

DT 02-105

Local Exchange Carriers

Quality of Service Reporting

Order Nisi Regarding Quality of Service Reporting

O R D E R N O. 24,156

April 11, 2003

I. BACKGROUND

This docket was opened pursuant to the resolution of Docket No. DT 02-049, initiated on March 28, 2002, by a petition to the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission from WorldCom, Inc. requesting relief from its obligation to publicly disclose quality of service information required by NH Admin. Code Rule Puc 1308.04. Puc 1308.04 requires that:

"(competitive local exchange carriers)CLECs and (incumbent local exchange carriers) ILECs shall file with the commission, for public availability, . . . (1) The average number of days between date of request for service and installation of service; (2) The percentage of installation appointments which the CLEC or ILEC failed to keep; (3) The average answer time to connect caller to repair service operator; (4) The percentage of calls to a repair number that are abandoned; (5) The percentage of service outages lasting longer than 24 hours; (6) The average length of repair time...; and (7) The percentage of repair appointments which the reporting CLEC or ILEC failed to keep."

WorldCom sought to file its quality of service information as a proprietary attachment to its annual report. WorldCom claimed that public disclosure of the information would unfairly interfere with its ability to compete with Verizon-New

Hampshire (Verizon) and would negatively affect competitive market entry.

In response to WorldCom's petition to waive the Puc 1308.04 requirements, the Commission opened Docket No. DT 02-049, in which the Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) and AT&T Broadband (now known as and hereinafter referred to as Comcast) intervened. At the May 29, 2002 hearing in DT 02-049, the Commission Staff (Staff) proposed an alternative resolution to the docket. Staff proposed that the Commission open a separate docket to develop a Carrier Report Card that could be published for the benefit of consumers. The Carrier Report Card would be based upon the Puc 1308.04 information. A Quality of Service Working Group (Work Group) comprised of carriers, OCA and Staff would evaluate the type of information required by Puc 1308.04, develop criteria for judging the performance represented by the information, and establish a rating system by which to convey the judgment. Carriers would proceed to file the Puc 1308.04 information, presumably in protected format, apply the rating system and report the information in a different format, as a Carrier Report Card that contains no confidential information.

Pursuant to Order No. 23,997, (June 21, 2002) the Commission temporarily granted WorldCom's request, pending the outcome of a new docket, Docket No. DT 02-105. This new docket was opened to: (1) examine the issue of quality of service

reporting by telephone utilities; (2) establish a working group in accordance with Staff's recommendations; and (3) create an alternate form of reporting and dissemination of information to consumers. The Commission's order encouraged any interested telephone utility registered in New Hampshire to participate in the Work Group and it set a date of September 30, 2002, for submission of a Final Report on the Work Group's efforts.

The following carriers requested and were granted intervenor status: WorldCom, Inc., Verizon New Hampshire, Union Telephone Company, Granite State Telephone, Inc., Dunbarton Telephone Company, Inc., Northland Telephone Company of Maine, Inc., Bretton Woods Telephone Company, Inc., Dixville Telephone Company, Inc., BayRing Communications, Inc., Global Naps, Inc., Conversent Communications of New Hampshire, LLC, AT&T Broadband Phone of New Hampshire, Kearsarge Telephone Company, Merrimack County Telephone Company, Wilton Telephone Company, Inc., and Hollis Telephone Company, Inc.

On July 11, 2002, the Work Group convened its first technical session. The Work Group was comprised of representatives from WorldCom, AT&T, BayRing, Dunbarton, Granite State Telephone, TDS, Union, Verizon, OCA, and Staff. After numerous additional technical sessions and several extensions of time to permit further discussion and investigation, Staff submitted a Final Report on the Work Group's efforts to the

Commission on December 2, 2002. As the Final Report contained compromises to which some parties disagreed, the Commission accepted Comments regarding the Final Report on December 16, 2002. Verizon, Union, and Comcast filed Comments.

II. THE WORK GROUP FINAL REPORT

The proposed Carrier Report Card purports to deal with three categories of Service Quality: Responsiveness, Accessibility and Reliability. The Work Group developed a "Quality of Service Scoring Matrix," to score each carrier on several measured items in each of the three categories. The Work Group, however, could not reach a consensus on what score should be assigned to various levels of performance (point ranges) for Responsiveness and Reliability. Consequently, the Work Group relied on Staff to recommend, in the Final Report, scoring for these two categories. The Quality of Service Scoring Matrix, proposed by Staff, is appended hereto as Exhibit 1.

1. Responsiveness contains three measurements:
 - a.) average number of days to install;
 - b.) percent installation appointments missed;
 - c.) percent repair appointments missed.
2. Accessibility contains two measurements:
 - a.) average answer time for repair;
 - b.) percent abandoned calls to repair.

3. Reliability contains two measurements:

- a.) percent of service outages that last longer than 24 hours;
- b.) average repair time.

The Work Group identified and listed exceptions that affect all or some carriers for each measurement. The exceptions are situations that would cause a rating to change unfairly and will therefore be excluded from reported carrier performance. The exceptions include, for example, exclusion of delays caused by customer request, terrorism, natural disasters, strikes, third party failure and unsafe conditions. The full list of exceptions is attached to this order as Exhibit 2.

Lastly, the Work Group developed a Quality of Service Template (QST) to be utilized as the reporting method on the Commission's website. The QST, attached to this order as Exhibit 3, is the Carrier Report Card that consumers will be able to access. The Work Group's recommendation is that each carrier produce a separate QST, based on the quality of service information required by Puc 1308.04 as well as carrier specific information. The QST will contain the name, address, and contact information for the carrier; a general description of the carrier (type of services offered and service area); and the quality of service ratings achieved by the carrier. The QST will also contain narrative explanations of special circumstances and

exceptions. Once received, Staff will post all QSTs on the Commission's website.

III. COMMENTS

Verizon questions the usefulness of any formal Carrier Report Card, arguing that the marketplace provides a sufficient report on service quality and that operational differences among competitors make comparisons of limited value to customers. For instance, Verizon points out, franchise territories differ widely in size and that service offerings differ as well. For those reasons, the point ranges for assessing service quality justifiably vary widely. Verizon disagreed with Staff's recommended point ranges and suggested alternate point ranges, which in some instances were more lenient than Staff recommended, and in other instances were more rigorous than Staff recommended.

Union indicated its appreciation of the Commission's need to provide consumers with information to assist in choosing a carrier. Furthermore, Union agrees with the recommendations in the Final Report, stating that when results exceed the point ranges, Union will manually add a footnote to explain the cause. However, Union did express concern that its own customers may experience confusion when viewing Carrier Report Cards because no other carrier has applied for authority to serve within the Union franchise territory.

Comcast agrees with Verizon that differences in carrier type, service and reporting systems mean that a single Carrier Report Card is unworkable. Comcast advises that although it agrees with the general categories developed by the Work Group, Comcast itself is unable to exclude any of the exceptions identified and therefore its report will be skewed. Comcast argues that, as a result, ILECs will obtain an unfair boost to their ratings. The unfair boost, it contends, constitutes discriminatory treatment that the Commission should avoid. Comcast further urges that its ratings point ranges should be adjusted to reflect its unique position as a new, residential-only provider of voice, video, and data services. In sum, Comcast supports web-links to individual reports set up pursuant to the Final Report but with different point ranges for different carriers and excluding data from prior to 2003.

IV. COMMISSION ANALYSIS

We appreciate the complexity of transforming the seven apparently straightforward quality of service elements of Puc 1308.04 into measurable units for a report card that encompasses diverse carriers. We find the proposed Carrier Report Card, as described in the Final Report, to be fair and reasonable. The fact that consumers will access carriers one-by-one emphasizes diversity and allows for consideration of all the explanatory information provided. We find that New Hampshire consumers and

the competitive marketplace will benefit from the availability of this information.

The standards implicit in the scoring we approve today reflect our determination that customers of telecommunications carriers are entitled to safe and adequate service. In fashioning these standards, we draw on the work done by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), and the extensive experience of carriers and customers in New Hampshire. We are not persuaded that it would be unfair to carriers to provide customers with the means to compare carriers who provide service in different ways or in different territories. The Report Card is intended to be a mechanism to assist consumers in making informed decisions. We do not believe it would be meaningful to customers to score, for example, a 10-day installation interval the same as a 2-day installation interval, just because a carrier's wholesaler has caused the delay. It is important that customers be provided accurate information about what they can expect for service from the different carriers irrespective of the carriers' method of providing service. It is therefore left to the carriers to either persuade customers that any differences are justified or to provide improved service and thus bring the scores closer to those achieved by other carriers.

As for the dispute over point ranges, we will adopt the point ranges recommended by Staff. We find reasonable the assumption that generally expected performance should receive an average score.

Regarding the score proposed by Staff for Average Days to Installation, Comcast argued it was disadvantaged because most Comcast customers choose to port their existing telephone number. Number porting, according to Comcast, is subject to an industry standard 3-day interval. Therefore, the best score Comcast can achieve is a "2" because most Comcast installations will take more than 3 days. Verizon also argues the best score should be given for installations within 5 days because the majority of its installations can be completed in that time. We find that an average score of "2" for installations completed between 4 and 10 days is appropriate, and that carriers who are able to install service faster than what is usually achieved should be rewarded with a higher score.

Regarding Percentage of Installation and Repair Appointments Missed, the NARUC standard we adopted for Verizon in Order No. 22,484 in Docket No. DR 96-220, (82 NHPUC 30) was 10%. Therefore, carriers who miss installation appointments more than 10% of the time are providing substandard performance. Staff's recommendation in this instance, to assign a performance score of

"1" for missed installation and repair appointments greater than 10%, is appropriate.

Regarding Percent Service Outages Greater than 24 Hours, Comcast agreed with the Staff recommendation. Verizon, however, recommended the best score be assigned for performance significantly below the NARUC standard adopted in Order No. 22,484 because it believes it is delivering good service to customers even though it is not meeting the NARUC standard. Verizon ultimately recommended a middle ground between its suggested ranges and the NARUC standard. The Staff recommended point range assigns a "3" to Percent Service Outages Greater than 24 Hours that meets the NARUC standard, a "2" for marginally substandard performance and a "1" for clearly substandard performance. Based on our experience in monitoring Verizon in this category, we recognize the NARUC standard is difficult to achieve and should be rewarded with a maximum score when accomplished. We find Staff's recommendation a more appropriate middle ground and will adopt it. We believe service outages should be corrected, most of the time, within 24 hours.

Regarding Average Repair Time, there is no established NARUC standard. This measurement includes all troubles (not just out-of-service troubles) but is influenced by how long it takes a carrier to clear out-of-service troubles. Here, Comcast recommended point ranges more lenient than Staff and Verizon

recommended point ranges similar to Staff. Again, based on our determination that most troubles should be corrected within 24 hours, we find Staff's average score of "2" for average repair time between 16 and 30 hours reasonable.

Accordingly, we adopt the method and point ranges outlined in the Final Report and will direct Staff to implement the posting of the Carrier Report Card on our website within three months from the effective date of this order. To facilitate that posting, we will direct the carriers to file completed QSTs at the Commission within 30 days of the effective date of this order. Completed QSTs should be based on the carriers' annual quality of service filings made on March 31, 2003. In the future, annual quality of service filings shall include completed QSTs. For carriers who do not file a QST, we direct Staff to calculate the quality of service rating based on the carriers' information reported pursuant to Puc 1308.04 and complete a QST including the name, address and contact information, without additional carrier specific information. QSTs completed by Staff are to be posted with the QSTs filed by the other carriers.

We will convert to permanent status the temporary waiver of Puc 1308.04 granted to WorldCom in Order No. 23,997, conditioned on WorldCom's compliance with the Carrier Report Card filings adopted herein.

Based upon the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED NISI, that subject to the effective date below, the Carrier Report Card and methodology outlined in the Final Report on the Work Group efforts is hereby adopted; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that Staff shall implement the posting of the Carrier Report Card within three months from the effective date of this order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that WorldCom's Petition for a Waiver of PUC 1308.04, granted temporarily by Order No. 23,997 is hereby fully granted, conditioned upon WorldCom's compliance with the Carrier Report Card requirements adopted in this order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that the Commission shall cause a copy of this Order Nisi to be published once in a statewide newspaper of general circulation, such publication to be no later than April 21, 2003 and to be documented by affidavit filed with this office on or before May 5, 2003; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that all persons interested in responding to this order Nisi shall be notified that they may submit their comments or file a written request for a hearing on this matter before the Commission no later than April 28, 2003; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that any party interested in responding to such comments or request for hearing shall do so no

later than May 5, 2003; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that this Order Nisi shall be effective May 12, 2003, unless the Commission provides otherwise in a supplemental order issued prior to the effective date.

By order of the Public Utilities Commission of New Hampshire this eleventh day of April, 2003.

Thomas B. Getz
Chairman

Susan S. Geiger
Commissioner

Nancy Brockway
Commissioner

Attested by:

Debra A. Howland
Executive Director & Secretary

Exhibit 1
Quality of Service Scoring Matrix

RESPONSIVENESS

Average Number of Days to Install	
<u>Performance</u>	<u>Score</u>
0-3 days	3
4-10 days	2
>10 days	1
% Installation Appointments Missed	
<u>Performance</u>	<u>Score</u>
0-5%	3
6-10%	2
>10%	1
% Repair Appointments Missed	
<u>Performance</u>	<u>Score</u>
0-5%	3
6-10%	2
>10%	1

ACCESSIBILITY

Average Answer Time for Repair Service	
<u>Performance</u>	<u>Score</u>
0-25 seconds	3
26-50 seconds	2
>50 seconds	1
% Abandoned Calls to Repair	
<u>Performance</u>	<u>Score</u>
0-5%	3
6-10%	2
>10%	1

RELIABILITY

% Out of Service > 24 Hours	
<u>Performance</u>	<u>Score</u>
0-10%	3
11-20%	2
>20%	1
Average Repair Time	
<u>Performance</u>	<u>Score</u>
0-15 hours	3
16-30 hours	2
>30 hours	1

Exhibit 2

PUC 1308.04 Reports on Quality of Service	Category/Criteria	Res/Bus	Exceptions
<p>(1) The average number of days between date of request for service and installation of service;</p> <p>(See also 1308.04(b)) per DTC</p>	<p>Consensus not reached, some categorized as Customer Service and others as Network Reliability</p> <p>Verizon criteria: Verizon reports the % installation orders (including features) appointed within 3 days for Residence and Small Business. Based on calendar days.</p> <p>Bayring & other ILEC's criteria: The average number of days between date of request for service and installation of service is based on calendar days from the date the customer requests service until it is completed. The count includes business and residence requests. The count is not limited to dial tone installations.</p> <p>Dunbarton: Limited to dial tone installations</p> <p>ATTB criteria: Category: Customer Service. Based on calendar days, excluding Sunday (no installs performed). Current metric <u>includes</u> customer initiated delays.</p>	<p>Residence&Business</p> <p>ATTB: Residence only</p>	<p>Customer request later date No access Third party failure Natural Disaster/Acts of God Strikes/Work Stoppage Terrorism Catastrophic Events Extreme Weather Conditions Unsafe Conditions Waiver Granted by NHPUC</p> <p>ATTB: Currently do not exclude above. Working on excluding Customer Request, Cust. Not Home and No Access.</p>
<p>(2) The percentage of installation appointments which the CLEC or ILEC failed to keep;</p>	<p>Consensus not reached, some categorized as Customer Service and others as Network Reliability and Customer Service.</p>	<p>Residence&Business</p>	<p>Customer request later date No access Third party failure Natural Disaster/Acts</p>

	<p>Verizon criteria: Limited to company misses. Dunbarton criteria: Limited to company misses. Dial tone only. Granite State criteria: Limited to company misses.</p> <p>Bayring & other ILEC's Criteria: Customer and company missed appointments. The percentage is not limited to dial tone installations.</p> <p>ATTB: Category: Customer Service. Currently include both Customer and Company missed appointments.</p>	<p>ATTB: Residence only</p>	<p>of God Strikes/Work Stoppage Terrorism Catastrophic Events Extreme Weather Conditions Unsafe Conditions Waiver Granted by NHPUC</p> <p>ATTB: Currently do not exclude above. Working on excluding Customer Request, Cust. Not Home and No Access.</p>
<p>(3) The average answer time to connect caller to repair service operator;</p>	<p>Customer Service</p> <p>Reported by Verizon, MCT, TDS, ATTB, (World Com, ?) Bayring is filing a waiver for this as we have no method for measurement.</p> <p>Waivers granted to Dunbarton, GST, Bretton Woods, Union</p> <p>Verizon criteria: This data is compiled for the entire New England region combining residence and business. In New England, calls to repair are given the option up-front to use the automated system or hold for a repair representative. Once the caller decides to go to a live representative (by NOT pressing "1"), the Answer Time "clock" starts, and stops when the call is connected to a live agent. If the caller opts to use our automated system, that answer time is not measured in the calculation of average speed of answer.</p> <p>ATTB: Data is compiled for Northeast Region and includes both Massachusetts and New Hampshire.</p>	<p>Residence&Business</p> <p>ATTB: Residence only</p>	<p>Natural Disaster Strikes/Work Stoppage Terrorism Catastrophic Events Extreme Weather Conditions Unsafe Conditions Waiver Granted by NHPUC</p> <p>ATTB: Abandoned calls tracked separately. Other factors cannot be automatically backed out or tracked separately.</p>

	<p>lasting longer than 24 hours is based on calendar days between the time the customer reports an outage until it is repaired. The time is based on a 24-hour period to repair service, and includes business and residence requests.</p> <p>ATTB: Category: Network Reliability. Calendar days, 24 hour clock.</p>	<p>ATTB: Residence only</p>	<p>Inside Wire</p> <p>ATTB: Currently track customer caused, third party caused. May be able to track broader categories of weather, natural disaster/fire and commercial power failure in the future. TBD.</p>
<p>(6) The average length of repair time, which means the time elapsing from the time trouble is reported until the time trouble is cleared; and</p>	<p>Consensus not reached, some categorized as Customer Service and others as Network Reliability and Customer Service</p> <p>Based on calendar days; 24 hour clock;</p> <p>Bayring & other ILEC's criteria: The average length of repair time which means the time elapsing from the time trouble is reported until the time trouble is cleared, the time is based on a period of 24 hours to repair. The number of days is based on the calendar, and includes business and residence requests.</p> <p>ATTB: Category: Network Reliability. Calendar days, 24 hour clock.</p>	<p>Residence&Business</p> <p>ATTB: Residence only</p>	<p>Customer request later date No access Third party failure Natural Disaster/Acts of God Strikes/Work Stoppage Terrorism Catastrophic Events Extreme Weather Conditions Unsafe Conditions Waiver Granted by NHPUC Trouble found to be on customer side of NID</p> <p>ATTB: Currently track customer caused, third party caused. May be able to track broader categories of weather, natural disaster/fire and commercial power</p>

			failure in the future. TBD.
(7) The percentage of repair appointments which the reporting CLEC or ILEC failed to keep.	<p>Consensus not reached, some categorized as Customer Service and others as Network Reliability and Customer Service</p> <p>Verizon criteria: Limited to company misses. MCT criteria: Limited to company misses. TDS criteria: Limited to company misses. Dunbarton criteria: Limited to company misses. Granite State criteria: Limited to company misses.</p> <p>Bayring & other ILEC's criteria: The percentage of repair appointments which the reporting ILEC failed to keep includes business and residence requests. The percentage includes both customer-missed appointments and company missed appointments.</p> <p>ATTB: Category: Customer Service. Not currently tracked. Will attempt to implement as set forth in #2 above. (Currently include both Customer and Company missed appointments.)</p>	<p>Residence&Business</p> <p>ATTB: Residence only</p>	<p>Customer request later date No access Third party failure Natural Disaster/Acts of God Strikes/Work Stoppage Terrorism Catastrophic Events Extreme Weather Conditions Unsafe Conditions Waiver Granted by NHPUC Trouble found to be on customer side of NID</p> <p>ATTB: See #2 above. (Currently do not exclude above. Working on excluding Customer Request, Cust. Not Home and No Access</p>
(b) CLECs and ILECs may file with the commission, in addition to the information listed in (a) above, information as to the average number of days between the customer-requested date for installation of service and the actual date of installation.			

Exhibit 3**Quality of Service Template**

Name, Address, Telephone Number, Web Site Link and Other Contact Information

General Description of Business

Description company, type of carrier (ILEC, CLEC, facilities-based, resale, etc.), service areas, types of service offered, services emphasized (residential/business; data/voice; switched/non-switched; etc.), approximate size (e.g. serves more than X access lines)

Quality of Service Scores

Scores are compiled from information submitted by the carrier to the Public Utilities Commission, with 3 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest. Narrative explanations have been furnished by the carrier.

Responsiveness: Score ___ out of 3.

Narrative explanation of special circumstances and exceptions reflected in data reported by the carrier:

This score represents information regarding the average number of days to complete an installation request, the percentage of installation appointments missed and the percentage of repair appointments missed.

Accessibility: Score ___ out of 3.

Narrative explanation of special circumstances and exceptions reflected in data reported by the carrier:

This score represents the average answer time of a call to repair (in seconds) and the percentage of repair calls that are abandoned.

Reliability: Score ___ out of 3.

Narrative explanation of special circumstances and exceptions reflected in data reported by the carrier:

This score represents the percentage of service outages lasting longer than 24 hours and the average completion time for all repair requests (in hours).