

April 24, 2001

OBSERVATION REPORT #1

KPMG Consulting has observed discrepancies in the February 2001 release of the Verizon – Progression Test Deck (Version 3.5) LSOG4 documentation.

Issue

The Verizon-Virginia (Verizon) progression test deck (LSOG 4, version 3.5¹) consists of a set of pre-order and order transactions with provided inputs and expected outputs, that is, if those provided inputs are submitted in a transaction then the documented expected outputs should be returned by Verizon.

As part of its new release process for EDI electronic interface software, Verizon executes the test deck in both its CLEC Test Environment (CTE) and production environment at different stages of the new release process and has executed the February 2001 release several times. Each time the test deck is executed, Verizon publishes the results of the execution and indicates if there are any differences between the actual system generated outputs versus the documented expected outputs.² Verizon has publicly certified all test deck transactions as accurate and valid through the Bell Atlantic Change Control electronic mail distribution list.^{3,4}

As part of KPMG Consulting's new entrant testing, KPMG Consulting executed the Verizon-Virginia progression test deck in the CLEC Test Environment (CTE). KPMG Consulting encountered multiple instances where the published test deck documentation was incorrect. Specifically, the following issues were identified:

- As part of the scenarios included with Version 3.5 of the CTE test deck, Verizon provided examples of Local Service Requests (LSRs) and their associated expected outbound EDI requests. KPMG Consulting observed instances where the values in some of the LSR examples were inconsistent with the values in the EDI examples. These instances are provided in Table 1 below.

¹ Release date: February 17, 2001; Publication date: February 26, 2001

² Further information on the test deck execution process may be found in the Bell Atlantic CLEC/Resale Handbook, March 2001, Volume II, Section 4.5.2.

³ "February Production Release Status" dated March 5, 2001 9:50 AM

⁴ "February Production Release Status" dated February 26, 2001 5:09 PM

This observation report is for discussion purposes only and is subject to change without notice.

Table 1
Test Deck Scenarios with Discrepancies Between the LSR and EDI Examples

NO.	FORM	FIELD	ISSUE
# 2	CRS-SD Group	TNS & Feature Detail	LSR lists same TNs in both fields; EDI lists 2 different TNs
# 4, 5, 7, 17, 19, 24, 26, 29, 30, 33	DL & DIR Group	YPHV, DIRQTYNC, DIRTYP	LSR incorrectly lists YPHV/YPH fields in DIR group and DIRQTYNC & DIRTYP in DL form. EDI is correct.
# 5 & 17	DL	RTY	LSR example shows field populated with LAM; EDI has LAL in field
#6	DL	LALOC	LSR example has 'Herndon'; EDI example has 'Hernodon'
#31	LSNP-TN Group	CKR & PORTED NBR	LSR example lists different TN for each field. EDI example lists same TN in both fields.

- KPMG Consulting also observed one inconsistency between the CTE Test Deck and the individual LSR and EDI examples. Test case #4 is listed as “CLEC small business, new customers order ISDN BRI line.” In the CTE test deck, the actual LSR and EDI examples have the order as “CLEC small business, new customer orders POTS line.”

Assessment

CLECs cannot use the CTE effectively without accurate and complete documentation. The inconsistencies and incorrect information provided in Version 3.5 of the CTE Test Deck cause delays in the testing process and may impede the CLECs’ ability to conduct business in a timely fashion.

Additionally, these inconsistencies raise the question as to how the test decks could be certified by Verizon with these inconsistencies present.