

DT 01-006

VERIZON NEW HAMPSHIRE

Petition for Approval of Carrier to Carrier  
Performance Guidelines

Order Approving Interventions and Procedural Schedule

O R D E R    N O.    23,723

June 7, 2001

On October 19, 2000, Verizon New Hampshire (Verizon) filed a Petition for Approval of Proposed Carrier to Carrier Guidelines (Petition) by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (Commission). On April 27, 2001, Verizon filed a revised version of the proposed Carrier to Carrier Guidelines (C2C metric). Pursuant to N.H. Admin. Rule Chapter Puc 203.05 and the Commission's Order of Notice issued on May 15, 2001; a prehearing conference was convened on June 4, 2001.

At the prehearing conference, the Commission acknowledged and granted Petitions for Intervention from AT&T Communications of New England, Inc. (AT&T) and from Sprint Communications Company, L.P. (Sprint). The Office of the Consumer Advocate (OCA) entered its appearance under RSA 363:28 on behalf of the interests of residential utility consumers.

In stating its position with regard to the Petition, Verizon averred that the C2C metric, developed by the New York Public Service Commission (NYPSC), consists of approximately 800 metrics measuring 8 domains of interconnection. They consist of

both parity measurements and benchmark measurements and can determine whether competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) have a reasonable opportunity to compete. According to Verizon, the C2C metrics are in effect in Massachusetts, are currently the subject of a stipulated agreement before the Vermont Public Service Board, and have been cited with approval by the Federal Communications Commission. Verizon claims that adoption of the C2C metrics will establish clear, pre-determined, consistent and comprehensive measurement standards. This is the most efficient system and will also benefit from continued examination by the NYPSC as part of an industry and regulatory collaborative effort. Verizon recommended an aggressively paced procedural schedule in order to begin the reporting process as soon as possible.

AT&T indicated that it considered the C2C metrics a good start at creating accountability for Verizon. However, AT&T is not convinced that the metrics developed in New York and adopted in Massachusetts are appropriate for New Hampshire. AT&T noted that appropriate remedies must be in place in order to make the C2C metric effective. AT&T pointed out that additional remedies are available in New York, such as a Performance Assurance Plan (PAP) and the imposition of fines above and beyond the PAP provisions. AT&T suggests that additional metrics are necessary for a number of carrier interactions, including but not

limited to billing, hot cuts, loss of line reports, and local number portability.

The OCA urged the Commission to consider this docket in the broader context of a §271 application, necessitating an investigation of current competitive conditions. As a result, the OCA argued against expediting the procedural schedule, citing the Commission's need and obligation to be fully informed.

The Commission Staff (Staff) stated that it views the C2C metrics docket as having three components: an examination of what processes will be measured, an examination of the standards proposed for measuring the processes, and a determination of the mechanism the Commission will use to ensure Verizon's compliance with the standards. In Staff's view, determination of the compliance mechanism or PAP is of paramount importance.

Staff expects to recommend that the Commission adopt the proposed C2C metrics, subject to the subsequent evolutions in New York, with a condition. Staff would condition adoption on the addition of a process whereby the Commission can address New Hampshire specific issues that are not addressed by the New York process but clearly affects New Hampshire customers. The condition would be narrowly drawn to exclude re-argument of New York decisions.

At a technical session after the prehearing conference, the parties and Staff discussed their positions and agreed upon a

procedural schedule. The procedural schedule, as detailed below, represents an expectation that agreement will be reached by a certain date with regard to the first two components of the docket, namely, the interconnection processes to be measured and the standards by which they will be measured. If no agreement can be reached, the procedural schedule will require revision. The parties and Staff also agreed that all CLECs should be contacted and encouraged to participate in the initial technical session, whether or not they wish to participate in the docket as full parties. Because the parties agree that the resolution of this docket does not turn on factual questions, hearings will be legislative style rather than adjudicative.

#### Proposed Procedural Schedule

Technical Session	June 14 at 1:30 p.m.
Technical Session	June 27 at 1:30 p.m.
Reach Stipulation On components 1 and 2	July 17
File Stipulation for approval with Commission	
Verizon files PAP - component 3	July 31
Technical Session	August 3 at 10 a.m.
Data Requests	August 9
Data Responses	August 23
Comments to Commission	September 6
Reply Comments	September 14
Settlement Discussions	September 20 at 10 a.m.

Hearings - Legislative Type

October 1 & 2 at 10 a.m.

We consider the proposed schedule to be reasonable and will therefore approve it.

**Based upon the foregoing, it is hereby**

**ORDERED**, that the procedural schedule proposed by the parties and Staff and detailed above is APPROVED; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED**, that the Petitions for Intervention filed by AT&T and Sprint are GRANTED; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED**, that Staff shall inform all registered CLECs of the initial technical session, encouraging their participation.

By order of the Public Utilities Commission of New  
Hampshire this seventh day of June, 2001.

---

Douglas L. Patch  
Chairman

---

Susan S. Geiger  
Commissioner

---

Nancy Brockway  
Commissioner

Attested by:

Thomas B. Getz  
Executive Director and Secretary