

Number	Baseline MTP Page Number	MTP Section	Comment Source	Comments/ Revised Language	KPMG Consulting, LLC Consulting Notes
11	3	II.A Background	MWCOM	Add the following language after the last paragraph: "Some AIT systems may not be available for test until the completion of the SBC/AIT OSS POR. These systems, which will include a web-based ordering system similar to the SBC Verigate/Toolbar System as well as other systems and significant software enhancements must be addressed as part of the testing. While these systems may not be available at the beginning of the test, the test cannot conclude successfully until they have been tested. For this reason, supplemental test plans will be constructed for these interfaces/software releases."	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion Category 1 Issues <b>OPEN</b>
12	3	II.A Background	MWCOM	Test Plan must include significant changes (defined as one that replaces a system or causes a system to operate in a materially different way) resulting from SBC/Ameritech merger Condition.  Expand the scope of the test by adding language to include additional processes <sup>2</sup> to be tested.	Issues covered in change management discussion <b>CLOSED</b>  A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion Categories 1, 2, 3 <b>OPEN</b>
13	3-4	II.B Scope	McLEOD USA	As a means of accurately evaluating the real-world situations faced by CLECs operating in Michigan, consideration should be given to items A – K contained in the Statement of Principles filed with the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin (Docket No. 6720-TI-160 - Investigation Into the Operational Support Systems of Ameritech Wisconsin).	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion Categories 1, 2, 3 <b>OPEN</b>
14	3-4	II.B Scope	McLEOD USA	The MTP must ensure that the OSS Testing includes all systems and processes necessary for, or made available to, CLECs, including, without limitation, systems and processes that will be	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion Category 2 <b>OPEN</b>

				required for emerging products or services. Examples of such processes and systems include, but are not limited to, UNE-P, Sub Loops, Extended Loops, Line Sharing and Dark Fiber (as specified in the FCC UNE Remand Order). Products to be evaluated include, but are not limited to Centrex Mate. Furthermore, all flow through service offerings, should be defined and tested as such.	
18	4	II. B Scope	<b>MWCOM</b>	Second paragraph, last sentence, add the following service delivery methods to the scope of the test: “EELs, sub-loop unbundling, DSL, other potential service delivery methods.”	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion Category 2 <b>OPEN</b>
19	4	II. B Scope	<b>MWCOM</b>	Third paragraph: Somewhere here we need to say that metrics must be available before the start of the test and that the way in which these metrics will be calculated will be audited here. Again, this may have to wait until the metrics collaborative is completed. If that’s not possible, then we need to have a way to preserve the data. Also, we need a way to preserve the data in the event metrics are changed or expanded during the test process. In addition, these metrics and results will be compared to AIT performance reports to the PSC. Data collection methods and data integrity must be examined and evaluated.	Issues pertaining to performance measures/ PM Audits, tabled for further discussion  From 6/6/00 transcript: Performance Metrics collaborative is set to conclude soon. Possible baseline Metrics for testing will be available. Two ongoing initiatives: New Products and Changes/Improvements to Performance Metrics. <b>OPEN</b>
22	4	II. B Scope	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	The following existing Ameritech interfaces will be tested: Maintenance (GUI/App-App), Pre-order (GUI/App-App), Ordering (EDI and ASR), Billing (usage and invoice feeds). Additionally, the test will be conducted using the most current release of the Ameritech business rules at the time of the test.	Scope section substantially revised for version 1.1  A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion  From 6/6/00 transcript: All interfaces will be tested. Timing issue is still open. <b>OPEN</b>
34	5	II.B. Scope	<b>MWCOM</b>	Does not specify “what combinations” or “all combinations” of UNEs will be included. Leaves	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion

				the statement up for interpretation.	From 6/6/00 transcript: When final UNE-P tariff is provided, this can be closed. <b>OPEN</b>
35	5	II.B. Scope	<b>MWCOM</b>	<p>“The Phase II Test Manager is expected to test OSS ‘99, scheduled for release in Dec 99”</p> <p>The test manager needs to verify the version of LSOG that will be used for the test and update the MTP accordingly.</p>	<p><b>CLOSED</b></p> <p>LSOG Version 4 is part of A-Y discussion, tabled for further discussion Category 1 <b>OPEN</b></p>
67a	11	III.A.1.0. Scenario Purpose	<b>Ameritech</b>	<p>“In this regard...” sentence should be rewritten to be clear that the Production Environment is to be used.</p>	<p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): KPMG Consulting, LLC Consulting amended language taking into account suggested comments: Page 14 Scenario Purpose. Sentence added to read, “During the production test, transactions will be sent to the Ameritech production environment.”</p> <p>Propose to close <b>OPEN</b></p>
89	16	III.E E. Evaluation Criteria	<b>MWCOM</b>	<p>Interpret. Parity maybe limited to stove-pipe testing of processes of individual OSS functions.</p> <p>“ These are criteria that require two measurements to be developed and compared, such as whether external response time is at least as good as internal response time” “Examples” CLEC transaction time no greater than SBC Retail transaction time.</p> <p>MTP does NOT state that it is responsible to test for data consistency between function, e.g. Pre-Order to Order, which is vital for parity of order rejection rates and flow through rates. Evaluation criteria is not clear if or how this import testing issue would be considered under criteria for evaluation.</p>	<p>A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion</p> <p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Page 81 of the MTP was updated to read, “Data returned in pre-order responses will be analyzed to assess its usability in formatting and submitting order requests.” This addresses the pre-order to order data consistency.</p> <p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3):: Table VI-2 on page 83 also updated to include this as an Evaluation Measure. <b>OPEN</b></p>

				Reference to the OSS needs to be removed.	
98a	21-22	III. F. 1.0.6. Global Entrance Criteria	<b>MWCOM</b>	Test plan calls for the Test Manager to assign a category of duplicative testing to any functionality that has been successful validated in another part of the Ameritech region. This amounts to a form of regional testing. Has this been approved by the collaborative?	7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3):: Revised to the following: "KPMG Consulting, LLC will review OSS testing in other states in the Ameritech region to determine whether the results of those tests may be applicable to any specific portion of this Master Test Plan. KPMG Consulting, LLC may recommend to the MPSC to utilize the results of those tests rather than conducting duplicative testing, where KPMG Consulting, LLC can attest that the testing done in the other states is independent and reliable and can be used as a basis for evaluation acceptable to the Michigan Public Service Commission. To be considered duplicative, a test must meet the specifications listed in the Michigan MTP." <b>OPEN</b>
100	20	IV. Performance Metrics Review Test Section	<b>MWCOM</b>	Somewhere here we need to say that metrics must be available before the start of the test and that the way in which these metrics will be calculated will be audited here. Again, this may have to wait until the metrics collaborative is completed. If that's not possible, then we need to have a way to preserve the data. Also, we need a way to preserve the data in the event metrics are changed or expanded during the test process.  A. We need to have some final reporting on metrics and evaluation on standards that come out of MI collaborative at least. We also will need a way of coming back and auditing new measures and business rules changes added in other collaborative discussions.	Issues pertaining to performance measures/ PM Audits, tabled for further discussion  7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Page 21, Section IV, Performance Metrics Audit Test Section, middle of paragraph, added sentence, "The performance metrics audit will be initiated as soon as possible." <b>OPEN</b>

				<p>B. MI metric discussions also has highlighted issues KPMG Consulting, LLC will need to resolve:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are the OSS Query benchmarks from TX appropriate (i.e. not too Generous) for AIT OSS processes? An examination of what AIT's actual retail performance for the query intervals will have to be measured.</li> <li>2. FOC Interval: KPMG Consulting, LLC examination of how quickly AIT reps can provide due dates to customer to develop more appropriate benchmark is needed. In addition, time missing from the FOC interval (pulling batched orders every half hour and unknown unpacking intervals that could take hours) that take place before AIT measurement even begins.</li> <li>3. Hot cuts: Whether hot cut metrics are adequate to capture all interval and quality issues with hot cuts in general and migrations in particular--including the ability to log troubles during and shortly after the cut.</li> <li>4. Are the database loading intervals and accuracy truly parity by design for E911, DA/DL, LIDB, etc. Also re clearing of errors and unlock problems (for E911 updates), accidental deletion of DA updates due to orders sequence--disconnect comes in after update on new LNP customer—problems handled in a parity manner as well.</li> <li>5. Missing notices: Metrics only captures intervals for things sent. When notices are not sent, are there ways to ensure that situations where 10 orders are sent and 5 get on-time notice and 5 don't arrive at all are captured in the metric. Are metrics such as those adopted for BA necessary or are other means available to capture those items missing notices?</li> <li>6. Based on KPMG Consulting, LLC's findings</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>on other parts of OSS test--help desk responsiveness, software validation and error correction, hot cuts, etc.--are additional metrics needed to address deficiencies. (i.e. KPMG Consulting, LLC's NY findings led to adding various change control metrics in addition to those posed by CLECs in NY.)</p> <p>In a more global issue, can KPMG Consulting, LLC calculate the impact application of statistics to benchmarks to AIT's metric failures--i.e. what percentage of measurements passed as parity that would have failed if only whether the benchmark was made or missed was used?</p> <p>Need to address the issue of whether using a third-party vendor should have any impact on how AIT measures system availability, change and documentation notice, query response times.</p> <p>KPMG Consulting, LLC also needs to do a study comparing retail and wholesale response times.</p>	
120b	44	V. 4.4 Description	<b>MWCOM</b>	<p>The Ameritech OSS Interface systems that are relevant to the testing should be identified. Even if it is based on a timeline of availability the scope of testing will be much clearer</p>	<p>(6/3) Not sure what specific test this is referencing. Possibly PPR4: CLEC Training</p> <p>From 6/6/00 transcript: KPMG Consulting, LLC will update this at a future time when it is clear what versions of interface documentation and business rule specifications will be used during the test.</p> <p><b>OPEN</b></p>
123	43	V.6.0 Collocation & Network Design	<b>Rhythms</b>	<p>Because collocating at Ameritech's premises is essential for all carriers, OSS testing should address the efficiency and timeliness of processing orders and provisioning all types of collocation, including</p>	<p>A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion</p> <p>From 6/7/00 transcript: Performance Metrics include collocation metrics. The</p>

		Verification and Validation review		caged, cageless, shared and adjacent collocation. Further, Ameritech's OSS must ensure for scalability to process orders for collocation. Specifically, KPMG Consulting, LLC should test the processes on the basis of specific quantitative standards for missed collocation due dates, the number of days a collocation turnover is delayed, and the percentage of processed orders for competitors. The testing must also address the efficiency and timeliness of the processes for ordering and obtaining all types of collocation at the Ameritech premises, including caged, cageless, shared and adjacent collocation arrangements.	test will evaluate data collection and application of the metrics. Also, the provisioning process will be assessed in PPR6 Test, Collocation and Network Design Verification and Validation Review. <b>OPEN</b>
124a	46	V.7.1. Description	<b>MWCOM</b>	Testing will also consider manual processing of CLEC pre-order requests that Ameritech has not mechanized. What pre-order requests is this referring to? What pre-order functionality will the CLECs have to perform manually?	From 6/13/00 AIT presentation: Address Validation, CSR Retrieval, and as of 6/30, Loop Makeup Inquiry are available via TCNET. All others will be tested via EDI or manually. If further GUI functionality is offered during the test timeframe, these pre-orders will also be tested. <b>OPEN</b>
136	73	VI. 1.0 POP Functional Evaluation	<b>Rhythms</b>	KPMG Consulting, LLC must examine the information and processes available for advanced services providers in the pre-ordering phase of OSS. Prior to ordering loops, Rhythms requires access to specific loop makeup information in order to service its customers competitively. Rhythms must be able to discern the capability of a loop for the provisioning of its xDSL services in the same manner and timeframe that Ameritech uses for provisioning of its own loop-based services, including all advanced services. In particular:  1. KPMG Consulting, LLC should evaluate the adequacy and completeness of the loop makeup information provided to CLECs. Ameritech	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion  From 6/7/00 transcript: GUI functionality will be provided at a future time and test won't be end until this is tested.  KPMG Consulting, LLC will not evaluate the adequacy and completeness of the Loop makeup information. KPMG Consulting, LLC will test if the pre-order functionality does provide the information that Ameritech has agreed to provide, in the appropriate timeframes specified within the performance metrics.

				<p>must provide sufficient information about the characteristics of a particular loop to establish its suitability for certain types of xDSL services prior to ordering.</p> <p>2. KPMG Consulting, LLC should evaluate the intervals by which such information is provided, both on an electronic and manual basis.</p> <p>3. KPMG Consulting, LLC should evaluate</p>	<p>From 6/13-14 Overview: Loop makeup information includes: actual cable length, cable gauge, number of segments, number of repeaters, number of coils, and adjacent disturbers. <b>OPEN</b></p>
137	73	VI. 1.1. Description	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	<p>Second paragraph first sentence, The test will include the submission of live transactions over three Ameritech-supported interfaces: 1) interactively via graphical user interfaces, 2) machine-machine interfaces, and 3) manually.</p>	<p>It is unclear what interfaces will be included in the test.</p> <p>A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion</p> <p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Changed GUI to TCNet on page 80 of TVV1 Table that lists the functionality and mechanism that will be tested. Still open as to GUI order functionality. Also, clarified some language in this Description section. <b>OPEN</b></p>
138	73	VI.1.1 Description	<b>Ameritech</b> First Table  Paragraph 2	<p>Remove check marks under ordering GUI column</p> <p>Remove all reference to LENS99, TAG and RoboTag. Look through entire document. Replace with references as noted above for p. 4.</p>	<p>Change accepted and document updated to remove check mark under GUI for ordering, remove references to LENS99, TAG and RoboTag. Inserted a GUI row and included a X under GUI Pre-Order. (6/3)</p> <p>Same as 137 above: 7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Changed GUI to TCNet on page 80 of TVV1 Table that lists the functionality and mechanism that will be tested. Still open as to GUI order functionality. <b>OPEN</b></p>

140	73	VI. 1.1. Description	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Table - Ameritech Supported Interfaces	It is unclear what interfaces will be included in the test.  7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Same as 137 and 138 above. <b>OPEN</b>
142	73	VI.1.1 Test Description Table	<b>MWCOM</b>	Edit chart <sup>3</sup> , see end notes for proposed chart.	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion <b>OPEN</b>
143	74-75	VI. 1.3. Entrance Criteria	<b>Rhythms</b>	KPMG Consulting, LLC should validate the existence (or lack of) a GUI interface for obtaining loop make-up information. Such access is essential for smaller CLECs.	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion  From 6/7/00 transcript: This will be tested once available. <b>OPEN</b>
145	75-77	VI. 1.4. Test Scope	<b>Rhythms</b>	In testing the processes for ordering UNEs, KPMG Consulting, LLC must be careful to recognize the inherent complexities in ordering UNEs for xDSL services. Thus, Rhythms urges KPMG Consulting, LLC to include numerous testing scenarios for ordering all xDSL types in significant volumes. Rhythms also recommends that KPMG Consulting, LLC test the processes specific for provisioning loops capable of xDSL transmission.	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion  From 6/7/00 transcript: Scenario input <b>OPEN</b>
146	75-77	VI. 1.4. Test Scope; Appendix A (page 95)	<b>Rhythms</b>	The Master Test Plan must test Ameritech's processes for pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, repair and maintenance, and billing of line shared loops. (Ameritech also refers to this UNE as the High Frequency Portion of the Loop, or HFPL.) In particular, KPMG Consulting, LLC must ensure that Ameritech's processes are adequate to process orders at commercial volumes. Such testing must verify the adequacy of all of Ameritech's EDI, GUI, and manual processes for line sharing. Appendix A should include line shared loops as a separate category in the test scenarios.	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion  From 6/7/00 transcript: Scenario input Page 82, Table VI-1 POP Processes, added process, "Submit an order to convert a customer to a line shared Loop." <b>OPEN</b>
147	75-77	VI. 1.4 .Test Scope	<b>Rhythms</b>	The test plan should test conditioning of loops as a provisioning process.	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion <b>OPEN</b>

148	75	VI. 1.4. Test Scope	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Second paragraph, "The Ordering Transactions test suite will be comprised of "real-life", end-to-end test cases that cover the entire spectrum of pre-order, order, and provisioning. The following order types will be tested:"	It is unclear as to what order types will be tested.  A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion  From 6/6/00 transcript: Wording seems fine for now. However, it will remain open as a placeholder for a change at a later date. <b>OPEN</b>
149	76	VI. 1.4. Test Scope	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Third paragraph, "The order types identified above will be ordered using the available and applicable Ameritech service delivery methods. The following service delivery methods will be tested:"	It is unclear as to what service delivery methods will be tested.  A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion  7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3):: Page 80, VI, 1.4 Test Scope, Changed UNE Combinations bullet to UNE Platform and EELs <b>OPEN</b>
154	77	VI. 1.4. Test Scope	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Paragraph ten, "The following chart (applicable to TVV1, TVV2, TVV3, and TVV4) contains the processes and sub-processes that will be used in evaluating Ameritech's pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning functionality and performance:" Also see Table VI-1 POP Processes	It is unclear as to what processes and sub-processes will be used to evaluate Ameritech's pre-order, ordering, and provisioning functionality and performance.  A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion <b>OPEN</b>
154c	85	VI. 1.4. Test Scope. Table VII-1 POP Processes	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Added the following PO Processes to be tested: Inquire about order status; Inquire about NC/NCI codes, Inquire about CFAs; Request Loop Makeup information; Inquire about Working Telephone Numbers	7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Added pre-order processes from 6/13 AIT presentation. <b>OPEN</b>
157	81	VI. 2.1 Description	<b>MWCOM</b>	Last paragraph , last sentence amended as follows: "There will be one 4-hour, "stress" test during normal business working hours."	From 6/7/00 transcript: Parties agreed that Stress will be run during business, off-peak hours. MPT, page 86 updated to reflect this.

					<p>Ameritech to define what their peak hours are.</p> <p>Ameritech wants some assurance that will protect them from penalties associated with performance metrics standards reliance due to stress test impacts.</p> <p><b>OPEN</b></p>
160a	84	VI. 3.1. Description	<b>MWCOM</b>	The order transactions will be monitored to verify that they do not “fall out” for manual handling in the Ameritech work center. The orders should be monitored to verify that they produce the appropriate FOC and CN within the correct interval.	<p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Amended Page 89, Section VI. 3.1. Description to read:</p> <p>“Orders will also be monitored to ensure that Firm Order Confirmations are received within the appropriate timeframes as defined in the performance metrics.”</p> <p>Also, at some point AIT will need to provide their definition of Flow through which will be validated by MPSC to assure the definition is what is expected. KPMG Consulting, LLC will then use this definition as the basis for the Flow Through test. The definition is not needed now, but will be needed prior to the start of the test.</p> <p><b>OPEN</b></p>
160c	various	VI.5.0 and 6.0	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Added reference to Ameritech’s M&R system, Electronic Bonding Trouble Administration (EBTA)	<p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3):: Added reference to Ameritech specific M&amp;R system in various places throughout TVVs 5 and 6.</p> <p><b>OPEN</b></p>
161a	102-103	VI.6.1 Description	<b>Ameritech</b>	Need Clarification. It is unclear as to what are the overall test cases and what is the duration of the tests.	<p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): KPMG Consulting, LLC revised language within the TVV6 Test Description, M&amp;R Performance Evaluation to provide</p>

					further clarification. <b>OPEN</b>
163b	115-120	VI.TVV9.Functional Carrier Bill Evaluation	<b>KPMG</b>	CAMPS: Common Ameritech Message Processing System RBS: Resale Billing System ACIS: Ameritech Customer Information System CABS: Carrier Access Billing System	7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Revised and added Ameritech specific systems throughout text and Table VI-9, Key Characteristics of Billing Information for Resale and UNE Customers. Outstanding question as to the DL systems and Retail systems (see table in MTP) <b>OPEN</b>
164	97	VI. 10.6. Test Approach	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	The test calls will include a variety of call types with the exception of 911, and will be placed from a variety of locations, throughout the state of Michigan, encompassing all the available switch types and rate zones.	It is unclear what switch types will be included in the test.  KPMG Consulting, LLC Consulting and MWCOR to propose language  From 6/6/00 transcript: WCOM and Ameritech will work to coordinate tests (in conjunction with the PSAPs and MPSC). <b>OPEN</b>
165	104	VI 11.0 Test TVV11	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Charges will be examined for all the available service delivery methods and the corresponding billing systems they employ. Table VI-9 reflects a number of key billing characteristics that will be used in the design of test cases.	It is unclear what billing systems will be evaluated during the test.  7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): KPMG Consulting, LLC amended language to incorporate Ameritech billing systems. <b>OPEN</b>
166	107	VI. 11.1 Description	<b>MWCOR</b>	Table VI-10: Table needs to be updated for UNE-P and EELs and what will be required for these offerings.	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion Category 2 <b>OPEN</b>
167	109	Appendix A Test Scenarios	<b>MWCOR</b>	Make editions to chart. See end notes <sup>4</sup>	A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion  From 6/6/00 transcript: AT&T to propose

					<p>process by which new products and /or functionality necessitating new scenario development be included in the MTP. This may be encompassed by the over MTP change management process which has yet to be defined.</p> <p>7/12/00: Appendix A to be updated once scenarios discussed and finalized. <b>OPEN</b></p>
168	109-113	Appendix A	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Test Scenarios	<p>It is unclear what test scenarios will be used during the test.</p> <p>A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion</p> <p>7/12/00: Appendix A to be updated once scenarios discussed and finalized. <b>OPEN</b></p>
169	111	Appendix A	<b>AT&amp;T</b>	Removed, “if available” from UNE-P products table)	<p>A-Y issues, tabled for further discussion</p> <p>7/12/00: Appendix A to be updated once scenarios discussed and finalized. <b>OPEN</b></p>
169a	104-108	Appendix A	<b>Ameritech</b>	<p>Remove Appendix A since it is from the Florida plan.</p> <p>Replace with the CLEC submitted scenarios after they are reviewed and agreed to at the Collaborative.</p>	<p>7/12/00: Appendix A to be updated once scenarios discussed and finalized. <b>OPEN</b></p>
169b	105	Appendix A	<b>MWCOM</b>	<p>UNE Combinations Involving Switch Ports (including <u>UNE Platform, if available</u>): This table should reflect at least a proposed date for UNEP availability and the testing criteria associated with the product. UNEP and DSL Line Sharing should</p>	<p>7/12/00: Appendix A to be updated once scenarios discussed and finalized. <b>OPEN</b></p>

				be tested. <b>If Ameritech is offering DSL Line Sharing then they should test.</b>	
169c	106	Appendix A	<b>MWCOM</b>	The proper time intervals should be added to the Standalone Preorder Activity test. Reserve Telephone number interval will be important to CLEC ability to reserve then get the order down the pike to AIT. DDD reservation time interval should be tested to determine the length is adequate to allow order flow. WCOM needs these intervals extended.	7/12/00: Appendix A to be updated once scenarios discussed and finalized. <b>OPEN</b>
169d	107	Appendix A	<b>MWCOM</b>	Stand Alone Maintenance & Repair Additional Activity Line Items: Add MLT Testing should be a part of the testing. Establishing DSL service on an existing residential line should be tested.	7/12/00: Appendix A to be updated once scenarios discussed and finalized. <b>OPEN</b>
170a	109	Appendix B	<b>Ameritech</b>	Add reference to submission of test data to Ameritech.  Suggested change: "...provide this data to the test Manager" and Ameritech "... for its analysis."	Volume issues <b>OPEN</b>
171	117	Appendix D	<b>KPMG Consulting, LLC</b>	Metrics – Quantitative	It is unclear what performance metrics and standards will be used in the test.  Issues pertaining to performance measures/ PM Audits, tabled for further discussion  Performance Metrics issues: Awaiting information from PM collaborative <b>OPEN</b>
175b	137-141	Appendix F Glossary	<b>KPMG</b>	Updated based upon information received during 6/13-14 presentations.	7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Glossary updated <b>OPEN</b>
177			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<b>The Revised MTP provides insufficient detail concerning the testing that KPMG Consulting, LLC will manage:</b>  The Revised MTP provides no information about	Volume issue  7/12/00: The specific volumes that are to be tested will not be disclosed to the parties in the

				the volumes of transactions that will be tested, presumably deferring this matter. However, the volumes for transaction testing and volume testing must be determined in advance if the collaborative participants are to evaluate whether the test scenarios are sufficiently sized to provide statistically valid conclusions.	MTP or prior to the conduct of the test. It is possible, however, that the Commission may wish to have a technical conference about statistical methods and sample sizes, as done in several other states. <b>OPEN</b>
178			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<b>The Revised MTP provides insufficient detail concerning the testing that KPMG Consulting, LLC will manage:</b>  The Revised MTP indicates that a “test bed” will be built and is vital to the conduct of the test. KPMG Consulting, LLC provides a definition of the “test bed” in the glossary: “A set of fictitious customers that are designed to assist with testing. The test bed consists of working lines and provisioned products, although the owning customer is fictitious. The test bed is used to test all Ameritech system functions.” KPMG Consulting, LLC should provide some indication of the size of the test bed, the amounts of time it has allocated in its project plan to build the test bed with Ameritech, and the role and responsibility attached to managing the test bed.	<b>OPEN</b>
179	97		<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<b>The Revised MTP provides insufficient detail concerning the testing that KPMG Consulting, LLC will manage:</b>  The Revised MTP confirms that KPMG Consulting, LLC will test Ameritech’s provisioning processes, but it does not provide any indication of the types of services and the volumes of those services.	7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Updated TVV4.4 Test Scope to include the following operational reviews: UNE Loop Migrations (including LNP), xDSL Installations Analog, Digital, High Capacity and Inter-Office Facility Installation Disconnect and Intercept Messaging Switch Translation Update Reconciliation Provisioning Completion Notice Reconciliation Directory Listing Reconciliation

					CSR Update Reconciliation <b>OPEN</b>
180			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<p><b>The Revised MTP provides insufficient detail concerning the testing that KPMG Consulting, LLC will manage:</b></p> <p>The Revised MTP proposes to review the functionality of the Ameritech wholesale and retail systems, but it provides no information about how it will determine what that functionality should encompass.</p>	<b>OPEN</b>
181			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<p><b>Significant omissions in the Revised MTP:</b></p> <p>The Revised MTP fails to obligate KPMG Consulting, LLC to perform a test of the Ameritech documentation and specifications that CLECs use to build interfaces to Ameritech’s OSS. This is a key test that should be added to the Revised MTP.</p>	<p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3):</p> <p>VI.1.4 Test Scope, Page 85 KPMG Consulting, LLC added underlined language to the following sentence: “Documentation affecting the POP domain given to the CLECs and the resellers –training materials, <u>interface guidelines</u>, <u>business rules</u>, and other appropriate documentation – will be used to submit the transactions, and the accuracy and usefulness of this documentation will be evaluated.</p> <p><b>OPEN</b></p>
184			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<p><b>Significant omissions in the Revised MTP:</b></p> <p>The Revised MTP fails to provide for testing by which KPMG Consulting, LLC would evaluate the compliance of Ameritech’s OSS with industry standards, nor does it indicate which version of industry standards should be the basis for testing.</p>	<p>From 6/6/00 transcript: AT&amp;T and other interested parties to provide a list of specific standards and how they expect them to be implemented and the nature of how they would expect compliance to be met.</p> <p><b>OPEN</b></p>
185			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<p><b>Significant omissions in the Revised MTP:</b></p> <p>The Revised MTP fails to provide for connectivity testing that KPMG Consulting, LLC should</p>	<p>From 6/6/00 transcript: Ameritech to provide information on SSL-3 for order and timeframe for testing.</p>

				perform in the course of testing each of the Ameritech electronic interfaces.	7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): PPR 5, OSS Interface Development Verification and Validation Review and TVV1, include establishing and testing interfaces to be used within the test. <b>OPEN</b>
186			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<b>Significant omissions in the Revised MTP:</b> The Revised MTP fails to provide the audit standards that will be applied by KPMG Consulting, LLC in conducting the audit of the Ameritech performance measurements system.	From 6/6/00 transcript: KPMG Consulting, LLC to propose and discuss with MPSC <b>OPEN</b>
187			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<b>Significant omissions in the Revised MTP:</b> The Revised MTP does not indicate the standards against which Ameritech's OSS and interfaces will be held for the volume performance tests. The capabilities of the systems to sustain performance at some level of proficiency while processing higher volumes of transactions should be described thoroughly in the Volume Test sections of the Draft MTP.	From 6/6/00 transcript: AT&T to review POP 5 from NY and propose any additional parameters around Volume evaluation that they would recommend be measured. <b>OPEN</b>
188			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<b>Key issues that are not addressed in The Draft MTP:</b> The Ameritech OSS were reviewed by the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Michigan PSC"), the United States Department of Justice ("U.S. DOJ") and the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") in 1997 and were found to be inadequate. The key findings have been previously supplied and AT&T expects the MTP to specify the testing that KPMG Consulting, LLC would undertake in validating that Ameritech has remedied the failings in its systems and operations identified by the Michigan PSC, the U.S. DOJ and	From 6/6/00 transcript: If there is a specific issue that is not being addressed by the current test, AT&T will recommend additional testing. <b>OPEN</b>

				the FCC.	
189			<b>AT&amp;T</b>	<p><b>KPMG Consulting, LLC's initial concerns have not been addressed:</b></p> <p>In fact, many of these same concerns were highlighted by KPMG Consulting, LLC when it first circulated the Florida/Michigan Baseline Master Test Plan. KPMG Consulting, LLC identified the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear as to what service delivery methods will be tested.</li> <li>• It is unclear what products and services will be included in the test.</li> <li>• It is unclear what interfaces will be included in the test.</li> <li>• It is unclear how many test cases will be included in the test.</li> <li>• It is unclear what date will be used to base volume projections.</li> <li>• It is unclear if a major software release will take place during the test period.</li> <li>• It is unclear if Ameritech has indicated that the provisioning systems for wholesale and retail are the same.</li> <li>• It is unclear what Network Surveillance Support Centers exist within Ameritech.</li> <li>• It is unclear as to what order types will be tested.</li> <li>• It is unclear as to what processes and sub-processes will be used to evaluate Ameritech's pre-order, ordering, and provisioning</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPEN</b></p> <p>7/12/00 draft (Version 1.3): Verbiage added to Change Management Section.</p>

				<p>functionality and performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear what date will be used to base volume projections and it is unclear what percentage levels will be used to calculate the number of volume transactions.</li> <li>• It is unclear as to the number of times this test [VI. 7.1. Description End-to-End Trouble Report Processing] will be conducted and what date will be used to base volume projections.</li> <li>• It is unclear what switch types will be included in the test.</li> <li>• It is unclear what billing systems will be evaluated during the test.</li> <li>• It is unclear what test scenarios will be used during the test.</li> <li>• It is unclear what percentage levels will be used to calculate the number of volume transactions.</li> <li>• It is unclear what performance metrics and standards will be used in the test.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

<sup>4</sup> (including UNE Platform, when proposed tariff has been filed)

Activity	Res. POTS	Bus. POTS	Res. ISDN	Bus. ISDN	Res. xDSL Capable Loop	Bus. xDSL Capable Loop	Bus. DS1 Loop
Migration from Ameritech "as is"	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Migrate from CLEC to CLEC	X	X			x	X	X
Feature changes to existing customer	X	X			X	X	X

Migration from Ameritech "as specified"	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
New customer	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Telephone number change	X	X			X	X	X
Directory change	X	X			X	X	X
Add lines/trunks/ circuits	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Suspend/restore service	X	X			X	X	X
Disconnect (full and partial)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Moves (inside and outside)	X	X			X	X	x
Convert line to ISDN			X	X			
Migrate from CLEC to Ameritech	X	X			x	x	X
Convert from Resale to UNE-Combinations	X	X	X	X	x	x	x

Please note: The scenarios will include variations such as planned errors and supplements to cancel, change an order, or revise due dates (based on a 4 hour reservation interval).