

NON PROPRIETY

ATTACHMENT 1

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------|--|
| Policy Issues | | | | |
| 1. | Should the cross-connect rate elements priced in Case No. TO-97-40 be used in lieu of SWBT's proposed modifications in Case No. TO-2001-438? | Therefore, the Commission holds that, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, it will address all of those UNEs listed by Staff in its list filed on February 23, 2001. The Commission will not address any UNEs not listed by Staff in its list filed on February 23, 2001. | N/As | |
| 2. | Should the STP Port rate elements (STP Port, STP Port Termination, Signaling Point Code, and Global Title Translation) priced in Case No. TO-97-40 be used in lieu of SWBT's proposed modifications in Case No. TO-2001-438? | All parties agree that the Commission established permanent rates for these UNEs in TO-97-40 and that those rates should continue to be used. Therefore, the Commission finds that the appropriate rates for these elements are the permanent prices that the Commission established in its Final Arbitration Order in TO-97-40. | Yes | SWBT only referenced the TO-97-40 rates on its rate sheet. The Joint Sponsors have entered the precise TO-97-40 rates on their rate sheet. |
| 3. | Should the SS7 Transport rate element priced in Case No. TO-97-40 be used in lieu of SWBT's proposed modification in Case No. TO-2001-438? | All parties agree that the Commission established permanent rates for these UNEs in TO-97-40 and that those rates should continue to be used. Therefore, the Commission finds that the appropriate rates for these elements are the permanent prices that the Commission established in its Final Arbitration Order in TO-97-40. | Yes | SWBT only referenced the TO-97-40 rates on its rate sheet. The Joint Sponsors have entered the precise TO-97-40 rates on their rate sheet. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|------------|--|---|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 4. | Should the LIDB Validation Query rate element priced in Case No. TO-97-40 be used in lieu of SWBT's proposed modification in Case No. TO-2001-438? | <p>The Joint Sponsors contend that the Commission set a permanent rate for this UNE in TO-97-40. Therefore, they argue that the Commission should not address that UNE in this case. SWBT agrees that a permanent rate was set for this element in TO-97-40, but it contends that the Commission needs to revisit this rate because the original rate does not include costs for the use of SWBT's Service Management System (SMS) and its fraud detection system known as SLEUTH. SWBT points out that Staff included this element among its list of elements to be reviewed in this case. The Joint Sponsors respond that SWBT <i>should not be permitted to correct mistakes in selected previously established rates unless the Commission wants to conduct a general review of all such rates.</i></p> <p>In fact, the Commission has now established Case No. TO-2002-397 to conduct a general review of all the TO-97-40 rates. As a result, the Joint Sponsors will not be harmed if the Commission chooses to review this rate in this case.</p> <p>As indicated in issue 1, the Commission will review all rates included by Staff in its UNEs-at-issue list. This UNE is in Staff's list and, therefore, the Commission finds that it should be reviewed in this case.</p> | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|---|--------------|--|
| 5. | Should the CNAM Service Query rate element priced in Case No. TO-97-40 be used in lieu of SWBT's proposed modification in Case No. TO-2001-438? | This rate element was included in Staff's UNES-at-issue list. As indicated in issue 1, the Commission will review all rates included by Staff in its UNES-at-issue list. This UNE is in Staff's list and, therefore, the Commission finds that it should be reviewed in this case. | Yes | |
| 6. | Should the LIDB Service Order Charge rate element priced in Case No. TO-97-40 be used in lieu of SWBT's proposed modification in Case No. TO-2001-438? | All parties agree that the Commission established permanent rates for these UNES in TO-97-40, and that those rates should continue to be used. Therefore, the Commission finds that the appropriate rates for these elements are the permanent prices that the Commission established in its Final Arbitration Order in TO-97-40. | Yes | SWBT only referenced the TO-97-40 rates on its rate sheet. The Joint Sponsors have entered the precise TO-97-40 rates on their rate sheet. |
| 7. | Did SWBT fail to provide a Standard Features Centrex Like Offering cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | The Commission finds that the testimony of SWBT's witness is credible. SWBT has produced a cost study sufficient to support the price it has proposed for its Standard Features Centrex Like Offering. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|--------------------------|
| 8. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | The Commission finds that the testimony of SWBT's witness is credible. SWBT has produced a cost study sufficient to support the price it has proposed for its Standard Features Centrex Like Offering. Because it has found that SWBT has produced an appropriate cost study, the Commission need not address issue 8. | N/A | |
| 9. | Did SWBT fail to provide a Dark Fiber Records Research cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | SWBT did not provide a cost study for Dark Fiber Records Research because Dark Fiber Records Research was not included as an issue in Staff's UNEs-at-issue list, which established the rate elements that would be examined in this case. As the Commission indicated in issue 1, it would be fundamentally unfair to alter the established list of elements at issue. Therefore, the Commission finds that SWBT has not failed to provide a cost study for Dark Fiber Records Research because no such cost study is required. | N/A | |
| 10. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | Because it has found that SWBT was not required to produce a cost study for Dark Fiber Records Research, the Commission need not address issue 10. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--------------------------|
| 11. | Did SWBT fail to provide a Branding cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | <p>SWBT did not provide a cost study for Branding because Branding was not included as an issue in Staff's UNES-at-issue list that established the rate elements that would be examined in this case. As the Commission indicated in issue 1, it would be fundamentally unfair to alter the established list of elements at issue. Therefore, the Commission finds that SWBT has not failed to provide a cost study for Branding because no such cost study is required.</p> <p>This finding resolves the issue presented, and the Commission need not address the question of whether the Commission approved a permanent rate for this element by approving the M2A.</p> | N/A | |
| 12. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | Because it has found that SWBT was not required to produce a cost study for Branding, the Commission need not address issue 12. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| 13. | Did SWBT fail to provide a Rating cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | <p>SWBT did not provide a cost study for Rating because Rating was not included as an issue in Staff's UNEs-at-issue list that established the rate elements that would be examined in this case. As the Commission indicated in issue 1, it would be fundamentally unfair to alter the established list of elements. Therefore, the Commission finds that SWBT has not failed to provide a cost study for Rating because no such cost study is required.</p> <p>This finding resolves the issue presented, and the Commission need not address the question of whether the Commission approved a permanent rate for this element by approving the M2A.</p> | N/A | |
| 14. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | Because it has found that SWBT was not required to produce a cost study for Rating, the Commission need not address issue 14. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|------------|---|--|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 15. | Did SWBT fail to provide a White Pages cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | <p>This element was not included in Staff's list of elements that needed to be addressed in this case. As the Commission indicated in issue 1, it would be fundamentally unfair to alter the established list of elements at issue. Therefore, the Commission finds that SWBT has not failed to provide a cost study for White Pages because no such cost study is required.</p> <p>This finding resolves the issue presented, and the Commission need not address the question of whether the Commission approved a permanent rate for this element by approving the M2A.</p> | N/A | |
| 16. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | Because it has found that SWBT was not required to produce a cost study for White Pages, the Commission need not address issue 16. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| 17. | Did SWBT fail to provide a Directory Assistance Listing cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | <p>SWBT did not provide a cost study for Directory Assistance Listings because Directory Assistance Listings was not included as an issue in Staff's UNEs-at-issue list that established the rate elements that would be examined in this case. As the Commission indicated in issue 1, it would be fundamentally unfair to alter the established list of elements at issue. Therefore, the Commission finds that SWBT has not failed to provide a cost study for Directory Assistance Listings because no such cost study is required.</p> <p>This finding resolves the issue presented, and the Commission need not address the question of whether the Commission approved a permanent rate for this element by approving the M2A.</p> | N/A | |
| 18. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | Because it has found that SWBT was not required to produce a cost study for Directory Assistance Listings, the Commission need not address issue 18. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--------------------------|
| 19. | Did SWBT fail to provide an LSP Emergency Contact for Non-Published Service cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | <p>SWBT did not provide a cost study for LSP Emergency Contact for Non-Published Service because LSP Emergency Contact for Non-Published Service was not included as an issue in Staff's UNEs-at-issue list that established the rate elements that would be examined in this case. As the Commission indicated in issue 1, it would be fundamentally unfair to alter the established list of elements at issue. Therefore, the Commission finds that SWBT has not failed to provide a cost study for LSP Emergency Contact for Non-Published Service because no such cost study is required.</p> <p><i>This finding resolves the issue presented, and the Commission need not address the question of whether the Commission approved a permanent rate for this element by approving the M2A.</i></p> | N/A | |
| 20. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | Because it has found that SWBT was not required to produce a cost study for LSP Emergency Contact for Non-Published Service, the Commission need not address issue 20. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--|
| 21. | Did SWBT fail to provide an LSP Complex Service Conversion – Resale cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | SWBT concedes that it failed to produce the necessary cost study and agrees that the price proposed by the Joint Sponsors in their rebuttal testimony is appropriate. Therefore, the Commission finds that the appropriate permanent rate for Complex Resale Conversion Orders is \$54.29. | No | This rate element was not listed in final rates provided by SWBT. This rate element was added to the revised rate sheet filed by the Joint Sponsors. |
| 22. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | SWBT concedes that it failed to produce the necessary cost study and agrees that the price proposed by the Joint Sponsors in their rebuttal testimony is appropriate. Therefore, the Commission finds that the appropriate permanent rate for Complex Resale Conversion Orders is \$54.29. | No | This rate element was not listed in final rates provided by SWBT. This rate element was added to the revised rate sheet filed by the Joint Sponsors |
| 23. | Did SWBT fail to provide an LSP Simple Service Conversion – Resale cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | SWBT concedes that it failed to produce the necessary cost study and agrees that the price proposed by the Joint Sponsors in their rebuttal testimony is appropriate. Therefore, the Commission finds that the appropriate permanent rate for Simple Resale Conversion Orders is \$5.00. | No | This rate element was not listed in final rates provided by SWBT. This rate element was added to the revised rate sheet filed by the Joint Sponsors |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--|
| 24. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | SWBT concedes that it failed to produce the necessary cost study and agrees that the price proposed by the Joint Sponsors in their rebuttal testimony is appropriate. Therefore, the Commission finds that the appropriate permanent rate for Simple Resale Conversion Orders is \$5.00. | No | This rate element was not listed in final rates provided by SWBT. This rate element was added to the revised rate sheet filed by the Joint Sponsors. |
| 25. | Did SWBT fail to provide an Access to Directory Assistance Database cost study to establish permanent prices for the elements that had earlier been studied in Case No. TO-98-115? | Therefore, the Commission finds that SWBT has not failed to provide a cost study for Access to Directory Assistance Database because no such cost study is required. | N/A | |
| 26. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study? | Because it has found that SWBT was not required to produce a cost study for Access to Directory Assistance Database, the Commission need not address issue 26. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|---|
| 27. | Should SWBT be permitted to use a 2-Wire Analog Trunk Port (DID) cost study as the basis for DID Number Block Assignment (10-Numbers or 100-Numbers) on Analog DID Trunk Ports? | Based on the testimony of [the] witnesses, the Commission concludes that SWBT has failed to produce an appropriate cost study to support the rates it proposed for DID Number Block Assignments. | Yes | T2A rates are referenced in the compliance filing rate sheet. |
| 28. | If the answer above is negative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study for DID number assignment? | In the absence of any other evidence, the Joint Sponsor's recommendation that the Commission adopt the rate approved in Texas is reasonable. Therefore, the Commission finds that the permanent rate for DID Number Block Assignment (10-Numbers or 100-Numbers) on Analog DID Trunk Ports shall be the rate established in the T2A. | Partial | SWBT had only referenced the T2A rates in its rate sheet but did not enter the specific rates. The SWBT rate sheet also still referenced the trunk ports as headers for the DID number block rate elements. The rates and element titles have been changed to match the T2A in the Joint Sponsor's revised rate sheet |
| 29. | Should the 2-Wire Analog Trunk Port (DID) rate element priced in Case No. TO-97-40 be used in lieu of SWBT's proposed modification in Case No. TO-2001-438? | The parties agree that a final rate was established for this rate element in TO-97-40. They also agree that SWBT is not proposing to modify that rate. Therefore, this issue need not be addressed. | Partial | SWBT rate sheet is still unclear in this area. There are no rate elements listed for Trunk Ports but there are headers for trunk ports. The SWBT rate sheet has been modified to remove references to trunk ports associated with DID number blocks. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|--|
| 30. | Should SWBT be permitted to use a Digital DS1 Trunk Port (DID) cost study as the basis for DID Number Block Assignment (10-Numbers or 100-Numbers) on Digital DS1 DID Trunk Ports? | This is the same issue as that addressed by the Commission in issues 27 and 28 except that this issue applies to number assignments on digital trunk ports rather than analog trunk ports. For the reasons offered in its consideration of those issues, the Commission will order that the permanent rate for DID Number Block Assignment (10-Numbers or 100-Numbers) on Digital DS1 DID Trunk Ports shall be the rate established in the T2A. | Yes | T2A rates are referenced in the compliance filing rate sheet. |
| 31. | If the answer above is negative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost study for DID number assignment? | This is the same issue as that addressed by the Commission in issues 27 and 28 except that this issue applies to number assignments on digital trunk ports rather than analog trunk ports. For the reasons offered in its consideration of those issues, the Commission will order that the permanent rate for DID Number Block Assignment (10-Numbers or 100-Numbers) on Digital DS1 DID Trunk Ports shall be the rate established in the T2A. | Partial | SWBT had only referenced the T2A rates in its rate sheet but did not enter the specific rates. The SWBT rate sheet also still referenced the trunk ports as headers for the DID number block rate elements. The rates and element titles have been changed to match the T2A in the Joint Sponsor's revised rate sheet. |
| 32. | Should the Digital DS1 Trunk Port (DID) rate element priced in Case No. TO-97-40 be used in lieu of SWBT's proposed modification in Case No. TO-2001-438? | The parties agree that a final rate was established for this rate element in TO-97-40. They also agree that SWBT is not proposing to modify that rate. Therefore, this issue need not be addressed. | Partial | SWBT rate sheet is still unclear in this area. There are no rate elements listed for Trunk Ports but there are headers for trunk ports. The SWBT rate sheet has been modified to remove references to trunk ports associated with DID number blocks. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--------------------------|
| 33. | Should SWBT be required to offer 1-Number DID Number Block assignments? | SWBT indicates in its brief that it is willing to provide 1-number DID number blocks but that no CLEC in Missouri has ever requested such a service. If a CLEC does ask for such an element, SWBT argues that the rate for that element would be determined on an individual case basis pursuant to the Bona Fide Request process. SWBT also points out that a rate for a 1-number DID number block was never included in the UNEs-at-issue list filed by Staff at the beginning of this case. The Commission agrees. | Yes | |
| 34. | If the answer to the above is affirmative, what rates should the Commission order in lieu of SWBT's failure to produce a cost for 1-Number DID Number Block assignments? | Since SWBT did not have notice that this element would be addressed in this case, it would be unfair to expect SWBT to have produced a cost study to support a proposed rate for this element. As the Commission indicated in its discussion of issue 1, it will strictly adhere to the UNEs-at-issue list prepared by Staff. As 1-number DID number block assignments was not included in the UNEs-at-issue list, the Commission will not establish a rate for that UNE. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------------|---|
| 35. | Should SWBT be required to offer an OLNS rate element? | SWBT's original testimony did not include a rate for OLNS because it was not included in Staff's UNEs-at-issue list. When the Joint Sponsors raised this issue, SWBT included a specific rate for OLNS in its surrebuttal testimony. Joint Sponsors concede that this specific issue is now moot. The Commission agrees that this issue is moot and does not require resolution by the Commission. | Yes | |
| Labor Rate Issues | | | | |
| 36. | What labor rates should be adopted for use in this case? | The Commission will address the specific questions raised regarding SWBT's labor rates in subsequent issues. It will not attempt to establish specific labor rates but will instead require SWBT to redevelop and resubmit its labor rates incorporating the revisions ordered by the Commission in its ruling on subsequent issues 37-44. | Partial | SWBT failed to compute Support Assets factors correctly (see below) and did not comply entirely with some exclusion requirements. Labor rates have been revised by the Joint Sponsors to comply with all elements and included in the Joint Sponsors' rates. Supporting work papers were submitted to Staff for review. |
| 37. | Should SWBT's loaded labor rates include amounts for termination or severance pay or other force reduction expenses? | The Commission agrees with SWBT that the costs associated with potentially terminating an employee are costs that must be incurred by any employer when engaging the services of that employee. As such, those costs are appropriately apportioned over all productive hours of that worker and are appropriately included in rates. The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | SWBT did not eliminate these costs from labor rates. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|---|
| 38. | Should SWBT's labor rates include amounts for electric power? | The Commission agrees with the Joint Sponsors. SWBT has not presented sufficient evidence to justify incorporating electric power costs into its labor rates. SWBT's argument that these electricity costs are labor costs because they would be eliminated if the labor was eliminated is unsound. If SWBT eliminated all of its employees, it would also eliminate many, if not all of the costs of operating its business. That does not turn all of the hypothetically eliminated costs into labor costs. Furthermore, the Joint Sponsors' concern that including electric power costs in labor rates could result in double counting of those costs is well founded, as electric power costs are also a component in SWBT's support asset factor. The Commission finds that SWBT must not include electric power costs in its labor rates. | Yes | Electric power costs removed from 15XX labor rates. |
| 39. | Should SWBT's labor rates include amounts for purchases from affiliates? | The Commission agrees with the Joint Sponsors. SWBT has not presented sufficient evidence to justify incorporating purchase of services from affiliates into its labor rates. Furthermore, the Joint Sponsors' concern that including purchase of services from affiliates in labor rates could result in double counting of those costs is well founded, as SWBT has failed to demonstrate that purchase of services from an affiliate is not also a component in SWBT's maintenance, support asset, or common cost factors. The Commission finds that SWBT must not include the cost of purchasing services from affiliates in its labor rates. | Yes | SWBT eliminated identifiable purchases from affiliates. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|---|
| 40. | Should SWBT's labor rates include amounts for collection agent commissions? | The Commission finds that SWBT must not include the cost of collection agent commissions in its labor rates. | Yes | SWBT removed Collection Agent Commissions |
| 41. | Should SWBT's labor rates include amounts for consultant fees? | SWBT has not presented sufficient evidence to justify incorporating the cost of hiring consultants into its labor rates. Furthermore, the Joint Sponsors' concern that including the cost of hiring consultants in labor rates could result in double counting of those costs is well founded, as SWBT has failed to demonstrate that the cost of hiring consultants is not also a component in SWBT's maintenance, support asset, or common cost factors. The Commission finds that SWBT must not include the cost of hiring consultants in its labor rates. | Partial | SWBT failed to eliminate all identifiable consultant fees which overstated SWBT's labor rates. s. Work papers provided to Staff identify SWBT errors. The Joint Sponsor's included the restated labors in the revised rates. |
| 42. | Should SWBT include annualized costs of contracts with Bell Communications Research and/or other vendors in the development of labor rates and then also base the labor rate development on less than a full-year's worth of productive hours? | SWBT has not presented sufficient evidence to justify incorporating the cost of contracts with Bell Communications Research and other vendors into its labor rates. Furthermore, the Joint Sponsors' concern that including the cost of contracts with Bell Communications Research and other vendors in labor rates could result in double counting of those costs is well founded, as SWBT has failed to demonstrate that such costs are not also a component in SWBT's maintenance, support asset, or common cost factors. The Commission finds that SWBT must not include the cost of contracts with Bell Communications Research and other vendors in its labor rates. | Partial | SWBT failed to eliminate all identifiable purchases from Bellcore, which overstated labor rates. The Joint Sponsors' identified and corrected these errors and provided work papers to Staff. The Joint Sponsor's included the restated labors in their revised rates |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|--|
| 43. | Should any changes in Support Asset factors be incorporated into the development of loaded labor rates? | The Joint Sponsors presented evidence that SWBT made input errors in calculating the Support Asset factor incorporated in loaded labor rates. The Commission finds that SWBT must make the correction to its Support Asset factor. | Partial | SWBT incorrectly applied decision regarding support asset factors resulting in over-stated labor rates. SWBT changed the original Support Asset Factors to its incorrectly restated Support Asset Factors Joint Sponsors' used the correct Support Asset Factors in the restated rates. See Issue 49 |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|---|--------------|--|
| 44. | Has SWBT used the correct Support Assets factors in operator services labor rate development? | <p>The Joint Sponsors' expert witness, Daniel P. Rhinehart, testified that SWBT used incorrect support assets factors for operator services personnel. Rhinehart testified that based on his prior experience with SWBT's labor rate development, he believed that wages reported as operator wages in the development of support asset factors include the wages of not only operators but also their supervisors and support clerical personnel. Therefore, the operator services support assets factor should be applied to all wage titles in the operator services organization. SWBT's failure to do so will result in excessive non-operator labor rates and cost recovery for SWBT wherever operator services organization personnel are used in the delivery of service to CLECs.</p> <p>SWBT denied Rhinehart's allegation and claimed that operator service labor rates are not at issue in this proceeding.^{1[18]} But the Joint Sponsors point out that related - non-operator - operator services personnel costs are at issue in this case as part of the development of certain recurring and non-recurring costs. As these labor costs are dependent upon the operator service support asset factor, that support asset factor is at issue. In their reply brief, the Joint Sponsors specifically indicate that failure to properly apply the operator services support assets factor will inflate the labor rates used in the calculation of NXX migration non-recurring charges, which are at issue in this case.</p> <p>The Commission finds that the Joint Sponsors are correct: proper application of the operator</p> | Partial | <p>SWBT incorrectly applied the decision regarding support asset factors resulting in over-stated labor rates. SWBT made a new input error when chang the original Support Asset Factors. This error was included in its restated Support Asset Factors. The Joint Sponsors' corrected SWBT new error and used the appropriate Support Asset Factors in the restated rates. See Issue 49</p> |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|---|--|--------------|---|
| <i>Capital Cost Factor Issues</i> | | | | |
| 45. | Should CAPS (SWBT's capital cost program) be run with a longer planning period? | SWBT shall use a 99-year planning period when running its CAPCS program. | Yes | SWBT ran CAPCS with a 99-year planning period. |
| 46. | Should SWBT use the latest FCC-approved asset lives? | SWBT shall use FCC-approved asset lives and depreciation parameters in its CAPCS runs. | Yes | SWBT ran CAPCS with the most recent projection lives reviewed by the FCC. |
| 47. | Should SWBT use the latest FCC-approved depreciation parameters? | SWBT shall use FCC-approved asset lives and depreciation parameters in its CAPCS runs. | Yes | SWBT ran CAPCS with the most recent depreciation parameters reviewed by the FCC. |
| 48. | Should SWBT use the latest FCC-approved future net salvage values? | SWBT shall use FCC-approved asset lives and depreciation parameters in its CAPCS runs. | Yes | SWBT ran CAPCS with future net salvage values that comport with the latest review by the FCC. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|---|---|--------------|--|
| <i>Support Assets Factor Issues</i> | | | | |
| 49. | What Support Asset Factors should be adopted? | The Commission will address the specific issues raised by the Joint Sponsors in subsequent issues. The Commission will have more difficulty in dealing with the issue raised by Staff. The Commission agrees that CLECs looking to purchase UNEs should not be required to pay for that portion of SWBT's assets that are used to support SWBT's retail services. Unfortunately, Staff does not provide any indication of how that goal can be accomplished. Therefore, the Commission is unable to order SWBT to make any particular adjustment to its costs studies in response to Staff's concern. | Partial | SWBT develops its Support Asset factors on a five-state basis by summing the costs of all five SWBT states' support asset costs and dividing by all wages from the five states to come up with an average support asset cost per wage dollar. Included in those costs are the capital costs (depreciation, return and tax) that are heavily influenced by the rate of return amount. The commission ordered SWBT to use a 10.32% rate of return in this case. However, SWBT only applied the 10.32% rate of return to the Missouri support asset costs but continued to use its proposed 12.19% rate of return for all other states. As Missouri assets represent only a portion of the total included in the support asset computation. Because the support asset factors, which are used in the later development of maintenance factors, labor rates and common costs, are a blend of costs from all 5 states, the effective rate of return being used by SWBT in its support asset factor development is far above the 10.32% authorized. The Joint Sponsors recomputed the support asset factors using a 10.32% rate of return for all support assets across all five states to ensure that the costs imposed on Missouri do not exceed the costs authorized by the Commission. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|---|
| 50. | Did SWBT make errors in its inputs for accounts 2111 and 2116 in the Support Asset factor development? | The Joint Sponsors' expert witness, Daniel Rhinehart, testified that he had identified two input errors in SWBT's development of support assets factors. He indicated that the input for total land investment, account 2111, was overstated by \$100 million, and there was a \$100 thousand input error in the "Small Value Items" column of Other Work Equipment, account 2116. ^{2[30]} The Commission finds that SWBT must make the correction to its Support Asset factor. | Yes | SWBT corrected identified input errors. |
| 51. | Did SWBT use incorrect current cost to book cost ratios for buildings investment in its Support Assets factor development? | The Joint Sponsors and Staff contend that SWBT incorrectly distributed Transitional Benefit Obligation - "TBO" - expense reductions in its Support Asset factor development. SWBT admits the error but contends that its impact on rates is insignificant and should not require correction. ³ The Commission finds that SWBT must make the correction to its Support Asset factor. | Yes | The correction of the original error identified by Joint Sponsors is mooted by the Commission's finding that the CC/BC ratios to use for all buildings should be 1.0. SWBT's filing conforms to this requirement. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--|---|--------------|---|
| 52. | Did SWBT incorrectly distribute "TBO" expense reductions in its Support Assets factor development? | The Joint Sponsors and Staff contend that SWBT incorrectly distributed Transitional Benefit Obligation - "TBO" - expense reductions in its Support Asset factor development. SWBT admits the error but contends that its impact on rates is insignificant and should not require correction. The Commission finds that SWBT must make the correction to its Support Asset factor. | Yes | SWBT corrected identified computation errors. |
| 53. | Has SWBT double counted certain computer assets in its Support Asset factors and certain cost studies? | SWBT acknowledged this error and corrected for it in its surrebuttal testimony. The correct results are reflected in the revised list of prices that SWBT presented at the hearing. There is no need for the Commission to further address this issue. | N/A | SWBT previously corrected another study in this case to address the issue. |
| <i>Maintenance Factor Issues</i> | | | | |
| 54. | What Maintenance and Other Expense Factors should be adopted? | The Joint Sponsors and Staff recommend specific modifications to the maintenance factors in subsequent issues. The Commission will address the proposed modifications in those issues. | Partial | See Issues 55 to 58. |
| 55. | Do SWBT's Missouri maintenance factors incorrectly include costs attributable to other SWBT states? | The Commission finds that the inputs for Missouri expenses used to determine the maintenance factor used in setting UNE rates should be modified to reflect the amount of expenses for Missouri that SWBT reports to the FCC. | Partial | SWBT provided work papers to the Joint Sponsors to identify the expenses transferred to other states, but then SWBT only removed a portion of those costs as its correction to conform with the decision on this issue. Therefore, SWBT's included expenses still do not match what SWBT reports to the FCC. The Joint Sponsors corrected SWBT's "correction" and have provided explanatory work papers to Staff. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|---|
| 56. | Are account 6534 wages overstated in the maintenance factor computations? | The Joint Sponsors contend that SWBT improperly failed to exclude supervision costs found in account 6534, Plant Operations Administration, from its maintenance factor computations. Whether costs are overstated or understated, the error must be corrected when SWBT reruns its cost studies. | No | SWBT did not reduce account 6534 wages as required. Consequently, SWBT has now included these Plant Operations Administration Expenses in both its calculation of maintenance factors and its calculation of the shared and common cost factor (see related Issue 76, where SWBT has included these specific expenses, plus additional inappropriate expenses, in its common cost factor calculation). AT&T has referred Commission Staff to Excel work book MO 2000 Mtce Expense Factor with TO-2001-438_Compliance_09-20-02.xls, sheet: Support Assets, Cell: D51 where the correct adjustment is made. The Joint Sponsor's used the restated maintenance factors in its rates. |
| 57. | Should various computational errors identified by AT&T in SWBT's maintenance factor development be corrected? | The Joint Sponsors' witness testified that he had found other computational errors in SWBT's spreadsheet and indicates that he noted those corrections in the spreadsheet. Unfortunately, the witness' corrections to SWBT's spreadsheet are not in evidence. Therefore, the Commission has no way of judging whether SWBT has made the alleged errors. SWBT generally has the burden of proving the appropriateness of its proposed rates. But in this situation, the Joint Sponsors have failed to present any evidence by which the Commission can find in their favor. With no evidence to guide its decision, the Commission finds that SWBT must correct the error that it concedes, but need not correct the other errors that the Joint Sponsors have failed to identify for the Commission. | Yes | SWBT's correction likely conforms to the decision, but Joint Sponsors have not reviewed every possible modification required. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|--|--|--------------|--|
| 58. | Should the buildings maintenance factor be modified to reflect the use of book costs of network buildings in the development of the buildings investment factor? | The Commission previously addressed this issue in issue 51. In that issue, the Commission found that it was inappropriate to apply the CC/BC ratio to the buildings factor, in effect using the book cost of network buildings in the development of the buildings investment factor. The buildings maintenance factor should also be modified to reflect that decision. | Yes | SWBT used book cost of buildings in its computations. |
| <i>Building Factor Issues</i> | | | | |
| 59. | Should the network buildings investment factor be based on booked investment as previously required in Case No. TO-97-40? | The Commission previously addressed this issue in issue 51. In that issue, the Commission found that it was inappropriate to apply the CC/BC ratio to the buildings factor, in effect using the book cost of network buildings in the development of the buildings investment factor. The network investment factor should also be modified to reflect that decision. | Yes | SWBT used book cost of buildings in its computations. |
| <i>Transitional Benefit Obligation Issues</i> | | | | |
| 60. | Is the so-called "Transitional Benefit Obligation" (TBO) a forward-looking cost? | The fact that SWBT continues to amortize that cost on its regulatory books is merely a means by which it recovers an embedded cost. It is not a forward-looking expense for purposes of TELRIC. | N/A | |
| 61. | Should TBO expenses be removed from SWBT's TELRIC studies? | Having found in issue 60 that TBO expenses are not a forward-looking cost for purposes of TELRIC, the Commission concludes that those expenses must be removed from SWBT's TELRIC studies. | Partial | SWBT erroneously includes some capitalized TBO as an expense in the development of its Common Cost Factor. Other TBO expense was removed. All TBO "expense" should be removed. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--|--|--------------|--|
| 62. | Should capitalized TBO amounts be removed from SWBT's TELRIC studies? | SWBT will not be required to remove capitalized TBO expenses from its TELRIC studies. | Partial | The decision did not require SWBT to remove capitalized TBO from its studies. However, SWBT's treatment of capitalized TBO as an expense item in its Common Cost computation is incorrect. Capitalized TBO, if inclusion by SWBT is elected, should be recovered, by definition, through the application of depreciation, return, and tax factors. SWBT's mistreatment of capitalized TBO overstated its common costs. The Joint Sponsors corrected this error. Explanatory work papers have been supplied to Staff and the Joint Sponsors have used the revised common cost in the rates. |
| <i>Inflation and Productivity Factors Issues</i> | | | | |
| 63. | Do SWBT's cost studies reflect productivity improvements to be expected in the study period? | This problem could be solved by requiring SWBT to incorporate overt prospective productivity adjustments into its cost studies but no party has proposed a formula that would permit the easy development of such adjustments. However, the expert witnesses for both Staff and the Joint Sponsors indicate that productivity factors would roughly balance out the inflation factors and that if productivity factors are not used, then inflation factors should also be excluded. For that reason, the Commission will order SWBT to exclude overt inflation factors from its cost studies. | N/A | See Issue 64. |
| 64. | Should SWBT's studies include inflation adjustments? | For that reason, the Commission will order SWBT to exclude overt inflation factors from its cost studies. | Yes | SWBT's cost factor development excludes inflation. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| 65. | Has SWBT correctly "levelized" inflation measures where it has used them? | Therefore, this issue is moot and need not be further addressed. | N/a | See Issue 64. |
| <i>Shared and Common Cost Issues</i> | | | | |
| 66. | What Common Cost factor should be adopted in this case? | The final factor that the Commission will direct SWBT to use when it reruns its cost studies will be determined based on the decisions reached regarding subsequent issues. | No | SWBT's restatement does not conform to the Commission decision in numerous ways. Joint Sponsors indicate a number of required corrections to SWBT's computations as stated in Issues 66- 81. Depending on the Commission's determination with respect to the specific issues identified below, the Joint Sponsors recommend a Shared and Common Cost factor specific to Missouri in a range of 10.36% to 11.32%. Joint Sponsors restated rates incorporate a Shared and Common Cost Factor of 10.82%. The Common Cost Factor is supported by workpapers provided to Staff. |
| 67. | Should the Common Cost factor computation be determined using revenues in the development of the denominator? | SWBT will not be required to use revenues in the development of the denominator for the common cost factor calculation. | Partial | While, SWBT does not use revenues in the denominator of its computation, SWBT does not correctly compute the denominator. SWBT properly calculated its wholesale marketing expense but SWBT has incorrectly allocated that expense. SWBT was required to allocate its wholesale marketing expense across all direct expenses. However, SWBT only allocated its wholesale marketing expense across a portion of its expenses. This has understated the denominator, causing an overstatement of the Shared and Common Cost Factor. The Joint Sponsors have corrected this error. Work papers supplied to Staff demonstrate the Joint Sponsors' concerns. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|---|
| 68. | Should TBO be excluded from Common costs? | The Commission previously addressed this issue in issues 60-62. The Commission concluded that TBOs should be excluded from common costs. There is no need to further discuss this issue. | Partial | See Issue 62 above. The decision did not require SWBT to remove capitalized TBO from its studies. However, SWBT's treatment of capitalized TBO as an expense item in its Common Cost computation is incorrect. Capitalized TBO, if inclusion by SWBT is elected, should be recovered, by definition, through the application of depreciation, return, and tax factors. Explanatory work papers have been supplied to Staff. |
| 69. | Has SWBT correctly used support Asset factors in its Common Cost Factor development? | SWBT will not be permitted to apply wage-based support asset factors to assets to identify supposed support asset costs. | Partial | SWBT did eliminate some but not all of its Support Assets computed costs as SWBT did not demonstrate that the portion it retained was based on an application of the correct support assets factor to wages and salary dollars only, as required by the Order. SWBT incorrectly applies disaggregated Support Asset Factors to the <u>total expenses</u> of certain accounts. The Joint Sponsors' proposed rates reflect the proper application of the correct support assets factor only to wages and salary dollars in compliance with the Commission's decision on this issue. The Joint Sponsors have developed work papers showing corrections to SWBT's errors and have provided them to Staff. |
| 70. | Has SWBT correctly reflected corrections to ARMIS data reported to the FCC for accounts 6612 and 6722 | The Commission finds that SWBT must make the correction to use the most current data available. | Yes | SWBT now uses the correct values. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|---|--------------|---|
| 71. | Has SWBT correctly applied the Commission Assessment factor in its Common Cost development? | The Commission has no evidence before it but has only SWBT's assertion that it is using the correct assessment factor, and the Joint Sponsors' intimations that perhaps SWBT is in error. The Commission makes no finding about the appropriateness of the assessment factor used by SWBT but directs SWBT to demonstrate in its compliance filing that it has used the correct Commission Assessment factor. | No | In its compliance studies, SWBT identified a Commission Assessment factor based on revenues. However, through SWBT's computations of summary Annual Cost Factors (ACFs), SWBT converts the revenue-based factor to an investment-based one. In making this calculation, SWBT made a computational error, which increased Commission Assessment factor by a factor of 10 as input into the Common Cost Study. The result was an overstatement of Common Costs. The Joint Sponsors corrected SWBT's computational error and included the results in their rates. |
| 72. | Is it appropriate for SWBT to base the Common Cost factor on year 2000 data when its cost studies are based on 1999 data? | SWBT is directed to use 1999 data in preparing its common cost factor. | Yes | |
| 73. | Is it appropriate to include inflation in SWBT's computation of Common Costs? | The Commission previously addressed this issue in issues 63-64. The Commission concluded that SWBT would not be permitted to utilize overt inflation factors in computing its common costs. There is no need to further discuss this issue. | Yes. | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|---|
| 74. | If inflation is determined to be appropriately included in the determination of Common Costs, is SWBT's use of non-levelized inflation factors correct? | Therefore, this issue is moot and need not be further addressed. | N/A | |
| 75. | What amount of Executive and Planning and General and Administrative costs should be considered avoided in determining the Common Cost Factor? | The Joint Sponsors would exclude 15.67 percent of those costs, with certain exceptions, using the Indirect Factor established by the Commission in TO-97-40. ...the Commission finds that the position espoused by the Joint Sponsors is most reasonable in that it is based on the findings previously made by this Commission in TO-97-40 and the expert opinion of the Joint Sponsors' witness. | Partial | SWBT was required to eliminate 15.67% of the amounts from accounts 6711-6712 and 6721-6728. Although the Order refers to "Executive and Planning and General and Administrative costs," that is just a general description of the types of accounts for which retail-attributable costs should be removed. A reference to the rebuttal testimony of Joint Sponsor witness Dan Rhinehart (Ex. 28, pgs. 29 – 30, Schedule DPR-7) and of Staff Witness Dr. Ben Johnson (Ex. 25, corrected HC Schedule 4, Recommended Common Cost Factor Spreadsheet) makes clear that both the Joint Sponsors and Staff were concerned with removing retail costs from the general category of "General and Administrative" accounts, and not just accounts specifically named "general and administrative," i.e., account 6728. In addition, the Commission's rationale for removing a percentage of retail costs from General and Administrative accounts is applicable to ALL such accounts. However, SWBT only reduced accounts 6711, 6712, and 6728. The result was an overstatement of costs. The Joint Sponsors have correct this error in calculating their rates. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|---|--------------|---|
| 76. | What amount of Network Operations – General Supervision costs should be considered avoided in determining the Common Cost Factor? | <p>[SWBT's] omission of the costs results in a slight understatement of SWBT's costs. The Joint Sponsors argue that, nevertheless, the proper adjustment should be made, including an avoided cost adjustment of 15.67 percent, the Indirect Factor it proposed in issue 75.</p> <p>The Commission agrees with the Joint Sponsors. SWBT will be required to correct what its witness acknowledged to be an error.</p> | No | <p>This issue addresses the same issue as Issue 75, but with respect to different expenses. The Commission ruled that the same 15.67% reduction to these expenses should be taken. The Order does explicitly authorize SWBT to add these costs into its Common Cost factor Calculation. The Joint Sponsors do not oppose inclusion of the omitted costs as long as only those costs that were inappropriately omitted are added back in to the calculation. SWBT has now included additional inappropriate costs and then applied the 15.97% reduction.</p> <p>The Order contemplates SWBT including only certain Network Operations – General Supervision costs as part of the Shared and Common Cost factor. Although the Order references the entire account 6534, SWBT originally only excluded costs from a single sub-account of 6534, which is sub-account 6534.2. This is reflected in the testimony at hearing of SWBT witness Ries (Tr., Pages 444 – 445, Lines 20-25, 1-15; cited to in the Order). Despite Mr. Ries' admission at hearing that it was only the sub-account costs that had been omitted, SWBT incorrectly included the costs of the <u>entire</u> 6534 account – ("Plant operations administrative expense, 47 C.F.R. §32.6534), in its common cost calculation, which is about 10 times the amount for the supervision portion that had been inappropriately omitted in SWBT's original studies.</p> <p>The Joint Sponsors have corrected this error in their stated rates.</p> |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|---|
| 77. | What amount of uncollectibles expense should be considered avoided in determining the Common Cost Factor? | Faced with this complete lack of evidence the Commission has no choice but to make no finding on this issue. This will have the effect of leaving this aspect of SWBT's cost study unchanged | No | SWBT did not use 1999 data for uncollectable expense. The Joint Sponsor's were unable to correct this error so the resulting shared and common factor is overstated. |
| 78. | What amount of Marketing costs should be considered avoided in determining the Common Cost Factor? | 90 percent of marketing costs are to be considered avoided. | No | SWBT was required to include only its wholesale marketing expense in a factor applied to all direct expenses. Total wholesale marketing expense is calculate by removing its retail marketing expense from total marketing expenses. SWBT properly removed retail expense from total expenses to calculated total wholesale marketing expenses. However, SWBT removed its retail marketing costs from a portion of its total expenses. This has understated the denominator, causing an overstatement of the Shared and Common Cost Factor. The Joint Sponsors have corrected this error. Work papers supplied to Staff demonstrate the Joint Sponsors' concerns. |
| 79. | What amount of Customer Operations (call completion and number services) costs should be considered avoided in determining the Common Cost Factor? | The Joint Sponsors and SWBT agree that these costs are 100 percent direct costs that are included in other cost studies. Therefore, they should be excluded entirely from the common cost factor. Given the agreement of the parties, the Commission need not further address this issue. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|--|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| 80. | What amount of Customer Services costs should be considered avoided in determining the Common Cost Factor? | The Joint Sponsors and SWBT agree that these costs are 100 percent direct costs that are included in other cost studies. Therefore, they should be excluded entirely from the common cost factor. Given the agreement of the parties, the Commission need not further address this issue. | Yes | |
| 81. | Should the Common Cost Factor be applied to non-recurring rates? | The Commission concludes that common costs should be applied to non-recurring rates. | N/A | |
| <i>Cost of Capital Issues</i> | | | | |
| 82. | What is the weighted average cost of capital that should be used in this case? | When those amounts are inserted into the weighted average cost of capital formula, the result is a weighted average cost of capital of 10.32 percent | Yes | |
| 83. | What is the cost of equity? | The Commission will accept the 13 percent cost of equity proposed by SWBT. | Yes | |
| 84. | What is the cost of debt? | The Commission will accept 7.18 percent as the cost of debt. | Yes | |
| 85. | What target capital structure should be used for the UNE leasing business? | The Commission concludes that the use of the 46 percent debt to 54 percent equity ratio advocated by Staff is appropriate | Yes | |
| "Issues 86-102, related to the cost of capital, were eliminated when the parties consolidated them into issues 82-85." | | | | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|--|--|--------------|--|
| <i>UNE Sub-Loop Cross-connects TELRIC Study Recurring, 2001 - 2003, March 2001</i> | | | | |
| 103 | Should the recurring cost contain an in-place factor for optical jumpers? | Given the agreement of the parties, the Commission will order that the in-place factor be removed from the recurring cost studies for the dark fiber sub-loop cross-connect, and the OC3 and OC12 Unbundled Dedicated Transport Cross-connects, because the cost identified by this factor are captured in the non-recurring dark fiber sub-loop cost study. | Yes | The investment formula has been changed in SWBT's SPICE model to formula 1, which contains no in-place factor. |
| 104 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsor's revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsor's rates. |
| <i>Sub-loop Cross-connects Non-recurring (TELRIC) Cost Study, 2001 - 2003, June 2001</i> | | | | |
| 105 | Are all of the charges for Sub-Loop cross-connects already contained in the Sub-Loop charge? | The Joint Sponsors are proposing modifications to a cost study that is no longer at issue in this case. There is, therefore, no reason to order SWBT to take any action with regard to this issue. | N/A | |
| <i>UNE Dark Fiber Cross-Connect to Collocation Cage Non-Recurring (TELRIC) Cost Study, 2001 - 2003, June 2001</i> | | | | |
| 106 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | The Commission concludes that Staff is correct; SWBT should not be permitted to charge a CLEC for the cost of disconnection until a disconnection is ordered. | Yes | Disconnect is now a separate rate element |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|---|
| 107 | Fiber optic Cross-connect installation time | The Commission concludes that SWBT's time estimates are somewhat inflated but not to the extent asserted by the Joint Sponsors' witness. The Commission will reduce the time for installing fiber optic jumpers to match the time allotted for installing a 2-wire copper cross-connect. SWBT's cost studies shall assume an average installation time of five minutes for running fiber optic cross-connects. | No | SWBT has only revised the Central Office Force installation time and not the Installation & Maintenance installation time. The cross-connect times should be the same for these cross-connects regardless of the work groups involved. Also, in accordance with the Commission ruling on issue 126, the disconnect times have been reduced by the Joint Sponsors to match the connect times. SWBT's cost study was revised accordingly and the rate restated. |
| 108 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 109 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is no need for a present value calculation. |
| 110 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. Revised costs on the rate sheet. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|--|--------------|--|
| <i>UNE Loop Cross-Connects TELRIC Study Recurring, 2001 - 2003, March 2001</i> | | | | |
| 111 | Should multiplexing equipment be included in the recurring cost for the cross-connects in this study? | The Commission finds that Mr. Turner's testimony was more credible and convincing. Multiple multiplexing in the situation described by the witnesses is not reasonable. Therefore, SWBT should be able to recover the cost of multiplexing equipment only once. The Commission finds that multiplexing equipment costs should not be included in the recurring costs for loop to DCS cross-connects. | Yes | Equipment costs for FX0 plug-ins have been removed from the study. |
| 112 | Should IDF equipment be included? | The Commission concludes that the use of an IDF is a forward-looking design and that it is appropriate for SWBT to include costs for the use of IDFs in its cost study. | Yes | |
| 113 | Should DSX equipment be included in the DS3 cross-connect? | SWBT and the Joint Sponsors agree that this issue has been withdrawn because a final rate for this element was set in TO-97-40. Specifically, the rates established for the Unbundled Dedicated Transport (UDT) DS3 cross-connect should also apply to the DS3 cross-connect element. The Commission need not further address this issue. | Yes | The DS3 disconnect no longer appears on the rate sheet. |
| 114 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsor's rates. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| <i>UNE Loop Cross-connects Non-recurring (TELRIC) Cost Study, 2001 - 2003, June 2001</i> | | | | |
| 115 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 116 | Probability of disconnect occurrence from loop to switch port | The Commission accepts SWBT's assertion that it will actually disconnect a cross-connect 95 percent of the time. That means that five percent of the time that SWBT receives a disconnect order from a CLEC it will not actually perform the work of disconnection. Therefore, SWBT's charges to the CLECs for that disconnection work must be reduced by five percent. | Yes | |
| 117 | Dispatch time to Unmanned Central Offices, and Order completion | The Commission finds that the average dispatch time is 30 minutes and that four cross-connects will be performed per dispatch. | Yes | Time reduced to 7.5 minutes per cross-connect, which is equivalent to 4 cross-connects per dispatch. |
| 118 | Procurement activities time | SWBT's cost study should include no time associated with procurement activities for loop to DCS and loop to multiplexer cross-connect non-recurring charges. | Yes | |
| 119 | Login and completeness check times | The Commission concludes that the time assumed for the "Log-in and Completeness Check" activity for establishing DS1 and DS3 cross-connects should be the same as the time assumed for the "Log-in and Completeness Check" activity for establishing a DS0 cross-connect. | Yes | |

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|---|--------------|---|
| 120 | Establish Circuit Cross-Connect times | <p>The Commission finds that the Joint Sponsors' position is more reasonable. SWBT's cost study shall assume that an initial 2-wire cross-connect will take three minutes to complete and that additional 2-wire cross-connects also will be completed in three minutes.</p> <p>The Commission finds that SWBT's cost study shall assume that the time required to install a digital cross-connect is the same as the time utilized in the study for the installation of an analog cross-connect.</p> <p>SWBT will not be required to modify the installation times it assumes for DS1 and DS3 connections.</p> | No | Digital Loop to DCS 4W and Digital Loop to Switch Port installation times were still ** __ ** minutes first and additional in the SWBT compliance filing. These times should match the times for analog 4W times. Therefore, these times have been changed to ** __ ** minutes first and additional and incorporated into the restated rates. |
| 121 | Plug-in activities times | The Commission concludes that SWBT's cost study also should not include installation tasks associated with plug-ins. | Yes | |
| 122 | Cross office testing times | <p>There is nothing to indicate that the time allowed for that testing is excessive.</p> <p>The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue.</p> | Yes | |
| 123 | Circuit completion and order closeout add'l times | The Commission finds that the "additional" time for the Circuit Completion and Order Close-Out function should be set to zero because this task relates to an order and not the number of cross-connects on the order. | Yes | |

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--|
| 124 | Circuit Order and Administration time for disconnect additional time | SWBT acknowledged the error and corrected it in its surrebuttal testimony. There is no remaining dispute | No | This activity time was supposed to be corrected to link back to the time for a 2-wire digital DS0 cross connect. However, several cross-connects elements still had the incorrect ** _____ ** minute times for the "additional" time in the SWBT compliance filing. These times were reduced to 0.5 minutes. |
| 125 | Remove plug-in (This issue is basically duplicative of Issue 121.) | This issue was addressed at issue 121 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 126 | Disconnect cross-wire times | The Commission finds that the appropriate times for disconnection of a cross-connect should be no greater than the installation times for that cross-connect. | Yes | |
| 127 | MLT testing times, all activities | The Commission rejected [the Joint Sponsors'] assertion and found in favor of SWBT on issue 122. For the same reason, the Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue. | Yes | |
| 128 | High Capacity (HC) circuits Login and completeness check times (Duplicates Issue 119, except this is digital.) | This issue was addressed at issue 119 and need not be addressed again | Yes | |
| 129 | HC Install times for HC cross-connects . (Duplicates Issue 120, except this is digital.) | This issue was addressed at issue 120 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|---|--------------|---|
| 130 | HC plug-in times. (Duplicates Issue 121, except this is digital.) | This issue was addressed at issue 121 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 131 | HC cross-office testing times. (Duplicates Issue 122, except this is digital.) | This issue was addressed at issue 122 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 132 | HC circuit completion and order closeout add'l times. (Duplicates Issue 123, except this is digital.) | This issue was addressed at issue 123 and need not be addressed again | N/A | OC3 and OC12 elements not in this study |
| 133 | HC remove plug-in times. (Duplicates Issue 121, except this is digital.) | This issue was addressed at issue 121 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 134 | HC Disconnect cross wire times. (Duplicates Issue 126, except this is digital.) | This issue was addressed at issue 126 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 135 | Local Operations Center (LOC) activities times | This issue was addressed at issue 127 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 136 | Special Services Center (SSC) Testing | These are the same arguments that were presented to the Commission in issues 122 and 127. For the reasons explained in its discussion of those issues, the Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|-------------------|---|--------------|--|
| 137 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 138 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is not need for a present value calculation. |
| 139 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>LSP to SS7 Links Cross-Connects and Interoffice Facilities for Voice Grade DS0 and DS1 Links Recurring 2001 - 2003, March 2001</i> | | | | |
| 140 | Fiber Fill Factor | For purposes of its cost studies, SWBT shall utilize a fill factor for interoffice transport fiber of 90 percent. | Yes | The revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors' restated studies using a 90% fill rate. |
| 141 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsor's rates. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|---|--|--------------|--------------------------|
| <i>LSP to SS7 Links Cross-Connects and Interoffice Facilities for Voice Grade DS0 and DS1 Non-Recurring (TELRIC) Cost Study, 2001 - 2003, June, 2001</i> | | | | |
| 142 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 143 | Dispatch to STP Central Offices | SWBT's explanation about the need for dispatching a technician to an unmanned central office to complete an STP connection is reasonable, and is not challenged by any other party. The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue. | Yes | |
| 144 | Provision IDST A Link | The Commission concludes that the proper time required for provisioning two IDST A links is one hour. SWBT's cost studies shall utilize that length of time for that task. | Yes | |
| 145 | Fallout percentage for Orders | SWBT shall use a five percent fallout rate for order activities when running its cost studies. | Yes | |
| 146 | Establish Circuit Cross-Connect times | This issue was addressed at issue 120 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 147 | Cross office testing times | This issue was addressed at issue 122 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 148 | Circuit completion and order closeout add'l times | This issue was addressed at issue 123 and need not be addressed again | Yes | |
| 149 | Coordinate/Conduct Preservice Tests | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--------------|--|
| 150 | Coordinate/Conduct CKL Tests - time | This is the same issue as in issue 149, applied to a different test. Again, the Joint Sponsors would substantially reduce the amount of time that SWBT indicates is required to perform these test. For the reasons explained in issue 149, the Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| 151 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 152 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is not need for a present value calculation. |
| 153 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Unbundled Dedicated Transport Cross-Connects, Digital Cross-Connect System (DCS) and Multiplexing TELRIC Study Recurring, 2001 - 2003, March 2001</i> | | | | |
| 154 | DS-1 Port pro-rata share on DS0 Port | In his rebuttal testimony, the Joint Sponsors' witness pointed out that SWBT forgot to include the pro-rata share of the cost of the DS1 Port on the DCS. In its surrebuttal testimony, SWBT agreed that it had forgotten to include this cost and adjusted its cost accordingly. This had the effect of slightly increasing SWBT's cost. The Commission need not further address this issue. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|---|--------------|---|
| 155 | DS-1 to Voice Grade Circuit Equipment Utilization Factor | The Commission agrees with SWBT. TELRIC principles permit SWBT to account for the costs of maintaining extra capacity and inventory in its network through a fill factor. Contrary to the Joint Sponsors' assertion, the extra capacity and inventory for which SWBT is utilizing a fill factor relates to unused plug-in units, not unused DS0 signals. As a result, the Joint Sponsors arguments against the fill factor miss the point. The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue. | Yes | |
| 156 | DS-3 to DS-1 Circuit Equipment Utilization Factor | This issue was addressed at issue 155 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 157 | Should DSX equipment be included in the DS3 cross-connect? | This issue was addressed at issue 113 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 158 | Should multiplexing equipment be included in the recurring cost for the cross-connects in this study? | This issue was addressed at issue 111 and need not be addressed again. | No | FX0 plug-ins still included in the SPICE runs for 2 and 4 wire cross-connects. The equipment costs for these plug-ins have been removed in the Joint Sponsors compliance study. |
| 159 | Should Intermediate Distribution Frame (IDF) equipment be included? | This issue was addressed at issue 112 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 160 | Should the recurring cost contain an-in place factor for optical jumpers? | This issue was addressed at issue 103 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| 161 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsor's rates. |
| <i>Unbundled Dedicated Transport Cross-Connects, Digital Cross-Connect, System (DCS), and Multiplexing Non-Recurring (TELRIC) Cost Study, 2001 - 2003, June 2001</i> | | | | |
| 162 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 163 | Dispatch time to Unmanned Central Offices, and Order completion | This issue was addressed at issue 117 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 164 | Special Services Center (SSC) Testing | This issue was addressed at issue 136 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 165 | Network Operations Center (NOC) Software Mapping | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue. | Yes | |
| 166 | Acceptance Testing times | This is the same issue as in 165. For the reasons set forth in its discussion of that issue, the Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| 167 | Cross office testing times | This issue was addressed at issue 122 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|---|--------------|--|
| 168 | Coordinate with Customer time | The coordinate with customer time for additional DCS arrangements shall be set at zero. | Yes | |
| 169 | Coordinate with Network time | The Commission finds that the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors (0 min first and additional) is reasonable and will be adopted. | Yes | |
| 170 | Coordinate with Marketing time | The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors. (0 minutes additional) | Yes | |
| 171 | Administration login order completion | The Commission finds for the Joint Sponsors. SWBT shall remove all costs associated with "Administration login order completion" from its cost study. | Yes | |
| 172 | Dispatch for Multiplexing | The Commission finds that the probability of having a dispatch for the multiplexing nonrecurring costs should be set to zero. | Yes | |
| 173 | Cross-connects in multiplexing costs | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| 174 | Plug-in activities times | This issue was addressed at issue 121 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 175 | Login and completeness check times | This issue was addressed at issue 119 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 176 | Establish Circuit Cross-Connect times | This issue was addressed at issue 120 and need not be addressed again. | Partial | In accordance with the Commission's ruling on Issue 126, the disconnect times have been reduced to match the connect times for Voice Grade 2W and 4W cross-connects. |
| 177 | Circuit completion and order closeout add'l times | This issue was addressed at issue 123 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 178 | DCS Training times | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|---|---|--------------|--|
| 179 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 180 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is not need for a present value calculation. |
| 181 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Unbundled Dedicated Transport Interoffice Facilities for DS0, OC3, and OC12 Recurring, 2001 - 2003, March 2001</i> | | | | |
| 182 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsor's rates. |
| 183 | Fiber Fill Factor | This issue was addressed at issue 140 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | The revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors restated studies using a 90% fill rate. |
| 184 | Is SWBT's sample size for Interoffice Facilities Circuits reasonable? | Failure to include those high capacity circuits may make SWBT's cost study sample unreliable. If it has not included high capacity interoffice circuits in its cost study sample, SWBT shall do so. | Yes | The revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors' restated studies. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|--|--------------|---|
| <i>Unbundled Dedicated Transport Interoffice Facilities Voice Grade, OC3, and OC12 NonRecurring (TELRIC) Cost Study 2001-2003 July, 2001</i> | | | | |
| 185 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 186 | Fallout percentage for Orders | This issue was addressed at issue 145 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 187 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 188 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is not need for a present value calculation. |
| 189 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 -- 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and those labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Unbundled Dedicated Transport Entrance Facilities DS1 TELRIC Recurring Study, 2001 - 2003, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 190 | Fiber Fill Factor | This issue was addressed at issue 140 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|---|---|--------------|--|
| 191 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsor's rates. |
| <i>Unbundled Dedicated Transport Entrance Facilities DS3, OC3, and OC12 TELRIC Recurring Study, 2001 - 2003, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 192 | Fiber Fill Factor | This issue was addressed at issue 140 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 193 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsor's rates. |
| <i>Unbundled Dedication Transport Entrance Facilities DS1, DS3, OC3, and OC12 Non-Recurring (TELRIC) Cost Study, 2001 - 2003, June 2001</i> | | | | |
| 194 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 195 | Should SSC Testing be included in the Entrance Facilities Study? | The Commission found in favor of SWBT on issue 136 and did not exclude SSC testing from the cross-connect. Therefore, this issue is moot and need not be further addressed. | Yes | |

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|---|
| 196 | Time for Log, Sort, Match, Distribute ordering tasks | The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors. The times for both the initial and the additional Log, Sort, Match, Distribute Ordering Tasks are set at zero. | Yes | |
| 197 | Order Analysis times | The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors. The time for additional Order Analysis is set at 0.5 minutes per each additional entrance facility. | Yes | |
| 198 | Dispatch time to Unmanned Central Offices, and Order completion | The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors. The time that SWBT allots in this cost study for dispatching a technician to a customer's premises to provision an entrance facility, is reduced to match the time allotted for the same task in SWBT's sub-loop cross-connect nonrecurring cost study. | No | SWBT's sub-loop cross-connect cost study uses a time of ** __ ** minutes for dispatch. The SWBT compliance cost study was revised to use this time instead of the ** __ ** minutes SWBT used. |
| 199 | Plug-in activities times | This issue was addressed at issue 121 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 200 | Login and completeness check times | SWBT and the Joint Sponsors agree that this issue has been withdrawn. Therefore, it need not be further addressed by the Commission. | Yes | |
| 201 | Establish Circuit Cross-Connect times | This issue was addressed at issue 120 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 202 | Circuit [order] completion and order closeout add'l times | This issue was addressed at issue 123 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|---|
| 203 | Disconnect cross wire times | This issue was addressed at issue 126 and need not be addressed again. | No | For this study SWBT has interpreted the Commission's ruling to be that the disconnect time should be equal to the connect time, rather than the correct interpretation that that disconnect times should be no greater than connect times (but not increased to match connect times). SWBT has increased the disconnect times on several elements in the study. These times have been corrected to the disconnect times in SWBT's original studies. The affected elements are Entrance Facilities DS3 (additional time), Entrance Facilities OC3, and Entrance Facilities OC12. |
| 204 | Coordinate / Conduct Preservice Tests Low Speed | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue. | Yes | |
| 205 | Coordinate / Conduct Preservice Tests High Speed | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this issue. | Yes | |
| 206 | Fallout percentage for probabilities <100% | This issue was addressed at issue 145 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 207 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 208 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is not need for a present value calculation. |
| 209 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and those revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Unbundled 2-Wire Analog Trunk Port Non-Recurring TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 210 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 211 | Prepare the route index for record keeping regarding the trunk group | This issue relates to a cost study used by SWBT to set rates for a DID number block assignment. In its discussion of issues 27-28, the Commission found that SWBT could not use a DID Trunk Port cost study to set rates for a DID number block assignment. Instead, the Commission ordered SWBT to use the rates established in the T2A. Because the Commission has decided that SWBT may not use this cost study, the Commission need not further address this issue. | N/A | |
| 212 | Load the trunk group information into the Mechanized Translations System | SWBT and the Joint Sponsors agree that this issue is simply a duplication of issue 211. The Commission need not further address this issue. | N/A | |
| 213 | Implementation Time for first trunk group | This issue relates to a cost study used by SWBT to set rates for a DID number block assignment. In its discussion of issues 27-28, the Commission found that SWBT could not use a DID Trunk Port cost study to set rates for a DID number block assignment. Instead, the Commission ordered SWBT to use the rates established in the T2A. Because the Commission has decided that SWBT may not use this cost study, the Commission need not further address this issue. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| 214 | Implementation Time for additional trunk groups | This issue relates to a cost study used by SWBT to set rates for a DID number block assignment. In its discussion of issues 27-28, the Commission found that SWBT could not use a DID Trunk Port cost study to set rates for a DID number block assignment. Instead, the Commission ordered SWBT to use the rates established in the T2A. Because the Commission has decided that SWBT may not use this cost study, the Commission need not further address this issue. | N/A | |
| 215 | Should the cost structure for this rate element be for an individual trunk? | This issue relates to a cost study used by SWBT to set rates for a DID number block assignment. In its discussion of issues 27-28, the Commission found that SWBT could not use a DID Trunk Port cost study to set rates for a DID number block assignment. Instead, the Commission ordered SWBT to use the rates established in the T2A. Because the Commission has decided that SWBT may not use this cost study, the Commission need not further address this issue. | N/A | |
| 216 | Should the Preparation and implementation times for DMS100 translations be the same as for 5ESS? | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | N/A | |
| 217 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 218 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|---|--|--------------|--|
| 219 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Unbundled Digital DS1 Trunk Port Non-Recurring TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 220 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 221 | Prepare the route index for record keeping regarding the trunk group | This issue was addressed at issue 211 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 222 | Load the trunk group information into the Mechanized Translations System | This issue is a duplicate of 221. It was addressed at issue 211 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 223 | Implementation Time for first trunk group | This issue was addressed at issue 213 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 224 | Implementation Time for additional trunk groups | This issue was addressed at issue 214 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 225 | Should the cost structure for this rate element be for an individual trunk? | This issue was addressed at issue 215 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|--|---|--------------|--|
| 226 | Should the Preparation and implementation times for DMS100 translations be the same as for 5ESS? | This issue was addressed at issue 216 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 227 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 228 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 229 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Originating Line Number Screening (OLNS) TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 230 | STP Link Utilization | For reasons explained in its Conclusions of Law, the Commission finds that the fill factor for STP links should be set at 40 percent, or 80 percent for a mated pair. | Yes | Since the Joint Sponsors don't have the revised CCSCIS model, the STP Link Utilization cannot be verified directly. However, the revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors restated studies. |
| 231 | STP Utilization | The Commission finds that SWBT's calculations should be based on 32 percent STP utilization during the busy hour in a forward-looking TELRIC cost study. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--|--|--------------|--|
| 232 | Expenses for NETPILOT and ACCESS7 Software, is it double counted? | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| 233 | CCSCIS Equipment Vendor Discount | The Commission finds that the 40 percent discount from list price established in Texas is reasonable and is adopted. | Yes | Since the Joint Sponsors don't have the revised CCSCIS model the vendor discount cannot be verified directly. However, the revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors restated studies. |
| 234 | What is the correct Marginal CCS per Channel in order to size material investment? | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| 235 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsors' rates. |
| 236 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Joint Sponsors also used the cost of capital ordered by commission in restating cost factors. |
| <i>SS7 Transport TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 237 | STP Link Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 230 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | TO-97-40 rate used for SS7 transport. See DPL items 2 and 3. |
| 238 | STP Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 231 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|
| 239 | Expenses for NETPILOT and ACCESS7 Software, is it double counted? | This issue was addressed at issue 232 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 240 | CCSCIS Equipment Vendor Discount | This issue was addressed at issue 233 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 241 | What is the correct Marginal CCS per Channel in order to size material investment? | This issue was addressed at issue 234 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | |
| 242 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsors' rates. |
| 243 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| <i>SS7 LIDB Validation Query TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 244 | STP Link Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 230 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 245 | STP Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 231 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 246 | Expenses for NETPILOT and ACCESS7 Software, is it double counted? | This issue was addressed at issue 232 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|--|
| 247 | CCSCIS Equipment Vendor Discount | This issue was addressed at issue 233 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 248 | Average # SS1 Clerks | <p>The Joint Sponsors would address this overlap by leaving in place the SS1 clerks that are assigned to SMS queries, while reducing the number of clerks assigned to SLEUTH queries, so that the total number of SS1 clerks assigned to SMS queries and SLEUTH queries would match the total number of SS1 clerks.</p> <p>This aspect of the Joint Sponsors' argument is reasonable and persuasive. It is not rebutted by SWBT in either testimony or argument. The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors on this portion of their argument.</p> <p>Because SS1 clerk positions assigned to SLEUTH queries are likely to be reassigned to SMS queries rather than eliminated, the Commission finds that the number of such positions should not be further reduced with the reduction in number of SLEUTH queries. The Commission finds in favor of SWBT on this portion of this issue.</p> | Yes | |
| 249 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 250 | X.25 Links (transport) Investment | The Commission finds that the investment cost for a pair of X.25 Links shall be assumed to be equal to the investment cost for a pair of DS0 Dedicated Transport Links. | Yes | Tab 7.3 of SWBT compliance study modified to include cost for DS0 links. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|--|
| 251 | SLEUTH system Vendor Maintenance expense | SWBT acknowledged that the Joint Sponsors' position was correct, corrected the cost study, and presented the results in its surrebuttal testimony.[209] The Commission need not further address this issue. | Yes | |
| 252 | # Sun Workstations to Upgrade | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| 253 | Should expenses to upgrade the Sun Workstation be expenses every year? | The CLECs should not be required to bear the one-time installation costs year after year. The Commission finds in favor of the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors. The installation expenses relating to the Sun Workstations must be capitalized. | Yes | |
| 254 | Should loaded labor rates be used within this cost study? | The Joint Sponsors allege that SWBT has misapplied loaded labor rates but they do not offer any specifics to support that allegation. As a result, the Commission is unable to direct SWBT to make any specific corrections to its cost studies. The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| 255 | Area Manager's allocation to the SLEUTH function | The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors. The area manager's allocation to the SLEUTH function will be 12.5 percent of the Area Manager's time and cost. | Yes | The number of hours on Tab 8.4 for this task were multiplied by .125 |
| 256 | # Managers for SLEUTH and SMS | The Commission finds in favor of the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors. The number of managers in the job function codes associated with SLEUTH and SMS shall be limited to the number proposed by the Joint Sponsors. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|---|
| 257 | # SS7 Clerks | For the reasons described in issue 256, the Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors. The number of SS7 clerks shall be reduced to the number supported by SWBT's labor rate support documentation and set out in the Joint Sponsors' testimony. | Yes | |
| 258 | Software License and Support Inflation Factor | The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors. SWBT's cost report shall not include an inflation factor for software licenses and software support. | Yes | |
| 259 | Was the present value calculation within the study done correctly? | The Joint Sponsors' witness testified that SWBT had incorrectly performed present value calculations in its cost study. SWBT agreed that the calculations were initially done incorrectly and corrected them in its surrebuttal testimony. The Commission need not further address this issue. | Yes | |
| 260 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. It also appears that SWBT incorrectly used the 377C maintenance factor for 357C maintenance on Tab 8.1.2. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in their restated rates. |
| 261 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is not need for a present value calculation. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|---|---|--------------|--|
| 262 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Signal Transfer Point (STP) Port TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 263 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | Commission ordered use of T0-97-40 rates |
| 264 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsors' rates. |
| 265 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 266 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--|--|--------------|--|
| <i>SS7 CNAM Query TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 267 | STP Link Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 230 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Since the Joint Sponsors don't have the revised CCSCIS model the STP Link Utilization cannot be verified directly. However, the revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors restated studies. |
| 268 | STP Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 230 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 269 | Expenses for NETPILOT and ACCESS7 Software, is it double counted? | This issue was addressed at issue 232 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 270 | CCSCIS Equipment Vendor Discount | This issue was addressed at issue 233 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Since the Joint Sponsors don't have the revised CCSCIS model the vendor discount cannot be verified directly. However, the revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors restated studies. |
| 271 | What is the correct Marginal CCS per Channel in order to size material investment? | This issue was addressed at issue 234 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
| 272 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. It also appears that SWBT incorrectly used the 377C maintenance factor for the 357C maintenance factor on Tab 8.02. As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the restated rates. |
| 273 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Joint Sponsors also used the Cost of Money ordered by commission in restating cost factors. |
| <i>Custom Routing - Resale TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 274 | STP Link Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 230 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Since the Joint Sponsors don't have the revised CCSCIS model the STP Link Utilization cannot be verified directly. However, the revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors restated studies. |
| 275 | STP Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 231 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 276 | Expenses for NETPILOT and ACCESS7 software, is it double counted? | This issue was addressed at issue 232 and need not be addressed again | Yes | |
| 277 | CCSCIS Equipment Vendor Discount | This issue was addressed at issue 233 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Since the Joint Sponsors don't have the revised CCSCIS model the vendor discount cannot be verified directly. However, the revised rate in SWBT's compliance filing is consistent with the Joint Sponsors restated studies. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--|
| 278 | What is the correct Marginal CCS per Channel in order to size material investment? | This issue was addressed at issue 234 and need not be addressed again | Yes | |
| 279 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsors' rates. |
| 280 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Joint Sponsors also used the Cost of Money ordered by commission in restating cost factors. |
| 281 | Link Utilization within Study tabs | This issue was addressed at issue 231 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 282 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 283 | Should the Preparation and implementation times for DMS100 translations be the same as for 5ESS? | This issue was addressed at issue 216 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 284 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|--|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| 285 | Should customized routing-resale be charged per query or per line? | The Commission agrees with the argument presented by SWBT. Each user should be responsible for bearing the cost of its own usage. The fact that SWBT has used a different method of charging for these services in Texas does not require it to offer the same deal in Missouri. The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| <i>Custom Routing - UNE TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 286 | STP Link Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 230 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 287 | STP Utilization | This issue was addressed at issue 231 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 288 | Expenses for NETPILOT and ACCESS7 Software, is it double counted? | This issue was addressed at issue 232 and need not be addressed again | Yes | |
| 289 | CCSCIS Equipment Vendor Discount | This issue was addressed at issue 233 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 290 | What is the correct Marginal CCS per Channel in order to size material investment? | This issue was addressed at issue 234 and need not be addressed again | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--|
| 291 | Cost Factors | Cost factors are specifically addressed under issues 45-85 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained in the Joint Sponsors' comments on Issues 45 – 85, SWBT's restated cost factors were not consistent with the Commission's decision. As explained in the Joint Sponsor's comments on Issues 45 – 85, the Joint Sponsors have revised the Cost Factors to be consistent with the Commission's decision, as applicable. The Joint Sponsors' revised cost factors were included in the Joint Sponsors' rates. |
| 292 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Joint Sponsors also used the Cost of Money ordered by commission in restating cost factors. |
| 293 | Link Utilization within Study tabs | This issue was addressed at issue 231 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 294 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 295 | Should the Preparation and implementation times for DMS100 translations be the same as for 5ESS? | This issue was addressed at issue 216 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 296 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 297 | Should customized routing-resale be charged per query or per line? | This issue was addressed at issue 285 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|---|--------------|--|
| 298 | Input and translation of line class codes for connect and disconnect | The Commission is not able to consider evidence that is not in the record. Therefore, this issue is unsupported by any evidence in the record and the Commission considers it to have been withdrawn. | Yes | |
| 299 | Should the Preparation and implementation times for DMS100 translations be the same as for 5ESS? | This issue was addressed at issue 216 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 300 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 301 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | Joint Sponsors also used the Cost of Money ordered by commission in restating cost factors. |
| 302 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| 303 | Expenses for NETPILOT and ACCESS7 software, is it double counted? | This issue was addressed at issue 232 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| <i>Unbundled Call Trace TELRIC Cost Study, April, 2001</i> | | | | |
| 304 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 305 | Fall Out rate for automated systems | The Commission finds in favor of the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors. For those processes that should be highly automated, such as feature activations in the local switch, service order processing, and similar processes, SWBT shall utilize a fallout rate of two percent. | Yes | |
| 306 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 307 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is not need for a present value calculation. |
| 308 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Centrex System TELRIC Cost Study</i> | | | | |
| 309 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--|--|--------------|--|
| 310 | Should the Preparation and implementation times for DMS100 translations be the same as for 5ESS? | This issue was addressed at issue 216 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 311 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 312 | Cost of Capital | Cost of Capital is addressed at issues 82-102 and need not be addressed again. | N/A | This issue is moot because the disconnect is now a separate element and there is not need for a present value calculation. |
| 313 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Simple and Complex UNE Feature Non-Recurring Cost 2001 - 2003, May 2001</i> | | | | |
| 314 | Should rounding be used in translating time from hours to minutes? | The Commission finds in favor of the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors. For the purposes of this cost study, SWBT may not use rounding. | Yes | |
| 315 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|---|--|--------------|---|
| 316 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| 317 | Probability of occurrence for verifying a feature | The arguments presented by the parties are the same as those presented in issue 305, which dealt with fallout rates. The Commission's decision in that issue also applies to this issue. | No | SWBT incorrectly applied the Commission's ruling to the study and in effect applied a fallout rate of 0.2% instead of 2%. The fallout rate for verifying a feature in SWBT's study is sourced from Tabs 8.6 and 8.8. In SWBT's original study, this rate was ** __ ** and Joint Sponsors successfully argued that it should be 2%. In SWBT's compliance filing, the value on Tabs 8.6 and 8.8 was left at ** __ ** but another factor of 2% was applied on Tab 6.4. The correct implementation of this ruling within the study is to change the ** __ ** fallout rate to 2% on Tabs 8.6 and 8.8 and leave the occurrence factor on Tab 6.4 at 100%. This produces a TELRIC cost of .04 for activation of simple features. |
| 318 | Probability of occurrence for verifying a feature | This is a duplication of issue 317 and need not be addressed | N/A | |
| 319 | Should supplements be charged per feature? | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|--|--|--------------|---|
| <i>Primary Rate Interface (PRI) Port Features TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 320 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 321 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 322 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| 323 | Should the Preparation and implementation times for DMS100 translations be the same as for 5ESS? | This issue was addressed at issue 216 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 324 | Preparation and implementation times for inputting backup D channel trunk group into MTS | The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors. SWBT must remove this cost from its cost study. | No | This task relates to both the connect and the disconnect for the PRI. The ruling eliminated the costs for this task in connection with the Backup D channel, therefore the task should be eliminated both for the connect and disconnect functions. The times for disconnect were not removed from SWBT's compliance studies. The disconnect time for this task was set to zero in Joint Sponsors revised study on Tab 8.1.2. |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| <i>Unbundled BRI Port Features TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 325 | Should full disconnect cost be paid at the time the connection is made? | This issue was addressed at issue 106 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 326 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 327 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Electronic UNE Service Order Cost, 2001 - 2003, May 2001</i> | | | | |
| 328 | Fallout for complex orders | The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. The fallout rates for complex orders that SWBT utilized in its cost studies need not be altered. | Yes | |
| 329 | Should rounding be used in translating time from hours to minutes? | This issue was addressed at issue 314 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 330 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|--|--|---|--------------|--|
| 331 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| <i>Manual UNE Service Order Cost, 2001 – 2003</i> | | | | |
| 332 | Should rounding be used in translating time from hours to minutes? | This issue was addressed at issue 314 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 333 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 334 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| 335 | Workflow manager fallout time for all simple order types | There is no reason to believe that for this system the fallout rate for simple orders is any different than the fallout rate for complex orders. The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|--|--------------|--|
| <i>Electronic UNE Service Order Type Study NonRecurring Cost Study 2001-2003</i> | | | | |
| 336 | Should rounding be used in translating time from hours to minutes? | This issue was addressed at issue 314 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 337 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 338 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| 339 | LSR processing by Service Rep on all simple order types except Expedite | The time estimates contained in SWBT's cost studies are more credible than the speculations of the Joint Sponsors' witness. The Commission finds in favor of SWBT. | Yes | |
| 340 | Should processing time for complex suspend and restore activities be the same as for simple activities in this study? | The Commission finds in favor of the Joint Sponsors (reduce the complex time to match the simple time). | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|---|--|--------------|--|
| <i>Manual UNE Service Order Type Study NonRecurring Cost Study 2001-2003</i> | | | | |
| 341 | Should rounding be used in translating time from hours to minutes? | This issue was addressed at issue 314 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 342 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 343 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| 344 | LSR processing by Service Rep on all simple order types except Expedite | This issue was addressed at issue 339 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 345 | Should processing time for complex suspend and restore activities be the same as for simple activities in this study? | This issue was addressed at issue 340 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---|--|--|--------------|--|
| <i>UNE-P Migration Service Order and Provisioning Cost NonRecurring Cost Study 2001-2003</i> | | | | |
| 346 | Should rounding be used in translating time from hours to minutes? | This issue was addressed at issue 314 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 347 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 348 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| 349 | RC MAC fallout percentage | This issue was addressed at issue 305 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | SWBT applied 2% on Tab 6.2. |
| <i>NXX Migration TELRIC Cost Study, April 2001</i> | | | | |
| 350 | Inflation Factor | Inflation factors are specifically addressed under issues 63-65 and need not be addressed again. | Yes | |
| 351 | Labor Rates | Labor rates are addressed at issues 36-44 and need not be addressed again. | No | As explained on Issues 37 – 44, SWBT's compliance labor rates were not consistent with the Commission's decision. The Joint Sponsors have revised those rates to be consistent with the Commission's decision and the revised labor rates were entered into the Joint Sponsors' cost studies to produce the revised costs on the rate sheet. |
| 352 | Coordinate with marketing times | The Commission finds in favor of the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors. The time estimate for this activity shall be set at zero. | Yes | |

Missouri Case TO-2001-438
Joint Sponsor's Decision Point List Compliance Assessment

Attachment 1-NP

| Issue # | Issue | Commission Ruling | Compliance ? | Joint Sponsors' Comments |
|---------|--|--|--------------|--|
| 353 | White pages activities | The Commission finds in favor of the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors (no need for the involvement of Directory White Pages personnel in an NXX migration) | No | SWBT did not remove the cost for White Pages personnel in Tab 6.0 of SWBT's study. |
| 354 | Redundant activities for LVAS | The Commission finds in favor of the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors (eliminate the cost of the Technical Architect) | Yes | |
| 355 | Communications Consultant and Service Representative coordination activities | For reasons explained in its Conclusions of Law, the Commission finds that all trunking related costs associated with NXX migration should be apportioned between SWBT and the requesting CLEC according to the provisions of their interconnection agreement for sharing of interconnection expenses. | Yes | |
| 356 | Coordination meetings times | The Commission finds in favor of the position advocated by the Joint Sponsors(the two times are redundant and would eliminate the shorter time) | Yes | |

**NON
PROPRIETARY
ATTACHMENT 2**

Joint Sponsors' Results of Commission Ordered Changes to SWBT's Cost Studies

| UNE/SERVICE | Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | Corresponding Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--|-----------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| | | | | Shared and Common Factor | | ** HC ** |
| Loop Cross Connects (with testing unless otherwise noted) | | | | | | |
| Loop to Multiplexer - 4-Wire Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 14.17 | \$ 87.29 | \$ 69.41 |
| Loop to Multiplexer - 4-Wire Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 13.86 | \$ 11.40 |
| Analog Loop to DCS 2W - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 0.27 | \$ 84.87 | \$ 66.98 |
| Analog Loop to DCS 2W - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 11.44 | \$ 8.98 |
| Analog Loop to DCS 4W - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 0.53 | \$ 87.29 | \$ 69.41 |
| Analog Loop to DCS 4W - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 13.86 | \$ 11.40 |
| Digital Loop to DCS 2W - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 0.27 | \$ 87.26 | \$ 70.56 |
| Digital Loop to DCS 2W - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 11.44 | \$ 8.98 |
| Digital Loop to DCS 4W - Install/Disconnect | TO-97-40 | TO-97-40 | TO-97-40 | \$ 9.00 | \$ 60.04 | \$ 41.06 |
| Digital Loop to DCS 4W - Disconnect (no separate disconnect rate in 97-40) | | | | | | |
| Analog Loop to Switch Port - Install | None | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | None | \$ 24.77 | \$ 18.70 |
| Analog Loop to Switch Port - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 6.37 | \$ 4.04 |
| Digital Loop to Switch Port 2W - Install | None | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | None | \$ 21.12 | \$ 15.05 |
| Digital Loop to Switch Port 2W - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 12.15 | \$ 4.04 |
| Digital Loop to Switch Port 4W - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 14.17 | \$ 153.23 | \$ 132.55 |
| Digital Loop to Switch Port 4W - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 18.94 | \$ 10.84 |
| DS3 Loop Crossconnect - Install | TO-97-40 | TO-97-40 | TO-97-40 | \$ 30.08 | \$ 54.98 | \$ 42.90 |
| Subloop Cross Connect | | | | | | |
| Feeder | | | | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 1 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 2 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 3 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 4 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 4-Wire Analog Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire DSL Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 4-Wire DSL Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire ISDN Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| DS1 Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| Distribution | | | | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 1 | \$ - | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 2 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 3 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 4 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 4-Wire Analog Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 2-Wire DSL Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| 4-Wire DSL Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | Withdrawn in 438 | | | |
| UNE-Customized Routing | | | | | | |
| Customized Routing Per Originating Query | ** HC ** | | | \$ 0.004022 | | |
| CLEC order for Customized Routing per switch | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ 6.43 | None |
| Setup MARCH RPM and AIN Tables per CLEC per switch | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ 78.78 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ 127.58 | None |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ 103.27 | None |

Joint Sponsors' Results of Commission Ordered Changes to SWBT's Cost Studies

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|------|------|----------|--------|------|
| PLEXAR Line Translations for all technologies per 5 stations | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.58 | None |
| POTS | | | | | | | |
| POTS Translations per 5ESS office | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 24.29 | None |
| POTS Translations per DMS100 office | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 130.00 | None |
| POTS Line Translations for all technologies per line | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.29 | None |
| DID | | | | | | | |
| Translations per 1st DID number - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 24.29 | None |
| Translations per Addl. DID number - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 12.13 | None |
| Translations per 1st DID number - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 8.50 | None |
| Translations per Addl. DID number - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 4.85 | None |
| SHARED COST FOR ALL AIN SERVICES | | | | | | | |
| AIN setup translations per office - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 42.52 | None |
| AIN setup translations per office - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 352.34 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | | |
| PLEXAR AIN setup translations per office - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 352.34 | None |
| NONRECURRING COST - DISCONNECT | | | | | | | |
| CLEC order for Customized Routing per switch | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 6.43 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | | |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 42.52 | None |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 103.27 | None |
| PLEXAR Line Translations for all technologies per 5 stations | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.58 | None |
| POTS | | | | | | | |
| POTS Translations per 5ESS office | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 24.29 | None |
| POTS Translations per DMS100 office | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 130.00 | None |
| POTS Line Translations for all technologies per line | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.30 | None |
| DID | | | | | | | |
| Translations per 1st DID number - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 12.13 | None |
| Translations per Addl. DID number - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 12.13 | None |
| Translations per 1st DID number - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 8.51 | None |
| Translations per Addl. DID number - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 4.85 | None |
| RESALE-Customized Routing | | | | | | | |
| Customized Routing Per Originating Query | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 0.003719 | | |
| CLEC order for Customized Routing per switch | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 6.43 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | | |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 279.42 | None |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 103.27 | None |
| POTS | | | | | | | |
| POTS Translations per 5ESS office | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 42.51 | None |
| POTS Translations per DMS100 office | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 69.26 | None |
| NONRECURRING COST - DISCONNECT | | | | | | | |
| CLEC order for Customized Routing per switch | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 6.43 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | | |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - 5ESS | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 151.82 | None |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - DMS100 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 103.27 | None |
| POTS | | | | | | | |
| POTS Translations per 5ESS office | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 42.51 | None |
| POTS Translations per DMS100 office | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 69.26 | None |
| Feature Activation per Analog Port Type | | | | | | | |
| Call Waiting | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------|------|------|----|-----------|-------|
| Call Forwarding Variable | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Call Forwarding Busy Line | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Call Forwarding Don't Answer | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Three-Way Calling | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Speed Calling 8 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Speed Calling 30 | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Auto Callback/Auto Redial | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Distinctive Ring/Priority Call | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Selective Call Rejection/Call Blocker | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Auto Recall/Call Return | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Selective Call Forwarding | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Calling # Delivery | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| CNAM Delivery | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Calling Number/Name Blocking | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Anonymous Call Rejection | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.04 | None |
| Feature Activation per Analog Arrangement | | | | | | | |
| Personalized Ring | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.24 | None |
| Hunting Arrangement | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.33 | None |
| Feature Activation per Successful Occurrence | | | | | | | |
| Call Trace (per feature per port) - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.29 | None |
| Call Trace (per feature per port) - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.29 | None |
| Call Trace (per successful occurrence per port) | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 3.49 | None |
| ISDN BRI Port Features | | | | | | | |
| CSV/CSD per B channel - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.58 | None |
| CSV/CSD per B channel - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.58 | None |
| Basic EKTS per B channel - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.58 | None |
| Basic EKTS per B channel - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.58 | None |
| CACH EKTS per B channel - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.58 | None |
| CACH EKTS per B channel - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.58 | None |
| ISDN PRI Port Features | | | | | | | |
| Backup D Channel - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 33.61 | None |
| Backup D Channel - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 30.22 | None |
| CNAM Delivery - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 14.66 | None |
| CNAM Delivery - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 14.66 | None |
| Dynamic Channel Allocation - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 41.88 | None |
| Dynamic Channel Allocation - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 30.22 | None |
| Analog DID Number Blocks | | | | | | | |
| 10 Number DI/D Number Block | None | T2A | T2A | None | \$ | 123.65 \$ | 5.60 |
| 100 Number DI/D Number Block | None | T2A | T2A | | \$ | 130.21 \$ | 11.23 |
| DS1 Digital DI/D Number Blocks | | | | | | | |
| 10 Number DI/D Number Block | None | T2A | T2A | None | \$ | 123.65 \$ | 5.60 |
| 100 Number DI/D Number Block | None | T2A | T2A | | \$ | 130.21 \$ | 11.23 |
| Centrex-like System Charges | | | | | | | |

Joint Sponsors' Results of Commission Ordered Changes to SWBT's Cost Studies

| | | | | | | | |
|--|------|----------|------|------|------|--------|------|
| System Establishment per serving office - Analog Only - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 443.51 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - Analog Only - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 115.22 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - Analog/ISDN BRI Mix - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 443.51 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - Analog/ISDN BRI Mix - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 115.22 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - ISDN BRI Only - Connect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 443.51 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - ISDN BRI Only - Disconnect | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 115.22 | None |
| System Subsqnt Conversion per serving office - Add Analog to existing ISDN BRI only system | None | \$ - | None | None | \$ - | None | None |
| System Subsqnt Conversion per serving office - Add ISDN to existing Analog only system | None | \$ - | None | None | \$ - | None | None |
| Analog Port Features | | | | | | | |
| Standard feature initialization per analog port | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Auto Callback Calling/Business Group Callback | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Forwarding Variable/ Business Group Call Forwarding Variable | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Forwarding Busy Line | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Forwarding Don't Answer | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Hold | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Pickup | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Transfer - All Calls | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Waiting - Intragroup/Business Call Forwarding Var. | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Waiting - Orig. | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Waiting - Term. | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Fully | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Semi | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Toll | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Consult. Hold | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Dial Call Waiting | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Directed Call Pickup - Non Barge in | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Directed Call Pickup - With Barge in | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Distinctive Ring and Call Waiting Tone | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Hunting Arrgmt - Basic | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 3.48 | None |
| Hunting Arrgmt - Circular | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 3.48 | None |
| Speed Calling Personal | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Three Way Calling | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Voice/Data Protection | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| ISDN (BRI) Port Features | | | | | | | |
| Standard feature initialization per ISDN BRI port | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Add'l Call Offering for CSV | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Forwarding Busy Line | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Forwarding Don't Answer | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Forwarding Variable | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Hold | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Pickup | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Call Transfer - All Calls | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Fully | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Semi | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Toll | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Consult. Hold | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |

Joint Sponsors' Results of Commission Ordered Changes to SWBT's Cost Studies

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|------|----------|------|------------------|
| Dial Call Waiting | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Directed Call Pickup - Non Barge in | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Directed Call Pickup - With Barge in | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Distinctive Ringing | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Hunting Arrgmt - Basic | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 3.48 | None |
| Hunting Arrgmt - Circular | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 3.48 | None |
| Speed Calling Personal | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Three Way Calling | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.19 | None |
| Dedicated Transport - Entrance Facilities | | | | | | | |
| DS1 Entrance Facilities | | | | | | | |
| Zone 1 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 68.65 | \$ | 247.38 \$ 124.56 |
| Zone 1 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 107.23 \$ 16.99 |
| Zone 2 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 70.19 | \$ | 247.38 \$ 124.56 |
| Zone 2 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 107.23 \$ 16.99 |
| Zone 3 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 73.54 | \$ | 247.38 \$ 124.56 |
| Zone 3 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 107.23 \$ 16.99 |
| Zone 4 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 68.93 | \$ | 247.38 \$ 124.56 |
| Zone 4 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 107.23 \$ 16.99 |
| DS3 Entrance Facilities | | | | | | | |
| Zone 1 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 159.47 | \$ | 242.52 \$ 90.46 |
| Zone 1 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 129.75 \$ 28.14 |
| Zone 2 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 175.16 | \$ | 242.52 \$ 90.46 |
| Zone 2 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 129.75 \$ 28.14 |
| Zone 3 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 255.25 | \$ | 242.52 \$ 90.46 |
| Zone 3 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 129.75 \$ 28.14 |
| Zone 4 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 160.42 | \$ | 242.52 \$ 90.46 |
| Zone 4 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 129.75 \$ 28.14 |
| OC3 Entrance Facilities | | | | | | | |
| Zone 1 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 381.30 | \$ | 273.38 \$ 112.05 |
| Zone 1 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 118.54 \$ 34.35 |
| Zone 2 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 413.58 | \$ | 273.38 \$ 112.05 |
| Zone 2 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 118.54 \$ 34.35 |
| Zone 3 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 483.87 | \$ | 273.38 \$ 112.05 |
| Zone 3 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 118.54 \$ 34.35 |
| Zone 4 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 387.14 | \$ | 273.38 \$ 112.05 |
| Zone 4 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 118.54 \$ 34.35 |
| OC12 Entrance Facilities | | | | | | | |
| Zone 1 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 1,228.73 | \$ | 273.38 \$ 112.05 |
| Zone 1 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 118.54 \$ 34.35 |
| Zone 2 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 1,261.01 | \$ | 273.38 \$ 112.05 |
| Zone 2 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 118.54 \$ 34.35 |
| Zone 3 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 1,331.30 | \$ | 273.38 \$ 112.05 |
| Zone 3 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 118.54 \$ 34.35 |
| Zone 4 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 1,234.57 | \$ | 273.38 \$ 112.05 |
| Zone 4 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 118.54 \$ 34.35 |
| Dedicated Transport - Interoffice Transport | | | | | | | |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 6.45 | \$ | 8.69 \$ 2.93 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.60 \$ 0.90 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 7.27 | \$ | 8.69 \$ 2.93 |

Joint Sponsors' Results of Commission Ordered Changes to SWBT's Cost Studies

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|------|----------|-------|--------|------|-------|
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ | 2.60 | \$ | 0.90 | |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 7.23 | \$ | 8.69 | \$ | 2.93 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.60 | \$ | 0.90 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 6.35 | \$ | 8.69 | \$ | 2.93 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.60 | \$ | 0.90 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 7.05 | \$ | 8.69 | \$ | 2.93 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.60 | \$ | 0.90 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 0.00 | None | | None |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 0.08 | None | | None |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 0.15 | None | | None |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 0.00 | None | | None |
| VG Interoffice Transport - Interzone Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 0.03 | None | | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 555.45 | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 1,377.76 | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Install | None | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | None | | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 327.53 | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 1,009.15 | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 5.49 | None | | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 86.37 | None | | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural Add'l Mile | None | None | None | None | | None | None | | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport - Zone 4 - Springfield Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 1.27 | None | | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport - Interzone Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 18.90 | None | | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 1,640.24 | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Install | None | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | None | | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Install | None | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | None | | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 761.74 | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ | 2,438.37 | \$ | 172.97 | \$ | 38.72 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | | \$ | 2.79 | \$ | 1.14 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 18.10 | None | | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban Add'l Mile | None | None | None | None | | None | None | | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural Add'l Mile | None | None | None | None | | None | None | | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport - Zone 4 - Springfield Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 5.09 | None | | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport - Interzone Add'l Mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ | 28.31 | None | | None |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB | | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB | | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB | | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB | | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban Add'l Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB | | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban Add'l Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB | | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural Add'l Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB | | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport - Interzone Add'l Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB | | ICB |

Joint Sponsors' Results of Commission Ordered Changes to SWBT's Cost Studies

Dedicated Transport Cross Connect (All Zones)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Voice Grade 2 Wire - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 0.27 | \$ 84.87 | \$ 66.98 |
| Voice Grade 2 Wire - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 11.43 | \$ 8.98 |
| Voice Grade 4 Wire - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 0.53 | \$ 84.87 | \$ 66.98 |
| Voice Grade 4 Wire - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 11.43 | \$ 8.98 |
| DS1 with test equipment - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 14.17 | \$ 94.67 | \$ 63.36 |
| DS1 with test equipment - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 22.47 | \$ 18.80 |
| OC3 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 0.86 | \$ 150.38 | \$ 98.06 |
| OC3 - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 34.62 | \$ 30.95 |
| OC12 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 0.86 | \$ 150.38 | \$ 98.06 |
| OC12 - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 34.62 | \$ 30.95 |
| OC48 - Install | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 - Disconnect | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |

Digital Cross-Connect System (DCS) for all Zones

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| DS0 DCS Port - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 7.45 | \$ 19.11 | \$ 18.46 |
| DS0 DCS Port - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 6.72 | \$ 6.07 |
| DS1 DCS Port - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 14.43 | \$ 24.93 | \$ 24.30 |
| DS1 DCS Port - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 6.72 | \$ 6.07 |
| DS3 DCS Port - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 125.10 | \$ 24.94 | \$ 24.30 |
| DS3 DCS Port - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 6.71 | \$ 6.07 |
| DCS Establishment - Install | None | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | None | \$ 2,144.01 | \$ 1,868.28 |
| DCS Establishment - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 245.96 | \$ 245.96 |
| Database Modification - Install | None | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | None | \$ 109.35 | \$ 109.35 |
| Database Modification - Disconnect | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| Reconfiguration Charge - Install | None | \$ 0.08 | None | None | \$ 0.09 | None |
| Reconfiguration Charge - Disconnect | None | None | None | None | None | None |

Multiplexing for all Zones

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| DS-1 to Voice Grade - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 164.37 | \$ 84.22 | \$ 66.99 |
| DS-1 to Voice Grade - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 13.22 | \$ 11.40 |
| DS-3 to DS-1 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 404.12 | \$ 197.55 | \$ 153.21 |
| DS-3 to DS-1 - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 43.60 | \$ 31.45 |
| OC-3 to 84 DS1 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 556.22 | \$ 230.54 | \$ 186.09 |
| OC-3 to 84 DS1 - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 92.58 | \$ 80.21 |
| OC-3 to 3 DS3 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 391.26 | \$ 165.54 | \$ 85.66 |
| OC-3 to 3 DS3 - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 58.69 | \$ 46.32 |
| OC-12 to 12 DS3 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 591.10 | \$ 179.45 | \$ 99.56 |
| OC-12 to 12 DS3 - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 78.67 | \$ 66.31 |
| OC-12 to 4 OC3/OC3-c - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 595.85 | \$ 179.45 | \$ 99.56 |
| OC-12 to 4 OC3/OC3-c - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 78.67 | \$ 66.31 |

SS7 Links - Cross Connect

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| STP to Collo Cage - DS0 (Zones 1,2,3&4) - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 76.68 | \$ 155.56 | \$ 147.97 |
| STP to Collo Cage - DS0 (Zones 1,2,3&4) - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 15.90 | \$ 11.45 |
| STP to Collo Cage - DS1(Zones 1,2,3 & 4) - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 65.47 | \$ 151.31 | \$ 143.97 |
| STP to Collo Cage - DS1(Zones 1,2,3 & 4) - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 15.90 | \$ 11.45 |
| STP to SWBT TDF - DS0 - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 76.68 | \$ 155.56 | \$ 147.97 |
| STP to SWBT TDF - DS0 - Disconnect | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 15.90 | \$ 11.45 |

| STP to SWBT DSX Frame - DS1 - Install | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | \$ 65.47 | \$ 151.31 | \$ 143.97 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| STP to SWBT DSX Frame - DS1 - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | | \$ 15.90 | \$ 11.45 |
| STP Port | | | | | | | |
| Monthly STP Port Cost, per Port | TO-97-40 | | | | \$ 480.61 | | |
| STP Port Termination, Cost per Port | | TO-97-40 | TO-97-40 | | | \$ 217.14 | None |
| Signaling Point Code, Cost per STP Pair | | TO-97-40 | TO-97-40 | | | \$ - | None |
| Global Title Translation, Cost per STP Pair | | TO-97-40 | TO-97-40 | | | \$ - | None |
| SS7 Transport | | | | | | | |
| SS7 Transport, Cost per Octet | TO-97-40 | | | | \$ 0.0000007 | | |
| STP Access Link 56 Kbps per Link | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ 6.64 | None | None |
| STP Access Link 56 Kbps per mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ 0.01 | None | None |
| STP Access Connection 1.544 Mbps - Fixed | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ 21.79 | None | None |
| STP Access Connection 1.544 Mbps - per mile | ** HC ** | None | None | | \$ 0.19 | None | None |
| Line Information Database - Validation, OLNS and CNAM | | | | | | | |
| LIDB Validation Query | ** HC ** | None | None | | | | |
| -Total SLEUTH Cost Per Query | ** HC ** | None | None | | | | |
| -Total SMS Cost Per Query | ** HC ** | None | None | | | | |
| LIDB OLNS Validation Query | ** HC ** | None | None | | | | |
| CNAM Validation Query | ** HC ** | None | None | | | | |
| LIDB Validation Query | | | | | \$ 0.013175 | None | None |
| CNAM Validation Query | | | | | \$ 0.000564 | None | None |
| OLNS Validation Query | | | | | \$ 0.000615 | None | None |
| Query Transport (LIDB, CNAM, OLNS) | TO-97-40 | | | | \$ 0.000005 | None | None |
| Service Order Charge | | TO-97-40 | | | | \$ 108.55 | |
| Manual Service Order Type Charges - Unbundled Elements | | | | | | | |
| New Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 12.31 | None |
| New Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 73.43 | None |
| Change Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 4.82 | None |
| Change Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 73.43 | None |
| Record Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 6.16 | None |
| Record Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 6.16 | None |
| Disconnect Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 5.21 | None |
| Disconnect Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 26.75 | None |
| Suspend Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 2.47 | None |
| Suspend Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 2.47 | None |
| Restore Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 2.47 | None |
| Restore Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 2.47 | None |
| Expedited Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 12.36 | None |
| Expedited Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 12.36 | None |
| Due Date Change Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 4.12 | None |
| Due Date Change Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 4.12 | None |
| Cancellation Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 4.12 | None |
| Cancellation Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | | None | \$ 4.12 | None |
| Electronic - UNE Service Order Type Charges | | | | | | | |

Joint Sponsors' Results of Commission Ordered Changes to SWBT's Cost Studies

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------|------|------|-----------|-------|
| Electronic - UNE Service Order | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 2.86 | None |
| Suspend Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.12 | None |
| Suspend Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.12 | None |
| Restore Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.12 | None |
| Restore Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 0.12 | None |
| Expedited Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 6.31 | None |
| Expedited Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 6.31 | None |
| Due Date Change Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 2.11 | None |
| Due Date Change Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 2.11 | None |
| Cancellation Simple | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 2.11 | None |
| Cancellation Complex | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 2.11 | None |
| UNE-P Migration Service Order And Provising Cost | | | | | | | |
| Manual UNE-P POTS Migration, per LSR | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 37.38 | None |
| Manual UNE-P Non-POTS Migration, per LSR | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 176.96 | None |
| Electronic UNE-P Migration (POTS), per LSR | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 1.03 | None |
| Electronic UNE-P Migration (Non-POTS), per LSR | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 157.13 | None |
| Miscellaneous | | | | | | | |
| Performance Data | | ICB | | | | ICB | |
| Special Request Processing | | ICB | | | | ICB | |
| Dark Fiber | | | | | | | |
| Dark fiber to Collo Cross-Connect (Loop/Subloop) - Install | ** HC ** | ** HC ** | None | \$ | 0.86 | \$ | 23.96 |
| Dark fiber to Collo Cross-Connect (Loop/Subloop) - Disconnect | | ** HC ** | None | | | \$ | 24.60 |
| NXX Migration per NXX | | | | | | | |
| | None | ** HC ** | None | None | \$ | 10,736.08 | None |
| LSP Complex Service Conversion - Resale | | | | | \$ | 54.29 | None |
| LSP Simple Service Conversion - Resale | | | | | \$ | 5.00 | None |

ATTACHMENT 3

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----------|--|------------------|----------------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| Loop Cross Connects (with testing unless otherwise noted) | | | | | | |
| Loop to Multiplexer - 4-Wire Install | \$ 14.17 | \$ 87.29 | \$ 69.41 | \$ 14.95 | \$ 92.84 | \$ 73.82 |
| Loop to Multiplexer - 4-Wire Disconnect | | \$ 13.86 | \$ 11.40 | | \$ 14.75 | \$ 12.13 |
| Analog Loop to DCS 2W - Install | \$ 0.27 | \$ 84.87 | \$ 66.98 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 90.25 | \$ 71.24 |
| Analog Loop to DCS 2W - Disconnect | | \$ 11.44 | \$ 8.98 | | \$ 12.17 | \$ 9.55 |
| Analog Loop to DCS 4W - Install | \$ 0.53 | \$ 87.29 | \$ 69.41 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 92.84 | \$ 73.82 |
| Analog Loop to DCS 4W - Disconnect | | \$ 13.86 | \$ 11.40 | | \$ 14.75 | \$ 12.13 |
| Digital Loop to DCS 2W - Install | \$ 0.27 | \$ 87.26 | \$ 70.56 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 92.80 | \$ 75.04 |
| Digital Loop to DCS 2W - Disconnect | | \$ 11.44 | \$ 8.98 | | \$ 12.17 | \$ 15.37 |
| Digital Loop to DCS 4W - Install/Disconnect | \$ 9.00 | \$ 60.04 | \$ 41.06 | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates |
| Digital Loop to DCS 4W - Disconnect (no separate disconnect rate in 97-40) | | | | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates |
| Analog Loop to Switch Port - Install | None | \$ 24.77 | \$ 18.70 | None | \$ 26.34 | \$ 19.88 |
| Analog Loop to Switch Port - Disconnect | | \$ 6.37 | \$ 4.04 | | \$ 6.78 | \$ 4.29 |
| Digital Loop to Switch Port 2W - Install | None | \$ 21.12 | \$ 15.05 | None | \$ 22.46 | \$ 16.01 |
| Digital Loop to Switch Port 2W - Disconnect | | \$ 12.15 | \$ 4.04 | | \$ 12.92 | \$ 10.43 |
| Digital Loop to Switch Port 4W - Install | \$ 14.17 | \$ 153.23 | \$ 132.55 | \$ 14.95 | \$ 169.43 | \$ 147.44 |
| Digital Loop to Switch Port 4W - Disconnect | | \$ 18.94 | \$ 10.84 | | \$ 20.15 | \$ 17.66 |
| DS3 Loop Crossconnect - Install | \$ 30.08 | \$ 54.98 | \$ 42.90 | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates |
| Subloop Cross Connect | | | | | | |
| Feeder | | | | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 1 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 2 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 3 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 4 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 4-Wire Analog Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire DSL Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 4-Wire DSL Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire ISDN Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| DS1 Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| Distribution | | | | | | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 1 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 2 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 3 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire Analog Zone 4 | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 4-Wire Analog Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 2-Wire DSL Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| 4-Wire DSL Sub-Loop | None | Withdrawn in 438 | | None | Withdrawn in 438 | |
| UNE-Customized Routing | | | | | | |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| Customized Routing Per Originating Query | \$ 0.004022 | | | \$ 0.004298 | | |
| CLEC order for Customized Routing per switch | None | \$ 6.43 | None | None | \$ 6.85 | None |
| Setup MARCH RPM and AIN Tables per CLEC per switch | None | \$ 78.78 | None | None | \$ 83.76 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - 5ESS | None | \$ 127.58 | None | None | \$ 135.82 | None |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - DMS100 | None | \$ 103.27 | None | None | \$ 109.94 | None |
| PLEXAR Line Translations for all technologies per 5 stations | None | \$ 0.58 | None | None | \$ 0.60 | None |
| POTS | | | | | | |
| POTS Translations per 5ESS office | None | \$ 24.29 | None | None | \$ 25.87 | None |
| POTS Translations per DMS100 office | None | \$ 130.00 | None | None | \$ 138.41 | None |
| POTS Line Translations for all technologies per line | None | \$ 0.29 | None | None | \$ 0.30 | None |
| DID | | | | | | |
| Translations per 1st DID number - 5ESS | None | \$ 24.29 | None | None | \$ 25.87 | None |
| Translations per Addl. DID number - 5ESS | None | \$ 12.13 | None | None | \$ 12.94 | None |
| Translations per 1st DID number - DMS100 | None | \$ 8.50 | None | None | \$ 9.06 | None |
| Translations per Addl. DID number - DMS100 | None | \$ 4.85 | None | None | \$ 5.18 | None |
| SHARED COST FOR ALL AIN SERVICES | | | | | | |
| AIN setup translations per office - 5ESS | None | \$ 42.52 | None | None | \$ 45.28 | None |
| AIN setup translations per office - DMS100 | None | \$ 352.34 | None | None | \$ 375.11 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | |
| PLEXAR AIN setup translations per office - DMS100 | None | \$ 352.34 | None | None | \$ 375.11 | None |
| NONRECURRING COST - DISCONNECT | | | | | | |
| CLEC order for Customized Routing per switch | None | \$ 6.43 | None | None | \$ 6.85 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - 5ESS | None | \$ 42.52 | None | None | \$ 45.28 | None |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - DMS100 | None | \$ 103.27 | None | None | \$ 109.94 | None |
| PLEXAR Line Translations for all technologies per 5 stations | None | \$ 0.58 | None | None | \$ 0.60 | None |
| POTS | | | | | | |
| POTS Translations per 5ESS office | None | \$ 24.29 | None | None | \$ 25.87 | None |
| POTS Translations per DMS100 office | None | \$ 130.00 | None | None | \$ 138.41 | None |
| POTS Line Translations for all technologies per line | None | \$ 0.30 | None | None | \$ 0.30 | None |
| DID | | | | | | |
| Translations per 1st DID number - 5ESS | None | \$ 12.13 | None | None | \$ 12.94 | None |
| Translations per Addl. DID number - 5ESS | None | \$ 12.13 | None | None | \$ 12.94 | None |
| Translations per 1st DID number - DMS100 | None | \$ 8.51 | None | None | \$ 9.06 | None |
| Translations per Addl. DID number - DMS100 | None | \$ 4.85 | None | None | \$ 5.18 | None |
| RESALE-Customized Routing | | | | | | |
| Customized Routing Per Originating Query | \$ 0.003719 | | | \$ 0.003912 | | |
| CLEC order for Customized Routing per switch | None | \$ 6.43 | None | None | \$ 6.85 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - 5ESS | None | \$ 279.42 | None | None | \$ 297.53 | None |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - DMS100 | None | \$ 103.27 | None | None | \$ 109.94 | None |
| POTS | | | | | | |
| POTS Translations per 5ESS office | None | \$ 42.51 | None | None | \$ 45.29 | None |
| POTS Translations per DMS100 office | None | \$ 69.26 | None | None | \$ 73.73 | None |
| NONRECURRING COST - DISCONNECT | | | | | | |
| CLEC order for Customized Routing per switch | None | \$ 6.43 | None | None | \$ 6.85 | None |
| PLEXAR | | | | | | |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - 5ESS | None | \$ 151.82 | None | None | \$ 161.70 | None |
| Translations per Plexar Customer - DMS100 | None | \$ 103.27 | None | None | \$ 109.94 | None |
| POTS | | | | | | |
| POTS Translations per 5ESS office | None | \$ 42.51 | None | None | \$ 45.29 | None |
| POTS Translations per DMS100 office | None | \$ 69.26 | None | None | \$ 73.73 | None |
| Feature Activation per Analog Port Type | | | | | | |
| Call Waiting | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Call Forwarding Variable | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Call Forwarding Busy Line | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Call Forwarding Don't Answer | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Three-Way Calling | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Speed Calling 8 | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Speed Calling 30 | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Auto Callback/Auto Redial | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Distinctive Ring/Priority Call | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Selective Call Rejection/Call Blocker | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Auto Recall/Call Return | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Selective Call Forwarding | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Calling # Delivery | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| CNAM Delivery | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Calling Number/Name Blocking | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Anonymous Call Rejection | None | \$ 0.04 | None | None | \$0.00 | None |
| Feature Activation per Analog Arrangement | | | | | | |
| Personalized Ring | None | \$ 0.24 | None | None | \$ 0.21 | None |
| Hunting Arrangement | None | \$ 0.33 | None | None | \$ 0.30 | None |
| Feature Activation per Successful Occurrence | | | | | | |
| Call Trace (per feature per port) - Connect | None | \$ 0.29 | None | None | \$ 0.30 | None |
| Call Trace (per feature per port) - Disconnect | None | \$ 0.29 | None | None | \$ 0.30 | None |
| Call Trace (per successful occurrence per port) | None | \$ 3.49 | None | None | \$ 3.71 | None |
| ISDN BRI Port Features | | | | | | |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| CSV/CSD per B channel - Connect | None | \$ 0.58 | None | None | \$ 0.60 | None |
| CSV/CSD per B channel - Disconnect | None | \$ 0.58 | None | None | \$ 0.60 | None |
| Basic EKTS per B channel - Connect | None | \$ 0.58 | None | None | \$ 0.60 | None |
| Basic EKTS per B channel - Disconnect | None | \$ 0.58 | None | None | \$ 0.60 | None |
| CACH EKTS per B channel - Connect | None | \$ 0.58 | None | None | \$ 0.60 | None |
| CACH EKTS per B channel - Disconnect | None | \$ 0.58 | None | None | \$ 0.60 | None |
| ISDN PRI Port Features | | | | | | |
| Backup D Channel - Connect | None | \$ 33.61 | None | None | \$ 35.78 | None |
| Backup D Channel - Disconnect | None | \$ 30.22 | None | None | \$ 33.92 | None |
| CNAM Delivery - Connect | None | \$ 14.66 | None | None | \$ 15.60 | None |
| CNAM Delivery - Disconnect | None | \$ 14.66 | None | None | \$ 15.60 | None |
| Dynamic Channel Allocation - Connect | None | \$ 41.88 | None | None | \$ 44.58 | None |
| Dynamic Channel Allocation - Disconnect | None | \$ 30.22 | None | None | \$ 32.15 | None |
| Analog DID Number Blocks | | | | | | |
| 10 Number DID Number Block | None | \$ 123.65 | \$ 5.60 | None | T2A Rate | T2A Rate |
| 100 Number DID Number Block | | \$ 130.21 | \$ 11.23 | | | |
| DS1 Digital DID Number Blocks | | | | | | |
| 10 Number DID Number Block | None | \$ 123.65 | \$ 5.60 | None | T2A Rate | T2A Rate |
| 100 Number DID Number Block | | \$ 130.21 | \$ 11.23 | | | |
| Centrex-like System Charges | | | | | | |
| System Establishment per serving office - Analog Only - Connect | None | \$ 443.51 | None | None | \$ 471.75 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - Analog Only - Disconnect | None | \$ 115.22 | None | None | \$ 122.55 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - Analog/ISDN BRI Mix - Connect | None | \$ 443.51 | None | None | \$ 471.75 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - Analog/ISDN BRI Mix - Disconnect | None | \$ 115.22 | None | None | \$ 122.55 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - ISDN BRI Only - Connect | None | \$ 443.51 | None | None | \$ 471.75 | None |
| System Establishment per serving office - ISDN BRI Only - Disconnect | None | \$ 115.22 | None | None | \$ 122.55 | None |
| System Subsqnt Conversion per serving office - Add Analog to existing ISDN BRI only system | None | \$ - | None | None | \$ - | None |
| System Subsqnt Conversion per serving office - Add ISDN to existing Analog only system | None | \$ - | None | None | \$ - | None |
| Analog Port Features | | | | | | |
| Standard feature initialization per analog port | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Auto Callback Calling/Business Group Callback | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Forwarding Variable/ Business Group Call Forwarding Variable | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Forwarding Busy Line | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Forwarding Don't Answer | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|---|--|---------|-----------|--|---------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| Call Hold | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Pickup | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Transfer - All Calls | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Waiting - Intragroup/Business Call Forwarding Var. | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Waiting - Orig. | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Waiting - Term. | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Fully | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Semi | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Toll | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Consult. Hold | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Dial Call Waiting | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Directed Call Pickup - Non Barge in | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Directed Call Pickup - With Barge in | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Distinctive Ring and Call Waiting Tone | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Hunting Arrgmt - Basic | None | \$ 3.48 | None | None | \$ 3.70 | None |
| Hunting Arrgmt - Circular | None | \$ 3.48 | None | None | \$ 3.70 | None |
| Speed Calling Personal | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Three Way Calling | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Voice/Data Protection | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| ISDN (BRI) Port Features | | | | | | |
| Standard feature initialization per ISDN BRI port | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Add'l Call Offering for CSV | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Forwarding Busy Line | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Forwarding Don't Answer | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Forwarding Variable | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Hold | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Pickup | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Call Transfer - All Calls | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Fully | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Semi | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Class of Service Restr. - Toll | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Consult. Hold | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Dial Call Waiting | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Directed Call Pickup - Non Barge in | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Directed Call Pickup - With Barge in | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Distinctive Ringing | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Hunting Arrgmt - Basic | None | \$ 3.48 | None | None | \$ 3.70 | None |
| Hunting Arrgmt - Circular | None | \$ 3.48 | None | None | \$ 3.70 | None |
| Speed Calling Personal | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |
| Three Way Calling | None | \$ 1.19 | None | None | \$ 1.26 | None |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| Dedicated Transport - Entrance Facilities | | | | | | |
| DS1 Entrance Facilities | | | | | | |
| Zone 1 - Install | \$ 68.65 | \$ 247.38 | \$ 124.56 | \$ 72.37 | \$ 272.34 | \$ 132.46 |
| Zone 1 - Disconnect | | \$ 107.23 | \$ 16.99 | | \$ 123.31 | \$ 18.07 |
| Zone 2 - Install | \$ 70.19 | \$ 247.38 | \$ 124.56 | \$ 74.00 | \$ 272.34 | \$ 132.46 |
| Zone 2 - Disconnect | | \$ 107.23 | \$ 16.99 | | \$ 123.31 | \$ 18.07 |
| Zone 3 - Install | \$ 73.54 | \$ 247.38 | \$ 124.56 | \$ 77.52 | \$ 272.34 | \$ 132.46 |
| Zone 3 - Disconnect | | \$ 107.23 | \$ 16.99 | | \$ 123.31 | \$ 18.07 |
| Zone 4 - Install | \$ 68.93 | \$ 247.38 | \$ 124.56 | \$ 72.66 | \$ 272.34 | \$ 132.46 |
| Zone 4 - Disconnect | | \$ 107.23 | \$ 16.99 | | \$ 123.31 | \$ 18.07 |
| DS3 Entrance Facilities | | | | | | |
| Zone 1 - Install | \$ 159.47 | \$ 242.52 | \$ 90.46 | \$ 168.09 | \$ 267.16 | \$ 96.20 |
| Zone 1 - Disconnect | | \$ 129.75 | \$ 28.14 | | \$ 147.26 | \$ 36.55 |
| Zone 2 - Install | \$ 175.16 | \$ 242.52 | \$ 90.46 | \$ 184.63 | \$ 267.16 | \$ 96.20 |
| Zone 2 - Disconnect | | \$ 129.75 | \$ 28.14 | | \$ 147.26 | \$ 36.55 |
| Zone 3 - Install | \$ 255.25 | \$ 242.52 | \$ 90.46 | \$ 269.08 | \$ 267.16 | \$ 96.20 |
| Zone 3 - Disconnect | | \$ 129.75 | \$ 28.14 | | \$ 147.26 | \$ 36.55 |
| Zone 4 - Install | \$ 160.42 | \$ 242.52 | \$ 90.46 | \$ 169.09 | \$ 267.16 | \$ 96.20 |
| Zone 4 - Disconnect | | \$ 129.75 | \$ 28.14 | | \$ 147.26 | \$ 36.55 |
| OC3 Entrance Facilities | | | | | | |
| Zone 1 - Install | \$ 381.30 | \$ 273.38 | \$ 112.05 | \$ 401.91 | \$ 299.98 | \$ 119.17 |
| Zone 1 - Disconnect | | \$ 118.54 | \$ 34.35 | | \$ 155.21 | \$ 56.41 |
| Zone 2 - Install | \$ 413.58 | \$ 273.38 | \$ 112.05 | \$ 435.98 | \$ 299.98 | \$ 119.17 |
| Zone 2 - Disconnect | | \$ 118.54 | \$ 34.35 | | \$ 155.21 | \$ 56.41 |
| Zone 3 - Install | \$ 483.87 | \$ 273.38 | \$ 112.05 | \$ 510.17 | \$ 299.98 | \$ 119.17 |
| Zone 3 - Disconnect | | \$ 118.54 | \$ 34.35 | | \$ 155.21 | \$ 56.41 |
| Zone 4 - Install | \$ 387.14 | \$ 273.38 | \$ 112.05 | \$ 408.06 | \$ 299.98 | \$ 119.17 |
| Zone 4 - Disconnect | | \$ 118.54 | \$ 34.35 | | \$ 155.21 | \$ 56.41 |
| OC12 Entrance Facilities | | | | | | |
| Zone 1 - Install | \$ 1,228.73 | \$ 273.38 | \$ 112.05 | \$ 1,295.13 | \$ 299.98 | \$ 119.17 |
| Zone 1 - Disconnect | | \$ 118.54 | \$ 34.35 | | \$ 155.21 | \$ 56.41 |
| Zone 2 - Install | \$ 1,261.01 | \$ 273.38 | \$ 112.05 | \$ 1,329.19 | \$ 299.98 | \$ 119.17 |
| Zone 2 - Disconnect | | \$ 118.54 | \$ 34.35 | | \$ 155.21 | \$ 56.41 |
| Zone 3 - Install | \$ 1,331.30 | \$ 273.38 | \$ 112.05 | \$ 1,403.38 | \$ 299.98 | \$ 119.17 |
| Zone 3 - Disconnect | | \$ 118.54 | \$ 34.35 | | \$ 155.21 | \$ 56.41 |
| Zone 4 - Install | \$ 1,234.57 | \$ 273.38 | \$ 112.05 | \$ 1,301.28 | \$ 299.98 | \$ 119.17 |
| Zone 4 - Disconnect | | \$ 118.54 | \$ 34.35 | | \$ 155.21 | \$ 56.41 |
| Dedicated Transport - Interoffice Transport | | | | | | |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Install | \$ 6.45 | \$ 8.69 | \$ 2.93 | \$ 6.81 | \$ 9.24 | \$ 3.09 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.60 | \$ 0.90 | | \$ 2.78 | \$ 0.95 |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Install | \$ 7.27 | \$ 8.69 | \$ 2.93 | \$ 7.67 | \$ 9.24 | \$ 3.09 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.60 | \$ 0.90 | | \$ 2.78 | \$ 0.95 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Install | \$ 7.23 | \$ 8.69 | \$ 2.93 | \$ 7.62 | \$ 9.24 | \$ 3.09 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.60 | \$ 0.90 | | \$ 2.78 | \$ 0.95 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Install | \$ 6.35 | \$ 8.69 | \$ 2.93 | \$ 6.69 | \$ 9.24 | \$ 3.09 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.60 | \$ 0.90 | | \$ 2.78 | \$ 0.95 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Install | \$ 7.05 | \$ 8.69 | \$ 2.93 | \$ 7.43 | \$ 9.24 | \$ 3.09 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.60 | \$ 0.90 | | \$ 2.78 | \$ 0.95 |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban Add'l Mile | \$ 0.003325 | None | None | \$ 0.003490 | None | None |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban Add'l Mile | \$ 0.076466 | None | None | \$ 0.080268 | None | None |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural Add'l Mile | \$ 0.154040 | None | None | \$ 0.162862 | None | None |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield Add'l Mile | \$ 0.001108 | None | None | \$ 0.001163 | None | None |
| VG Interoffice Transport- Interzone Add'l Mile | \$ 0.025489 | None | None | \$ 0.026756 | None | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Install | \$ 555.45 | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | \$ 585.47 | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Install | \$ 1,377.76 | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | \$ 1,452.25 | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Install | None | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | None | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Install | \$ 327.53 | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | \$ 345.22 | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Install | \$ 1,009.15 | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | \$ 1,063.67 | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban Add'l Mile | \$ 5.49 | None | None | \$ 5.79 | None | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban Add'l Mile | \$ 86.37 | None | None | \$ 91.11 | None | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural Add'l Mile | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield Add'l Mile | \$ 1.27 | None | None | \$ 1.34 | None | None |
| OC3 Interoffice Transport - Interzone Add'l Mile | \$ 18.90 | None | None | \$ 19.94 | None | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Install | \$ 1,640.24 | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | \$ 1,728.83 | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Install | None | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | None | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Install | None | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | None | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Install | \$ 761.74 | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | \$ 802.89 | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 4 - Springfield First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Install | \$ 2,438.37 | \$ 172.97 | \$ 38.72 | \$ 2,570.09 | \$ 183.64 | \$ 41.12 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile - Disconnect | | \$ 2.79 | \$ 1.14 | | \$ 2.95 | \$ 1.21 |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban Add'l Mile | \$ 18.10 | None | None | \$ 19.10 | None | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban Add'l Mile | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural Add'l Mile | None | None | None | None | None | None |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|--|--|-------------|-------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport - Zone 4 - Springfield Add'l Mile | \$ 5.09 | None | None | \$ 5.37 | None | None |
| OC12 Interoffice Transport - Interzone Add'l Mile | \$ 28.31 | None | None | \$ 29.87 | None | None |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban First Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban First Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural First Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Interzone First Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 1 - Urban Add'l Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 2 - Suburban Add'l Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport- Zone 3 - Rural Add'l Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 Interoffice Transport - Interzone Add'l Mile | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| Dedicated Transport Cross Connect (All Zones) | | | | | | |
| Voice Grade 2 Wire - Install | \$ 0.27 | \$ 84.87 | \$ 66.98 | \$ 3.00 | \$ 90.25 | \$ 71.24 |
| Voice Grade 2 Wire - Disconnect | | \$ 11.43 | \$ 8.98 | | \$ 14.74 | \$ 12.13 |
| Voice Grade 4 Wire - Install | \$ 0.53 | \$ 84.87 | \$ 66.98 | \$ 5.10 | \$ 90.25 | \$ 71.24 |
| Voice Grade 4 Wire - Disconnect | | \$ 11.43 | \$ 8.98 | | \$ 14.74 | \$ 12.13 |
| DS1 with test equipment - Install | \$ 14.17 | \$ 94.67 | \$ 63.36 | \$ 14.95 | \$ 100.70 | \$ 67.39 |
| DS1 with test equipment - Disconnect | | \$ 22.47 | \$ 18.80 | | \$ 23.89 | \$ 20.00 |
| OC3 - Install | \$ 0.86 | \$ 150.38 | \$ 98.06 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 159.95 | \$ 104.31 |
| OC3 - Disconnect | | \$ 34.62 | \$ 30.95 | | \$ 36.82 | \$ 32.92 |
| OC12 - Install | \$ 0.86 | \$ 150.38 | \$ 98.06 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 159.95 | \$ 104.31 |
| OC12 - Disconnect | | \$ 34.62 | \$ 30.95 | | \$ 36.82 | \$ 32.92 |
| OC48 - Install | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB |
| OC48 - Disconnect | | ICB | ICB | | ICB | ICB |
| Digital Cross-Connect System (DCS) for all Zones | | | | | | |
| DS0 DCS Port - Install | \$ 7.45 | \$ 19.11 | \$ 18.46 | \$ 7.85 | \$ 20.32 | \$ 19.65 |
| DS0 DCS Port - Disconnect | | \$ 6.72 | \$ 6.07 | | \$ 7.14 | \$ 6.46 |
| DS1 DCS Port - Install | \$ 14.43 | \$ 24.93 | \$ 24.30 | \$ 15.22 | \$ 26.52 | \$ 25.85 |
| DS1 DCS Port - Disconnect | | \$ 6.72 | \$ 6.07 | | \$ 7.14 | \$ 6.46 |
| DS3 DCS Port - Install | \$ 125.10 | \$ 24.94 | \$ 24.30 | \$ 131.86 | \$ 26.52 | \$ 25.85 |
| DS3 DCS Port - Disconnect | | \$ 6.71 | \$ 6.07 | | \$ 7.14 | \$ 6.46 |
| DCS Establishment - Install | None | \$ 2,144.01 | \$ 1,868.28 | None | \$ 2,276.71 | \$ 1,983.81 |
| DCS Establishment - Disconnect | | \$ 245.96 | \$ 245.96 | | \$ 261.53 | \$ 261.53 |
| Database Modification - Install | None | \$ 109.35 | \$ 109.35 | None | \$ 116.31 | \$ 116.31 |
| Database Modification - Disconnect | | None | None | | None | None |
| Reconfiguration Charge - Install | None | \$ 0.09 | None | None | \$ 0.09 | None |
| Reconfiguration Charge - Disconnect | | None | None | | None | None |
| Multiplexing for all Zones | | | | | | |
| DS-1 to Voice Grade - Install | \$ 164.37 | \$ 84.22 | \$ 66.99 | \$ 173.24 | \$ 89.57 | \$ 71.24 |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------|--|----------------|----------------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| DS-1 to Voice Grade - Disconnect | | \$ 13.22 | \$ 11.40 | | \$ 14.06 | \$ 12.13 |
| DS-3 to DS-1 - Install | \$ 404.12 | \$ 197.55 | \$ 153.21 | \$ 425.94 | \$ 210.10 | \$ 162.94 |
| DS-3 to DS-1 - Disconnect | | \$ 43.60 | \$ 31.45 | | \$ 46.38 | \$ 33.46 |
| OC-3 to 84 DS1 - Install | \$ 556.22 | \$ 230.54 | \$ 186.09 | \$ 586.26 | \$ 245.25 | \$ 197.96 |
| OC-3 to 84 DS1 - Disconnect | | \$ 92.58 | \$ 80.21 | | \$ 98.54 | \$ 85.39 |
| OC-3 to 3 DS3 - Install | \$ 391.26 | \$ 165.54 | \$ 85.66 | \$ 412.40 | \$ 176.08 | \$ 91.11 |
| OC-3 to 3 DS3 - Disconnect | | \$ 58.69 | \$ 46.32 | | \$ 62.43 | \$ 49.29 |
| OC-12 to 12 DS3 - Install | \$ 591.10 | \$ 179.45 | \$ 99.56 | \$ 623.03 | \$ 190.90 | \$ 105.93 |
| OC-12 to 12 DS3 - Disconnect | | \$ 78.67 | \$ 66.31 | | \$ 83.72 | \$ 70.57 |
| OC-12 to 4 OC3/OC3-c - Install | \$ 595.85 | \$ 179.45 | \$ 99.56 | \$ 628.03 | \$ 229.41 | \$ 131.53 |
| OC-12 to 4 OC3/OC3-c - Disconnect | | \$ 78.67 | \$ 66.31 | | \$ 71.26 | \$ 58.11 |
| SS7 Links - Cross Connect | | | | | | |
| STP to Collo Cage - DS0 (Zones 1,2,3&4) - Install | \$ 76.68 | \$ 155.56 | \$ 147.97 | \$ 80.81 | \$ 165.47 | \$ 157.37 |
| STP to Collo Cage - DS0 (Zones 1,2,3&4) - Disconnect | | \$ 15.90 | \$ 11.45 | | \$ 16.90 | \$ 12.16 |
| STP to Collo Cage - DS1(Zones 1,2,3 & 4) - Install | \$ 65.47 | \$ 151.31 | \$ 143.97 | \$ 69.01 | \$ 160.94 | \$ 153.11 |
| STP to Collo Cage - DS1(Zones 1,2,3 & 4) - Disconnect | | \$ 15.90 | \$ 11.45 | | \$ 16.90 | \$ 12.16 |
| STP to SWBT TDF - DS0 - Install | \$ 76.68 | \$ 155.56 | \$ 147.97 | \$ 80.81 | \$ 165.47 | \$ 157.37 |
| STP to SWBT TDF - DS0 - Disconnect | | \$ 15.90 | \$ 11.45 | | \$ 16.90 | \$ 12.16 |
| STP to SWBT DSX Frame - DS1 - Install | \$ 65.47 | \$ 151.31 | \$ 143.97 | \$ 69.01 | \$ 160.94 | \$ 153.11 |
| STP to SWBT DSX Frame - DS1 - Disconnect | | \$ 15.90 | \$ 11.45 | | \$ 16.90 | \$ 12.16 |
| STP Port | | | | | | |
| Monthly STP Port Cost, per Port | \$ 480.61 | | | TO-97-40 Rates | | |
| STP Port Termination, Cost per Port | | \$ 217.14 | None | | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates |
| Signaling Point Code, Cost per STP Pair | | \$ - | None | | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates |
| Global Title Translation, Cost per STP Pair | | \$ - | None | | TO-97-40 Rates | TO-97-40 Rates |
| SS7 Transport | | | | | | |
| SS7 Transport, Cost per Octet | \$ 0.0000007 | | | TO-97-40 Rates | | |
| STP Access Link 56 Kbps per Link | \$ 6.64 | None | None | \$ 7.00 | None | None |
| STP Access Link 56 Kbps per mile | \$ 0.01 | None | None | \$ 0.012 | None | None |
| STP Access Connection 1.544 Mbps - Fixed | \$ 21.79 | None | None | \$ 22.87 | None | None |
| STP Access Connection 1.544 Mbps - per mile | \$ 0.19 | None | None | \$ 0.198 | None | None |
| Line Information Database - Validation, OLNS and CNAM | | | | | | |
| LIDB Validation Query | | | | | | |
| -Total SLEUTH Cost Per Query | | | | | | |
| -Total SMS Cost Per Query | | | | | | |
| LIDB OLNS Validation Query | | | | | | |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|--|----------------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| CNAM Validation Query | | | | | | |
| LIDB Validation Query | \$ 0.013175 | None | None | \$ 0.013946 | None | None |
| CNAM Validation Query | \$ 0.000564 | None | None | \$ 0.000863 | None | None |
| OLNS Validation Query | \$ 0.000615 | None | None | \$ 0.000916 | None | None |
| Query Transport (LIDB, CNAM, OLNS) | \$ 0.000005 | None | None | \$ 0.000005 | None | None |
| Service Order Charge | | \$ 108.55 | | | TO-97-40 Rates | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Manual Service Order Type Charges - Unbundled Elements | | | | | | |
| New Simple | None | \$ 12.31 | None | None | \$ 13.06 | None |
| New Complex | None | \$ 73.43 | None | None | \$ 77.93 | None |
| Change Simple | None | \$ 4.82 | None | None | \$ 5.12 | None |
| Change Complex | None | \$ 73.43 | None | None | \$ 77.93 | None |
| Record Simple | None | \$ 6.16 | None | None | \$ 6.54 | None |
| Record Complex | None | \$ 6.16 | None | None | \$ 6.54 | None |
| Disconnect Simple | None | \$ 5.21 | None | None | \$ 5.53 | None |
| Disconnect Complex | None | \$ 26.75 | None | None | \$ 28.38 | None |
| Suspend Simple | None | \$ 2.47 | None | None | \$ 2.62 | None |
| Suspend Complex | None | \$ 2.47 | None | None | \$ 2.62 | None |
| Restore Simple | None | \$ 2.47 | None | None | \$ 2.62 | None |
| Restore Complex | None | \$ 2.47 | None | None | \$ 2.62 | None |
| Expedited Simple | None | \$ 12.36 | None | None | \$ 13.11 | None |
| Expedited Complex | None | \$ 12.36 | None | None | \$ 13.11 | None |
| Due Date Change Simple | None | \$ 4.12 | None | None | \$ 4.37 | None |
| Due Date Change Complex | None | \$ 4.12 | None | None | \$ 4.37 | None |
| Cancellation Simple | None | \$ 4.12 | None | None | \$ 4.37 | None |
| Cancellation Complex | None | \$ 4.12 | None | None | \$ 4.37 | None |
| Electronic - UNE Service Order Type Charges | | | | | | |
| Electronic - UNE Service Order | None | \$ 2.86 | None | None | \$ 3.04 | None |
| Suspend Simple | None | \$ 0.12 | None | None | \$ 0.13 | None |
| Suspend Complex | None | \$ 0.12 | None | None | \$ 0.13 | None |
| Restore Simple | None | \$ 0.12 | None | None | \$ 0.13 | None |
| Restore Complex | None | \$ 0.12 | None | None | \$ 0.13 | None |
| Expedited Simple | None | \$ 6.31 | None | None | \$ 6.69 | None |
| Expedited Complex | None | \$ 6.31 | None | None | \$ 6.69 | None |
| Due Date Change Simple | None | \$ 2.11 | None | None | \$ 2.23 | None |
| Due Date Change Complex | None | \$ 2.11 | None | None | \$ 2.23 | None |
| Cancellation Simple | None | \$ 2.11 | None | None | \$ 2.23 | None |
| Cancellation Complex | None | \$ 2.11 | None | None | \$ 2.23 | None |
| UNE-P Migration Service Order And Provising Cost | | | | | | |
| Manual UNE-P POTS Migration, per LSR | None | \$ 37.38 | None | None | \$ 39.66 | None |

| UNE/SERVICE | AT&T Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | | SWBT Resultant Rates From Commission Ordered Cost Results | | |
|---|--|--------------|-----------|--|--------------|-----------|
| | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l | Recurring | NRC 1st | NRC Add'l |
| Manual UNE-P Non-POTS Migration, per LSR | None | \$ 176.96 | None | None | \$ 187.79 | None |
| Electronic UNE-P Migration (POTS), per LSR | None | \$ 1.03 | None | None | \$ 1.09 | None |
| Electronic UNE-P Migration (Non-POTS), per LSR | None | \$ 157.13 | None | None | \$ 166.77 | None |
| Miscellaneous | | | | | | |
| Performance Data | | ICB | | | ICB | |
| Special Request Processing | | ICB | | | ICB | |
| Dark Fiber | | | | | | |
| Dark fiber to Collo Cross-Connect (Loop/Subloop) - Install | \$ 0.86 | \$ 23.96 | None | \$ 0.91 | \$ 41.16 | None |
| Dark fiber to Collo Cross-Connect (Loop/Subloop) - Disconnect | | \$ 24.60 | None | | \$ 33.00 | None |
| NXX Migration per NXX | None | \$ 10,736.08 | None | None | \$ 11,541.61 | None |
| LSP Complex Service Conversion - Resale | | \$ 54.29 | None | | | |
| LSP Simple Service Conversion - Resale | | \$ 5.00 | None | | | |