

MI PM #	FCC PM #	E&Y FCC 09/01 AUDIT FOR YEAR 2000	E&Y FCC 09/02 AUDIT FOR YEAR 2001	E&Y MI AUDIT OF 10/18/02 FOR MARCH, APRIL AND MAY 2002 (References are only to those PMs corresponding to the prior E&Y FCC audits)	BEARINGPOINT INDETERMINATE OR NOT SATISFIED DETERMINATION (page references are to the Bearing Point 10/30/02 Report and references are only to those PMs corresponding to the prior E&Y FCC audits)
1.1	9	Noted that October 2000 results were restated in November 2000. No explanation given. (9/01 report, p. 7)	Noted that the March, April or May 2001 results were restated in June or July 2001 for the appropriate treatment of holidays. (9/02 report, page 9).	Notes in interpretations section that the company excluded weekends and holidays although not specifically stated in the business rules. (page 1 of Interpretations, Attachment "B" to the report).	
4	19	Noted that "for November 2000 the numerator and denominator for a certain level of disaggregation was reported in seconds rather than hours. This did not impact the quotient portion." (9/01 report, p. 12)	Noted that September 2001 data was restated in December 2001 due to a problem with one of the interfaces. Also, April through June 2001 results were restated in August 2001 to include new interfaces implemented with the March 2001 release of new business rules. Also, May through November 2001 data		Indeterminate: pages 305, 306  Not Satisfied: pages 307, 308, 309

			<p>was restated in March 2002 to add another interface. December 2001 results were restated in April 2002 to correct miscalculated downtime. (9/02 report, p. 19).</p>		
5	1	<p>For the month of February 2000, for a state, the incorrect benchmark was reported. This was restated in 2000. For the month of May 2000, improper exclusions were taken related to disconnected orders. This was restated in August 2000. (9/01 report, p. 1)</p>	<p>April 2001 results were restated in July 2001. February 2001 results were restated in November 2001. February through October 2001 results were restated in March 2002 "to correct a variety of data issues." During 2001, the Company did not have the ability to track project due dates, and therefore orders submitted as a project were not included in the results. (9/02 report, p. 2)</p>	<p>"Certain data from one of the Company's sources 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 data of this report." (Report, p. 8).</p> <p>"April and May 2002 results misclassified certain loop orders processed through the LASR system</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 314 Not Satisfied: p. 318</p>

				<p>as auto/auto instead of auto/manual.” (Report, p. 11)</p> <p>“Certain valid LASR transactions were incorrectly excluded from PM results due to invalid ACNA/Company code values. And, some xDSL loops with LNP were not captured in the reported results.” (Report, p. 11)</p> <p>The company excluded LNP with loop orders in which the loop portion of the order was rejected and then later corrected.” (Report, p. 14).</p>	
7.1	4d	The benchmark for a state was incorrectly reported for May and June 2000 and was restated in August 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)	March through May 2001 data was restated in July 2001 to include UNE Combo orders in the results and exclude test transactions in error. Results for 2001 did not include LNP transactions and were not restated. January and February	<p>“During the evaluation period, 4 wholesale submeasures were reported on a monthly basis. This restatement was made in June 2002 and impacted 1 submeasure.” (Report, p. 5).</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 311</p> <p>Not Satisfied: p. 310, 315, 316</p>

		<p>2001 results did not include UNE-P transactions and were not restated. (9/02 report, p. 8).</p>	<p>“Certain valid LASR transactions were incorrectly excluded from PM results due to invalid ACNA/Company code values.” (Report, p. 11)</p> <p>Results for the Evaluation Period did not exclude CLEC-caused misses from the calculation as required by the Business Rules. This has not been corrected. (Report, p. 11-12).</p> <p>The company excluded LNP with loop orders in which the loop portion of the order was rejected and then later corrected.” (Report, p. 14).</p>	
13	3	<p>The July and August 2001 numerators and denominators were incorrectly reported and restated in October 2000. The September 2000</p>	<p>May 2001 data was restated in July 2001 because LNP with Loops, which were not designed to flow through, had been incorrectly included in the results. January 2001 results for</p>	<p>During the evaluation period, approximately 10 wholesale and 9 retail submeasures were reported on a monthly basis. Various issues were</p>

	<p>results were restated in November 2000 related to an exclusion that was not taken. The November 2000 results were restated in January 2001 to properly report a level of disaggregation. (9/01 report, p. 3).</p>	<p>UNE loops were restated in March 2001 to remove reject orders from the measure as required by the business rules. March 2001 data was restated in May 2001 to correct a data point related to the UNE-P level of disaggregation. Results for August through December 2001 were restated in August 2002 to include flow through eligible resale projects and other data elements that should be included. The January through July 2001 results were not restated, although they were affected. April 2001 data was restated in July 2001 due to a data error. (9/02 report, p. 4).</p>	<p>restated in June, July, August and September 2002. Issues included "a data processing problem", LASR processes, treatment of projects, posting of results, and incorrect programming logic. (Report, pages 5-6).</p> <p>"Certain valid LASR transactions were incorrectly excluded from PM results due to invalid ACNA/Company code values." order was rejected and then later corrected." (Report, p. 11).</p> <p>A problem which has not been corrected, and for which no restatement has been issued is that certain supplemental and cancelled orders related to UNE loops with LNP have had the ability to flow through the Company's systems, but the Company did not have the capability to</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

				<p>identify and report this data. (Report, p. 12).</p> <p>The company excluded LNP with loop orders in which the loop portion of the order was rejected and then later corrected. During the Evaluation Period, the Company excluded projects from these PMs although there is no exclusion allowed in the Business Rules. (Report, p. 14)</p>	
18		<p>For the January through April 2000, billings improperly excluded billings for UNEs. (9/01 report, p. 12).</p>	<p>July 2001 results were restated in October 2001 to correct an unspecified error. January through March 2001 data improperly excluded certain electronically transmitted billing data from the numerator of the calculation, but this data was not restated. The stop time reported has been the time the bill was available to the transmission time, but this has not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 18).</p>	<p>Noted that instead of utilizing the time bills are transmitted to the CLECs in the calculation of bill timeliness, the Company utilized the time the bill was created and ready for transmission. E&amp;Y considers this to be a matter of interpretation of the business rules. (Report, Interpretations, p. 3)</p>	
27	6a	Calculation of intervals	April through September 2001	March, April, and May	Indeterminate: p. 319,

	<p>was improper which impacted January and February 2000 results which were restated in April 2000. Order entry errors for the months of January and March 2000 were restated in April 2000. "During 2000, results omitted an exclusion. This was not restated." (9/01 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. January through August 2001 results incorrectly identified orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p>	<p>2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>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, but E&amp;Y did not verify that this change was implemented. (Report, p. 9)</p> <p>The company included Centrex orders in the retail comparison for business POTS and UNE-P. Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail</p>	<p>320 Not Satisfied: p. 323, 324</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>with due dates beyond the next business day. December 2001 results were restated in January 2002 because data processing problems were encountered while upgrading the application that publishes the performance reports. Zeros were reported when data actually existed. (9/02 report, p. 10)</p>	<p>comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	
29	4a	<p>March 2001 results were restated in May 2001 to capture orders cancelled after a Company caused miss date. April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. January through August 2001 results incorrectly</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>Cancels were not being properly included in the results during the evaluation period. The company was not including only Ameritech caused cancels after the due date.</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 319, 320, 321</p> <p>Not Satisfied: p. 313, 324</p>

	<p>identified orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p>	<p>Results for the evaluation period were restated in October 2002 to correct this issue. Additionally, cancels are not being mapped to the correct Michigan metro area, this was corrected with July 2002 results on a prospective basis. Also, cancels for no field-work are still not being captured and reported in the PMs. (Report, p. 4).</p> <p>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, but E&amp;Y did not verify that this change was implemented. (Report, p. 9)</p> <p>The Company incorrectly reported certain internal</p>
--	--	--

32	7a	<p>orders impacting the CLEC portion of a partially "won back" account as wholesale orders during the evaluation period. This has not been corrected. (Report, p. 13).</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p> <p>The Company is excluding CLEC-caused misses from the numerator but not the denominator as stated by the Business Rules. (Report, interpretations, p. 3)</p>	<p>April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing</p> <p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has</p> <p>Indeterminate: p. 319, 320, 321</p> <p>Not Satisfied: p. 323, 324</p>
----	----	---	--

		<p>error that affected POTS installation transactions. January through August 2001 results incorrectly identified orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p>	<p>not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>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, but E&amp;Y did not verify that this change was implemented. (Report, p. 9)</p> <p>The Company incorrectly reported certain internal orders impacting the CLEC portion of a partially "won back" account as wholesale orders during the evaluation period. This has not been corrected. (Report, p. 13).</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

35	5a		<p>April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p>	<p>comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p> <p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 322</p> <p>Not Satisfied: p. 325</p>
37	13a	<p>Due to a system issue, dates for POTS maintenance were advanced one day beginning on 2/29/00. The</p>	<p>December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5)</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 329, 331</p>

38	10a	<p>resulted in certain orders reported in the incorrect month. No restatement was issued. (9/01 report, p. 8)</p>	<p>September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 to correct the UNE-P residential and Business disaggregations. August 2001 results were restated in October 2001 because the wrong line count was used. January through April 2001 results were posted in July 2001 to report the UNE combo level of disaggregation. (9/02 report, p. 16)</p>	<p>transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 327, 328, 329, 330, 331</p>
			<p>The reported results for voice grade private line ("VGPL") orders counted all circuits that ride a T1 instead of counting just the T1 pipe. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with</p>	

39	12a	Due to a system issue, dates for POTS maintenance advanced one day beginning on 2/29/00. The reported in certain orders month. No restatement was issued. (9/01 report, p. 8)	December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P retail transactions, but have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5)	field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3). March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)	Indeterminate: p. 327, 328, 329, 330, 331
41	11a	Due to a system issue, dates for POTS	December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P	The Company excludes trouble tickets in excess of 720 hours from results even though this exclusion is not allowed by the Business Rules. (Report, p. 13)  Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3). March, April, and May 2002 results were restated	Indeterminate: p. 329, 331

	<p>transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5)</p>	<p>in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p>	
<p>43</p>	<p>maintenace were advanced one day beginning on 2/29/00. The reported in certain orders month. No restatement was issued. (9/01 report, p. 8)</p>	<p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 319, 320, 321 Not Satisfied: p. 323, 324</p>
<p>6b</p>	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p> <p>Order entry errors for the months of January and March 2000 were restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>A coding error which</p>

		<p>error that affected POTS installation transactions. December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. January through August 2001 results incorrectly identified orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p> <p>March through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to exclude certain ISDN-PRI circuits, which were being double counted. October 2001 results were restated in March 2002 to include transactions for UNE Loop and UNE Port ISDN-PRI products. August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation</p>	<p>incorrectly excluded UNE Loop and Port-ISDN PRI records from May 2002 results was restated in October 2002. E&amp;Y has not rested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 4)</p> <p>March and April 2002 results did not properly capture all projects in this PM. Beginning in May 2002, the Company enhanced its method of capturing transactions related to projects which resulted in the proper inclusion of "most" projects in this PM. (Report, p. 9)</p> <p>During May 2002, the Company experienced a problem with a source system utilized to identify LNP with loop orders and application date and loop length which was not</p>	
--	--	---	---	--


45	4b	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>and 9).  March 2001 results were restated in May 2001 to capture orders cancelled after a Company caused miss date. April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. January through August 2001 results incorrectly identified orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).  March through September 2001</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>A coding error which incorrectly excluded UNE Loop and Port-ISDN PRI records from May 2002 results was restated in October 2002. E&amp;Y has not rested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 4)</p> <p>Cancels were not being properly included in the results during the evaluation period. The company was not including only Ameritech caused cancels after the due date.</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 319, 320, 321  Not Satisfied: p. 323, 324</p>
----	----	---	--	---	--

			<p>results were restated in February 2002 to exclude certain ISDN-PRI circuits, which were being double counted. October 2001 results were restated in March 2002 to include transactions for UNE Loop and UNE Port ISDN-PRI products. August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. Reported results in 2001 for voice grade private lines orders counted all circuits that ride a T1, instead of counting just the T1 pipe – not restated. The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>Results for the evaluation period were restated in October 2002 to correct this issue. Additionally, cancels are not being mapped to the correct Michigan metro area, this was corrected with July 2002 results on a prospective basis. Also, cancels for no field-work are still not being captured and reported in the PMs. (Report, p. 4).</p> <p>The Company is excluding CLEC-caused misses from the numerator but not the denominator as stated by the Business Rules. (Report, interpretations, p. 3)</p>	
46	5b	Certain data was not	April through September 2001	March, April, and May	Indeterminate: p. 322

	<p>included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p> <p>March through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to exclude certain ISDN-PRI circuits, which were being double counted. October 2001 results were restated in March 2002 to include transactions for UNE Loop and UNE Port ISDN-PRI products. August through September 2001 results were</p>	<p>2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>A coding error which incorrectly excluded UNE Loop and Port-ISDN PRI records from May 2002 results was restated in October 2002. E&amp;Y has not rested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 4)</p>	<p>Not Satisfied: p. 325</p>
--	--	---	--	------------------------------

		<p>restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. The 2001 results "did not identify and report transactions related to certain products" and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>"Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products." – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 to incorporate changes in the numerator selection criteria so that actual trouble reports are used and so that provisioning trouble reports are identified. "January through April 2001 ILEC results for one submeasure (resold specials ISDN) were accidentally dropped in August 2001." (9/02 report, p. 9).</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 319, 320, 321</p>
49	7b	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation</p>	<p>April through September 2001 results were restated in</p>	

<p>for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. January through August 2001 results incorrectly identified orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p> <p>March through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to exclude certain ISDN-PRI circuits, which were being double counted. October 2001 results were restated in March 2002 to include transactions for</p>	<p>in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>A coding error which incorrectly excluded UNE Loop and Port-ISDN PRI records from May 2002 results was restated in October 2002. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 4)</p>	<p>Not Satisfied: p. 323, 324</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

52	12b	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>UNE Loop and UNE Port ISDN-PRI products. August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. Reported results in 2001 for voice grade private lines orders counted all circuits that ride a T1, instead of counting just the T1 pipe – not restated. The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 327, 328, 329, 30, 331</p>
----	-----	---	--	--	---

			<p>include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. Reported results in 2001 for voice grade private lines orders counted all circuits that ride a T1, instead of counting just the T1 pipe – not restated. The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>A coding error which incorrectly excluded UNE Loop and Port-ISDN PRI records from May 2002 results was restated in October 2002. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 4)</p> <p>The Company excludes trouble tickets in excess of 720 hours from results even though this exclusion is not allowed by the Business Rules. (Report, p. 13)</p>	
53	11b	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>October 2001 results were restated in March 2002 to</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 329, 331</p>

			<p>include transactions for UNE Loop and UNE Port ISDN-PRI products. August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. Reported results in 2001 for voice grade private lines orders counted all circuits that ride a T1, instead of counting just the T1 pipe – not restated. The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>A coding error which incorrectly excluded UNE Loop and Port-ISDN PRI records from May 2002 results was restated in October 2002. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 4)</p>	
54	13b	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>October 2001 results were restated in March 2002 to include transactions for UNE Loop and UNE Port ISDN-PRI products. August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to</p>	<p>March, April, and May 2002 results were restated in August - October 2002 to report certain UNE-P and UNE Loop and Port transactions that were not originally identified due to</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 329, 331</p>

55.1	8	<p>include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. Reported results in 2001 for voice grade private lines orders counted all circuits that ride a T1, instead of counting just the T1 pipe – not restated. The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>a data entry error. E&amp;Y has not tested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>A coding error which incorrectly excluded UNE Loop and Port-ISDN PRI records from May 2002 results was restated in October 2002. E&amp;Y has not rested the accuracy of the restatement. (Report, p. 4)</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 320 (x2), 322</p> <p>Not Satisfied: p. 324, 325</p>
		<p>April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. January through August 2001 results incorrectly identified</p>	<p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions.</p>	

		<p>orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p> <p>The 2001 results "did not identify and report transactions related to certain products" and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>"Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products." – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>December 2001 results were restated in April and July 2002 to capture changes to service order number sequences associated with Broadband Line Share order. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders – not</p>	<p>March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>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, but E&amp;Y did not verify that this change was implemented. (Report, p. 9)</p> <p>During May 2002, the Company experienced a problem with a source system utilized to identify LNP with loop orders and application date and loop length which was not populated which caused some CHC and FDT Michigan data to not be reported. Additionally, the Company utilized the</p>	
--	--	---	---	--



56	6c	<p>Order entry errors for the months of January and March 2000 were restated in April 2000. September through November 2000 results were restated in January 2001. (9/01 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>modifications are counted for no line share conditioned/non-conditioned loops. During 2001, the Company did not have a way to track expedited orders and therefore did not exclude expedited orders from the results – not restated. Results for 2001 did not exclude orders with CLEC requested due dates greater than the offered interval – not restated. (9/02 Report, p. 13).</p>	<p>in inaccurate PMs. (Report, p. 13)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 320 (x2), 322</p> <p>Not Satisfied: p. 324, 325</p>
		<p>August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. Reported results in 2001 for voice grade private lines orders counted all circuits that ride a T1, instead of counting just the T1 pipe – not restated. The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>During May 2002, the Company experienced a problem with a source system utilized to identify</p>		

		<p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>December 2001 results were restated in April and July 2002 to capture changes to service order number sequences associated with Broadband Line Share order. November and December 2001 results for certain DSL transactions were improperly classified as 8db loop transactions – not restated. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders – not restated. (9/02 report, p. 7)</p> <p>December 2001 results were restated in January 2002 because data processing problems were encountered while upgrading the application that publishes the performance reports. Zeros were reported when data actually existed. (9/02 report, p. 10)</p> <p>June through August 2001</p>	<p>LNP with loop orders and application date and loop length which was not populated which caused some CHC and FDT Michigan 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. This issue affected only the DSL line sharing submeasure. (Report, p. 13).</p> <p>For the DSL with line sharing level of disaggregation, the Company excluded broadband DSL line sharing transactions from the PM result. Additionally, the Company utilized three days (non-affiliates) and four days (affiliates) as the standard intervals for DSL with line</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>results were posted in October 2001. July 2001 results were restated in October 2001 to identify conditioning for DSL loops without line sharing and to include the disaggregation for DSL- Line Share. January through March 2001 results were restated in February 2002 and April and May 2001 results were restated in July 2001 to measure quantities at an "order level circuit count" instead of "item count." April 2001 results were restated in July 2001 to correct the measured due date on orders where the due date preceded the order receipt date. Results for October through December 2001 did not correctly identify conditioned and non-conditioned DSL orders. (9/02 report, p. 11).</p> <p>Noted that the March, April or May 2001 results were restated in June or July 2001 for the appropriate treatment of holidays. (9/02 report, pages 13 and 9).</p>	<p>sharing. (Report, interpretations, p. 4).</p> <p>DSL transactions were not identified by geographic region as required by the Business Rules and, therefore, are not required in the correct geographic region. (Report, p. 13).</p> <p>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. (Report, p. 13)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

58	4c	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p> <p>June 2000 z scores were incorrectly reported for certain states. Restated in March 2001. (9/01 report, p. 4).</p>	<p>March 2001 results were restated in May 2001 to capture orders cancelled after a Company caused miss date. April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. January through August 2001 results incorrectly identified orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. July through September 2001 results for UNE-P transactions were not sent to the reporting system, but these have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p> <p>March through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to exclude certain ISDN-</p>	<p>field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p> <p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>During the Evaluation Period, 34 retail and 43 wholesale submeasures were reported on a monthly basis. This restatement was made in May 2002. March 2002 retail results were restated in May 2002 to include only orders installing circuits or lines in the result. (Report, p. 4)</p> <p>New missed appointment and missed due date codes were implemented in</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 319</p> <p>Not Satisfied: p. 323, 325</p>
----	----	--	---	--	--

	<p>PRI circuits, which were being double counted. August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. The 2001 results "did not identify and report transactions related to certain products" and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>"Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products." - No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>March and April 2001 data was restated in June 2001 as a result of DSL Line Sharing disaggregation being omitted due to a missing tracking number. July through October 2001 results were restated in December 2001 to report the retail equivalent results for 8db loops at the individual item level rather than the order level. March through May 2001 results</p>	<p>January 2002. Effective with August 2002 results, the Company began properly reflecting these new codes in the numerator of the PMS, but E&amp;Y did not verify that this change was implemented. (Report, p. 9)</p> <p>DSL transactions were not identified by geographic region as required by the Business Rules and, therefore, are not required in the correct geographic region. (Report, p. 13).</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	--

	<p>for the UNE 8db datapoints were improperly reported which caused a variation in the levels of disaggregation to identify orders with and without fieldwork - not restated. June through August 2001 data was restated in October 2001 to indicate when a due date change was for a customer reason. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>December 2001 results were restated in April and July 2002 to capture changes to service order number sequences associated with Broadband Line Share order. November and December 2001 results for certain DSL transactions were improperly classified as 8db loop transactions - not restated. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders - not restated. March</p>	<p>in inaccurate PMs. (Report, p. 13)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. Also, the Company is excluding CLEC-caused misses from the numerator but not the denominator as stated by the Business Rules. The Company has indicated that a wording change has been proposed to the Business Rules and has been approved by the CLECs in the most recent six-month review process. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p> <p>Cancelations were not being properly included in the results during the evaluation period. The company was not including only Ameritech caused cancelations after the due date.</p>
--	--	--

59	5c	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>and April 2001 were posted late due to a dropped tracking number that caused the results fro one submeasure not to be reported. January through March 2001 data was restated in May 2001 to remove regional affiliate results which had been substituted for the parity comparison in those months where there was no affiliate activity. (9/02 report, p. 7)</p>	<p>Results for the evaluation period were restated in October 2002 to correct this issue. Additionally, cancels are not being mapped to the correct Michigan metro area, this was corrected with July 2002 results on a prospective basis. Also, cancels for no field-work are still not being captured and reported in the PMs. (Report, p. 4).</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 319, 322 Not Satisfied: p. 325</p>
		<p>April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p>	<p>April through September 2001 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p>	<p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>During the Evaluation Period, 34 retail and 43 wholesale submeasures were reported on a monthly</p>	

		<p>March through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to exclude certain ISDN-PRI circuits, which were being double counted. August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. The 2001 results "did not identify and report transactions related to certain products" and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>July through October 2001 results were restated in December 2001 to report the retail equivalent results for 8db loops at the individual item level rather than the order level. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>	<p>basis. This restatement was made in May 2002. March 2002 retail results were restated in May 2002 to include only orders installing circuits or lines in the result. (Report, p. 4)</p> <p>DSL transactions were not identified by geographic region as required by the Business Rules and, therefore, are not required in the correct geographic region. (Report, p. 13).</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

62	7c	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>December 2001 results were restated in April and July 2002 to capture changes to service order number sequences associated with Broadband Line Share order. November and December 2001 results for certain DSL transactions were improperly classified as 8db loop transactions – not restated. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders – not restated. (9/02 report, p. 7)</p> <p>Noted that the March, April or May 2001 results were restated in June or July 2001 for the appropriate treatment of holidays. (9/02 report, page 9).</p> <p>April through September 2001 results were restated in November 2001 due to processing delays that posted data to the wrong months. Four months results were restated in November 2001 or later to correct for a data processing error that affected POTS installation transactions. January</p>	<p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p.</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 319 Not Satisfied: p. 323, 325</p>
----	----	---	---	--	---

		<p>through August 2001 results incorrectly identified orders as duplicates, yet only April 2001 results were restated in August 2002. (9/02 report, p. 5).</p> <p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>March through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to exclude certain ISDN-PRI circuits, which were being double counted. August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of</p>	<p>3)</p> <p>DSL transactions were not identified by geographic region as required by the Business Rules and, therefore, are not required in the correct geographic region. (Report, p. 13).</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>July through October 2001 results were restated in December 2001 to report the retail equivalent results for 8db loops at the individual item level rather than the order level. March through May 2001 results for the UNE 8db datapoints were improperly reported which caused a variation in the levels of disaggregation to identify orders with and without fieldwork - not restated. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p>		
		<p>December 2001 results were restated in April and July 2002 to capture changes to service order number sequences associated with Broadband Line Share order. November and December 2001 results for certain DSL transactions were improperly classified as 8db loop transactions - not restated. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders - not restated. (9/02 report, p. 7)</p>		

65	13c	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p> <p>Eligible exclusions related to interconnection trunks and UNE combos were not taken in January through March 2000. Restated in June 2000. (9/01 report, p. 9)</p>	<p>January through April 2001 retail results were restated in July 2001 and April, May, October, and November 2001 results were restated in May 2002 to include misses due to facility reasons. July through September 2001 results have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 12)</p>	<p>December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5)</p> <p>“Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products.” – No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and</p>	<p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 330, 331</p>
		<p>DSL transactions were not identified by geographic region as required by the Business Rules and, therefore, are not required in the correct geographic region. (Report, p. 13).</p>				

66	10b	<p>there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>November and December 2001 results for certain DSL transactions were improperly classified as 8db loop transactions – not restated. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders – not restated. (9/02 report, p. 7)</p>	<p>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. (Report, p. 13)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 327, 328, 329, 330, 331</p>
		<p>The 2001 results “did not identify and report transactions related to certain products” and</p>	<p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL</p>	

		<p>there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>November and December 2001 results for certain DSL transactions were improperly classified as 8db loop transactions - not restated. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders - not restated. (9/02 report, p. 7)</p> <p>2001 data did not exclude no access or delayed maintenance time for orders processed via LMOS. (9/02 report, p. 14).</p>	<p>retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>The March and April 2002 retail comparisons for 8db loops and line sharing were restated in July 2002 to exclude tickets processed through LMOS coded as no access or delayed maintenance from the reported results as required by the Business Rules. Restatements between August-October 2002. (Report, pages, 2-3).</p> <p>The Company improperly calculated the wholesale numerator during the evaluation period for the line share submeasure. The Company only included trouble reports for the</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

				<p>voice portion of the line and improperly excluded to 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. (Report, p. 13)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	
67	12c	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p> <p>Eligible exclusions related to interconnection trunks and UNE combos were not taken in January through March 2000. Restated in</p>	<p>December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5)</p> <p>August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting. The 2001 results "did not</p>	<p>The March and April 2002 retail comparisons for 8db loops and line sharing were restated in July 2002 to exclude tickets processed through LMOS coded as no access or delayed maintenance from the reported results as required by the Business Rules. Restatements between August-October 2002.</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 327, 328, 329, 330, 331</p>

		<p>June 2000. (9/01 report, p. 9)</p> <p>identify and report transactions related to certain products” and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>November and December 2001 results for certain DSL transactions were improperly classified as 8db loop transactions – not restated. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders – not restated. (9/02 report, p. 7)</p> <p>2001 data did not exclude no access or delayed maintenance time for orders processed via LMOS. (9/02 report, p. 14).</p> <p>August through December 2001 results were restated in March 2002 to include dispatch and no dispatch situations. (9/02 report, p. 16).</p>	<p>(Report, pages, 2-3).</p> <p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

69	11c	<p>Certain data was not included in the calculation for the months of January and February 2000. This was restated in April 2000. (9/01 report, p. 4)</p>	<p>December 2001 results were misstated due to certain UNE-P transactions being classified as retail transactions, but have not been restated. (9/02 report, p. 5)</p> <p>August through September 2001 results were restated in February 2002 to include results for two new service centers for installation and trouble reporting.</p>	<p>Company troubles when they were not. (Report, p. 13)</p> <p>The Company excludes trouble tickets in excess of 720 hours from results even though this exclusion is not allowed by the Business Rules. (Report, p. 13)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	<p>Indeterminate: p. 329, 331</p>
				<p>May 2002 results were restated in September 2002 to correct certain DSL retail and wholesale transactions that were improperly classified as 8cb loop transactions. March and April 2002 results were restated in October 2002. (Report, p. 3)</p>	

		<p>The 2001 results "did not identify and report transactions related to certain products" and there was no restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>"Results did not identify and report transactions related to certain products." - No restatement. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>January through December 2001 retail results were restated in April 2002 for a small number of submeasures. (9/02 report, p. 6)</p> <p>December 2001 results were restated in April and July 2002 to capture changes to service order number sequences associated with Broadband Line Share order. November and December 2001 results for certain DSL transactions were improperly classified as 8db loop transactions - not restated. Results for 2001 did not properly classify certain transactions as DSL orders - not restated. (9/02 report, p. 7)</p>	<p>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. (Report, p. 13)</p> <p>Retail ISDN transactions are included in the retail comparison for both ISDN and POTS business with field work. (Report, interpretations, p. 3).</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

70	15	Eligible exclusion was not taken in May 2000 and results were restated in July 2000. (9/01 Report, p. 11)	October 2001 results were restated in March 2002 to include CLEC data received after the initial reporting deadline and to correct certain retail data. (9/02 report, p. 17).	
71	20			This issue was restated in October 2002 for the evaluation period - the company had posted an invalid retail comparison. (Report, p. 6).
77	14			
107	17	Due to clerical input errors, October 2000 results were restated in December 2000. Transaction testing performed revealed seven collocation applications that did not include date stamps and two collocation projects where completion date was incorrect. These errors impact the reliability of the data used to report this PM. (9/01 report, pages 11-12).	April and May 2001 results were restated in August 2001 to reflect data not previously reported. During 2001, no data was reported for the "Additions" level of disaggregation when data actually existed. (9/02 report, page 18).	

114.1	16		Due to a clerical input errors, February and March 2000 reported results were restated in July 2000. (9/01 report, p. 11).						Indeterminate: p. 356, 357 Not Satisfied: p. 358
-------	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---