

ORIGINAL



0000011442

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

CARL J. KUNASEK  
Chairman  
JIM IRVIN  
Commissioner  
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL  
Commissioner

APR 13 10:21

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

APR 13 2000

DOCKETED BY

DOCKET NO. T-00000B-97-0238

IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST )  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S COMPLIANCE )  
WITH § 271 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS )  
ACT OF 1996. )

NOTICE OF FILING ERRATA

The Arizona Corporation Commission Staff ("Staff"), by its attorneys, hereby files the attached Errata pages to the Master Plan for Testing U S WEST's Operations Support System in Arizona. The Errata pages are being filed to correct minor typographical errors, and do not in any way affect the substantive provisions of the Plan.

Staff would request that parties substitute the attached pages for those currently contained in the Master Test Plan filed by Staff on April 7, 2000.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 13<sup>TH</sup> day of April, 2000.

By

Maureen A. Scott  
Attorney  
Legal Division  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  
Telephone: (602) 542-6022  
Facsimile: (602) 542-4870  
e-mail: [maureenscott@cc.state.az.us](mailto:maureenscott@cc.state.az.us)

Original and fifteen copies of the foregoing filed this 13<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2000 with:

Docket Control  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

- a. Any participant may initiate a request for a new Test Scenario during the test period.
- b. The initiator documents the request in a format to be provided by the Test Administrator, and submits it to the Test Administrator, with copies to all participants.
- c. The Test Administrator evaluates the request and recommends its inclusion or rejection to the TAG.
- d. The TAG attempts resolution by consensus.
- e. If resolved in this manner, the Test Administrator implements this resolution and notifies all participants.
- f. If not resolved, the TAG escalates the request to the ACC Staff for decision.
- g. The ACC Staff reaches a decision and notifies participants.
- h. New Scenarios introduced during the test period will be tested in a manner which will not extend the overall test timeline unless recommended by the TAG and approved by the ACC Staff.

#### **2.2.5 Section 271 Web-site**

A web-site will be established for the Arizona Section 271 test. The web-site shall be a repository for information related to the test and U S WEST's Section 271 application.

#### **2.3 Document History**

The Master Test Plan is a map for how the Arizona OSS tests will be conducted. The MTP lists Test Scenario level detail and other high level requirements describing how tests will be conducted in Arizona. The 271 Test Standards document developed by the Test Administrator provides detailed Test Cases within the Scenarios, Scripts and other exact specifications as to how the Arizona tests will be conducted.

Drafts of the MTP were circulated to interested parties and reviewed in workshops and TAG meetings hosted by the ACC. See Document Milestones, page I. Before and at the workshop, the ACC solicited comments and suggestions from interested parties regarding changes to the overall testing strategy and the test plan. Changes were made through workshops and TAG Meetings.

### **3.3 Overview of Test Types**

The testing will include five types of Test Scenarios. Each of the five test types of Test Scenarios outlined below, and the following document sections (4 - 8) provide further detail for each Test Scenario type.

#### **3.3.1 Functionality Test**

The purpose of the Functionality Test is to determine the extent to which U S WEST's OSS provides operational functionality to CLECs. The test determines whether the OSS adequately performs the pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing functions using a set of predefined Test Scenarios. Testing will utilize U S WEST's production OSS and processes including manual operations.

The Functionality Test will focus on all OSS functions for resale, UNE-P, UNE-loop, UNE-loop with number portability, and number portability. Both business and residential orders will be tested, and the testing will encompass new, conversion 'as is', conversion 'as specified', partial migrations, change, disconnect, cancel, suspend, and restore activities. Test Cases developed for the Functionality Test will include end-to-end processing so that all functionality between pre-ordering and billing can be evaluated.

#### **3.3.2 Retail Parity Evaluation**

The Retail Parity Evaluation will compare the U S WEST graphical user interface provided to CLECs for processing pre-order inquiries, LSRs and repair requests to the U S WEST internal retail graphical user interface utilized by U S WEST service order representatives. Specifically, the purpose of this test is to determine whether a CLEC representative, using a U S WEST OSS interface, and provide a level of service and experience in substantially the same time and manner as the level of service and experience that a U S WEST representative can provide using a U S WEST standard interface.

The Evaluation will analyze the Retail Parity Test case data with the primary purpose to determine if the U S WEST OSS accessed by the CLECs collects and provides the required information in substantially the same time and manner as the information submitted and received internally by U S WEST. The evaluation will also determine whether the information received by the CLEC Service Representative from the U S WEST OSS is comparable in quality and completeness to the information received internally by the U S WEST Service Representative. Additionally, the evaluation will determine if the data entry experience of a CLEC Service Order Entry Operator is comparable in quality and required level of effort to that experienced by the U S

WEST Service Order Entry Operator. Specifically, the level of pre-order to order integration in the retail and resale interfaces will be compared.

An important element in determining whether the resale Service Representative's experience is in parity with the retail Service Representative's experience is the degree to which correctly entered CLEC LSRs flow through the U S WEST OSS infrastructure in comparison to correctly entered U S WEST Service Orders. Flow through as addressed in the Retail Parity Evaluation is flow through of the LSR such that the order is accepted and presented to the backend systems. Flow through in the context of these Retail Parity Evaluations does not include testing of how well orders are provisioned or billed. Therefore, the Test Cases for retail parity will be cancelled before provisioning occurs.

Quantitative pre-order metrics such as TN, feature validation, address validation, PIC/LPIC, due date, and facility availability query times will be measured and reported for all pre-order Test Cases and for the pre-order portions of all order Test Cases (for the Retail Parity Test). These metrics will be collected as detailed Test Cases and Scripts are executed by U S WEST Service Representatives for retail and Pseudo-CLEC Service Representatives for resale.

### **3.3.3 Capacity Test**

The Capacity Test will validate that U S WEST's OSS Systems and processes can handle loads equal to or greater than those projected by the various CLEC participants for estimated volumes projected one year from the date of the running of the Capacity Test. Additionally, Capacity Testing includes a review of procedures associated with computer system scalability and staff scalability, to determine, under stated assumptions, whether or not U S WEST appears capable of handling both projected and unexpected CLEC future demand. U S WEST's ability to handle unexpected CLEC future demand will be evaluated as part of these scalability evaluations. The Capacity Test differs from the Functionality Test, in that it is constructed of a repeatable, controlled, usually simulated test load, focused on volumes rather than on functionality. Consequently, a restricted subset of functionality will be used as the input workload to drive the systems, and large volumes of pre-order and order transactions will be evaluated, based on forecasts one year from the running of the Capacity Tests.

- Determine whether U S WEST will notify the CLEC or the Pseudo-CLEC of successful restoration of service after the service fault was identified and corrected.
- Determine if a participant CLEC or Pseudo-CLEC can initiate an Mechanized Loop Test (MLT) test for a reported trouble

Scenarios verifying the MLT will be included in Test Cases for the Functionality Tests. The FT is also intended to address certain special subjects, including the 911/E911 and Directory Assistance databases.

### 4.2 Functionality Test Scope

The Functionality Test will include a defined number of inputs and a specific set of scenarios. Scenarios are specific types of orders and products to be included in the 271 tests. The definition of Scenarios is primarily the responsibility of the CLECs and U S WEST with final additions possibly suggested by the Test Administrator.

Test Cases are different order types or product instances within a Scenario. Additionally, Test Case definitions include information on the inputs, purpose, expected results, measures, and failure criteria for the Test Case. The development of Test Cases is the responsibility of the Test Administrator.

Test Scripts are detailed step by step instructions for each Test Case. The development of Test Scripts are the responsibility of the Test Administrator.

Iterations are additional instances of Test Scripts of a specific Test Case with minor data changes to increase the samples within a statistical cell to achieve the required sample size. The development of additional iterations to achieve a required sample size is the responsibility of the Test Administrator.

The Test Cases will include appropriate Test Case instances and iterations covering the order types and product types detailed in Section 3 and in Appendix A<sup>1</sup>. The set of Scenarios will be enhanced with CLEC input through workshop and TAG participation.

The Test Administrator will analyze these Scenarios, develop Test Cases, and determine the proper mix of orders and the number of iterations required for loading and for statistical validity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix A is a detailed listing of the Test Scenarios for the Functionality Test and the Retail Parity Evaluation. Scenarios 1 to 126 are the Scenarios for the Functionality Test, and Scenarios 127 to 165 are the Scenarios for the Retail Parity Test. The chart lists each Scenario by order type, and it also includes columns indicating the details of the Scenario (e.g. the features involved, listing information), and explanation of the directory listings for the Scenario, and an indication of whether or not a maintenance and repair test will be included in the Scenario.

The focus of the Retail Parity Evaluation is on the experience which the customer has while on the line with a CLEC representative, in comparison to the experience of a customer while on the line with a U S WEST representative. Because of this, once the order has been submitted, it is only necessary to run the Retail Parity Evaluation through the ordering processes or through submission of a trouble report. Consequently, the Retail Parity Evaluation activities will be cancelled in the Service Order Processor (SOP).

The Retail Parity Evaluation will involve test comparisons between the IMA GUI and the retail systems utilized by U S WEST's Service Order Representatives.

### **5.3 Retail Parity Evaluation Coverage and Scenarios**

Section 2 of Appendix A details the proposed Test Scenarios for the Retail Parity Evaluation. These Scenarios will be used to create the detailed Test Cases and subsequent orders/LSRs. At a high level, the Scenarios cover pre-ordering and ordering processing. The following provides a high-level overview of the Retail Parity Evaluation scenarios:

- Resale New Connect compared to Retail New Connect
- Retail to Resale Conversion compared to Retail 'Win Back'
- Resale Change compared to Retail Change
- Resale Suspend and Restore compared to Retail Suspend and Restore
- Various Resale Maintenance and Repair Activities (Reporting, Start using, MLT) compared to the equivalent Retail Activities

### **5.4 Retail Parity Evaluation Volumes**

The appropriate test volume will be established to ensure that the comparison process provides a reliable statistical sample of performance measurements when evaluating the processes and outputs. It is anticipated that the volume required for this effort will be a subset of the volumes required for the overall Functionality Test detailed in Section 4. However, the number of accounts, transactions, and test iterations must still be determined to ensure that the test volume is adequate. The Test Administrator will determine these volumes.

### **5.5 Retail Parity Evaluation Data**

The goal of the Retail Parity Evaluation is to evaluate resale transactions against the equivalent retail transactions. Consequently, this effort should use test accounts, or Friendlies, where the basic account set-up and locations can be as similar as possible to provide the most accurate comparison. For example, to test that scheduling appointments for the dispatch of an installation technician occurs equally for retail and resale customers, it is most desirable to have these accounts serviced out of the same wire center, and as geographically close to one another as possible.

### **5.7.1.2 Test Planning Entrance Criteria**

- Identify test volumes, such as the exact number of Friendlies and test accounts and the total number of activities initiated by the Friendlies within the testing timeframe
- Identify test iterations to establish the appropriate number of tests and volumes to ensure statistical soundness
- Identify test execution interval (number of days) to cover multiple billing periods and other constraints such as installation intervals
- Identify test participants and the associated roles of each
- Identify the Friendlies mix and locations
- Define the overall testing environment
- The statistical methodology has been established

### **5.7.1.3 Test Planning Exit Criteria**

- Baselined test plan for each participant
- Baselined Test Scripts are complete
- Test specifications from the Pseudo-CLEC participants
- Defined schedule, including critical path items

## **5.7.2 Test Preparation**

This section documents the activities, entrance criteria, and exit criteria required for the Retail Parity Test Preparation Phase.

### **5.7.2.1 Test Preparation Phase Activities**

- Develop detailed test monitoring plans
- Develop detailed project plans
- Define OSS environment requirements
- Finalize the Test Scenarios and analyze the test coverage
- Finalize the Test Scripts
- Establish segregated operating terminals at U S WEST
- Identify and assigning the Friendlies
- Create the Friendlies test packages

### **5.7.2.2 Test Preparation Entrance Criteria**

- Test Standards written, reviewed and commented on by TAG
- Scope of the tests finalized and approved by the TAG
- Determine available Friendlies

### **5.7.2.3 Test Preparation Exit Criteria**

- Test plan activities section complete
- Test Scripts reviewed by Test Administrator

### **5.7.3 Test Execution**

This section documents the activities, entrance criteria, and exit criteria required for the Retail Parity Test Execution Phase.

#### **5.7.3.1 Test Execution Activities**

##### **Pseudo-CLEC and U S WEST**

- Execute the Test Cases according to the scripted Test Cases per the instructions of the monitoring Test Administrator representative.
- Document test results, issues, resolution, and status

##### **Test Administrator**

- Position staff at Pseudo-CLEC and U S WEST facilities to observe the input and processing of orders
- Closely guide the execution of the Retail Parity Evaluation Test Scripts in both the Pseudo-CLEC and U S WEST facilities carefully counting and measuring the planned data and documenting the results on the Test Scripts.
- Review recorded Report problems uncovered in the test, track problem resolutions and retests for resolution with the consensus of the TAG

#### **5.7.3.2 Test Execution Entrance Criteria**

- Baselined test plans for each participant
- Test Scripts for testing for each participant
- Friendlies preparation
- Operationally ready and available interfaces and systems required for the testing
- Executed system and access agreements, including assignment of required sign-on accounts and passwords
- Appropriate SME staff
- Sufficient establishment of the Arizona Performance Measures

- Is the ability to make a change on a pending order equal for both a Pseudo-CLEC Service Representative and for a U S WEST Service Representative?
- Is an equal ability provided to both the Pseudo-CLEC Service Representative and the U S WEST Service Representative to query status of a pending service order?
- For “working left-in” situations, does IMA provide the Pseudo-CLEC Service Representative an equivalent amount of status information as is provided to the U S WEST Service Representative?
- Are the hours of system availability the same for Pseudo-CLEC Service Representatives and for U S WEST Service Representatives? The determination will factor in the purposes for which the interfaces are up and available within U S WEST.

### **5.9 Retail Parity Evaluation Assumptions**

- The Retail Parity Evaluation will not require end-to-end processing to billing; orders generated for the Retail Parity Evaluation can be cancelled in the Service Order Processing (SOP) systems once the Test Case is complete.
- Time measurements will be established only for cases where accurate comparisons can be accomplished.
- The assumptions related to Friendlies in Section 4.8 for the Functionality Test apply to the Retail Parity Evaluation.

## **6. Capacity Test**

### **6.1 Capacity Test Purpose**

The Capacity Test will validate that U S WEST’s OSS Systems and processes for pre-order and ordering transactions can predictably handle loads equal to or greater than those projected by the various CLEC participants for estimated volumes projected one year from the date of the running of the Capacity Test. While some limited aspects of U S WEST’s provisioning processes will be evaluated, the test will pass no judgement on the capacity of U S WEST’s provisioning processes. For the Capacity Test, it is assumed that U S WEST will provision CLEC service requests in parity with retail operations. The Capacity Test is different from the Functionality Test, since it is constructed of a repeatable, controlled, and usually simulated test load. Volumes for this testing effort will be established by the Test Administrator with U S WEST and

### **8.5.2 Historical Data Evaluation**

U S WEST will provide performance measurement raw data from a three consecutive month period. The Test Administrator will validate the process and procedures and monitor U S WEST's ability to execute them. If appropriate, the Test Administrator will conduct interviews of U S WEST and/or CLEC personnel.

### **8.5.3 Functionality Testing and Capacity Testing**

During Functionality Testing and Capacity Testing, U S WEST will provide appropriate performance measurement data and results. The Test Administrator will verify such data and incorporate the results into the Functionality Testing and Capacity Testing. The Test Administrator will acquire and/or develop data, calculate Functionality and Capacity test results, and validate results of U S WEST, Pseudo-CLEC and CLEC analyses

### **8.6 Performance Measurement Evaluation Entrance and Exit Criteria**

The entrance criteria for this test include the U S WEST documented processes and procedures for the enumerated performance measurements listed in appendices B and C. Exit criteria will include a final report that performance measurement collection, analysis and reporting processes as reviewed by CGT are fully compliant with the performance measurements contained in the PID. Exiting this test will include a review session where all observed activities, data and results will be reviewed for validity. The actual exit criteria will be an outcome report generated by the Test Administrator detailing observations regarding U S WEST's performance measurements

### **8.7 Performance Measurement Evaluation Participants**

The Performance Measurement Evaluation participants are the same participants as outlined in Section 4.6 for the Functionality Test with the exception that Friendlies will not be involved. The Test Administrator will play an important role in this test in that it will perform the evaluation of the performance measurement data and calculations provided by U S WEST.

### **8.8 Performance Measurement Evaluation Assumptions**

- The performance measurements to be evaluated are those enumerated in Appendices B and C, as modified by the ACC.

### 9.3 Test Administrator

As part of its role of oversight or audit, the Test Administrator will:

Provide final input to the Master Test Plan, including development and validation of:

Functional Test coverage and scenarios.

Parity Test coverage and scenarios.

Capacity Test coverage and scenarios.

Change Management methods and processes.

Scalability of U S WEST interfaces.

- Ensure that U S WEST is following established business rules, and accurately collecting data and computing performance measurement results.
- Monitor test sites and activities, the test planning schedule, test execution schedule, overall project schedule and baseline documents.
- Prepare test planning schedule, test execution schedule, and overall project schedule.
- Track testing action items.
- Assign accountabilities and track resolution of issues/problems identified.
- Collect test status from U S WEST, Pseudo-CLEC and participating CLECs and report status to the ACC.
- Provide day-to-day supervision of the test program, including supervision of Friendlies.
- Analyze test results.
- Submit a report of results and its evaluation to the ACC, explicitly describing results of each of the five tests (e.g. functionality, capacity, etc.) and its evaluation for each, as well as overall results and overall evaluation.
- Provide technical advice to all test participants.
- With the TAG, ensure that testing is conducted in such a way as to achieve blindness to U S WEST.

- Maintain the level of openness in its contacts with U S WEST specified in Exhibit F and submit to the TAG and ACC on a bi-monthly basis a report of its incidental contacts with U S WEST.

#### **9.4 Participating CLECs**

Participating CLECs will have the following responsibilities:

- Provide input to the final Master Test Plan, through the TAG
- Provide input to the test specifications.
- Provide input to the test execution plans.
- Provide for test execution.
- Provide test support and SMEs as necessary to the Test Administrator.

#### **9.5 Pseudo-CLEC**

The Pseudo-CLEC will have the same responsibilities as the participating CLECs above, but will also have responsibility for the following:

- Build an application-to-application OSS interface necessary for the testing (based upon baseline documentation provided by U S WEST).
- Review and evaluate U S WEST documentation of EDI, IMA and EB-TA interfaces.
- Document the relative ease or complexity of creating the interface.
- Electronically submit pre-order inquiries, service order request, LSRs, associated trouble reports, and other transactions through U S WEST OSS interfaces.
- Receive various U S WEST confirmations, jeopardy notices, completion notices and responses back from querying the various OSS functions.
- Build the capability to deliver and receive a volume of transactions, including pre-order, LSRs, and trouble reports to allow for functionality and capacity testing of the U S WEST OSS systems, including manual processes when electronic processes fail, or as designed and specified in the Master Test Plan.
- Provide test results data to the Test Administrator for evaluation.

1 A copy of the foregoing was  
2 mailed this 13<sup>th</sup> day  
of April, 2000 to:

3 Steven H. Kukta  
4 Darren S. Weingard  
5 Spring Communications Company, LP  
6 1850 Gateway Drive, 7<sup>th</sup> floor  
San Mateo, CA 94404-2567

7 Thomas Campbell  
8 Lewis & Roca  
9 40 N. Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

10 Joan S. burke  
11 Osborn Maledon, P.A.  
12 2929 N. Central Ave., 21<sup>st</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 36379  
Phoenix, AZ 85067-6379

13 Thomas F. Dixon  
14 Karen L. Clausen  
15 MCI Telecommunications Corp.  
16 707 17<sup>th</sup> Street, #3900  
Denver, CO 80202

17 Scott S. Wakefield  
18 Residential Utility Consumer Office  
19 2828 North Central Ave., Suite 1200  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

20 Michael M. Grant  
21 Gallagher & Kennedy  
22 2600 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-3020

23 Michael Patten  
24 Brown & Bain  
25 2901 North Central avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

26 ...

27 ...

28

1 Daniel Waggoner  
2 Davis, Wright & Tremain  
3 2600 Century Square  
4 1501 Fourth Avenue  
5 Seattle, WA 98101-1688

6 Richard S. Wolters  
7 Maria Arias-Chapleau  
8 AT&T Law Department  
9 1875 Lawrence Street #1575  
10 Denver, CO 80202

11 David Kaufman  
12 e.spire Communications, Inc.  
13 466 W. San Francisco Street  
14 Santa Fe, NM 87501

15 Alaine Miller  
16 NEXTLINK Communications, Inc.  
17 500 108<sup>th</sup> Ave., NE, Suite 2200  
18 Bellevue, WA 98004

19 Carrington Phillip  
20 Cox Communications, Inc.  
21 1400 Lake Hearn Dr., N.E.  
22 Atlanta, GA 30319

23 Diane Bacon, Legislative Director  
24 Communications Workers of America  
25 5818 N. 7<sup>th</sup> St., Suite 206  
26 Phoenix, AZ 85014-5811

27 Penny Bewich  
28 Electric Lightwave, Inc.  
4400 NE 77<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Vancouver, WA 98662

Phillip A. Doherty  
545 South Prospect Street, Suite 22  
Burlington, VT 05401

W. Hagood Bellinger  
5312 Trowbridge Drive  
Dunwoody, GA 30338

...

1 Joyce Hundley  
2 U.S. Dept. of Justice  
3 Antitrust Division  
4 1401 H. Street, NW, #8000  
5 Washington, DC 20530

6 Andrew O. Isar  
7 Telecommunications Resellers Association  
8 4312 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave., NW  
9 Gig Harbor, WA 98335

10 Raymond S. Heymen  
11 Randall H. Warner  
12 Two Arizona Center  
13 400 North 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1000  
14 Phoenix, AZ 85004-3906

15 Craig Marks  
16 Citizens Utilities Company  
17 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 1660  
18 Phoenix, AZ 85012

19 Douglas Hsiao  
20 Rhythms Links, Inc.  
21 6933 Revere Parkway  
22 Englewood, CO 80112

23 Mark Dioguardi  
24 Tiffany and Bosco, PA  
25 500 Dial tower  
26 1850 North Central Avenue  
27 Phoenix, AZ 85004

28 Thomas L. Mumaw  
Snell & Wilmer  
One Arizona Center  
Phoenix, AZ 85005-0001

Richard Rindler  
Morton J. Posner  
Swider & Berlin  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007

...

...

1 Charles Kallenbach  
2 American Communications Services, Inc.  
3 131 National Business Parkway  
4 Anapolis Junction, Maryland 20701

4 By *Lisa R Pearce*  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28