

**Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01**

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
001	KPMG Consulting observed discrepancies in the February 2001 release of the Verizon progression test deck version 3.5 LSOG4 documentation	Closed	Discussion Complete	<p>5/22/01: Opened; Verizon agreed with the findings except the Item 2, the LSR listing in DL form issue. Verizon indicated that the findings they agree with have been corrected with the new release of the CTE Test Deck (May 7). <u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting is to further investigate the Item 2 and address Verizon’s comments at the next meeting. <p>06/05/01: Verizon indicated they no longer disagree with KPMG Consulting regarding Item 2. Further, Verizon indicated that Item 2 is corrected with the May 31 publication of CTE Test Deck. KPMG Consulting verified that the CTE Test Deck (Version 4.0) fixed the issues noted in Table 1 (as Verizon indicated in the previous meeting), except for Item 2. In addition, KPMG Consulting noted that the latest CTE Test Deck (Version 4.2, published May 31, 2001) partially fixed issues noted in Item 2. While the latest release fixed the DIRQTYNC & DIRTYYP fields in DL form, the LSR continues to incorrectly list YPHV/YPH fields in DIR group. <u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will investigate LSR listing of YPHV/YPH fields and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>06/12/01: Verizon indicated that Item #2 regarding YPHV/YPH fields in DIR group has been corrected with the updated CTE Test Deck release (June 11). KPMG Consulting asked a clarification question regarding Item #1, as to where the manual input error occurred during the process. Verizon indicated the manual error occurred at EDI where the tester entered the wrong telephone number. KPMG Consulting indicated that issues noted in Item #5 regarding CKR & PORTED NBR fields in test case #31</p>	

Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
				<p>reappeared in CTE Test Deck Version 4.2.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will investigate LSR listing of YPHV/YPH fields in the updated release and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. ▪ Verizon will investigate the reappearance of issue Item #5 regarding CKR & PORTED NBR fields in CTE Test Deck Version 4.2 and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>06/19/01: KPMG Consulting confirmed that Item #2 regarding YPHV/YPH fields in DIR group has been corrected with the updated CTE Test Deck release (June 11). Verizon indicated that issues noted in Item #5 regarding CKR & PORTED NBR fields in scenario #31, which reappeared in the CTE Test Deck Version 4.2, have been corrected in the CTE Test Deck Version 4.4 (June 15).</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will investigate issue Item #5 in the updated release and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>06/26/01: KPMG Consulting confirmed that the issues have been corrected in the CTE Test Deck Version 4.4 (June 15) and proposed to close the observation next week</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will close the observation at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/03/01: Closed</p>	

**Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01**

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
002	KPMG Consulting observed that Verizon's Product Interval Guides do not provide provisioning intervals for Directory Listing (DL) orders for either Resale or UNE products	Closed	Discussion Complete	<p>5/22/01: Opened; Verizon disagreed with the findings. <u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon is to provide information as to where the information regarding provisioning intervals can be located (website address, page number, line number, etc.). ▪ Verizon is to provide a date as to when the two versions of the Interval Guides will have consistent information at the next meeting. ▪ KPMG Consulting is to further investigate the issue and address Verizon's comments at the next meeting. <p>06/05/01: Verizon indicated that page 2 of the Resale Standard Intervals is changed to reflect the Directory Listing (DL) information. However, KPMG Consulting noted that the change provides intervals for Residential customers only, and not for Business customers. In addition, KPMG Consulting noted that while the <i>Resale Standard Intervals</i> references DL orders under Directory Listing Changes and Adds, the <i>Intervals for Unbundled Network Elements</i> references DL orders under Directory Assistance. <u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will investigate provisioning intervals for DL activities for business customers and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>06/12/01: Verizon indicated that the Product Interval Guides for North and South are consistent. Verizon's website has been updated to include both residence and business Directory Assistance interval information as follows: Verizon South – Residence, Pg 2; Business, Pg 4 Verizon North – Residence, Pg 18; Business, Pg 20 <u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will investigate the updated Product Interval Guides regarding residential and business Directory Listing intervals and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. 	

**Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01**

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
				<p>06/19/01: KPMG Consulting indicated that the changes to the Product Interval Guides for North and South do not appear in the documents posted on the website. Verizon indicated that the updates are available on the website referenced in the Observation itself.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will reinvestigate the Product Interval Guides and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>06/26/01: Verizon indicated that the changes to the Product Interval Guides for North and South had been made to one of the two Verizon websites which is the reason why KPMG Consulting was not able to verify the changes last week. Verizon indicated that they updated the link so that both websites point to the same file. KPMG Consulting confirmed that the changes have been verified and proposed to close the observation next week.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will close the observation at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/03/01: Closed</p>	
003	KPMG Consulting observed conflicting product intervals in documentation found on the Verizon web site for Resale service requests	Closed	Discussion Complete	<p>5/22/01: Opened; Verizon agreed with the findings with an exception of the first item in Exhibit 1. KPMG Consulting may have transposed columns of Exhibit 1. Verizon indicated they would add disclaimer in the 'Resale Handbook' to indicate that the official Interval Guide is in the 'Resale Standard Intervals.'</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon is to provide a date as to when they will add the disclaimer at the next meeting. ▪ KPMG Consulting is to further investigate this issue and determine whether to issue amended observation. <p>06/05/01: Verizon indicated they will eliminate all intervals in the Resale Handbook and include a link in the website to the Resale Standard Intervals by June 15, 2001.</p>	VA Observation Report 03 v2.pdf

Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
				<p>KPMG Consulting indicated the columns in Exhibit 1 were transposed and the observation will be amended accordingly. This observation is deferred until June 19, 2001 for further verification.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will report on the status re the Resale Handbook changes at the June 19 Observation meeting. <p>06/12/01: Deferred until June 19, 2001. Amended observation VA Observation Report 03 v2.doc is posted on the website.</p> <p>06/19/01: Verizon indicated that they removed the intervals in the 'Resale Handbook' and added a link pointing to the 'Resale Standard Intervals.'</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will investigate the updates in the 'Resale Handbook' and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>06/26/01: KPMG Consulting confirmed that the changes have been verified and proposed to close the observation next week.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will close the observation at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/03/01: Closed</p>	
007	KPMG Consulting cannot complete Resale pre-orders when adhering to Verizon's LSOG 4.5.1 Business Rules documentation	Closed	Discussion Complete	<p>06/26/01: Opened; Verizon indicated that they agree with KPMG Consulting's findings and plan to update company codes through normal change control process. They will post a bulletin for CLECs around July 5.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will provide status on the change process and address any follow-up questions at the July 10th Observation meeting. <p>07/03/01: Deferred until July 10, 2001.</p> <p>07/10/01: Verizon indicated that Change Control Bulletin #2151 for LSOG 4 was issued and discussed in the Change Control</p>	

Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
				<p>meeting on July 6, 2001. Verizon indicated that in CR #2151, the following two Field notes were added: 1) The CLEC/Reseller should input their Exchange Carrier Code in this field. 2) This field matches or maps to the RSID for Reseller or AECN for CLEC.</p> <p>KPMG Consulting indicated that we have two codes that do not map to each other. KPMG Consulting's ECC is WLAZ and RSID is 9995. Verizon asked if KPMG Consulting brought this issue up on the Change Control call. KPMG Consulting responded that the issue was discussed and Verizon's response was that the codes should not be conflicting.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will investigate whether this issue is unique to KPMG Consulting or not and find out if there are similar conditions that may affect other CLECs and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/17/01: Verizon reiterated that per Change Control Bulletin #2151, when a CLEC/Reseller uses the Exchange Carrier Code (ECC), the system matches or maps the ECC to the RSID for Reseller or AECN for CLEC. In south, ECC will map to RSID or AECN; in north, ECC will match. The two codes do not need to be identical. VASCC asked if there would be potential problems if an entity was both CLEC and Reseller. Verizon indicated that there would be no potential problem.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will investigate and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/24/01: KPMG Consulting indicated that the documentation remains unclear. Verizon indicated that Change Request #2151 was made as clarification per KPMG Consulting. Verizon would like KPMG Consulting to recommend a clarifying statement. KPMG Consulting indicated that</p>	

**Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01**

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
				<p>we do not provide specific recommendations as to how the documentation should be worded; however, we would like to see more clarification so that, for example, a CLEC would not make the mistake of entering RSID in the company code field.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will investigate and address any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/31/01: Verizon indicated that they believe the bulletin is clear and concise. Further, they have nothing more to add to the bulletin. KPMG Consulting indicated that the first note is clear but the second note creates confusion. Verizon indicated that the second note was included per CLECs’ request and that they do not intend to remove the second item. KPMG Consulting indicated that we understand Verizon’s perspective, however, we still believe that the bulletin is unclear.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will address the issue at the next Observation meeting. <p>08/07/01: KPMG Consulting indicated that the bulletin remains unclear, however, the Change Control Bulletin does address the issue and we proposed to close the observation.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will close the observation at the next Observation meeting. <p>08/14/01: Closed</p>	
009	KPMG Consulting observed discrepancies in the June 2001 release of the Verizon – expressTRAK Quality Baseline Validation Test Deck (Version 4.4) for LSOG 4.6.1.	Closed	Discussion Complete	<p>06/26/01: Opened; Verizon indicated that the issue is under investigation and they will respond at the next Observation meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will address the issues and any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/03/01: Verizon indicated that they agree with the findings noted</p>	

**Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01**

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
				<p>as items 1 and 2 in Exhibit 1. For Item #1, the control sheet was corrected but not updated before LSR. For Item #2, the control sheet was corrected after LSR. Verizon indicated the issues observed for items 1 and 2 are corrected in the eTRAK Test Deck version 4.5 (6/22/01). The third item (Scenario #33) is still under investigation.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will address Item #3 and any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/10/01: KPMG Consulting verified that items 1 and 2 are corrected as indicated by Verizon last week. Verizon indicated that the finding noted in the last paragraph (Scenario #33) has been corrected with Test Deck version 4.6 (7/9/02).</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will verify the correction for Scenario #33 in the new Test Deck and address any questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/17/01: KPMG Consulting verified that Item 3 and the fourth finding (Scenario #33) are corrected as indicated by Verizon last week. KPMG Consulting proposed to close the observation.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will close the observation at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/24/01: Closed</p>	
010	KPMG Consulting observed that Verizon's EDI system returns inaccurate error responses to Local Service Requests (LSR)	Closed	Discussion Complete	<p>06/26/01: Opened; Verizon indicated that the issue is under investigation and that they need additional information (In/Out EDI files) from KPMG Consulting.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will provide EDI In/Out files to Verizon. ▪ Verizon will address the issue and any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. 	

**Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01**

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
				<p>07/03/01: KPMG Consulting provided Verizon with the additional information (In/Out EDI files). Verizon indicated that the issue is under further analysis and they will respond at the next Observation meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will address the issue and any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/10/01: Verizon indicated that the issue is under further analysis and that they will address the issue at the next Observation meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will address the issue and any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/17/01: Verizon indicated that they agree with the findings and had applied an enhancement software pack on June 16, 2001 and asked if KPMG Consulting would be able to retest. KPMG Consulting indicated that we would address the issue at the next Observation meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will address the issue at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/24/01: KPMG Consulting indicated that we retested the planned error and verified the corrections. KPMG Consulting proposed to close the observation at the next Observation meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KPMG Consulting will close the issue at the next Observation meeting. <p>07/31/01: Closed</p>	

**Virginia SCC/Verizon
Inactive Observation Status Summary – As of 08/14/01**

ID	Brief Description	Status	Status Reason	Notes	Additional Documents
ACTIVE OBSERVATIONS					
025	KPMG Consulting received late Local Service Request Local Responses (LSRLRs) on Flow-Through orders.	Rescinded	Non Issue	08/07/01: Opened; Verizon indicated that they would address the issue at the next Observation meeting. <u>Action Items:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verizon will address the issue and any follow-up questions at the next Observation meeting. 08/14/01: KPMG Consulting rescinded the observation, indicating that these PONs should not have flown-through in the first place.	