaling, formatting, content, or syntax error was detected during the resale bill audit process. This process was revised for June 2002 reporting.	Log used in the audit process did not have the ability to document an error condition. RBS developers confirmed that 100% formatting accuracy is possible, due to the stability of the format of the bill itself.	A new column was added to the log to document if a bill contains a formatting error.	Update to log was implemented June results reported in July.	None
8	27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 55.1, 56.1, 58	New missed appointment and missed due date codes were implemented in January 2002. Effective with August 2002 results, the Company began properly reflecting these new codes in the numerator of the PMs. E&Y did not verify that this change was implemented.	New missed appointment and missed due date codes reflecting end-customer caused misses separately from CLEC-caused misses introduced into Network OSSs in January 2002 were not implemented in the measurement systems in a timely fashion	Update measurement system code to process these new codes.	Implemented with August results reported in September. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes have been provided to E&Y for validation.</i>	Performance for June and July are understated, as not all CLEC or end-customer caused missed appointments or due dates were excluded from the PMs. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement not planned, as results will only improve.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
9	43 and 73	<p>March and April 2002 results did not properly capture all projects in this PM. Beginning with May 2002 results for PM 73 and June 2002 for PM 43, the Company enhanced its method of capturing transactions related to projects which resulted in the proper inclusion of most projects in the PM. Additionally, the Company has identified additional project identifiers for PM 73 that will be tracked and reported but have not yet been implemented.</p>	<p>Complete Capture of Projects Issue: Operational analysis identified additional logic to more accurately report projects Additional Project Identifier Issue: New M&P adopted in May 2002. PM enhancement was made and in place to accompany new M&P. Additional project codes implemented as notified by Network.</p>	<p>Complete Capture of Projects Issue: Program code updates required to reflect new project M&P effective May 2002. Additional Project Identifier Issue: Enhancement for additional Project Ids made effective August 2002</p>	<p>Complete Capture of Projects Issue: Updated code implemented with May results reported in June. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i> Enhancement to report new project identifiers implemented with August results reported in September. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes have been validated by E&Y.</i></p>	<p>Complete Capture of Projects Issue: None. Additional Project Identifier Issue: None</p>
10	91	<p>CLEC-initiated revisions and orders involving projects were improperly excluded from results. Effective with August 2002 results: CLEC-initiated revisions and projects were included in results. March through May 2002 results contained a coding error that excluded orders where the completion date was before the due date.</p>	<p>CLEC-Initiated Revisions and Projects Issue: Initial implementation of the measure incorrectly excluded projects and CLEC-initiated revisions Coding Error Issue: Initial implementation results in selection criteria that included only orders completed on or after the due date.</p>	<p>CLEC-Initiated Revisions and Projects Issue: Measurement code updated to properly include CLEC initiated revisions and projects. Coding Error Issue: Measurement code updated to properly include CLEC initiated revisions and projects.</p>	<p>CLEC-Initiated Revisions and Projects Issue: Updated code implemented with August results reported in September. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i> Coding Error Issue: Updated code implemented with August results reported in September. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes have been provided to E&Y for validation</i></p>	<p>Both Issues: August results reported with updated code and do not show inconsistent results. Need for restatement to be determined. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement targeted 1/6/03 to address June and July results.</i></p>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
11	93	Data related to the LASR system was not included in results for April and May 2002. June through August 2002 results were restated in October 2002. April and May 2002 restatements are pending.	Measurement system code was not updated to process LASR data until September results.	Measurement system code was updated to include LASR data	Updated code implemented with September results reported in October. June, July and August results restated October 7 th . <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i>	None
12	MI 9	Projects were incorrectly excluded from the calculation of this measurement during the Evaluation Period, and the PM contained a coding error that counted rejects in the result. Effective with August 2002 results, these errors were corrected by the Company. E&Y has not tested the correction of the coding error that counted rejects in the result.	Initial measurement system coding excluded projects and in some situations measured a reject notice as a missing FOC.	Measurement system coding has been updated to include projects and properly address reject notices.	Updated measurement code implemented with August results reported September. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code has been validated by E&Y.</i>	None – performance improved in August with updated code.
13	114 and 115	The Company did not have a process in place to capture actual start times of coordinated cutovers during the Evaluation Period for the frame due time ("FDT") level of disaggregation. Instead, the process utilized by the Company identified the start time as the scheduled due time which did not allow for premature disconnects or delayed coordinated cutovers to be properly identified and reported. The Company corrected this issue effective with July 2002 reporting, however, the process implemented has not been tested by E&Y as of the date of this report.	No operational process was in place to capture the start time of the FDT to report with.	Change to the PM implementation derives start time from the finish time less work duration time. Operational M&P changes made to have duration time recorded reflect start time to finish time.	PM implementation updated with July results reported in August. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i> M&P change implemented effective September 2002. <i>11-20-02 Update: Process change has been validated by E&Y.</i> Results restated with September reporting.	None – results corrected with restatement.

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
14	114, 115 and 115.2	Prior to May 2002, the Company incorrectly aggregated multiple orders that occurred on the same date with the same CLEC in the denominator. Beginning with May 2002 results, these orders were no longer aggregated.	Initial measurement implementation calculated results prior to May 2002 as follows: if multiple CHC orders or multiple FDT orders occurred on the same date to the same end user from the same CO from the same CLEC, the number of lines on those orders was summed and the orders were counted as one.	Measurement implementation updated to report/count the number of lines on the individual orders.	Updated implementation with May results reported in June	None.
15	MI 13	Line loss notifications are not being reported when the winning CLEC originates the order through one ordering system and the Company sends the loss notification to the losing CLEC through a different ordering system. This has been corrected on a prospective basis with August data. Additionally, the Company was not using the correct end date/time in one ordering system and was inaccurately capturing start times in another system. This issue has not be corrected by the Company as of the date of this report.	Winning and Losing CLEC Issue: Line Loss notice was not properly matched to the order originating the line loss when the winning CLEC used a different ordering system version than the losing CLEC, End/Start Date/Time Issue: Matching logic between SOCs and LLNs was not always matching the correct SOC and LLN	Winning and Losing CLEC Issue: Measurement system coding updated to match line loss notice to service order completion notice when CLECs use different version. End/Start Date/Time Issue: Update measurement system coding to more accurately match the LLN to the SOC to determine if the benchmark was met.	Winning and Losing CLEC Issue: Measurement process updated with September results reported in October. June, July and August results restated on October 7 th . <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i> End Date/Time Issue: Measurement process updated with September results reported in October. Restatement need to be determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Code has been validated by E&Y.</i>	Winning and Losing CLEC Issue: None End Date/Time Issue: Impact to be assessed. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement targeted 1/6/03 to address June, July and Aug results.</i>
16	MI 14	Trouble tickets related to customer premises equipment, interexchange carrier and information were excluded from results in error during the Evaluation Period. The Company restated June through August 2002 results in October 2002 but did not restate results for the Evaluation Period. E&Y has not tested this correction as of the date of this report.	Initial code implementation was based on maintenance reporting logic, where troubles traced to non-Ameritech reasons are excluded from the results.	As this is a notification measure, completion notices to CLECs for trouble reports traced to non-Ameritech reasons need to be included in the measure.	Measurement system code updated with September results reported in October. June through August results restated October 7 th . <i>11-20-02 Update: Code has been validated by E&Y.</i>	None

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
17	WI 1 and WI 2	March and April 2002 results were not reported by geographic metro areas as required by the Business Rules. This change was implemented with May 2002 data.	Initial implementation of the PMs failed to disaggregate by geography.	Implementation updated to disaggregate results by geography.	Change implemented with May 2002 results reported in June. <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i>	None
18	CWI 1	During the Evaluation Period, the average delay time was incorrectly calculated due to utilizing the wrong start time (i.e., the original FOC due date) on certain orders that were modified and by utilizing the expected due date from the FMOD form instead of the actual completion date of the order.	Wrong Start Time Issue: Initial implementation chose the earliest Form B to calculate the start date for the average delay in FOC due dates for the FMOD process. Also used the expected due date on the FMOD form instead of the completion date.	Measurement system code updated to use correct dates.	Updated code implemented with July results reported in August <i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i>	July and August reported properly. Changes increased volume and improved reported performance. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement targeted 12/5/02 to address June results.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
Section IV - Other Identified Issues						
1	1.2	<p>The denominator for this PM is not calculated in accordance with the Business Rules. The Business Rules state that the denominator should include the total actual loop make-up information responses. The actual denominator includes all DSL orders regardless of whether loop make-up information was obtained.</p> <p>Additionally for the numerator, the method of data collection for this PM does not guarantee that the order was identical to engineering work confirmations as required by the Business Rules. The numerator is calculated by subtracting the number of DSL orders with trouble reported within 10 days of DSL installation from total DSL orders.</p>	<p>This PM has been implemented since July 2001 in accordance with the original SWBT implementation where the PM originated. Implementation of this PM is currently under review in a DSL Loop Qual collaborative. SBC Ameritech acknowledges that the PM implementation is not in compliance with the defined business rules.</p>	<p>PM implementation and business rules will be updated, as appropriate, based on the result of the collaborative.</p>	<p>To Be Determined</p>	<p>To Be Determined.</p>
2	5 and 6	<p>April and May 2002 results misclassified certain loop orders processed through the LASR system as auto/auto instead of auto/manual.</p>	<p>Measurement system code has not been identifying "drop to manual" condition for certain loop LSRs submitted through ARIS. LSRs are received electronically and, because they "drop to manual" processed manually. Appropriate FOC standard is 5 hours. These LSRs are assessed against a 2 hour standard because they are classified as auto/auto.</p>	<p>Problem was corrected to properly identify LSRs that "drop to manual".</p>	<p>Implemented with September results reported in October. <i>11-20-02 Update: Implementation was not possible with September results. Targeted for Jan 03 data.</i></p>	<p>Performance results understate the actual level of service provided <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement of June02-Aug 02 results is under evaluation.</i></p>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
3	5, 5.2, 6, 7, 7.1, 8, 9, 10, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 13 and 13.1	Certain valid LASR transactions were incorrectly excluded from PM results due to invalid ACNA/Company code values.	Problem with matching of unique CLEC identifiers (AECN and ACNA) to a reference table for LASR transactions only.	New reference table for identifying wholesale transactions to each specific CLEC will be implemented. Measurement system code will be updated to use new reference table.	Planned for November results reported in December <i>11-20-02 Update: Code to correct issue targeted for implementation with Dec 02 data, reported 1-20-03.</i>	Analysis has identified minimal impact (less than 1% of transactions incorrectly excluded) <i>11-20-02 Update: No restatement planned, deemed to be immaterial.</i>
4	5, 7, 93, 10.4, 91 and MI 2	Some xDSL loops with LNP were not captured in the reported results.	The measurement system process that checks for LNP with Related Loop does not check for the "PreMerger DSL Loop" (order class 97). Issue limited to LSOG4 interface.	Measurement system code will be updated to include the PreMerger DSL Loop product	Implementation targeted for update with October results reported in November <i>11-20-02 Update: Code to correct issue implemented for Oct 02 data. Code has been validated by E&Y for PMs 7, 10.4 and MI2. Code for PMs 5, 91 and 93 targeted for implementation with Nov 02 data, reported 12-20-02.</i>	LNP with Loop orders are understated in the affected measures. Understatement expected to be small. Need for restatement to be determined. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement of June 02-Oct 02 tentatively targeted for 1-6-03.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
5	7 and 8	Certain orders that did not contain service order completion dates or contained start dates with a null value were reported as meeting the one-hour completion timeline when no data was available to make that determination. Additionally, the Company excluded the LNP portion of certain service order transactions from the results in error.	No Service Order Completion Date Issue: The situation identified occurs infrequently due to mismatched order number in a measurement system resulting from manually initiated completion notices. LNP Order Portion Exclusion Issue: Incomplete initial implementation logic used for matching to order completion date.	No Service Order Completion Date Issue: Measurement system code will be updated to use the forced completion date of the order in these situations. LNP Order Portion Exclusion Issue: Updated logic required to match to correct completion date so that LNP order portions are included	Updated measurement system implementations planned for October results reported in November <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement system process implemented for Oct 02 data to be reported 11-20-02. Process change to be reviewed by E&Y.</i>	The situation identified occurs infrequently, so impact is not expected to be material. Need for restatement to be determined. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement of June 02-Sept 02 tentatively targeted for 1-6-03.</i>
6	7.1 and 91	Results for the Evaluation Period did not exclude CLEC-caused misses from the calculation as required by the Business Rules.	Implementation of a change agreed to in the 2001 six-month review has not yet been completed. Implementation will improve results – current level of service is understated.	Update measurement system code to apply the exclusion	Implemented with September results reported in October. <i>11-20-02 Update: Implementation of updated measurement system code to apply exclusion was not possible for September results, schedule for implementation is under development.</i>	Current results are understated <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatements of June 02-Aug 02 results under evaluation.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
7	10.4 and MI 2	The Company did not apply an exclusion for CLEC-initiated end user codes as stated in the Business Rules and the Company excluded certain wholesale jeopardy transactions processed through LASR from results due to an error in extracting detailed information from a source system. Additionally, for MI 2, the Company excluded wholesale LASR transactions in which the scheduled date was erroneously stated as null, FMOD orders were not excluded from results and the calculation was performed utilizing days instead of minutes resulting in anything less than 48 hours being considered as a pass. Also, the start and stop times were not correct due to not considering the Value Added Network (VAN) time.	<p>A. Initial implementation of the measure did not care for the CLEC/end-user initiated jeopardy codes.</p> <p>B. Implementation of updates to measurement system code did not properly address the sourcing of data from LASR with POR release in April 2002.</p> <p>C. For MI 2 implementation of the measure did not include LASR transactions in which the scheduled date was erroneously stated as null.</p> <p>D. Implementation of the measure did not care for the exclusion of FMOD orders.</p> <p>E. Implementation of the measure utilized days instead of hours.</p> <p>F. Only sent times for jeopardy notices are required from a point closer to the VAN. Start times are internal to the Ameritech OSS environment.</p>	Multiple changes to the implementation of PMs 10.4 and MI 2 are currently underway, addressing each of these issues.	<p>Several changes have been implemented prospectively effective with August results reported in September.</p> <p>Other changes are pending for October results reported in November.</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Schedule for implementation of updated measurement system code to apply the exclusion is under development.</i></p> <p>B. <i>Implementation of updated measurement system code to include certain LASR jeopardy conditions is targeted for Nov 02 data, reported 12-20-02.</i></p> <p>C. <i>Implementation of updated measurement system code to include certain LASR jeopardy conditions is targeted for Nov 02 data, reported 12-20-02</i></p> <p>D. <i>Schedule for Implementation of updated measurement system code to exclude FMOD orders is under development.</i></p> <p>E. <i>Implementation of updated measurement system code to calculate based on days time is targeted for Nov 02 data, reported Dec 20, 2002</i></p> <p>F. <i>Implementation of updated measurement system code to include VAN time is targeted for Nov 02 data, reported Dec 20, 2002</i></p>	<p>To Be Determined.</p> <p>Issues are most focused on LASR implementation, which affects notices sent via LSOG5 only</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Restatements of June 02-Aug 02 results under evaluation.</i></p>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
8	13 and 13.1	Certain supplemental and cancelled orders related to UNE loops with LNP have had the ability to flow through the Company's systems; however, the Company did not have the capability to identify and report this data.	There are three different Supplemental LSRs: Due Date Change, Cancellations and Change in Request. Due Date Changes and Cancellations are the only two Supp types designed to flow through and only when the previous version of the LSR flowed through. Loop with LNP Due Date and Cancellations Supps became flow through eligible with the August 2002 OSS Release. The current issue applies only to LSOG4 LSRs.	Update of the measurement system code for LSOG4 orders to include Loop with LNP supplemental orders needed	Updated measurement system implementation to be made with October results reported in November. September results will be restated. <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement system code implemented for Oct 02 data. Code has been validated by E&Y.</i>	Issue impacts only Loop with LNP Supps for August <i>11-20-02 Update: Only Sept 02 data was impacted, not Aug 02. No impact to June – August 2002 Results.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
9	14	<p>The process by which the Company performed bill audits to verify wholesale universal service ordering code ("USOC") rates did not ensure all items in the audit sample were tested and did not obtain all the relevant information in all cases to accurately determine if the USOC rate was accurate. Additionally, for the retail comparison for both resale submeasures, the Company did not have a process in place to accurately capture and report when invalid USOC rates were identified in the bill audit process. Also, for the Resale Monthly Recurring/Non Recurring wholesale submeasure, the Company's process does not compare the USOC rates per the rate tables to the actual bill sent. Utilizing the Company's current process, a difference would not be identified.</p>	<p>Manual bill audit processes were not as robust and wide in scope as needed during the timeframe audited. Retail issue results in determination that retail bills are 100% accurate. That perfect result is used for the parity comparison.</p>	<p>Specific deficiencies in the audit and validation M&P are being investigated and will be corrected.</p>	<p>Initial enhancements to the process were implemented with August results reported in September. Additional enhancements implemented for September results <i>11-20-02 Update: E&Y has validated that effective in August 2002, USOC Reports began to be retained for 90 days instead of 20 days. This allows the bill validators to review more than one generation of the USOC report in order to locate all USOC rates needed for the validation. Also, the Methods and Procedures ("M&P") documents were updated to add additional steps to the bill validation process to ensure the information for USOC rate comparisons is utilized. The process to create the statistical sample of bills selected for validation was also mechanized to be initiated after the 20th process group each month. This will ensure that only USOCs from the previous month will be sampled for bill validation. A process is in place to compare line items from the Resale Billing System line items from the Resale Billing System ("RBS") bill to the USOC rate tables.</i></p>	<p>Potential for performance reported for wholesale to decline slightly. UNE error rate increased from average between .1% and .2% to 1.44%. <i>11-20-02 Update: Aug 02 results reported correctly. Impact on June 02-July 02 results immaterial.</i></p>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
10	25	Due to a manual calculation error, April 2002 retail data was improperly reported.	Data for a previous month was used when generating the results for April. Issue limited to one month and Retail only.	Additional controls have been implemented to ensure that the proper data elements are used to generate the results.	Process implemented with July Retail results	None – Wholesale performance significantly exceeds retail.
11	28	The Company did not properly identify customer-requested due dates during the Evaluation Period. Instead of capturing the actual customer-requested due date, the Company-offered due date was utilized in the calculation only when the requested due date was greater than or equal to the standard offered interval.	Implementation resulting from changes approved in the 2001 six-month review resulted in only those orders with due dates greater than the standard interval (5 days) being included in the measure. Should include all orders unless a customer requested a due date less than offered due date.	Update measurement system code to utilize Customer Requested Due Date and to include orders where due date is less than standard interval when customer requested due date is greater than or equal to the offered due date.	To be implemented with October results reported in November. Restatement will be made. <i>11-20-02 Update:</i> <i>Implementation of updated measurement system code to utilize the Customer Requested Due Date is targeted for Dec 02 data, reported 1-20-03.</i> <i>Implementation of updated measurement system code to include all orders unless a customer requested a due date less than the offered interval is targeted Dec 02, reported 1-20-03.</i>	Increased volume is expected in Field Work disaggregations, similar to PM 27 and PM 29 volume <i>11-20-02 Update:</i> <i>Restatements of June 02-Nov 02 targeted for 1-6-03.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
12	28 thru 33	The Company incorrectly reported certain internal orders impacting the CLEC portion of a partially "won back" account as wholesale orders during the Evaluation Period.	Orders to restructure CLEC accounts when Ameritech "wins back" a partial account are reported as wholesale orders due to incomplete order identification logic.	Update measurement system code to exclude orders to restructure CLEC accounts as a result of a "winback" from wholesale results..	Implementation planned for December results reported in January 2003 <i>11-20-02 Update: Code to correct issue targeted for implementation with Feb 03 data, reported 3-20-03</i>	Small decrease in volumes. Number of orders impacted is low as situation only occurs when an account that is won back has to be restructured. <i>11-20-02 Update: No restatements planned, deemed to be immaterial.</i>
13	39, 52 and 67	The Company excludes trouble tickets in excess of 720 hours from results although this exclusion is not allowed by the Business Rules.	Initial implementation relied on a pre-existing indicator which resulted in exclusion of the extra-long duration trouble tickets.	Assess issue and determine if these trouble tickets should be processed differently	To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement code to include tickets in excess of 720 hours implemented for Oct 02 data. Code validated by E&Y.</i>	Volume is extremely small (less than 1% of total trouble tickets), so impact is not expected to be material. <i>11-20-02 Update: Impact to reported results confirmed to be immaterial.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
14	43, 44, 55, 55.2, 55.3, 56 and 56.1	During May 2002, the Company experienced a problem with a source system utilized to identify LNP with loop orders and a source system application date was not populated which caused some CHC and FDT MI data to not be reported. Additionally, the Company utilized the wrong field to determine the exclusion for customer-requested due dates in excess of the stated time period in the Business Rules. For PMs 55,1, 55.2, 56, and 56.1, this issue affected only the DSL line sharing submeasure.	A data feed from a source OSS did not have data required for performance measurements on certain records. The issue affected May results during the audit time frame, and also affected June results.	Extract complete data records from source system and recalculate and repost results.	Restatement of May and June results targeted for November 5 th restatement <i>11-20-02 Update:</i> <i>May 02 results restated to include corrected source system data. Restatement completed on 11-5-02. Code validated by E&Y.</i> <i>Implementation of updated measurement system code to utilize the Customer Requested Due Date is targeted for Dec 02 data reported Jan 20, 2003.</i>	To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update:</i> <i>Source System Issue:</i> <i>Restatement of June 02 targeted for 1-6-03. No impact on July and Aug 02 results.</i> <i>Customer Requested Due Date Issue:</i> <i>Restatement of Jun 02-Nov 02 data targeted for 1-6-03.</i>
15	55.1 thru 63 and 65	DSL transactions were not identified by geographic region as required by the Business Rules and, therefore, are not reported in the correct geographic region.	Inconsistent reference table values resulted in a significant number of DSL-Line Share orders and troubles not being reported in a geographic disaggregation.	Updated measurement system logic required to accurately map the orders/trouble to the geographic disaggregation.	Implementation scheduled for October results reported in November. Notified E&Y that PM55 is not impacted since it does not measure DSL. <i>11-20-02 Update:</i> <i>Implementation of updated measurement system code to accurately map the orders/troubles to the geographic disaggregation is targeted for Jan 03 data reported Feb 20, 2003.</i>	No impact to state aggregate reporting.

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
16	55.1, 56 and 58	During the Evaluation Period, certain orders involving the FMOD database were not properly identified as loops involving conditioning or were incorrectly identified as FMOD orders. Additionally, the Company did not count the start time correctly during the Evaluation Period resulting in inaccurate PMs.	Conditioned/Non-Conditioned Issue: Inadequate logic had been defined to properly identify DSL Lineshare orders that entered the FMOD process as conditioned or non-conditioned. Start Time Issue: To Be Determined	Conditioned/Non-Conditioned Issue: Update measurement system logic to properly identify conditioning/non-conditioning. Start Time Issue: To be Determined	Conditioned/Non-Conditioned Issue: Implementation planned for October results reported in November Start Time Issue: To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement system logic to properly identify conditioning/non-conditioning implemented for Sept. 02 and Oct 02 data. Code validated by E&Y.</i>	Conditioned/Non-Conditioned Issue: Impact limited to shift of volume from "without conditioning" to "with conditioning" Start Time Issue: To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement of Aug 02 scheduled for 12-5-02. Restatement for June-July 02 scheduled for 1-6-03.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
17	65, 65.1, 66, 67, 68 and 69	The Company improperly calculated the wholesale numerator during the Evaluation Period for the line share submeasure. The Company only included trouble reports for the voice portion of the line and improperly excluded trouble reports related to the data portion of the line. Additionally, certain DSL trouble reports on circuits that the CLECs took "as is" were counted as Company troubles when they were not.	Voice vs. Data Trouble Report Issue: Current implementation uses an indicator set based only on the voice portion of the line. A "data only" trouble was not identified. Assume "As-Is" Troubles Issue: Trouble reports on DSL circuits that were assumed "as-is" by the CLEC should be excluded from the trouble report measures	Voice vs. Data Trouble Report Issue: Measurement implementation needs to be enhanced to include data troubles recorded in WFA. Assume "As-Is" Troubles Issue: Measurement implementation needs to be enhanced to correctly identify "assume as-is" troubles. <i>11-20-02 Update: PM 68 is not impacted as the issues deal with DSL and line share circuits. PM 68 is limited to 2-wire analog 8-dB loops.</i>	Voice vs. Data Trouble Report Issue: To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Measurement implementation to include data troubles recorded in WFA is under development.</i> Assume "As-Is" Troubles Issue: To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement system logic to correctly identify "assume as is" troubles for Oct 02 data. Code validated by E&Y.</i>	An increase in line share trouble volume is expected. Initial analysis indicates that performance against parity comparisons will not be materially affected. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement date to be determined.</i> Assume "As-Is" Troubles Issue: Trouble report volume will decrease as these excludable troubles are excluded. <i>11-20-02 Update: No restatements planned, deemed to be immaterial.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
18	74, 75 and 78	During March and April 2002, the Company excluded certain transactions with a missed appointment code associated with a project from reported results. In May 2002, the Company excluded all projects from the reported results. The Business Rules do not allow for projects to be excluded from results.	Certain projects were excluded that should have been included. Change made to include those projects incorrectly resulted in the exclusion of projects.	Update the measurement system code to include projects in the PMs	Updated effective with September results reported in October. Restatement of January through August 2002 results scheduled for November 5 th . <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement system code to include projects in the PMs for Oct 02 data. Code validated by E&Y.</i>	Volumes reported for Interconnection Trunks will increase. Reported results may degrade slightly due to CLEC-revised due date not being captured in some instances. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatements of June 02-Sept 02 targeted for 12-5-02-</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
19	91	<p>The following errors occurred during the Evaluation Period:</p> <p>(a) Data related to the LASR system was not included in these PMs for April and May 2002.</p> <p>(b) The Company improperly included LNP transactions that were not scheduled within industry guidelines in results.</p> <p>(c) The Company did not capture information by telephone number but instead captured the information by order number.</p>	<p>Issue (a): Addition of orders processed through LASR to the pre-existing implementation after POR was delayed.</p> <p>Issue (b): Initial logic implemented did not properly handle the industry guideline intervals.</p> <p>Issue (c): Initial implementation reported by orders, not TNs</p>	<p>Issue (a): Update measurement system processing to include LASR data</p> <p>Issue (b): Update measurement system code to exclude orders appropriately.</p> <p>Issue (c): Update measurement system code to report by TNs instead of orders</p>	<p>All Issues: Implemented with September results reported in October. June through August results restated October 7th.</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Implementation and restatement was not possible with September results .</i></p> <p><i>Issue (a): Schedule to update measurement system processing to include LASR data is under development.</i></p> <p><i>Issue (b): Schedule to update measurement system code to exclude orders appropriately is under development.</i></p> <p><i>Issue (c): Schedule to update measurement system code to report by TNs instead of orders is under development.</i></p>	<p>Issue (a): None</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Issues (a), (b) and (c): Need for restatement of June02-Aug 02 data under evaluation.</i></p>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
20	5, 6, 7, 7.1, 8, 9, 10, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, 13, 13.1, 91, 92, 93, 95, 99, MI 2 and MI 9	The Company excluded LNP with loop orders in which the loop portion of the order was rejected and then later corrected.	Initial coding of the measurement system does not correctly handle this specific infrequent situation.	Update measurement system code to properly report Loop with LNP orders	To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Update measurement system code to properly report Loop with LNP orders targeted for Nov 02 data for PMs 5, 6, 7, 7.1, 8, 9, 10, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, 13, 13.1, 91, 92, 93, MI 2 and MI 9. For PMs 99 there is no impact. For PM95 the schedule for the measurement code update is under development .</i>	Very small subset of orders affected (only those rejected and corrected, and only for this product). No material impact on results expected. <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement of PMs 7, 8, 91, and 93 targeted for 1-6-03. For PMs MI9, 92 and 99 the restatements are under evaluation. For other PMs the impact is immaterial so no restatement is planned.</i>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
21	95, 99, MI 9 and MI 13	During the Evaluation Period, the Company excluded projects from these PMs although there is no exclusion allowed in the Business Rules.	Initial implementation incorrectly excluded projects from the results.	Updated PM implementations to include projects.	<p>PM99: Update implemented with June results reported in July.</p> <p>PM 95: To Be Determined</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Schedule to update measurement system code to include projects is under development.</i></p> <p>PM MI-9: Update implemented with August results reported in September</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Code changes validated by E&Y in 10/18/02 report</i></p> <p>PM MI-13: To Be Determined</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement system code to include projects for Oct 02 data. Code has been validated by E&Y.</i></p>	<p>PM99: None</p> <p>PM 95: Volume increase expected.</p> <p>PM MI-9: Volume increased with improved results</p> <p>PM MI-13: To Be Determined</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement of Aug02-Sept 02 targeted for 1-6-03. Restatement of June 02-July 02 under evaluation.</i></p>
22	96 and 97	For LNP with loop orders, the related order field is not always populated resulting in certain LNP with loop orders being reported as loop orders.	Current measurement system logic matches the LNP order to the related Loop order. Implementation should also match from related LNP order to Loop order for correct LNP with Loop identification.	Revise measurement system logic evaluate additional fields to correctly identify Loop with LNP orders.	<p>Implementation planned for December results reported in January.</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: Update measurement system logic correctly identify Loop with LNP orders is targeted for Feb 03 data, reported Mar 20, 2003.</i></p>	<p>Volume shift expected</p> <p><i>11-20-02 Update: No restatement is planned, deemed to be immaterial.</i></p>

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
23	105, 106 and MI 5	Testing of supporting documentation for the transactions that comprise these PMs revealed that start and stop times were not accurately calculated and that supporting documentation for transactions was not appropriately maintained. Additionally, certain transactions were recorded in the wrong month.	Process has been measured using records processing dates, which can be several days later than the actual date the event was completed (for both start and end dates).	Updated measurement process to capture actual event dates will be implemented with enhanced date stamping.	Operational database application updates requested from external vendor to report data in form needed for the PM results. Delivery anticipated for November results Process changes implemented in October 2002 to ensure that all require information is retained and date stamped. <i>11-20-02 Update: Documentation of process changes provided to E&Y. E&Y to evaluate changes.</i>	None
24	110, 111, 112 and 113	The Company was unable to locate certain supporting documentation related to fax transactions. Additionally, critical dates or times on the source documents did not agree to the data file used to calculate the results. In all cases the times were misstated by less than 2 hours. This had no effect on the reported results for PM 110.	The issue listed does not affect PM 113, as it impacts the measures of manual updates only. Manual process for capturing the data for these PMs lacks complete controls.	Additional controls to be implemented	Controls to be implemented with November results. <i>11-20-02 Update: Documentation of process changes provided to E&Y. E&Y to evaluate changes.</i>	Issue impacted less than two percent of transactions tested. No material impact on performance results.

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
25	117 and 118	The Company considers an NXX code request to be on time as long as it completes testing by the end of the week containing the due date, instead of by the actual due date as required by the Business Rules.	Pre-existing internal SBC methods and procedures for reporting this measure state that all testing must be 100% complete by week's end containing the SBC Effective Date, and not necessarily by the actual SBC Effective Date. Codes that may not have completed testing before the SBC Effective Date, but are finished by the end of that week will not count as misses.	Process and measurement change to be implemented.	Change implemented effective EOM September 2002. October results reported in November will reflect <i>the changes</i> . <i>11-20-02 Update: Documentation of process changes provided to E&Y. E&Y to evaluate changes.</i>	None

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
26	MI 10 and MI 16	During the Evaluation Period, rejected and timed out pre-order transactions submitted through TCNet were improperly excluded from the numerators of MI 10 and MI 16. TCNet does not have the capability to capture the rejected and timed out status; therefore, these transactions cannot be reported in the numerator for these PMs. Additionally, certain valid EDI LSOG 1 transactions were improperly excluded from the reported results. This was due to an error in the programming logic designed to identify duplicate transactions.	TCNet Issue: TCNet application cannot capture these results for reporting. EDI LSOG1 Issue: Measurement system load procedures incorrectly identified selected LSOG1 pre-order transactions as duplicates of existing transactions already loaded onto the data base.	TCNet Issue: TCNet application is being discontinued – no update will be made. EDI LSOG1 Issue: Update measurement system logic to properly process LSOG1 transactions. I	TCNet Issue: No action planned <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement system code to include TCNet transactions previously excluded for Oct 02 data. Code has been validated by E&Y.</i> EDI LSOG1 Issue: Measurement system change implemented effective with October results reported in November. August and September data to be assessed for restatement based on impact to volumes and results. <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement system code to properly include LSOG1 transaction for Oct 02 data. Code has been provided to E&Y for validation.</i>	Increased volume in MI10 and MI16. Impact on results expected to be immaterial. <i>11-20-02 Update: TC Net Issue: Restatement of June 02-Aug 02 data targeted for 12-5-02.</i> <i>LSOG1 Issue: Restatement of Aug 02 targeted for 12-5-02.</i> <i>Restatement of June 02-July 02 under evaluation.</i>
27	MI 12	The Company excluded retail transactions from reported results where the field cycle date was null and excluded wholesale transactions when a field identifying the CLEC was blank. This issue was isolated to one day in the month of May 2002.	One day system processing issue. <i>11-20-02 Update: Root cause of second issue regarding exclusion of transactions from aggregate CLEC results that cannot be mapped to a CLEC was a coding logic error.</i>	Controls updated to ensure no recurrence.	Completed June 2002 <i>11-20-02 Update: Update of measurement code to properly report results when a field identifying the CLEC is blank targeted for Nov 02 data, reported Dec 20, 2002.</i>	None

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
28	MI 14	The Company was not able to identify electronic UNE-P transactions and as a result did not report the UNE-P level of disaggregation for electronically processed completion notifications.	Initial implementation of MI-14 has not obtained the data required to disaggregate the electronically delivered notices between UNE-P and Resale. All notices have been reported under Resale.	Measurement process will be updated to access data to determine product type for the trouble report.	To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Update of measurement code to properly determine product type for the trouble report targeted for Jan 03 data, reported Feb 20, 2003. Restatements are not possible.</i>	None-Shift of volume from Resale into UNE-P.
29	MI 15	The Company did not appropriately capture the denominator for this PM during the Evaluation Period. The exclusion for "approved exceptions" was not taken by the Company. Additionally, the Company was not including accessible letters in the calculation of the results.	This is an interpretation issue. The denominator is intended to be the number of notifications sent, with the numerator being the number of notifications sent with the required lead-time. Implementation is proper and appropriate. Believe E&Y is referring to Exception Letters, as Accessible Letter is the vehicle for distributing these notifications..	Manual process documentation has been updated to exclude Exception letters.	Implemented effective July. Restated April through July results on October 7 th .	None
30	WI 1	Customer-caused no access reports were incorrectly included in the numerator of the calculation during March and April 2002 resulting in a published result worse than actual results.	Initial implementation failed to include the exclusion for CLEC/customer-caused no access situations on orders.	Enhancement needed to exclude the orders coded "no access" for CLEC/customer cause	Updated measurement system logic implemented with May results reported June. <i>11-20-02 Update: Update of measurement logic to exclude orders codes "no access" for CLEC/customer cause targeted for Dec 02 data, reported Jan 20, 2003. Restatements are not possible. However, performance was understated because this exclusion was not applied.</i>	None

**Status of Prospective Changes and Other Identified Issues
 in E & Y's Attachment A Issued October 18, 2002**

No.	PM #	Issue	Root Cause	Corrective Action	Corrective Action Implementation	Impact Upon June – August 2002 Results
31	C WI 5	The Company did not report data for specials and UNEs during the Evaluation Period.	Initial implementation only included resale orders.	Enhancement needed to include orders for other product types in the PM.	To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Schedule to update of measurement logic to include specials and UNEs is under development. Restatements are not possible.</i>	Increase in volume – performance impact to be determined.
32	C WI 6, C WI 7 and C WI 8	Due to errors in data collection by the reporting systems, the Company improperly excluded certain transactions from reported results.	Initial implementation excludes transactions where the FOC is sent after the Form A (C WI-6), where subsequent forms are not sent but order is completed (C WI-7) and where FOC is not sent within 24 hours of the authorization (C WI-8)	Update measurement code to properly include orders with these scenarios	To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Updated measurement code to properly include orders with these scenarios for Sept 02 data. Code has been validated by E&Y.</i>	To Be Determined <i>11-20-02 Update: Restatement for these issues cannot be undertaken.</i>