EXHIBIT 2

WORK SESSION PROJECT NO. 16251

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

COMPRESSED TRANSCRIPT

OCTOBER 6, 1998 VOL. 24

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.

(512)474-2233

KENNEDY
REPORTING
SERVICE

a record of excellence

800 Brazos · Suite 340 · Austin, Texas 78701 · 512-474-2233

Page 1487

that on the dedicated transport. We do that same monitoring and analysis, but I will verify that again to make sure now that I have a little clearer understanding of what it was you were looking for.

MR. SRINIVASA: The network management administration -- the rates that you have, you monitor all of your transport facilities, DS1, DS3, if there is equipment at each end and regenerators in between, they do monitor them on a proactive basis, and you do have a maintenance program in the -- you have all the alarms.

MR. DYSART: Right?

MR. SRINIVASA: For the UNEs that are purchased by the CLECs, if they're high-capacity dedicated circuits, you're going to come back and verify or demonstrate that the same level of proactive monitoring on the maintenance system is done on that. Is that correct?

MR. DYSART: Correct.

MR. COWLISHAW: Pat Cowlishaw for AT&T. I think when we've had discussions around this issue before one of

Page 1488

the difficulties has been that that kind of proactive monitoring is not documented in any way that is readily transferable to the CLEC to see that in fact it's getting that same monitoring.

We talked in a different -- in this context about ALIT reports. The kind of monitoring, as we have understood it from Southwestern Bell, that has been talked about here doesn't reduce itself to any kind of documentation or measurement that can be readily shared with the CLEC that's effective.

MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart, Southwestern Bell. I think the issue that was brought up just recently to me was the unbundled transport. The issue with just normal lines that are connected to our switch, if we do it on ours, we do it on everybody's lines and that information is passed on to an analysis group where they will take that information and see if there are pockets of problems so we can do an analysis on the network.

To provide that information to

Page 1489

you, that's a little bit beyond -- I'm not sure what good it would do you because we're the ones that are actually going to have to fix the individual problems that occur.

I think some of the issues we talked about before were a little bit different regarding the actual individual loops and doing a sample test on those but --

MR. MINTER: When we previously talked about -- this is Sean Minter with AT&T. When we previously talked about this recommendation, we had two pieces of it. One was testing these individual lines. The second was really what the recommendation said it was, develop a process for simulation modeling for those measures for which actual results are not available or are so limited that a statistical comparison is not feasible. We have a lot of measures developed here that we have no data for.

The data is not available and -- or in some cases the orders are so few that

Page 1490

you can't really do a statistically valid sample. You guys didn't address in your recommendation how you were going to deal with those situations.

MR. SIEGEL: Let me ask what's AT&T's position on how many -- how large a sample needs to be before you can do a statistically valid test on it.

MR. MINTER: There's two things. One is a statistically valid test will show that there's parity when a CLEC is actually doing something. The second is the stress testing, or what you call volume testing, to make sure it can actually handle large volumes and still provide parity. So a small sample for an individual CLEC -- a CLEC is actually doing something, then that would be necessarity for liquidated damages purposes, but to actually know that something has been done, you would have a high volume. Ten would be -- for liquidated damages purposes, ten samples or so would probably be a valid sample.

MR. SIEGEL: What would

you-all say for a sample?
MR. DYSART: Randy Dysart, Southwestern Bell. Thirty is typically what you would use for a valid sample.
MR. SRINIVASA: Coming back to that, you brought up an issue on simulation, that for those services or those elements that are provided there are only a very few that do not have an adequate number to come up with any statistically valid results, and you said simulation. How do you expect them to do that? What kind of simulation, create some orders and find out what happens?
MR. MINTER: It could get tied in with the OSS simulation testing. That's something we would have to explore. I thought you guys -- you didn't, even in your recommendation, propose anything. So we would -- I mean, you definitely want to do some sort of simulation testing, whether it's just no-assess simulation or actually all the way through delivery and billing simulation, and those are the types of things we would have to talk about, and

that's when we come in and talk about the simulation testing generally.
MR. SRINIVASA: The emphasis in here was on the dedicated transport on end loops, dedicated transport being more critical -- mission critical rather.
MR. SIEGEL: If AT&T sent a simulated order of whatever, you wanted to see how something got provisions because provisions is the kind of -- actually in the real world doing something, but as far as billing formation, you've got those, and it's not something you're buying, what would you need?
Would you need to -- you wouldn't want it to go into your back systems because you wouldn't have something -- a false customer back there. If it was EDI, would you use an EDI simulator, and would you use a different company code number so it wouldn't get on your regular bill?
MR. MINTER: This issue was actually sort of addressed, I think, in NYNEX. I'm not sure how far they've gone with that, but I know in some of their

simulation type testing that was happening there they went all the way through testing the billing, and I can find more information out about that for a complete simulation testing from end to end, and it was an independent third party, I believe, that was doing that.
MR. SRINIVASA: Well, this one testing you're talking about, it doesn't get into the provisions and maintenance, but you only are trying to find out preorder, order and billing cycle. Is that what it is for these?
MR. MINTER: To the extent that it's provisioning --
MR. SRINIVASA: How would you do a simulation of provisioning and maintenance?
MR. MINTER: Well, you wouldn't want to provision 10,000 orders, but perhaps maybe you would provision 50 or 100 of them to a particular location all in one day to test the capacity of even the provision processes and simulate trouble tickets.

I'll have to find out how exactly all this was worked in NYNEX because they explored these same issues there.
MR. SIEGEL: Any ideas on --
MR. COWLISHAW: What you're really doing is when you do a third-party test of the OSS, you try and include some of these items that maybe there's been relatively little volume of so far as well as --
MR. SIEGEL: We're just trying to get an idea as to whether it's third party or not third party, how something might be designed.
JUDGE FARROBA: When do we want that?
MR. SIEGEL: Soon. I would -- the 19th.
MR. MINTER: Okay.
MR. SIEGEL: Again, it's not that -- especially if you have difficulty getting a hold of whoever your contact person may be in New York.
MR. SRINIVASA: Then the issue on dedicated transport that -- our