

Market Conditions
Staff Proposed Information/Data Request (4/7/00)

The following information/data request is being proposed by the MPSC staff as a result of staff's first proposal and the responses received. Staff proposes that this information be collected with December 31, 1999 used as the cut off date for the data with the information to be submitted by June 1, 2000.

For Ameritech Only:

1. Interconnection Agreements

- a. Number of Interconnection Agreements Approved by Commission.
- b. Number of Agreements Pending before the Commission
- c. Agreements in "a" and "b" that are CMRS, resale, full interconnection, other (identify type). Designate the names of providers in each category.
- d. Number of Agreements by category (from "c") that replace previously approved agreements between the same two providers.
- e. Number of approved agreements whose initial terms have expired but have not yet been replaced with new approved agreements and status of those agreements.

2. Please specify the number of access lines served today by competitors for each CLEC and totals for all CLECs as follows:

	# of Residential Access Lines Served	# of Business Access Lines Served	Total Access Lines Served
Lines Served Via Resale of ILECs service			
Lines Served Via unbundled network facilities			
Lines Served Via UNE Platform			
Total Lines Served Via Ameritech Facilities			
Estimated Lines Served Via CLEC own facilities			
Total Lines Served			

**For the definitions of these items, please refer to the FCC's definitions as set forth in the footnotes of the CCB Survey on the State of Local Competition, and of Broadband Deployment to Residential Customers.

3. Please provide the information requested in item #2 above for the last four six month periods.
4. Please provide the information requested in items #2 and #3 by geographic area (e.g., by LATA or other geographic market area as available).
5. For each provider for whom information is provided in items 2, 3 or 4 above, please specify whether the provider interconnects with Ameritech pursuant to approved interconnection agreement and/or pursuant to a tariff.
6. Specify by competitor the number of central offices at which each provider is collocated and the total number of lines which could be accessed by a competitor in each of these locations.
7. For Ameritech Michigan, specify the following information for today and for each of the last four six month periods: total number of access lines served, access lines served by LATA (or market area), total revenue, revenue by component (residential local revenue, business local revenue, residential long distance revenue, business long distance revenue, interstate network access revenue, intrastate network access revenue, local interconnection revenue, other revenue).
8. Please describe and give the status of any complaint filed against Ameritech Michigan or its affiliates before the Michigan Public Service Commission or the Federal Communications Commission by other carriers, competitors or entities that have requested interconnection, access or the ability to resell Ameritech Michigan's or its affiliates' services during the last three calendar years.

For Licensed CLECs:

1. Scope of license (geographic area for which license was granted).
2. Which tariffs, if any, have been filed with the MPSC (e.g., local exchange service tariff, toll tariff, toll access tariffs).
3. Have you begun to provide service in the state of Michigan. If not, when do you anticipate that Michigan operations will begin. If yes, please answer questions 5 -
4. Specify any ILEC with whom your company interconnects (e.g. Ameritech, GTE, etc.) and specify whether interconnection occurs pursuant to interconnection agreement approved by this Commission or tariffed offerings.
5. What types of service do you presently provide (e.g., local service, toll service, advanced services, internet services, local interconnection services, toll access services, etc.)

6. In regard to your customers to whom you provide local service please complete the following table:

	# of Residential Access Lines Served	# of Business Access Lines Served	Total Access Lines Served
Lines Served Via Resale of ILECs service			
Lines Served Via unbundled network facilities			
Lines Served Via UNE Platform			
Lines Served Totally via own facilities			
Total Lines Served			

7. If available, please provide the data in question 7 by market area (e.g., by LATA or MSA) and separately for areas in which Ameritech is the incumbent provider, GTE is the incumbent provider, other ILECs are the incumbent providers.

To the extent that any of the requested information has already been provided to the FCC by some providers (through voluntary or mandatory data submissions for use in the FCC's Local Competition Survey Results, the FCC's Trends in Telephone Service, or the recent FCC proceeding in CC Docket No. 99-301), copies of the FCC submissions can be submitted for use in the Michigan proceedings. If the CLECs desire to provide more detailed and specific information in regards to Michigan than perhaps is reported on a national or aggregated basis, staff would welcome this additional information. If the CLEC's wish to validate or verify data with each other or with Ameritech, staff would encourage this cooperation.

Procedures for Protecting Proprietary Data:

The staff position on the need for a protective order remains the same. The MTA provides for protection of confidential information submitted to the Michigan Public Service Commission's Executive Secretary and staff feels that this is appropriate for the data submissions in this proceeding.

In support of its position that a protective agreement is not needed in regard to the market survey, Staff submits the following additional information.

1. Access to the market survey information by parties to this proceeding is not required because it is merely factual information which the FCC has requested states submit, where available. It will not be utilized to determine compliance with a 271-checklist requirement or metrics test requirement of market share. Therefore, there is no need to contest the submissions.
2. Other sources of market information which will be utilized by the PSC in responding to the FCC's request (e.g., FCC reports, an earlier PSC survey cited in Staff's March 20, 2000 proposal in this matter) will similarly not be the subject of any contested proceeding nor will this information, other than in the aggregate reporting form, be available to other parties in this proceeding.
2. Although the Commission's order in U-12320 referred to "procedures for protecting proprietary data," no protective order was discussed. The procedure Staff envisions regarding submissions to the Executive Secretary's Office allow for protection of proprietary data but will not allow for access by all parties in this proceeding because such access is not needed.
3. No protective order was issued in Case No. U-11104, the PSC's earlier 271 docket.
4. Similar market information submitted to the PSC for access only by Staff and the Commission and has not been the subject of contested proceedings. Protective orders were therefore not issued in those proceedings. (E.g., Case No. U-10085 regarding the establishment of a program to monitor levels of subscriber connections or Case No. U-10177 gathering information to be issued in a report to the legislature on telecommunications issues). The protective agreement proposed by Ameritech in this proceeding was utilized in Case No. U-12039, a contested complaint by AT&T against Ameritech alleging violations of the Michigan Telecommunications Act. The latter case is not comparable to the instant case where the survey is proposed to occur.