

DRAFT

**BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
Application by SBC Communications Inc.,)
Michigan Bell Telephone Company, d/b/a) CC Docket No. _____
Ameritech Michigan, And Southwestern)
Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a)
Ameritech Long Distance for Provision of)
In-Region InterLATA Services in Michigan)

**AFFIDAVIT OF ROBIN M. GLEASON
ON BEHALF OF AMERITECH MICHIGAN**

STATE OF MICHIGAN)
)
COUNTY OF INGHAM)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PARAGRAPH(s)
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE	2
PURPOSE OF AFFIDAVIT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3-5
ORGANIZATION OF AFFIDAVIT	6
HISTORY OF AMERITECH MICHIGAN'S LONG-DISTANCE APPLICATION	7-10
THE MPSC'S § 271 EVALUATION- CASE NO. U-12320	11-12
COLLABORATIVE OUTCOMES	13-17
OPERATIONS SUPPORT SYSTEM TESTING	18
COST PROCEEDINGS, TARIFF FILINGS, AND MI2A	19-32
PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND REMEDY PLAN	33-34
MARKET CONDITIONS	35-42
CONCLUSION	43-47

DRAFT

I, Robin M. Gleason, being of lawful age and duly sworn upon my oath, do hereby depose and state as follows:

1. My name is Robin M. Gleason. My business address is 3893 Okemos Road, Suite A-1, Okemos, Michigan 48864. I am the Vice President-Regulatory Affairs for Michigan Bell Telephone Company d/b/a Ameritech Michigan (“Ameritech Michigan”).¹ I have primary responsibility for interacting with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“MPSC”) and its Staff (“MPSC Staff”) on various issues concerning the Michigan telecommunications industry. I am also responsible for overseeing all regulatory operations for Ameritech Michigan, including rate and tariff administration.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2. I hold a Bachelors of Business Administration Degree from the University of Michigan. I began my career with Michigan Bell Telephone Company in 1978 as a manager in the capital recovery group and have held various assignments within the regulatory organization at Ameritech. In 1989, I was appointed Director-Regulatory/Financial Matters for Ameritech Michigan. In 1993, I transferred to Ameritech Services, Inc., where I held various regulatory financial positions for the five state Ameritech region. In January 2000, I returned to Ameritech Michigan and assumed my current position as Vice President- Regulatory Affairs.

¹Michigan Bell Telephone Company, a Michigan corporation, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Ameritech Corporation, which owns the former Bell operating companies in the states of Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Ohio. Ameritech Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of SBC Communications, Inc. Michigan Bell offers telecommunications services and operates under the names "Ameritech" and "Ameritech Michigan" pursuant to assumed name filings with the state of Michigan.

PURPOSE OF AFFIDAVIT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. For over five years, Ameritech Michigan has traveled a long road with the MPSC and the Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (“CLECs”) to prepare for a § 271 Application that will allow the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) to approve Ameritech Michigan’s entry into the long distance market in Michigan. The journey is not over yet, but as demonstrated below, the end is in sight. The purpose of this Affidavit is to summarize the steps taken to comply with the roadmap provided by the MPSC in its February 9, 2000 Order. As such, I describe the progress made from early 2000 to date in this proceeding.

4. The recent extended review of Ameritech Michigan’s processes for irreversibly opening the Michigan market to local competition began when Ameritech Michigan notified, via correspondence, the MPSC Staff on January 28, 2000 of its proposed approach to complete a § 271 Application. As set out below, subsequent to Ameritech Michigan’s correspondence, the MPSC initiated these proceedings by opening Case No. U-12320 on February 9, 2000, and ordering a rigorous collaborative process that included:
 - a. Development and supervision of an extensive test of Ameritech Michigan’s Operational Support Systems (“OSS”) interfaces to be conducted by an independent, third party;
 - b. The filing of tariffs that demonstrate Ameritech Michigan’s full compliance with state and federal statutes, rules, and previous MPSC orders addressing the

DRAFT

- availability of the Unbundled Network Elements (“UNEs”), with emphasis regarding the UNE-Platform (“UNE-P”);
- c. The development and implementation of comprehensive performance measurements and an associated Remedy Plan;
 - d. An investigation into the local market conditions within the State of Michigan; and,
 - e. Active involvement and participation by Ameritech Michigan, MPSC Staff, the Michigan Attorney General, and CLECs in all of the above, including numerous technical conferences and work sessions that helped to identify and resolve CLEC concerns and problems. Where issues could not be resolved with the collaboratives, a number of dispute resolution mechanisms were instituted that included a comment cycle process and contested case hearings, all ending with MPSC Orders resolving the issues.
5. Throughout these proceedings, the MPSC has ensured that the process was open to participation by all interested parties and, as a result, received and reviewed a massive record of comments, pleadings, briefings, collaborative and hearing transcripts and related materials.²

ORGANIZATION OF AFFIDAVIT

6. My Affidavit summarizes the steps taken to date in response to the MPSC’s February 9, 2000 Order, which established a detailed framework for the MPSC’s evaluation of Ameritech Michigan’s planned § 271 Application. First, I provide a brief summary of Ameritech Michigan’s past § 271 Applications. Second, I outline the requirements

²Throughout this Affidavit, I make references to certain documents that are part of the record. These documents are posted on the MPSC’s website at: <<http://www.cis.state.mi.us/mpsc>>.

DRAFT

in the MPSC's February 9, 2000 Order. In doing this, I cross-reference to other Affidavits filed concurrently that provide more detail on particular requirements. Third, I summarize the extensive proceedings that have taken place in Michigan in this and related MPSC proceedings. These include numerous collaborative workshops, addressing OSS testing, OSS enhancements and process and product improvement. Fourth, I summarize related cost and tariff proceedings. Fifth, I summarize the proceedings that were used to develop Ameritech Michigan's performance measurement system, which includes detailed performance measures and a remedy plan. Finally, I discuss the overall status of competition in Michigan.

HISTORY OF AMERITECH MICHIGAN'S LONG-DISTANCE APPLICATION

7. On January 2, 1997, Ameritech Michigan filed its § 271 Application with the FCC. An amendment to Ameritech Michigan's initial Application was filed on January 17, 1997. On February 11, 1997, Ameritech Michigan asked the FCC to dismiss its Application without prejudice. On February 12, 1997, the Common Carrier Bureau granted Ameritech Michigan's request, and terminated review of Ameritech Michigan's Application without reaching the merits. On May 21, 1997, Ameritech Michigan refiled its § 271 Application with the FCC.
8. The process of checklist compliance review by the MPSC had earlier begun with the issuance of its June 5, 1996 Order in Case No. U-11104, a case established for the purpose of collecting and evaluating information related to Ameritech Michigan's compliance with the requirements of the competitive checklist of § 271 of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("Act"), and for the purpose of consulting with the FCC pursuant to this determination. The record in that proceeding was built through

DRAFT

comment cycles similar to one aspect of what is to be used in the current proceeding. Ameritech Michigan had submitted its proofs that it was in compliance with the § 271 checklist by way of a response to a questionnaire published by the MPSC in its initiating Order. Comments and reply comments were then submitted. Parties entered additional information on the record, as they deemed necessary. On May 28, 1997, the MPSC also conducted a one day informational OSS hearing.

9. On June 9, 1997, the MPSC filed its Consultation Report with the FCC in CC Docket No. 97-137, Ameritech Michigan's § 271 Application, which provided the MPSC's assessment of Ameritech Michigan's compliance with the competitive checklist. In its Consultation Report, the Commission concluded that Ameritech Michigan had satisfied 11 of the 14 checklist items.
10. The FCC ruled on Ameritech Michigan's Application on August 19, 1997. Although acknowledging the efforts of the State of Michigan and Ameritech Michigan in opening the state local exchange markets to competition, the FCC denied Ameritech Michigan's § 271 Application.

THE MPSC's § 271 EVALUATION- CASE NO. U-12320

11. On February 9, 2000, the MPSC closed Case No. U-11104 and opened a new Docket, Case No. U-12320, to establish procedures to review Ameritech Michigan's compliance with the checklist items in accordance with its obligation to consult with the FCC pursuant to §271(d)(2)(B) of the Act. In its February 9, 2000 Order in Case No. U-12320 ("Order"), the MPSC required Ameritech Michigan to initiate a number of notices, industry-wide collaborative discussions and filings with the MPSC. Specifically, Ameritech Michigan was required to:

DRAFT

- a. Serve a copy of the Order on every CLEC licensed to provide basic local exchange service in Ameritech Michigan's service territory, and upon all telecommunications providers with which Ameritech Michigan has interconnection agreements. Interested parties were provided an opportunity to file a Notice of Interest in the proceeding;³
- b. File a Notice of Intent to file its §271 Application with the MPSC, and serve a copy of the notice on all CLECs, telecommunication providers with which it has interconnection agreements, and any other persons who filed a Notice of Intent to participate in this proceeding. The Notice must set forth the status of Ameritech Michigan's conformance with the § 271 checklist, including the commitments necessary to reach full compliance. (See, Order at ¶ 3). Ameritech Michigan filed its Notice of Intent on May 9, 2001. Ameritech Michigan's Notice of Intent describes, in part, the remaining steps it will take to demonstrate full compliance with §271 and the MPSC's February 9, 2000 Order, and also recommends a proposed course of action in anticipation of its § 271 Application filing with the FCC. The Notice of Intent was, as required by the Order, filed at least two months prior to a planned filing at the FCC. (See, Order at ¶¶ 3, 14(d)). As required by the Order, Ameritech Michigan served a copy of the Notice of Intent on all CLECs and telecommunication providers with which Ameritech Michigan had interconnection agreements with, and any other persons who filed a notice of

³As Case No. U-12320 has progressed since that time and as additional parties have participated, a service list has been developed. All parties on that service list were provided with service of all filings by Ameritech Michigan.

DRAFT

interest to participate in the proceeding. (Ameritech Michigan filed its proof of service with the MPSC);

- c. Commence a collaborative process with the MPSC Staff and CLECs to assure § 271 checklist compliance (See, Order at ¶ 4). The collaborative discussions and workshops that were held are summarized below, and in the various supporting Affidavits;
- d. File an initial third-party testing proposal with respect to third-party testing of its OSS, and serve copies of its proposal on all parties in Case Nos. U-11104, U-12143, and U-11830.⁴ The MPSC further ordered that the precise details of the OSS testing program be determined in collaboration with the MPSC Staff and the CLECs, and in the event that the parties are not able to resolve differences regarding the details of the OSS testing program, they were to jointly submit a petition to the MPSC setting forth all areas of agreement and disagreement. The MPSC also stated that the joint petition should include the positions of all parties regarding the areas of disagreement as well as the MPSC Staff's recommendation on each disputed issue, and that following the filing of the joint petition, the MPSC could without further proceedings issue an order resolving all disputes regarding details of the OSS testing program. (See, Order at ¶ 5). Ameritech Michigan filed its Initial Proposal on the third party test with the MPSC on February 16, 2000. The subsequent collaborative discussions and final Master Test Plan ("MTP") are summarized below. For a more detailed discussion of

⁴Additionally, because Ameritech Michigan's proposal for the third party test was filed at the same time as the U-12320 February 9, 2000 Order was served, the proposal was also distributed to all CLECs in Ameritech Michigan's territory and to all carriers Ameritech Michigan had interconnection agreements with.

DRAFT

- Ameritech Michigan's current status of compliance with this provision, refer to the Affidavit of Mark Cottrell, "Cottrell Affidavit;"
- e. File tariffs demonstrating full compliance with state and federal statutes, rules, and previous MPSC Orders on UNE offerings, including MPSC Orders addressing the availability of the UNE-P discussed in the February 9, 2000 Order in Cases No. U-11104 and U-12143. The MPSC further stated that if any party believed that Ameritech Michigan's tariff filings were insufficient or inconsistent with the MPSC's prior orders regarding the UNE platform, it should first address its questions regarding the sufficiency of the tariffs in the collaborative process established by the Order. (See, Order at ¶ 6). For a more detailed discussion of Ameritech Michigan's compliance with this provision, refer to the Affidavits of Scott J. Alexander, "Alexander Affidavit," Michael Silver, "Silver Affidavit," and William C. Deere, "Deere Affidavit;"
 - f. Develop a comprehensive "customer-friendly" manual for all aspects of resale, interconnection, UNE provisioning, and OSS. The MPSC further ordered that the provisioning and constant updating of the manual would be subject to third party OSS testing. (See, Order at ¶ 7). These enhancements are summarized below and are discussed in the Affidavit of Mary Pat Regan, "Regan Affidavit;" the actual customer manuals are available at <<https://clec.sbc.com>>;
 - g. Demonstrate parity for all OSS between CLECs and Ameritech Michigan, as well as nondiscriminatory access to all interconnection services delineated in § 271's checklist provision. (See, Order at ¶ 8). As discussed below and in the Notice of Intent filed on May 9, 2001, Ameritech Michigan will demonstrate full

DRAFT

- compliance with this requirement subsequent to the issuance of final third party OSS test results and the submission of performance results. (See, Order at ¶ 14(a) and 14(b)). For a more detailed discussion of Ameritech Michigan's current status of compliance with this provision, refer to the Affidavits of Denise V. Kagan, "Kagan Affidavit," Justin Brown, "Brown Affidavit," and the Cottrell Affidavit.
- h. Demonstrate through third party testing the operational readiness of Ameritech Michigan's OSS at commercial volumes. The MPSC held that the methods by which Ameritech Michigan shall demonstrate OSS readiness shall be subject to definition in the collaborative process. (See, Order at ¶ 9). As discussed in this Checklist Filing, Ameritech Michigan will demonstrate full compliance with this requirement upon successful completion of third party OSS testing. For a more detailed discussion of Ameritech Michigan's current status of compliance with this provision, refer to the Cottrell Affidavit;
 - i. Implement immediately the performance measures and standards described in the May 27 and September 3, 1999 Orders in Case No. U-11830, and through the collaborative process, adopt measures to ensure continuing parity for all OSS between CLECs and Ameritech Michigan and nondiscriminatory access to all interconnection services delineated in the checklist provisions. (See, Order at ¶ 10). For a more detailed discussion of Ameritech Michigan's compliance with these provisions, refer to the Affidavit of Salvatore Fioretti, "Fioretti Affidavit;"
 - j. CLECs should contribute information regarding general market conditions and competition issues in the § 271 checklist proceeding. The information to be filed

DRAFT

- should be developed as a part of the collaborative process. The MPSC further stated that as soon as possible after issuance of this Order, the parties to the collaborative process shall finalize a list of the information to be filed by CLECs and procedures for protecting proprietary data contained in that information. When the list of information has been finalized, all CLECs shall file the required information regarding the state of local competition in Michigan within 45 days. (See, Order at ¶ 11). A summary of the MPSC's market conditions collaboratives are summarized below. For a more detailed discussion of the market conditions in the State of Michigan, refer to the affidavit of Deborah O. Heritage, "Heritage Affidavit;"
- k. The collaborative process should be used to develop specific performance assurance measures, including a self-effectuating system to prevent backsliding. The MPSC also ordered that Ameritech Michigan's performance enforcement plan include the key elements discussed in the December 22, 1999 Order in CC Docket No. 99-295, FCC 99-404, involving Bell Atlantic's § 271 Order. The MPSC further ordered that the performance enforcement plan include provisions for Ameritech Michigan to make self-executing performance payments in the event its performance does not meet standards. (See, Order at ¶ 12). A summary of Ameritech Michigan's compliance with this requirement is discussed below and in the Fioretti Affidavit;
 - l. Complete a minimum of three consecutive months of data reporting in compliance with all performance measures required by the MPSC's Orders in Case No. U-11830. (See, Order at ¶ 13). As discussed below, Ameritech

DRAFT

Michigan expects to file a report in the third or fourth quarter of 2001, including three consecutive months of performance data in compliance with this requirement.

12. In addition to the above requirements established in the Order, the MPSC established certain timelines for the filing of information, including:

- a. When Ameritech Michigan believes that it has satisfied a particular competitive checklist item, it shall file the information with the MPSC and should serve such information on all parties who have filed a notice of interest in the U-12320 proceeding. In the event that Ameritech Michigan believes that the information required to support its position is confidential, it shall complete the necessary protective arrangements prior to filing the information. (See, Order at ¶ 14(a));
- b. Parties shall have 15 days to file replies or comments related to Ameritech Michigan's filings. Those replies or comments shall be served on Ameritech Michigan and all other parties. Ameritech Michigan shall have 15 days to respond to the comments of other parties. (See, Order at ¶14 (b));
- c. Parties may file other information, but the MPSC advises the parties that it will be interested only in comments reflecting new or different data rather than a repetition of previous positions or arguments. (See, Order at ¶14 (c));
- d. Parties may file any information that they believe necessary for the MPSC's consideration at any time during the pendency of this proceeding. (See, Order at ¶14 (d)).

DRAFT

COLLABORATIVE OUTCOMES

13. In an effort to address many of the requirements set out by the MPSC in its U-12320 Order, the MPSC Staff, Ameritech Michigan, and the CLECs facilitated several dozen very thorough collaborative sessions. The parties were successful in resolving many issues that have since enhanced the CLECs' ability to provide their services in Michigan's local telecommunications market and have likewise reinforced Ameritech Michigan's compliance with the checklist items.
14. These collaborative sessions were held in Michigan, as well as in the other Ameritech states. In those instances where the collaboratives were held in the other Ameritech states, the results of the collaboratives were, in many instances, imported to Michigan, including, by way of example, the resolution of various performance measurement issues that were addressed in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and imported to Michigan. In addition, many OSS enhancements and operational process improvements were addressed and resolved in the Wisconsin collaboratives and imported to Michigan.
15. Ameritech Michigan approached these important collaboratives with the CLECs in a proactive and pro-competitive manner by structuring its §271 offers upon the culmination of years of regulatory guidance. For example, Ameritech Michigan brought to the table in Michigan the significant pro-competitive conditions in the FCC's SBC/Ameritech Merger Order dated October 8, 1999. These included twenty separate performance conditions designed to further open local markets and to promote advanced services deployment. These market opening conditions are backed up by a detailed Performance Remedy Plan ("PRP"), with monthly and annual

DRAFT

payment caps for all 13 SBC states, including Michigan. On top of those commitments, Ameritech Michigan's approach in Michigan is a mirror image of the detailed blueprint that the FCC found fully satisfied the competitive checklist requirements in its New York, Texas, and Kansas/Oklahoma Orders.

16. Because Ameritech Michigan's proposals were based on these proven blueprints, its collaborative discussions were, in many cases, successful. The collaborative discussions resulted in a prompt selection of the OSS test vendor- KPMG Consulting, Inc. ("KPMG"), and the development of a Master Test Plan ("MTP").

17. In addition, literally hundreds of issues regarding OSS enhancements, process improvements, new product introductions, and performance measurement refinements have already been resolved (or soon will be resolved) for purposes of Ameritech Michigan's §271 Application through the collaborative process, subject only to successful implementation and testing. Continued adherence to the FCC's blueprint will expedite this § 271 process and bring the benefits of full competition to Michigan consumers sooner.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SYSTEM TESTING

18. The collaborative discussions and workshops resulting from the MPSC's February 9, 2000 Order addressed, inter alia, third party testing, OSS enhancements and operational process improvements. As a result, Ameritech Michigan, the MPSC Staff, and the CLECs, through the collaborative process selected a test vendor, developed a Master Test Plan and resolved OSS enhancement issues in 2000 and early 2001, as discussed in more detail below:

DRAFT

a. Third Party Testing

The MPSC's U-12320 Order required the parties to work collaboratively to refine the details for a comprehensive third party OSS test. Consistent with the U-12320 Order, development of an OSS Master Test Plan ("MTP") began just one week after the MPSC initiated this proceeding. After several collaborative discussions, KPMG was engaged, subject to the oversight of the MPSC, to perform a comprehensive and independent test of Ameritech Michigan's OSS systems. Development of the MTP was facilitated by using KPMG's test plans and experiences from other states as a base model. The Michigan MTP was finalized using multiple collaborative meetings, informational sessions, and written comments.⁵ The MPSC Staff submitted the final Michigan MTP to the MPSC on August 14, 2000, filing it in Case No. U-12320. CLECs had requested that the Michigan MTP be expanded to provide additional review of certain manual processes. Ameritech Michigan agreed, and the parties worked with the MPSC Staff and KPMG to include these evaluations in the MTP.

b. OSS Enhancements

Numerous OSS interface and process issues (referred to as the "A to A-A issues") were discussed at last year's collaboratives. On December 27, 2000, Ameritech Michigan and several other parties filed a "Joint Report of the Participants Regarding Resolved OSS Enhancements and Process Improvement" ("Joint Report") with the MPSC, discussing the OSS interface and process issues.⁶ The Joint Report was

⁵Statistical Methodology remains an open issue. On April 9, 2001, the Collaborative filed a Joint Petition for Commission resolution of the OSS statistical methodology issue. This issue has been fully briefed and is currently pending before the MPSC.

⁶Parties participating in the filing of the Joint Report included: MPSC Staff, Attorney General, AT&T Communications, CoreComm, LDMI Telecommunications, MCI WorldCom

DRAFT

intended as a report to the MPSC on the resolution of many OSS enhancements and process improvements. As stated above, in many instances, the Michigan collaborative deferred to the Wisconsin collaborative regarding the A to A-A issues addressed in the Joint Report. Subsequent to the conclusion of the Wisconsin collaboratives, there remained only one issue in Michigan to resolve.⁷ As discussed below, apart from this one issue, numerous OSS interface and process issues (discussed in the Joint Report) were successfully resolved at last year's collaboratives, including:

1. Local Service Ordering Guide, Version 4:

Local Service Ordering Guide ("LSOG") is a Telecommunications Industry Standard for electronic provisioning. The parties reached agreement regarding how Ameritech Michigan should update its existing electronic data interchange ("EDI") interfaces used for ordering and pre-ordering to be consistent with the most current version of LSOG, Version 4 ("LSOG4"). These enhancements have since been implemented. (For a further discussion of LSOG4, refer to the Cottrell Affidavit).

2. Order "Flow-through" Process Improvements

"Flow-through" refers to orders that can be electronically received and processed by Ameritech Michigan's ordering systems without manual intervention. As a result of collaborative discussions, the parties reached agreement on a number of

Communications, McLeod USA, Sprint Communications, Z-Tel Communications, IP Communications, Rhythms Netconnections, and XO Michigan Inc.

⁷That issue relates to Ameritech Michigan's proposed quorum for certain votes on future OSS changes. It has been fully briefed and is currently pending before the MPSC.

DRAFT

“flow-through” process improvements. (For a further discussion of the “Flow-through” process improvements, refer to the Cottrell and Brown Affidavits).

3. Interim GUI Offering

Ameritech Michigan agreed to provide a graphical user interface (“GUI”) on an interim basis for CLEC use in ordering unbundled loops, UNE Platform and resale until a permanent GUI was implemented in the LSOG4 release. The interim GUI was made available to CLECs on October 1, 2000. The permanent GUI was implemented in the LSOG4 March 2001 release; thus it was made available for CLEC use on March 26, 2001. (For a further discussion of GUI, refer to the Cottrell Affidavit).

4. Directory Listing and Ordering Improvements

Currently, CLECs use separate electronic interfaces to place orders for services (from Ameritech) and for directory listings (from Ameritech Advertising Services). At the request of the CLECs, Ameritech Michigan committed to implement an enhancement that would allow CLECs to submit directory listing orders over the same interface they use for local service. This enhancement will be rolled out June 23, 2001, and will be available June 24, 2001. (For a further discussion of the directory listing and ordering improvements, refer to the Cottrell Affidavit and the Affidavit of Robben Kniffen-Rusu, “Kniffen-Rusu Affidavit”).

c. Operational Process Improvements

Through the collaborative process, several operational process improvements were made in 2000, including:

DRAFT

1. Facilities Modification Process

Concerns were raised by CLECs claiming that Ameritech Michigan's methods of ordering and provisioning unbundled loops to CLECs did not always identify, on a timely basis, facility problems that could delay order completion. As a result of extensive collaborative discussions in Wisconsin, Ameritech Michigan significantly revised its facility modification policy, agreeing to implement these improvements in Michigan. (For a further discussion of the Facilities Modification Process, refer to the Deere Affidavit).

2. Availability of IDLC Information and Tools

As a result of collaborative discussions, and in addition to all required loop make-up information, Ameritech Michigan now offers two new tools for CLECs to use to determine the presence of integrated digital loop carrier ("IDLC"): a Digital Subscriber Line ("DSL") Tracking Inquiry Tool ("DTI"), and Distribution Area Reports. (For a further discussion of IDLC Information and Tools, refer to the Deere Affidavit).

3. Unbundled Loop "Hot Cut" Procedures

As a result of extensive collaborative efforts in Wisconsin, Ameritech Michigan and the CLECs developed a detailed process flow for Coordinated Hot Cuts ("CHC"). Related processes are now used in Michigan as well. (For a further discussion of "Hot Cut" procedures, refer to the Brown Affidavit).

4. Network Interface Devices ("NIDs")

As a result of discussions with the CLECs, Ameritech Michigan clarified its procedures for moving existing internal NIDs outdoors to the satisfaction of the

DRAFT

CLECs. (For a further discussion of NIDs, refer to the Alexander and Deere Affidavits).

5. E 9-1-1 Database Management (parity of Ameritech and CLECs)

Based on collaborative discussions regarding E 9-1-1 Database Management, Ameritech Michigan agreed to notify CLECs through the CLEC User Forum of any new processes or updates to the E 9-1-1 database. (For a further discussion of E 9-1-1 Database Management, refer to the Affidavit of Patrick Harrison, “Harrison Affidavit”).

6. TC/Net Change Policy

- a. The CLECs initially raised concerns regarding the manner and content of the notification of changes to Ameritech Michigan’s CLEC website, which contains comprehensive information for CLECs regarding resale, interconnection, UNE provisioning and OSS. In response, Ameritech Michigan changed its procedures to resolve these concerns. Prior to the process change, Ameritech Michigan disseminated “Accessible Letters” informing CLECs of changes regarding OSS, EDI, and GUI related issues only. To address CLEC concerns, however, on September 30, 2000, Ameritech Michigan implemented SBC’s policy on “Accessible Letters,” and began migrating its TC/Net information to SBC’s nationwide website for CLECs, known as “CLEC OnLine.” Ameritech Michigan further agreed to provide “before and after” images of “Accessible Letters” as well as a “Change Log” reflecting changes posted on the web page so that CLECs

DRAFT

could follow and track changes made. (For a further discussion of the TC/Net Change Policy, refer to the Regan Affidavit and Cottrell Affidavits).

- b. As a result of the collaboratives, Ameritech Michigan and the CLECs also reached agreement on a Change Management Process for non-OSS issues. The parties agreed that Ameritech Michigan would communicate changes to its processes, procedures, and manual forms to CLECs via “Accessible Letters,” and would follow the change process outlined in the CLEC Users Forum. The CLEC Users Forum allows CLECs and Ameritech Michigan to identify, submit, discuss and resolve issues that impact Ameritech Michigan and CLECs in daily business practices. Examples of issues addressed in the CLEC Users Forum include network operations, business practices, maintenance and repair, and billing. The three categories of changes that were addressed using the Change Management Process included: a) Changes impacting CLEC methods and procedures; b) Informational changes; and c) Exception changes. (For a further discussion of the CLEC User Forum, refer to the Regan and Cottrell Affidavits).

7. LEC Protection

CLECs raised concerns about the nature of the LEC Protection process and the procedures that would apply prior to implementation. As a result of collaborative discussions, Ameritech Michigan agreed to provide the MPSC Staff an informal notice at least 90 days before it would seek to institute a LEC Protection program,

DRAFT

so that the collaborative and comment procedures delineated in Case No. U-11900⁸ may be instituted.

8. Account Management

Given the significant role a CLEC's account manager plays with regard to customer satisfaction and Ameritech Michigan's ability to provide good customer service, Ameritech Michigan worked with the CLECs to establish a well-documented account manager's handbook. This handbook contains the practices that various Ameritech Michigan employees are expected to follow as they pertain to customer contacts. (For a further discussion of the customer manuals, refer to the Regan Affidavit).

COST PROCEEDINGS, TARIFF FILINGS, and Mi2A

Cost Proceedings

19. The MPSC has established costs for all UNEs and interconnection services in Michigan. In Case No. U-11831, ("the Biennial Cost Docket") the MPSC considered total service long run incremental costs ("TSLRIC" or "TELRIC") for all UNEs, interconnection, access, toll, and local exchange services provided in Michigan at the time the docket was initiated in January, 1999. This proceeding resulted in the establishment of rates based on TELRIC principles as ordered by the MPSC for many of the products offered by Ameritech Michigan to CLECs. The last order in that docket was

⁸MPSC Case No. U-11900, *In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to determine procedures to ensure that an end user of a telecommunications provider is not switched to another provider with the authorization of the end user.* (September 18, 2000).

DRAFT

issued on August 31, 2000.⁹ (For a further discussion of TELRIC pricing and cost methodologies, refer to the Affidavit of Mr. Richard Florence, “Florence Affidavit”).

20. In addressing cost issues associated with new product offerings, the collaborative participants agreed to disagree. It was determined that cost issues, as well as other unresolved issues from the collaborative, would be teed up in other proceedings before the MPSC. Issues surrounding combinations of UNEs were handled in a comment cycle, dispute resolution process (U-12320), and separate contested case proceedings were used to deal with new product offerings, including newly required product offerings from the FCC’s UNE Remand, Line Sharing, and Merger Conditions Orders.¹⁰

21. With regard to disputed issues related to combinations, after three comment periods, the MPSC issued its first decision in Case No. U-12320 on January 4, 2001. A rehearing phase was commenced with a Rehearing Order issued on March 19, 2001, with a 10-day implementation requirement. In the Rehearing Order, the MPSC approved Ameritech Michigan’s proposed Michigan 271 Amendment (discussed below), with the modifications to its pricing schedule to make it compliant with U-11831. There were no required cost/rate changes to Ameritech Michigan’s Tariff for

⁹Certain issues in Case No. U-11831 have been appealed by Ameritech Michigan and are currently pending before the Michigan Court of Appeals (Docket Nos. 227590/229600).

¹⁰Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 96-98, *In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, 15 FCC Rcd 3696 (1999) (“UNE Remand Order”); Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 98-147, Fourth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98, *Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability*, 14 F.C.C. Rcd. 20912 (1999) (“Line Sharing Order”); Memorandum Opinion and Order, *Applications of Ameritech Corporation, Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, For Consent to Transfer Control of Corporations Holding Commission Licenses and Lines Pursuant to Sections 214 and 310(d) of the Communications Act and Parts 5, 22, 24, 25, 63, 90, 95, and 101 of the Commission’s Rules*, CC Docket 98-141, 14 FCC Rcd 14712 (1999) (“Merger Order”).

DRAFT

existing UNE-P and only rate clarification changes were required to Ameritech Michigan's Tariff addressing Special Access to UNE Conversion.

22. In Case No. U-12540, on August 9, 2000, Ameritech Michigan filed its application for approval of cost studies related to new product offerings mandated by the FCC's UNE Remand and Line Sharing Orders. This proceeding was also used to resolve disputes related to these product offerings that had remained unresolved from the collaborative efforts. The MPSC issued an Order on March 7, 2001, resulting in the establishment of permanent rates for these new UNE offerings, including line sharing, standard xDSL loop conditioning, loop qualifications, sub-loops and dark fiber. Compliant cost studies were filed for the Line Sharing OSS modification charge, Dark Fiber, and standard xDSL conditioning. For other offerings, the MPSC simply mandated certain pricing levels.¹¹

23. On September 18, 2000, Ameritech Michigan filed an Application in Case No. U-12622, for approval of its shared transport cost studies, and to address related issues that Ameritech Michigan and other parties to the collaborative were unable to resolve. On March 19, 2001, the MPSC issued an Order in Case No. U-12622, approving Ameritech Michigan's ULS-ST cost studies and the rates as filed, finding that Ameritech Michigan's methodologies were consistent with that approved in Case No. U-11831.¹²

24. On October 27, 2000, Ameritech Michigan filed an Application ("proposal") in Case No. U-12696, for MPSC approval to revise its reciprocal compensation rates and rate structure predicated upon dual charges for per-call setup and per-minute usage. On

¹¹Certain issues are currently on rehearing before the MPSC in Case No. U-12540.

DRAFT

January 23, 2001, the MPSC concluded that Ameritech Michigan's proposal for changing the rate structure for reciprocal compensation should be adopted and that the bifurcated rate structure better reflected cost causation.

25. Various issues from certain cases are currently the subject of rehearing or on appeal.

Ameritech Michigan is currently abiding by all those aspects of the MPSC Orders that are not the subject of rehearing before the MPSC, subject to reversal or modification on appeal.

Tariff Filings

26. The MPSC, in its U-12320 Order, required Ameritech Michigan to file tariffs that were in full compliance with all legal requirements regarding UNEs, including the UNE-P. The FCC's UNE Remand Order had required several new network elements, including: standard xDSL loop conditioning, dark fiber, sub-loops, unbundled DS3 Loops, and Access to the CNAM and AIN Databases. The FCC's Line Sharing Order also required a new unbundled network element known as the high frequency portion of the loop ("HFPL UNE"). In addition, the SBC/Ameritech Merger Order required Ameritech Michigan to provide a shared transport product similar to that provided in Texas no later than October 8, 2000. Ameritech Michigan has complied with the U-12320, U-12540, and U-12622 Orders, and has filed and updated the following tariffs:

- a. UNE-P for Existing Combinations was initially filed on March 10, 2000, but was updated pursuant to CLEC input during the collaborative on September 18, 2000 (both effective the next day); unresolved issues were addressed and resolved in U-

¹²Certain issues from Case No. U-12622 have been appealed by Ameritech Michigan and are currently pending before the U.S. District Court (Docket No. 01-CV-71517).

DRAFT

12320. On February 7, 2001, in fulfilling an Ameritech Michigan commitment accepted by the MPSC in the January 4, 2001 Order in U-12320, Ameritech Michigan's tariff containing the terms and conditions for Special Access to UNE ("SA to UNE") conversions became effective. On March 29, 2001, in accordance with the MPSC's Rehearing Order in U-12320, Ameritech Michigan updated its offering for converting special access to UNEs to clarify rate applications as established in Case No. U-11831, and updated its existing UNE-P tariffs to reflect the status of operator services and directory assistance pursuant to the MPSC's Order in Case No. U-12622.
- b. Tariffs complying with the FCC's UNE-Remand requirements were filed on March 10, 2000 and May 16, 2000 (both effective the next day); unresolved issues were addressed and resolved in U-12540. On April 6, 2001, in accordance with the MPSC's Order in U-12540, Ameritech Michigan filed revised tariffs in compliance with the MPSC's Order, reflecting updates to various rates, terms, and conditions for standard xDSL loop conditioning, dark fiber, and sub-loops.¹³
- c. Line sharing tariffs were filed on June 5, 2000 (effective June 6, 2000); unresolved issues were addressed and resolved in U-12540. On April 6, 2001, in accordance with the MPSC's Order in U-12540, Ameritech Michigan filed revised tariffs in compliance with the MPSC's Order updating updates to various rates, terms and conditions for the HFPL UNE.¹⁴
- d. Shared Transport or "ULS-ST" was filed on September 7, 2000 (effective October 8, 2000); unresolved issues were addressed and resolved in U-12622. On March

¹³See, footnote 11.

¹⁴*Id.*

DRAFT

29, 2001, in accordance with the MPSC's Order in U-12622, Ameritech Michigan filed revised tariffs updating some terms and conditions for ULS-ST (as the MPSC approved Ameritech Michigan's cost studies as filed), and reinstating the unbundled operator services tariff as required by the MPSC's Order. Shortly thereafter, Ameritech Michigan filed tariffs updating those OS/DA offerings to reflect changes to the products that occurred since they had been vacated as UNEs.¹⁵ The unbundled directory assistance tariff was reinstated pursuant to the MPSC's August 31, 2000 Order in U-11831, and was filed on October 2, 2000.

Michigan Section 271 Amendment ("Mi2A")

27. The MPSC's February 9, 2000 Order required Ameritech Michigan to file tariffs that demonstrated compliance with prior MPSC Orders as well as other pertinent federal and state statutes and rules, and previous MPSC Orders addressing the availability of the UNE-P. As discussed above, pursuant to the MPSC's Order in U-12320, Ameritech Michigan had filed tariffs on March 10, 2000, and subsequently commenced the collaborative process on March 30, 2000.

28. The Michigan collaboratives resulted in the Michigan 271 Amendment ("Mi2A") proposal. The Mi2A proposal was (and is) an interconnection agreement amendment offered by Ameritech Michigan to CLECs which provided the rates, terms, and conditions under which Ameritech Michigan agreed to provide, as part of the §271 collaborative process established in U-12320, existing and new combinations of UNEs in order to facilitate in-region interLATA approval.¹⁶ The Mi2A proposal also offered to CLECs another UNE combination known as enhanced extended loops

¹⁵See, footnote 12.

DRAFT

(EELs). Ameritech Michigan's initial proposal made two alternative forms of the Mi2A amendment available to CLECs, one that covered both existing and new UNE-Ps and EELs, and a second alternative that dealt only with new UNE-Ps and EELs.

29. On September 25, 2000, Ameritech Michigan and all interested parties provided comments on the list of 13 disputed issues surrounding combinations of UNEs. The list of issues had been developed through the collaborative process, with the participation of MPSC Staff. In its initial comments, Ameritech Michigan proposed to offer, on a voluntary basis, certain new UNE combinations in the form of a standard contractual amendment to its existing interconnection agreements with CLECs. Ameritech Michigan agreed to make this offering as part of its proposed Mi2A, as it had been modified during the collaborative process based on input received from the CLECs and Staff. Responses to comments were filed on October 23, 2000, and Replies to Responses were filed on November 13, 2000.
30. On January 4, 2001, the MPSC issued an Order in U-12320, requiring Ameritech Michigan to implement the proposed Mi2A, as modified by that Order, and to provide new and existing combinations of UNEs.
31. Subsequent to issuance of the MPSC's January 4, 2001 Order in Case No. U-12320, Ameritech Michigan along with several other carriers, filed petitions for rehearing. In response, the MPSC issued an Order on March 19, 2001. In the Order, the MPSC approved Ameritech Michigan's revised UNE combination proposal as consistent with the current combinations requirements of §271 of the Act, subject to subsequent judicial determinations. The MPSC further required Ameritech Michigan to modify

¹⁶The Mi2A language dealing with UNE combinations was based on the UNE combinations offerings contained in the Texas 271 Agreement ("T2A").

DRAFT

its Mi2A by specifically recognizing that further MPSC Orders may require changes to the scope of product offerings prior to the two-year time period specified in §§ X.2.5 and X.2.6 of the proposed Mi2A pursuant to judicial decisions that were anticipated in that timeframe and to clearly specify the parameters as well as the limitations of the § 271 compliance determination. Additionally, the MPSC required the tariffing of a contract summary of the complete Mi2A based on a procedure used in the past for access contracts.¹⁷

32. The Mi2A became effective, and was made available to CLECs, on March 29, 2001, with its initial term expiring on September 28, 2003. CLECs were notified via an accessible letter dated March 23, 2001 that the Mi2A would be available on “CLEC OnLine” on March 29, 2001. If the FCC approves Ameritech Michigan’s application to provide in-region, interLATA services in Michigan prior to June 28, 2003, the term of the Mi2A would automatically extend to March 28, 2005, as further discussed in the Alexander Affidavit. Should the FCC approve Ameritech Michigan’s application to provide in-region, interLATA services in Michigan after June 28, 2003, but prior to March 28, 2005, Ameritech Michigan may choose to extend the term of the Mi2A to March 28, 2005.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND REMEDY PLAN

MPSC Performance Measurement Orders prior to Case No. U-12320

33. On May 27, 1999, the MPSC issued an Order in Case No. U-11830, ordering Ameritech Michigan to report, on a monthly basis, certain performance measurements

¹⁷The contract summary tariff for the Mi2A was issued in MPSC Tariff No. 20R, Part 19, Section 22 on April 24, 2001, with an effective date of April 25, 2001, coincident with the first instance of filing an executed Mi2A with the MPSC for approval.

DRAFT

related to its processes and systems used to serve CLECs. In support of its Order, the MPSC referenced the FCC's April 17, 1998 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM"). In an Order issued on September 3, 1999 in Case No. U-11830, the MPSC concluded that Ameritech Michigan could seek approval for alterations in some of the performance measures at the conclusion of the then-pending proceedings related to the SBC/Ameritech merger, or other proceedings related to performance measurements.

Performance Measurements and Remedy Plan- Cases No. U-11830 and U-12320

34. In Michigan, many performance measurement and remedy plan issues were addressed and resolved by the MPSC through the collaborative process last year. For a complete and detailed discussion of the performance measurement and remedy plan issues addressed and resolved, refer to the Fioretti Affidavit. Because these issues are discussed extensively in the Fioretti Affidavit, I only provide a very brief discussion in my Affidavit.

a. Performance Measures

1. In its February 9, 2000 Order in Case No. U-12320, the MPSC required the implementation of the performance measures and standards described in the May 27 and September 3, 1999 Commission Orders. Ameritech Michigan has implemented these Orders.
2. On March 7, 2000, Ameritech Michigan filed a motion to amend the required U-11830 performance measures ordered by the MPSC. At the suggestion of MPSC Staff, collaboratives were initiated to address Ameritech Michigan's motion to change to a set of proposed "uniform" measures, which were based on those used

DRAFT

- in Texas. The performance measurement collaboratives started on March 17, 2000. After extensive discussion, the parties agreed on modifications and additions to the original Michigan performance measures that would serve as the baseline for the OSS test. On July 7, 2000, the parties filed a Joint Motion asking the MPSC to approve the agreement they had reached relative to these baseline performance measures. The MPSC approved the Joint Motion on July 17, 2000.
3. The Collaborative then continued its work on “Phase II,” to address performance measures for new services (UNE Remand, Line Sharing, etc.), and other new performance measures, especially for advanced services related offerings. On November 6, 2000, the collaborative, once again, filed a Joint Motion to ask the MPSC to approve the multitude of agreements reached on a number of performance measures. Additionally, this pleading included a Joint Petition that asked the MPSC to resolve seven narrow issues that remained in dispute among the parties. The Collaborative participants later submitted a Supplement to the Joint Motion & Petition to reflect additional agreements, including resolution of all seven previously disputed issues. The parties also asked the MPSC to approve a “Performance Measurement Change Management Process.” The Supplement to the Joint Motion was filed with the MPSC for approval on January 12, 2001, and the MPSC approved the revised performance measurements on February 22, 2001.
 - b. Performance Remedy Plan
 1. Pursuant to the MPSC Orders in U-11830, and in compliance with the U-12320 Order, Ameritech Michigan proposed specific performance assurance measures,

DRAFT

- including a self-effectuating system to prevent backsliding. In addition, pursuant to the MPSC's Order in U-12320, Ameritech Michigan's proposed plan includes the key elements discussed in the December 22, 1999 order in CC Docket No. 99-295, FCC 99-404, involving Bell Atlantic's § 271 Order. Ameritech Michigan's proposed performance enhancement plan also included, pursuant to the U-12320 Order, provisions for Ameritech Michigan to make self-executing performance payments in the event its performance does not meet standards. CLECs had also introduced a remedy plan to be considered. Comments and reply comments were filed on each of these proposals along with respective positions on the "Parity with a Floor" issue.
2. On April 17, 2001, the MPSC issued an Order in Case No. U-11830 addressing the remedy plan proposals submitted by Ameritech Michigan and the CLECs. In its Order, the MPSC approved Ameritech Michigan's Remedy Plan with modifications subject to future review and revision. The MPSC also rejected the use of the performance benchmarks known as "Parity with a Floor." Ameritech Michigan is currently reviewing the MPSC's Order, and parties have until May 17, 2001 to file petitions for rehearing.

MARKET CONDITIONS

35. On March 13, 2000, Ameritech Michigan and other carriers in Michigan submitted proposals to the MPSC Staff regarding "General Market Conditions," in accordance with the MPSC's February 9, 2000 Order in U-12320. In response to the proposals of Ameritech Michigan and other carriers, the MPSC Staff developed a proposed "market survey." Comments on the MPSC Staff's plan were exchanged.

DRAFT

36. Subsequently, a “Market Conditions” collaborative was held on April 12, 2000 to address the issues raised in comments on the MPSC Staff’s proposal. The goal of the collaborative was to reach consensus on the content of the data to be provided and manner in which carriers would provide data to the MPSC Staff in the § 271 docket. Based on input from all of the parties at the collaborative, it was agreed that Ameritech Michigan would provide data by wire center, and also provide data by CLEC where appropriate. It was also agreed that Ameritech Michigan and the CLECs “validate” their data before filing. In addition, the parties agreed that any confidential information be provided only to the MPSC and not shared with other parties.

37. On June 1, 2000, Ameritech Michigan and the other carriers filed their “Market Conditions Survey” responses with the MPSC. A supplemental filing was submitted by Ameritech Michigan on June 2, 2000. Ameritech Michigan submitted the filing under three different cover letters: 1) Ameritech’s response to the Survey, 2) Confidential Attachments to the Response, and 3) Supplemental Filing. Several hundred pages of documentation were submitted with the filing. Additionally, Ameritech Advanced Data Services of Michigan (“AADSM”), Ameritech Michigan’s advanced services affiliate which operates as a data CLEC, also submitted its confidential response to the Survey. The MPSC Staff subsequently issued its report on August 15, 2000, based on the responses received from all parties to the Market Survey. In an effort to update the market conditions information, the MPSC Staff forwarded another market survey early this year, and responses were filed on May 1, 2001.

DRAFT

38. With this filing, Ameritech Michigan is submitting additional data discussed in the Heritage Affidavit, and providing a detailed analysis of competition in the local Michigan market. Ameritech Michigan believes that subsequent to the MPSC Staff compiling the updated market conditions data and completing additional targeted data analysis (analyzing trends for business versus residential competition and trends in specific geographic areas), the data will demonstrate that Ameritech Michigan is facing increased competition in the local telecommunications market in Michigan. As discussed below and further detailed in the Heritage Affidavit, there has been competitive growth in the Michigan telecommunications market as demonstrated by the number of CLECs licensed to provide service in Michigan, the number of interconnection agreements entered into between Ameritech Michigan and CLECs, the number of collocation offerings, and the number of CLECs providing local service via resale, the use of UNEs, and entirely through their own facilities.
39. Current data demonstrates that as of April 19, 2001, more than 160 CLECs are licensed to provide local services in Michigan, and as of March 28, 2001, Ameritech Michigan had entered into approximately 70 approved wireline interconnection and resale agreements in Michigan.¹⁸
40. Ameritech Michigan also provides collocation offerings enabling requesting carriers to collocate their transmission equipment on Ameritech Michigan's premises for the purpose of interconnecting with Ameritech Michigan or accessing unbundled network elements. As of March, 2001, competitive carriers have collocated in 127 Ameritech Michigan wire centers. A total of 919 collocation arrangements are in service,

¹⁸ Approved interconnection agreements can be found at:
<http://ameritech.com/corporate/regulatory/interconnect_page.html>.

DRAFT

consisting of 803 physical and 116 virtual collocation arrangements. As evidence of continued CLEC demand, 15 collocation orders are currently pending or under construction.¹⁹

41. In addition, CLECs are providing local service in Michigan via resale, the use of UNEs, and entirely through their own facilities. Both the business and the residential markets are being served by CLECs using all 3 methods.

42. The Michigan local exchange market has been fully opened by Ameritech Michigan to all CLECs. CLECs are serving customers throughout the state of Michigan on a facilities basis and through resale. The dramatic annual growth of facility-based lines (60%) and the 90% growth in unbundled stand alone loops being purchased by CLECs clearly demonstrate an environment that fosters competition. Furthermore, the number of customers currently being served by the CLECs, coupled with the increased collocations and volume of additional facilities they have purchased in anticipation of their marketing efforts, clearly demonstrates that the local markets are open to competition throughout Michigan. (For a further discussion of collocation offers, market coverage and indicators of competitive growth, refer to the Heritage Affidavit).

CONCLUSION

43. The MPSC has conducted an exhaustive investigation of Ameritech Michigan's readiness for entry into the long distance market, per § 271(c) of the Act.

44. After over a year of continuous proceedings, Ameritech Michigan's § 271 Application has been investigated thoroughly by the MPSC, with input from the

¹⁹The competitive information referenced in ¶¶ 39-42 exclude all data associated with an SBC/Ameritech affiliate.

DRAFT

MPSC Staff, the Michigan Attorney General, the CLEC industry, and any other interested parties who chose to participate in the collaborative, dispute resolution, and contested case proceedings.

45. Ameritech Michigan's Checklist Filing demonstrates that the Michigan local exchange market has been fully opened by Ameritech Michigan to all CLECs, subject to third-party test results and three months of performance results.
46. Michigan customers will not have a full choice in obtaining their telecommunications services until Ameritech Michigan is granted freedom to compete in the interLATA market.
47. The efforts described herein allow the MPSC to ensure that the local markets in Michigan are and will remain open to competition.

DRAFT

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed on _____, 2001.

Vice President- Regulatory Affairs

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

COUNTY OF INGHAM)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ____ day of _____, 2001.

Notary Public