

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter, on the Commission's
own motion, to consider AMERITECH
MICHIGAN'S compliance with the
competitive checklist in Section 271 Case No. U-12320
of the federal Telecommunications
Act of 1996.

_____ /

Proceedings had in the above-entitled
matter at the offices of Ameritech Michigan, 3893 Okemos
Road, Suite A1, Okemos, Michigan, and Michigan Public
Service Commission, 6545 Mercantile Way, Lansing,
Michigan.

SESSION OF THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 2000

VOLUME 9

- - -

BEFORE: THOMAS LONERGAN, Director
 MPSC Communications Staff

 JOHN KERN, Facilitator

PARTICIPANTS

MPSC

ANN SCHNEIDEWIND, MPSC Communications Staff

AMERITECH MICHIGAN

CRAIG ANDERSON, Legal
KELLY FENNELL, Director
DONALD CALAMIA, Manager, Regulatory
SAL FIORETTI, Ameritech SBC
JEFF BERTON
ROBIN GLEASON, Vice President, Regulatory

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS

FRANCES BROWN
DOUG TRABARIS, via telephone
KAREN MOORE, via telephone
PATTY COUGHLIN, via telephone
DAVE CHORZEMPA, via telephone

CORECOMM

MARY CEGELSKI
LOUISE NG, via telephone

HORIZON TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

RICK GOULD, Regulatory

MCI WORLDCOM

JAMES R. DENNISTON, Legal, via telephone
KAREN A. COLEMAN, via telephone
JANEEN SANDERS, via telephone
KAREN KINARD, via telephone

RHYTHMS NETCONNECTIONS
CLEC ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN
McLEODUSA

LELAND ROSIER, Legal
ROD COX, McLeodUSA, via telephone

Okemos, Michigan

Thursday, April 20, 2000

9:10 A.M.

- - -

(The proceedings were commenced without the presence of the court reporters.)

* * *

MR. FIORETTI: ... Karen, and the order was due today, then, you need to be contacting us through the provisioning side, through the ordering side, and saying, "Hey, my order is due today, what's the status," and direct them to find out what's the status of the order. So if it's an installer we need to get back, we'd get them back, and so forth. If it's past the due date and you have gotten a completion notice from us, then it's a maintenance issue and you should call maintenance. It should be that simple.

MS. KINARD: But I mean calling for everyone, like if we have a mass markets launch like we have in New York where we had over 300,000 customers, I don't think calling your center to find out each day that they're due is going to be a (unintelligible) resource.

MR. FIORETTI: Karen, only if you have trouble. I don't expect your customer to call, like our customers don't call, you know, if they're not expecting a

1 technician till the P.M. and it's now noon, that "Where's
2 my installer?" And if they do, then you should be
3 contacting us. But the customers don't call unless
4 there's trouble typically. So you're not going to call on
5 every one of those.

6 MS. KINARD: I don't know. I want to think
7 about this one. With our launch notice situation in New
8 York, I think it would have helped us if we had had the
9 notices at the end times or the provisioning intervals,
10 that we would have gotten attention to it quicker.

11 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And this is Ann
12 Schneidewind again. I think that there were two issues
13 that our Commission ruled on that we're talking about here
14 now. One is that, at least for some of these measures,
15 the Commission did require that you institute a
16 methodology of specifying the exact time of completion
17 rather than the midnight date. And then the second issue
18 was that the interval had to include the completion
19 notice.

20 So even if we can separate out the interval
21 for the notice to your customer, there's still this other
22 issue hanging: Do you have to actually specify the time
23 of completion, because the Commission in its orders here
24 said your notification shouldn't take very long, it should
25 only take an hour. But they were saying that you're

1 measuring that notification time from when your people
2 were completing the installation, or in this case
3 completing the maintenance. So both of those issues, I
4 think, need to be resolved here.

5 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore with AT&T.
6 My concern on this issue as we're talking about how long
7 it actually takes, from a practical standpoint the results
8 that I've been seeing show that Ameritech is not coming
9 anywhere near meeting the 24-hour notice. It's not even
10 close. So I'm concerned more about what happens to our
11 end users if they have problems after they've been
12 provisioned. It takes longer than 24 hours for us.

13 MR. FIORETTI: But Karen, what you're
14 saying is what we're measuring today, on the one hand
15 you're saying what we're measuring today isn't acceptable;
16 and No. 2, you're saying that you're using that measure to
17 assess that we're not meeting our objective, in which case
18 that's specifically what the measurement is to determine,
19 whether we're meeting the objective or not.

20 MS. MOORE: So that's what I'm saying,
21 you're not even meeting the objective, the part that we
22 disagree with. So as Karen Kinard's concern is, gosh,
23 it's taken us so long to get notice, what do we do with
24 our customers when they have trouble? We're not even
25 getting it in 24 hours. So, you know, the ultimate

1 concern is what happens to our end user, right?

2 MR. FIORETTI: And you're suggesting that
3 you're not getting completion notices in 24 hours?

4 MS. MOORE: According to the data that you
5 provided us, no, we're not.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Let me suggest, is that more
7 of a compliance issue?

8 MS. MOORE: Well, my point is, we can't
9 even rely on what you're proposing to do, plus what the
10 Commission has already ordered.

11 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Excuse me just a minute.
12 The court reporters are now recording this conversation,
13 so please identify yourself when you speak.

14 MS. MOORE: Thank you. This was Karen
15 Moore speaking, from AT&T.

16 MR. FIORETTI: I guess from my perspective
17 the issue isn't what is our performance, the issue at hand
18 isn't what is our performance. The issue at hand is what
19 should the performance measurement be and compliance,
20 then, with that performance. And measurement becomes
21 another issue that we have to work on ongoing.

22 I'm not sure what, you know -- in
23 determining whether or not to include the interval or not.

24 I think our most recent measurements say, gee, we're
25 within one day of completion. The benchmark is 97

1 percent, we're at 89 percent across the board, based on
2 the Texas February measures. And so we're approaching
3 that.

4 You're right, we're not meeting it. I
5 think that's a given. But there is a difference there.
6 But 89 versus 97 percent, being the objective, how does
7 that mean that that's not an appropriate measure or
8 benchmark? Maybe the benchmark is too high. I don't
9 know.

10 MS. MOORE: No. I know we're not at remedy
11 plans yet, but the reason we always like to have the
12 notice part of the interval is that it's usually in remedy
13 plans where there is waiting or prioritization. The
14 missed interval gets the higher remedy, and the status
15 notices get pretty small remedies.

16 So you could be saying you're 95-percent on
17 time for provisioning and just missing these completion
18 notices, and it's like a fraction of what you would pay if
19 you were being late on the completion interval.

20 MR. ANDERSON: I suggest that is certainly
21 an issue, and we commit to responding to that issue, but
22 in the context of the performance assurance plan.

23 MR. FIORETTI: Right. Still and all, my
24 basic premise is when you're comparing it to using a
25 parity comparison to compare to the retail number, that

1 number does not include that. So in fact there is no way
2 that we would ever meet that interval without providing
3 you significantly better service.

4 As our retail unit, just to be able to meet
5 that interval because we don't notify, that's not a
6 portion. It's adding an apple and an orange and comparing
7 it to an apple. Common sense says unless we resort to
8 some extraordinary measure and establish somehow longer
9 intervals as a rule for our retail environment, there is
10 no way we would meet that measure.

11 MS. MOORE: Now you have to speed up
12 getting the completion notices out. You know, a short
13 immediate notice on the completion wouldn't add that much
14 time to your interval. That's the whole point, to be an
15 incentive, to get these notice intervals shorter.

16 It's a little bit different situation, I
17 think. As the incumbent, most of the time you're going to
18 assume that the customer is yours when you call already,
19 and we have a situation where the customer calls after the
20 guy has left and we have to say, "Well, we don't have you,
21 let us check and see if they -- I guess if he was out
22 there, you are ours," and then call the office and take
23 that additional time. And that doesn't instill a lot of
24 confidence in the customers.

25 MR. ANDERSON: Let me suggest that is an

1 issue where we're suggesting we want to speed up the
2 interval that the Commission already set for that portion
3 of it. The Commission said 24 hours, right?

4 MR. FIORETTI: No. The Commission, I
5 think, said within one hour of completion of the order.
6 Again we look at completion of the order as completion
7 back to the service order system. That's what the
8 completion of the order is.

9 MS. MOORE: -- pick up the time between
10 actual completion and closing it.

11 MR. FIORETTI: Exactly. The same as what I
12 think you measure at Bell Atlantic.

13 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: But our Commission did
14 require that you actually record the time of completion,
15 and that the notice should be no more than an hour from
16 the time of the completion, not midnight on that day.

17 MR. FIORETTI: That was because before we
18 have implemented the changes in our systems to be able to
19 pick up a precise time that that order was updated we were
20 saying we had to have the -- the order was updated back
21 into our service order system, we were saying, "Well, all
22 we can use is the day; all we have is the day, O.K.?"

23 Now we're picking up or will soon be
24 picking up not only the time of the completion of the
25 field work and the time of the update and the order

1 system, and now we have the time. But it's the update of
2 the order system by which we use the one hour because
3 these are batch -- these are batch completions. We go
4 back to all the issues with respect to number of orders
5 that are out there that may be part of more -- or part of
6 one PON that the CLECs sent us, and sending completions at
7 a PON level if you have two orders. And if you have one
8 completion, you send one completion for one PON. So for
9 us the completion notice is sent, and the first time our
10 retail reps have access to know that the order is
11 completed is the time it gets updated in the system, the
12 time the actual service order gets updated from the field
13 systems that do work on force: administration, trouble
14 tracking, service order installation, dispatch and such.

15 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: I don't think that's
16 what the Commission order properly says you should do, but
17 I don't think that that means that that isn't an
18 alternative that ought to be discussed given what you just
19 said about a number of orders involved in or a number of
20 lines involved in one order.

21 MR. FIORETTI: Right. A purchase order
22 number can have -- that the CLECs send us -- can have more
23 than one service order that we generate that can be
24 actually completed in a system more than once. So we have
25 to have a common point where we identify at a purchase

1 order number level, which is not how our retail system
2 works. Our retail system works on single orders.

3 We have related orders there that the CLECs
4 will have issued to us, and if we have a completion of one
5 but don't have the other, we can't send a completion
6 notice out.

7 It goes back on a PON basis. The CLECs do
8 have concerns on other types of issues of making sure that
9 they can match up with a PON their response, whether it's
10 a FOC, a recheck, or, I assume, a completion notice. And
11 that's the way the standard interface is intended to work
12 today, is one-for-one response.

13 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And so is there a CLEC
14 reaction to the alternative of measuring it on an order
15 basis rather than on a line basis, at least measuring from
16 that time?

17 MS. MOORE: You're saying this would just
18 apply to multiple orders where there's multiple lines?

19 MR. FIORETTI: No. We have to implement
20 the way you do this in a common fashion so we can do it
21 from both multiple orders on a PON and even when you have
22 a single order. We have to link it up with the PON, O.K.,
23 that has been established in order to give you a response.
24 So we really have to do that for all the orders.

25 It just can't be where there's multiple

1 orders. Then you're getting, No. 1, you'd be getting
2 different -- it would be a re-architecting of the entire
3 system to do that in the way our EDI system -- I believe
4 the way most of the EDI systems work today.

5 MR. GOULD: Rick Gould from Horizon. I
6 want to propose a scenario and see how this would work.

7 Again, Rick Gould for Horizon.

8 They come out for purposes of installation
9 of the CLEC line, install it, leaves, goes on to his next
10 job. There's problems with the line and the customer
11 calls us and says, "He was out here, but it's not
12 working."

13 Where -- what does the CLEC do in that
14 situation? I'm assuming basically what you said earlier
15 is that we should call in to --

16 MR. FIORETTI: The service center, if you
17 have not gotten a completion notice.

18 MR. GOULD: O.K. Now what is going to
19 happen from the service center standpoint? They're going
20 to contact the technician?

21 MR. FIORETTI: They're going to contact the
22 network organization: What's the status of the order, you
23 know, what's happening out there? Is the technician done?
24 Is there still a problem? You need to send a tech or we
25 need to send, you know -- at that point you don't care if

1 it's the same technician, another technician, or another
2 installation technician or a repair technician. But we
3 need to determine what do we have to do to rectify the
4 situation. Maybe we need to initiate a test call, do a
5 test on the line, if it's a resell line that we can test.

6 There may be several different scenarios in
7 terms of how you address that, but I think that's left to
8 the -- the burden is on the contact that you make. If you
9 haven't got a completion notice, you contact our service
10 center. Or in the case of an unbundled loop, for example,
11 you might contact our local operation center, LOC, which
12 was our NECC, to say, "I've not got, I don't have a
13 completion yet, the order doesn't work," and it's our
14 responsibility then to take that back and work the issue
15 with our network organization in whatever fashion it takes
16 to get that rectified, just as we would do for ourselves.

17 But the contact point would be based on
18 what you know. I don't have a completion, my order is not
19 complete, I call in to the ordering realm versus calling
20 in to maintenance, because maintenance wouldn't know for
21 our customers either.

22 MR. GOULD: I guess basically the question,
23 the reality of it is, O.K., if it's your installation for
24 your customer, and you have a customer with it and you say
25 to the installer or another tech, "It's not working, get

1 out there and take care of it," they get out there and
2 they take care of it.

3 From the CLEC's perspective, we make the
4 phone calls to whoever is the appropriate person, they do
5 whatever they need to do to get to the installer. The
6 installer says, "Well, I installed that and it was fine at
7 the time that I tested it," case closed.

8 We don't get the immediate response that
9 you would as far as in your scenario. Now that's the
10 reality.

11 I guess basically now if Ameritech would
12 commit to saying "If we get a call we'll have somebody out
13 there in 15 minutes," or the same sort of time frame that
14 you would for you, then I think it would be something that
15 we may look at this issue a little bit differently. But
16 that's the reality. That's what I guess we have as a
17 problem.

18 MR. FIORETTI: I would suggest though,
19 Rick, this: No. 1, the commitment even to our retail
20 customers isn't that we'll get somebody out there
21 immediately. The commitment is that we will begin working
22 on that particular trouble condition, whether it's an
23 installation problem or a maintenance problem. That might
24 require a test call, it might require a test, it might
25 require sending someone into the central office. It is

1 not going to require necessarily the dispatch of a
2 technician to that premise.

3 So if that's the expectation, that's wrong,
4 it shouldn't be. All we should be obligated to do and I
5 believe, you know, all we would commit to do is providing
6 the same kind of service for that particular scenario that
7 we would provide for our customer.

8 And I think, you know, there may be
9 situations, and in fact, I'm certain there are situations
10 where the fact that we now have a third party that might
11 be the originator of dial tone, there may be some other
12 mitigating circumstances that require us to do some other
13 things possibly that we wouldn't do in the retail world,
14 which might mean calling you, for example, and testing
15 with you in certain scenarios, but at a minimum we should
16 do the same thing that we do for our customer on the
17 retail side, and I think that's really our obligation.

18 MR. COX: Rod Cox, McLeodUSA. I'd just
19 like to make a comment here that it appears that the
20 problem is that Ameritech cannot track and measure this
21 system by their system. They have no way of putting in a
22 trouble ticket for a new-install trouble.

23 MR. FIORETTI: Well, Rod --

24 MR. COX: And I would suggest that you have
25 or could potentially develop a system that would monitor

1 and track just new-install troubles.

2 MR. FIORETTI: Rod, let's take the case of
3 a new installation, brand new installation, because this
4 is the easiest one to understand the issue with, because
5 it really works both ways.

6 I have a new order, brand new line going in
7 for somebody in a new subdivision. We go out there and
8 activate the line, and for some reason when the technician
9 leaves the order doesn't work.

10 What you're asking me to be able to do is
11 that at that moment in time be able to take a trouble
12 against a customer line record that doesn't exist, because
13 as yet the systems have not updated to take a trouble, to
14 be able to take a trouble against that order. I do have a
15 pending installation order or a recently completed today
16 installation order, so I can get the installer back, or I
17 should be able to get the installer back or do some
18 testing based on that as the ticket.

19 MR. COX: But you'd have no way of
20 measuring that today.

21 MR. FIORETTI: But that's not what we're
22 really talking about here.

23 MR. COX: Well, I think it is.

24 MR. FIORETTI: I mean I think what we're
25 talking about is --

1 MR. COX: We're talking about the interval,
2 the time delay between when we call you back and say, "Our
3 customer does not have service. Your installer was
4 supposed to be there today, he apparently was there today,
5 but they still do not have service." We can't enter a
6 trouble ticket because it's not yet completed, and I
7 suggest that there's a way we can monitor that if you
8 would come up with some system that would put out a
9 listing of new-install troubles that were called in by the
10 CLEC goes in a different bucket in your system someplace.

11 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore at AT&T.
12 SBC in Texas is implementing a process to do exactly that
13 called, I believe, a provisioning trouble report.

14 MR. COX: And so is U.S. West.

15 MS. CEGELSKI: I-trouble, I think they were
16 talking about.

17 MR. FIORETTI: And we have I-trouble cases,
18 and so, you know, I think what you're talking about is
19 specific definitions of those troubles, and maybe what
20 they're trying to do is institute some modifications to
21 systems which will change the capability of recording
22 installation troubles. We do that today but it's all
23 based on the fact that the order has completed, O.K.?

24 MS. MOORE: Not in Texas it isn't, Sal.

25 MR. COX: And it's not in U.S. West either.

1 MR. FIORETTI: And so, you know, maybe the
2 issue that I need to take back is finding out more about
3 that. I wasn't aware that they're doing that.

4 MS. MOORE: In Texas it's a change to
5 Measure 115. I'm sure Randy Dysart can fill you in.

6 MR. FIORETTI: But 115 is an LNP measure,
7 isn't it?

8 MS. MOORE: Well, it's not anymore.

9 MR. FIORETTI: Well, 115 is based on
10 coordinated cutovers. It doesn't apply, for example, to
11 resale orders.

12 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, Sal, let's talk about
13 the resale, because that's what I was thinking. If this
14 is the last job for the day for this customer or for the
15 technician and there's an issue afterwards, a CLEC can't
16 even reach the service office because it's closed. But
17 what happens on the retail side? Would they be able to
18 call their repair number and say, "Hey, your tech was out
19 here" and start doing some activity that night to get them
20 restored?

21 MR. FIORETTI: And if that's, you know --
22 what they would do, they would call our -- probably call
23 our repair office.

24 MS. CEGELSKI: Right.

25 MR. FIORETTI: Who would show no records,

1 and, you know, I'm not sure I can tell you in every
2 scenario how that would progress, but I would suggest that
3 just as well if you could not reach this business office
4 and contacted our maintenance and, you know --

5 MS. CEGELSKI: Maintenance won't take
6 anything from us. If we have an issue and the business
7 office is closed and we call repair, it's not a completed
8 order.

9 MR. FIORETTI: I think, then, that's a
10 process that we might need to go back and talk to them
11 about, you know, where we could establish some
12 modification there to be able to address the issue. It
13 still probably wouldn't be a trouble ticket because they
14 really do not have a way to answer it but they may be able
15 to go out on an informational ticket or something on an
16 ad-hoc basis. I can't establish their policy right here
17 and now, but I will tell you I will take that kind of a
18 process question back to talk with them about.

19 MS. CEGELSKI: And I think that's part of
20 the concern that CoreComm has anyway, is that, you know,
21 Ameritech walks away from our customer and believes that
22 the work is completed, and our customer doesn't have the
23 service. So they attempt to call us to get it resolved
24 because now we're their service providers in their eyes.

25 We are coming across stumbling blocks to

1 get them turned up. One, we don't even know that it was
2 completed. It was scheduled to happen, but everything
3 scheduled to happen doesn't always happen. And then we
4 can't take any steps to get their issues resolved, and
5 that's our big concern.

6 MR. KERN: Sal -- this is John Kern. If
7 you take this back and get an answer, I guess my question
8 is, is that going to help us move toward consensus on this
9 issue or are we still not addressing the issue
10 specifically?

11 MS. KINARD: But there's two parts to the
12 issue and that's sort of a later part. It's that customer
13 who got the line installed and it's not working calls us
14 and we don't know it's ours. Sal says we can call the
15 help desk.

16 First of all, before even the help desk,
17 even if you do have a system where you can do an I-trouble
18 and get that counted in the troubles on new-install
19 measurements and mean time to restore, which is one issue,
20 you're also waiting for the help desk to verify that that
21 customer was switched to us.

22 And I know from our troubles with Bell
23 Atlantic one of our consent decree measures, when we
24 called in with "Hey, we've got 10,000 orders without
25 completion," they would take forever to even get back to

1 us to let us know what had happened to those orders, and
2 the FCC did a three-day interval for them responding to
3 us.

4 So I mean even three days we think is too
5 long beyond the normal installation interval to know the
6 customer is ours.

7 So you have that time of how long it takes
8 the help desk plus if they find it is our customer and are
9 going to get somebody working on it, how long does that
10 take and does that get into the other measurements on
11 installation troubles or mean time to restore.

12 MR. FIORETTI: So let me understand
13 specifically what you're saying: that both SWBT and U.S.
14 West, I think, Rod, you said, right, are able to take a
15 trouble on the same day the order is due without the order
16 being completed.

17 MS. KINARD: And actually in the KPMG test
18 with Bell Atlantic in New York, they had the same
19 situation you had, and they made them fix it and take
20 these I-troubles at the help desk.

21 MR. ANDERSON: Well, let me ask the same
22 question that John, I think, was trying to get to, is Sal,
23 I think, can go back and take a look at that issue and
24 address it. But stepping back to the issue of combining
25 the completion in the notice-of-completion intervals, can

1 we come back to address that issue? If Sal can come back
2 and address your concerns on this what I'll call sub-issue
3 we've been talking about, what are the parties' positions
4 on whether we could agree to separation of these two?

5 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA. I'm
6 O.K. with separation of the completion notification as
7 long as we have the right benchmark.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Can I ask maybe we go around
9 the CLECs and ask folks for their thoughts? Can we --
10 MCI?

11 MS. KINARD: Well, this is Karen Kinard
12 from MCI. Our main concern is how quickly do we know we
13 own this customer and can be at the forefront of pushing
14 to resolve their problem, and how quickly we can get some
15 action, and if the troubles that we do have to spend a lot
16 of time on are even captured in any measurement.

17 So if Sal can come back and show there is a
18 way we can immediately deal with our customer problems,
19 then we can deal with the importance of completion notices
20 and remedies when we get to that, I may be able to live,
21 and as stated in the statement before, if the completion
22 notice interval measuring from actual work completion is
23 pretty quick.

24 MR. FIORETTI: Now, you said several things
25 there, Karen.

1 MS. KINARD: There's two things. I want to
2 see what you're going to do to deal with our problems and
3 I want a quick completion interval from actual work
4 completion. Then it can stay separate.

5 MR. FIORETTI: So -- and again I'm going to
6 go back to -- and I don't like to keep bringing this up --
7 but I think it's incumbent upon me, when we start talking
8 about the benchmark that we would set for any particular
9 item, is to look at things like Bell Atlantic in an order
10 that's been approved that said, I believe, within the
11 realm of reasonableness they get a day from the time the
12 work is completed. And so, you know, what you're saying
13 in that low bid is that you'd sure like to hold us to a
14 much higher standard than the FCC held Bell Atlantic.

15 MS. KINARD: Well, you know, in
16 Pennsylvania I've got 30 minutes from completion and Wafa.
17 That's Bell Atlantic, too. Do you want to do that?

18 MR. FIORETTI: Bell Atlantic New York,
19 which is the only one that's been approved. And again,
20 the FCC didn't say necessarily that was the best, they
21 didn't say necessarily that was the shortest, but they
22 said that fell within a range of reasonableness, and, you
23 know, therefore I would suggest my measure also falls
24 within that same range of reasonableness because it's the
25 same.

1 MS. KINARD: Well, they also said that they
2 might not approve the same benchmarks in another
3 proceeding but they knew there had been a rigorous
4 collaborative in New York, and unfortunately they had done
5 the benchmarks before I got involved, but I don't know how
6 hard people fought for things. But, you know, definitely
7 we got better in Pennsylvania than in New York and they
8 knew exactly what New York was doing.

9 MR. KERN: I want to hear from AT&T. Doug
10 or Karen, what do you think about -- if Sal goes back and
11 checks on this issue, does that satisfy it or are we still
12 back to --

13 MS. MOORE: Before I agree I'd like to hear
14 what he comes back with. But I'm definitely willing to
15 consider it.

16 MR. KERN: Subject to check, obviously.
17 I'm just trying to find out if Ameritech does this work
18 and they come back with an answer that's satisfactory,
19 that we can take this issue off the table, or is it really
20 a sub-issue and we still have to come back to the main
21 one. That's all I'm trying to figure out.

22 MS. MOORE: I'll repeat what I said again:
23 Subject to what Sal comes back with, I'm willing to
24 consider it.

25 MR. KERN: O.K.

1 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And as a staff person, I
2 would also like to say that on all of these measures where
3 notification is at issue, that you do have a separate
4 measure that would propose to measure that interval, and
5 then we can talk about what the benchmark ought to be for
6 it. But I know it's there for installations. I'm not
7 sure it's there for maintenance at all.

8 MR. FIORETTI: It's not there today for
9 maintenance.

10 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And so perhaps that
11 would be part of what we would ask you to do, is come back
12 with a proposal so that there is a measure for the
13 completion -- or, excuse me -- for the notification
14 interval on any of these items where completion versus
15 notification is at issue.

16 MR. FIORETTI: You know, certainly I would
17 agree that where we have the requirement today to combine
18 the two, we would absolutely agree to measure both. Even
19 if we're not currently doing that, we need to get that
20 done. So I'm considering that to be a given at this point
21 that we would do that.

22 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And then we can talk
23 about the benchmark for that interval.

24 MR. ANDERSON: And the two sub-issues I
25 see, then, are what is the right benchmark for that

1 completion notice interval and how can we handle the CLEC
2 concerns about how they can do trouble reports on that
3 order in that interim period.

4 Is that fair, Sal?

5 MR. FIORETTI: Those are the two that I
6 took.

7 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And perhaps one other,
8 and that is when do you start the measure of the
9 notification. In other words, when actually is the
10 completion, when you have multiple lines or back to what's
11 involved in the PON.

12 MR. FIORETTI: Well, again it would be our
13 position that, you know, completion of the service order
14 is just that, when the order is completed in the service
15 order system, and that's the first time, you know, from a
16 parity kind of perspective that our retail rep, in
17 answering the same phone call that would go to the CLEC
18 customer, would be able to know by looking at the system
19 whether or not the order is completed.

20 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: But I think that's part
21 of, Craig, your first issue, or perhaps it was your second
22 -- I forget which one you said first -- in addressing the
23 CLEC concerns about notification to you when their
24 customers' installation hasn't occurred on time.

25 MR. ANDERSON: O.K. But I want to be

1 clear. I think what Sal has said on that issue is I don't
2 think there is any way in the realm of possibility that we
3 can do it any sooner than that. On when we use the
4 beginning time for the completion notice interval has to
5 be when it gets into the service order system.

6 MR. FIORETTI: Certainly the way our entire
7 EDI and the whole specification of how EDI works today,
8 that's the way the system is architected, because again in
9 our view that's when the retail rep knows the order is
10 completed, not when the technician knows. I mean the
11 technician knows at the same time that -- potentially if
12 the technician is on the premise -- that the end-user
13 customer knows, and we don't then provide response back to
14 our retail rep except to update the service order system
15 to show the system the order is complete, and that's the
16 access that they have to say, oh, is it in a completed
17 status or no, is it still in a pending status.

18 MS. CEGELSKI: I think that's exactly our
19 point. Our customer is out there and is at their home
20 with Ameritech, they've installed the line. The customer
21 knows they are now our customer because this activity has
22 happened. We don't at that point.

23 MR. ANDERSON: And that is exactly the
24 thing that I think Sal has committed to address; how do we
25 deal with those orders, trouble reports on those orders,

1 in that interim period.

2 MS. CEGELSKI: And that's CoreComm's
3 biggest concern.

4 MR. FIORETTI: You know the same thing that
5 we know in the same realm, is all I would suggest there,
6 is that your rep who issued that order or any rep --

7 MS. CEGELSKI: But let me go through a
8 scenario when that customer calls us. I don't have a
9 completion notice. They're going to give us a call and
10 we're going to look at our systems and say, "You know,
11 I'll have to check on this because it's still showing as
12 pending."

13 MR. FIORETTI: So will our rep. So will
14 our rep.

15 MS. CEGELSKI: O.K.

16 MR. FIORETTI: He's going to say the exact
17 same thing.

18 MR. ANDERSON: And Sal is willing to go
19 back and see if we could find a way to address where you
20 call to address that problem and how we do that.

21 MR. FIORETTI: That becomes more of a
22 process question, where do you call, how do we handle
23 that, versus when do we know. We don't know anything
24 different then.

25 MS. CEGELSKI: But there are still steps --

1 and again with the process I believe that would help --
2 there are still steps that that rep can do to help this
3 customer, and we're kind of tied.

4 MR. FIORETTI: Again, not without making
5 other calls, just like you'd have to do. Now, maybe you'd
6 call a different person because of the nature of -- we're
7 talking carrier to carrier now, so you'd have to call us
8 and we do then the legwork. That's where the process
9 kicks in, where we have to now do the legwork for you to
10 resolve that issue. You can't do it yourself by nature of
11 probably the service that you're providing.

12 You know, I'll give you a circumstance
13 where you might be able to. If you're ordering an
14 unbundled loop in LNP and so you're providing the dial
15 tone, quite possibly you would be able to, if you've
16 installed testing capabilities into your collocation, you
17 might be able to actually test that line as long as you
18 turned your dial tone on.

19 So there might be some things that you can
20 do that, you know, we can't do.

21 MS. CEGELSKI: Sal, the other thing I
22 wanted to ask about is at the CLEC forum that past Monday
23 they were talking about some changes with LNP-only lines
24 that would be auto completed between 4:00 and 6:00 o'clock
25 -- or, excuse me -- 5:00 and 6:00 o'clock every day even

1 though we may not at that point have activated anything.
2 So how would that play with the measurement statistics
3 because -- and this is a question we raised to the SME
4 that was there -- if we do a cut at night, typically which
5 is what you would do with the business, your systems would
6 show completion when we didn't do anything or maybe had to
7 stop because of a problem that was going on at 8:00
8 o'clock when we were scheduling the call.

9 MR. FIORETTI: Since I wasn't there, I mean
10 I --

11 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, I know, but this
12 again, the system's going to show a completion prior to
13 the activity being done. Those were concerns that we were
14 phrasing at the CLEC forum.

15 MR. FIORETTI: And LNP would have tended to
16 trigger where you can activate that during a fair interval
17 after. You know, at some point we've got to come to
18 consensus. You know, we've got an order and we've
19 completed it, and we suggest, I think, based on what
20 you've told me -- and again I wasn't part of that
21 conversation -- I think what we're suggesting is -- well,
22 what I'm reading into your example --

23 MS. CEGELSKI: Let me give you an example.
24 We have an 8:00 o'clock cut and their vendor can't make
25 it. They call us at 7:30. Your system's already showing

1 this order has been completed here. So how is that going
2 to -- because it's auto completed between 5:00 and 6:00
3 that day, so how is that going to play into the system?

4 MR. KERN: How did the SME in Texas respond
5 to that issue?

6 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, this was in Chicago.

7 MR. KERN: Or Chicago. How did the SME in
8 Chicago respond to that? Did they have an answer?

9 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, he was saying that
10 there's really two orders that the system is going to
11 have, one to tear out the translations on the nine-digit
12 trigger, but our order that we sent in is going to show
13 completed and we could hopefully stop that translations to
14 be torn out. And I said how do you restore the order,
15 then, and he didn't know at that point. And questions
16 that we raised were how, Sal, would you take your
17 measurements on this particular type of an order, because
18 the completion is going to be already done in the books
19 because it will be batched.

20 MR. KERN: Now, is he going to take that
21 issue back and research it?

22 MS. CEGELSKI: That's supposed to happen,
23 but I wanted to bring that up.

24 MR. FIORETTI: Who was the tech that was
25 talking about that, just so I maybe have to link up?

1 MS. CEGELSKI: I'll have to get that name.

2 MR. KERN: I guess my question is, if this
3 individual is going to research it and get an answer back,
4 Sal is going to have to --

5 MS. CEGELSKI: He should be talking to Sal
6 about this. So I don't know if he did or not, and that's
7 why I brought it up here.

8 MR. FIORETTI: You know, this particular
9 issue plays into one of the other items down the list
10 here that I think was added at some point in terms of the
11 911 updates. I mean these things all play very well
12 together.

13 911 updates are being discussed at, I
14 think, the NENA conferences in terms of how that all
15 happens with an LNP order. Some carriers have asked us to
16 hold their orders for X period of time after they've
17 completed so that they can throw them back if they have
18 to, which in my opinion we shouldn't be doing. But the
19 update is triggered by the completion of that order to
20 unlock the database. The longer we hold that order has to
21 do with when you can update the 911 database, and some
22 CLECs think that should happen when we send that FOC,
23 because they immediately send their migrate order.

24 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, from my understanding
25 of the NENA regulations, is that Ameritech is supposed to

1 unlock that number the day of the conversion and the CLEC
2 is supposed to submit their order to capture that unlock
3 the day after, and there's a five-day window to capture
4 that.

5 MR. FIORETTI: Right. But the day of the
6 conversion, does that mean when the order completes?

7 Now, if we complete the order when you tell
8 us to complete the order, then you want to go back, now
9 we've got a problem, O.K. All these issues are
10 intertwined.

11 MS. CEGELSKI: That's a perfect example
12 with my scenario. It doesn't happen. Have you already
13 released that 911 to unlock?

14 MR. FIORETTI: That's an automatic process.
15 As soon as we complete that order, that flows downstream
16 and gets in the batch to get it done so that when you're
17 ready to send your order within that five-day interval,
18 you can update.

19 MS. CEGELSKI: The scenario where the
20 vendor could not come at the 8:00 o'clock cut and we have
21 to reschedule this, you've already released that number
22 and now we have to reschedule the meeting, I'm concerned
23 with this whole situation.

24 MR. FIORETTI: This is just -- you can't
25 talk about these things in a single focus of one

1 particular scenario and how you're going to measure it.
2 You have to consider a whole range of things. I don't
3 know what we're thinking there in terms of that particular
4 premise that has been posted.

5 MS. CEGELSKI: I was just concerned that
6 the completion notice, it's completed, out of completed
7 prior to activity.

8 MR. FIORETTI: If we want to talk about
9 Karen's issue that she had in that view, you complete
10 notices earlier. All right. How good is that?

11 I don't think by itself that early
12 completion notice is good for you in that scenario. We
13 want something later. If you throw it back, we already
14 sent the completion notice. We update the order. So
15 there's a lot of things here that play together that you
16 have to have a consistent policy, you have to put some
17 stake in the sand and say, "I'm going to complete the
18 order at this point" all the time.

19 So if you want me to hold orders for five
20 days, I should be telling you absolutely not because all
21 these other things are triggered off of that.

22 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, personally I think you
23 should say absolutely not. It should be done when it's
24 completed.

25 MR. FIORETTI: Again I need to go back to

1 work on the issue again. We have had all kinds of
2 requests from all of the different CLECs: Do this for me,
3 do that for me, and all of these things are impacted. So
4 we have got to wake up and make sure that we've got a
5 common system policy.

6 MS. KINARD: Karen Kinard, MCI WorldCom.

7 If you could assume when your customer
8 calls when we're both in this limbo situation of a pending
9 order and they say, you know, "We ordered service and the
10 guy was here," maybe they didn't know the guy was here,
11 they came home from work and it wasn't working, I think
12 you would probably assume it's yours and start right away
13 trying to figure out how to get someone out there and fix
14 it; where with us, we don't know yet, so there's that
15 extra time that your rep would be trying to find out if
16 the order was completed before going to maintenance and
17 getting it, getting somebody to go out there and fix that.
18 If there was some way that the fixing of the problem comes
19 first, and then deciding whose side of the metric it goes
20 on comes afterwards? Maybe that's something you can look
21 into.

22 MR. FIORETTI: Karen, I would suggest that
23 the person who takes that call is not at all thinking
24 about which side of the metric it should go on.
25 Regardless of whether it's our retail rep or our wholesale

1 rep, they should be focused on the customer and saying,
2 "I'm taking your concern and I'm going to work the issue."

3 The thing that I said before does apply.
4 The nature of the wholesale orders, in that you provide
5 some of the service on certain kinds of orders than we do,
6 may require us to take different steps in some cases than
7 we would just for ourselves. And we have got to know
8 that. O.K.

9 I mean, you don't want us to run off
10 blindly and do something either and have it end up being
11 yours and we didn't call you. We've got to take the
12 appropriate steps based on the situation.

13 And I would suggest that in the same kind
14 of situation that links up to me is a resale customer,
15 it's still on our network, we own the whole thing, we
16 should be basically going through the same kind of steps
17 as you are, as we are for retail.

18 MS. CEGELSKI: I agree, but that's not our
19 experience. I don't know. I would like to hear what
20 you're going to bring out.

21 MR. FIORETTI: Again, what you guys are
22 tell me is what you feel is your experience, and to
23 whatever degree -- I'm not discounting it, I'm not saying
24 I believe it. I worked on the service side for long
25 enough to know that.

1 But on the other hand, I'm suggesting that
2 that is a process issue that is independent of the measure
3 as long as you know what the process is. What I'm working
4 on is let's make sure we have the process documented so we
5 know what it is. And if our folks should be taking calls
6 that they're not taking, for example, then we go back in
7 and talk to them about that process.

8 MS. CEGELSKI: I will be glad to hear what
9 you are going to bring to the table.

10 MR. ANDERSON: Rick, would you concur that
11 if Sal can address those issues, which I think included
12 your concern, that -- would Horizon be willing to
13 consider, as I think Karen Moore put it, this separation
14 of those two piece parts?

15 MR. GOULD: Yes. I guess on behalf of
16 Horizon we would be willing to consider. The main point
17 is, No. 1, obviously being able to take care of our
18 customers, serving our customers and providing them with
19 satisfactory service.

20 I guess I have a question in kind of
21 follow-up, and I'm not sure, I guess, as far as your
22 terminology on it. But in the unlikely event that
23 Ameritech would take a customer back from a CLEC, whether
24 it's resale or take back of a loop or whatever, I'm not
25 sure whether or not that's considered an install for you

1 like it is for us, or whatever. How does that work for
2 you guys on a take-back scenario? If there's a problem
3 with that line at the time of the take back, what do you
4 guys do? Do you have --

5 MR. FIORETTI: As I understand that
6 process, and I will have to admit to you I certainly
7 haven't answered that particular question on that side of
8 things, but knowing that their orders come through us to
9 do that work, I expect that the same rules apply.
10 Because, for example, they can't see any records that have
11 to do with your customer while it's still your customer.

12 The update to the service order system is the beginning of
13 the process that changes that customer in our records from
14 looking like your customer to looking like our customer.

15 Our retail units can't see anything about
16 your customers on CSRs or whatever. So therefore, I'm
17 surmising to some degree -- I'm not sure -- but I'm pretty
18 sure that the process is the same for them in those
19 scenarios. Because they just don't have access to the
20 records. It's still showing as your customer. They don't
21 know.

22 MR. GOULD: O.K.

23 MR. COX: Sal, this is Rod from McLeodUSA.

24 If we lose a customer because of a new-
25 install trouble and that customer could not get turned on

1 and they got mad and called back to Ameritech, would your
2 service representative be able to put that customer in the
3 system right then?

4 MR. FIORETTI: I think in the scenario that
5 you're giving me -- again I'm guessing -- that since you
6 didn't get a completion yet, we didn't update our records,
7 we're still showing him as our customer, so it's unlikely
8 we'd be able to put an order in to make them our customer.

9 MR. COX: So in that case would your --

10 MR. FIORETTI: I'm not sure we'd do
11 anything because the retail rep would look at the customer
12 record and say, "Well, I'm showing you as our customer."
13 The order hasn't been updated to say I'm now McLeod's
14 customer. So they couldn't take them back because they're
15 still ours. I don't know what they'd say to him.

16 MR. COX: So in this case the customer
17 could say, "Just forget McLeod, I want to stay with
18 Ameritech." What would happen?

19 MR. FIORETTI: Again I'm guessing. I could
20 suggest our customer rep says, "Well, my records show that
21 you are with Ameritech. I can't take an order if you're
22 already here."

23 MS. CEGELSKI: Would they show the pending
24 order, though?

25 MR. FIORETTI: I don't think they'd see the

1 pending order.

2 MR. ANDERSON: The retail side shouldn't
3 see the pending order.

4 MR. FIORETTI: I don't know.

5 MR. COX: So they would probably issue a
6 trouble ticket?

7 MR. FIORETTI: I don't know what they'd do.
8 I can't guess what their answer would be. Because what
9 you're asking them to do is to say "I want to take back a
10 customer that I already have."

11 MR. COX: By your records because of the
12 lag time in the completion notice?

13 MR. FIORETTI: Sure. They're not showing
14 the customer going away until it updates all the way
15 through the system either.

16 MR. ANDERSON: But in the meantime, that
17 order that you had submitted would still be in the
18 process.

19 MR. FIORETTI: Would still be in the
20 process of being completed. If they looked the next day
21 they'd say "Oh." They wouldn't be able to see the customer's
22 record. It would have been updated to McLeod and, you
23 know, again I'm not sure what the actual process would be
24 on their side and what their thinking would be, if they
25 would hold it for a day, what they would intend to do

1 there.

2 MS. CEGELSKI: Could you check on that?

3 I'd like to know what they would do.

4 MR. COX: And I would suggest that they
5 probably would just say "We'll get your problem fixed." I
6 think the customer is probably mad enough, they don't
7 care, they just want a dial tone.

8 MR. FIORETTI: I think the answer you're
9 asking me to get for you is not probably something that's
10 written in an M and P to say when this specific thing
11 happens, here's what you tell the customer. I think it's
12 going to be based on whatever that rep thinks they need to
13 do for that customer and their recognition of what's
14 really happening here or not at that moment.

15 MR. COX: The issue is: Are they trying to
16 save that customer for McLeodUSA or win it back for
17 Ameritech?

18 MR. FIORETTI: I would suggest this, Rod,
19 and again this is totally outside maybe your question, but
20 I would suggest that any time a customer calls you or us
21 and says we want your service, regardless of the reason,
22 we're going to do what we can to win that customer.
23 That's the nature of the business.

24 So again I think you have to factor that
25 into any question that you might ask of that sort, because

1 now you're kind of putting me on the spot, would they try
2 to take that customer back.

3 Well, first of all, they're going to think
4 they already have that customer. And then whether or not
5 they recognized or not what was potentially happening here
6 is another issue.

7 And if they did, would they then wait a day
8 or two days and see that the orders got updated and issue
9 an order to try to take that customer back? Again, that's
10 all --

11 MR. KERN: Why don't you take that back,
12 Sal, and try to find out. I mean what appears on the
13 service center screen. You might be right, there may not
14 be a method and procedures.

15 But I mean you've already said more than
16 once you're guessing an awful lot in your answers, you're
17 not exactly sure. I'm not saying that your supposition is
18 wrong, but can you go back and make a few inquiries and
19 find out?

20 MR. FIORETTI: Sure. But I guess the path
21 we're going down is: Let's shoot out all the scenarios we
22 can think of of things that could happen and see if
23 Ameritech has a stated M and P to deal with that
24 particular scenario, or to what degree do we leave it to
25 our retail reps or our wholesale reps to have some

1 decision-making, understanding the process and, you know,
2 go with that to resolve whatever issue any customer has.

3 So I would only say this: I can't
4 guarantee that I'm going to come back with some stated
5 policy, "O.K., on this situation here is what our rep is
6 doing." I can certainly get some opinions, certainly, as
7 to what's on the screen. I can tell you what that is. I
8 can also probably tell you what we think the rep would be
9 doing.

10 If there is a policy on certain of those
11 issues, I can bring that back. But I don't expect for all
12 these kinds of scenarios there would be.

13 MR. KERN: I think what you're hearing from
14 more than one carrier of a potential concern, if there
15 isn't a policy or procedure to address this -- I'm not
16 suggesting this forum is the right forum to address it --
17 but I think you're hearing from more than one carrier that
18 this could be a potential problem. They would like to try
19 to work with you to address it.

20 MR. COX: I think what we're really trying
21 to get to is the heart of the issue here, getting that
22 completion into your system quicker. For your people to
23 know and for us to know is so critical to this whole
24 business and how we run this business today. The
25 completion notification process is way out of whack, in my

1 opinion.

2 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. But again, now when we
3 get to changing how we do that, changing the way we do
4 something that is an industry standard, I think there's a
5 fine line there where it goes over from the performance
6 measure issue to how the OSS works and those things as
7 well. And some of those things, when I think we cross
8 that line I'm going to suggest that we talk on the other
9 front as to how those things work, because at that point
10 -- I can only measure what is, O.K. I can take questions
11 back to understand what different statuses are and those
12 things, but I'm not going to try, from a performance
13 measure perspective, modifications to our OSSs which ought
14 to be discussed in another realm.

15 MS. BROWN: Sal, this is Francie Brown with
16 AT&T. Wouldn't there already be some experience about
17 methods and procedures in these types of situations, just
18 based on our resale customers or on the other CLECs
19 customers?

20 MR. FIORETTI: There might be. And there
21 might be some, again, might have been some training to
22 retail reps, for example, or, I'm sorry, retail reps that
23 say "Here's the way the process works," O.K., which might
24 be a way to train them on the process but not on the
25 specific what happens when this happens. So that, O.K.,

1 now I know some more about the process and I might be able
2 to make some more informed decisions versus here's what
3 happens when this customer calls and does this.

4 I think some of those very specific
5 scenarios in terms of what's happening, as I recall last
6 time I looked, and it's been a while since I looked at any
7 M and P for those retail service centers, we're not going
8 down scenario by scenario.

9 In the case of training, there might be
10 some what-if scenarios in there, but more likely it's:
11 "Here's what the process is like," so from there you can
12 make some informed decisions as to how to proceed, but not
13 necessarily identifying each of those.

14 MR. KERN: Ready to move on? Take a quick
15 break?

16 Sal wants a break. Five minutes.

17 (A brief recess was taken.)

18 - - -

19 MR. KERN: Second issue, average FOC notice
20 interval. Where are we on that issue?

21 MR. FIORETTI: I'll give a synopsis of
22 where I think we are.

23 The Michigan commission had ordered a
24 measure of FOC, one measure of FOC was notice interval.
25 The CLECs perceived that this should be a parity measure.

1 I believe that the Michigan commission ordered it to be a
2 parity measure.

3 No, I think they gave it benchmark. So the
4 CLECs believe that this should be a parity measure.
5 Ameritech thinks it should be a benchmark. Ameritech
6 thinks the benchmark that was established in Michigan is
7 really not a realistic benchmark in this vein, and so
8 Ameritech did agree to include a disaggregation for
9 trunks. I'd like to come back to that one as soon as
10 we're done talking about this.

11 Ameritech has agreed to measure unsolicited
12 FOCs and jeopardies as agreed to in Ohio rather than FOCs.

13 Ameritech, there was a question from the
14 CLECs to report completion notices that didn't receive
15 FOCs as the FOCs. In going back and investigating this,
16 one of the things -- first of all, in Ohio what I believe
17 we committed to do was to measure separately as I think a
18 diagnostic the number of completion notices that occurred
19 without a FOC being sent. But as I investigated further
20 in this issue, I learned that part of the code that's
21 written to send a completion notice, part of the code that
22 was written at some point ago to send a completion notice
23 checked our database to see if a FOC went out, and then if
24 not, sent a FOC and then sent the completion.

25 I am having our developers go back through

1 the code to make sure that that's still there. From my
2 perspective that would again -- that would tell me that,
3 O.K., having this diagnostic measure, that just checks to
4 see if that code is doing its job. And I don't have any
5 completion notices that I sent out that didn't have FOCs
6 associated with them. That would probably be sufficient
7 to say, "All right, I'm getting zeros, I should have
8 zeros, and we've addressed that issue."

9 So in a sense we are agreeing to do that.
10 But really, I look at that as being programmatic with
11 respect to the code that sends FOC back.

12 MS. MOORE: Sal, Karen Moore with AT&T.
13 Are you saying, then, that your proposal is to not have,
14 to not have a diagnostic measure because, based on your
15 understanding of the code, it's not possible to send a
16 completion notice without a FOC?

17 MR. FIORETTI: No, not at all. What I'm
18 saying is that's why it would be a diagnostic kind of
19 measure, and we would expect to be getting zeros. O.K.
20 And should we not find that we're getting zeros, we would
21 take that back in and investigate those.

22 I know that since the folks that I talked
23 to, the developers that I talked to, are running a report
24 to check, they're developing a query to check on this,
25 which I'm going to turn into this diagnostic measure. You

1 know, I have asked them to make sure that I can run that
2 monthly. So they didn't have any data to give me to say
3 we have zero or we have 22 or we have three.

4 My sense is, using it as a diagnostic
5 measure, if I have, for example, 10,000 orders and I send
6 -- and I can come up within this query zero, I know that
7 my code is working, is basically all it is telling me. If
8 I come up with 16 I'm thinking, "Oh, there's a leak in
9 that code somewhere, I better go back and fix it," but
10 it's not a terrible problem. But I've got to go back and
11 fix it. It gives me a flag, you know.

12 If I see 2000, then I'm saying, "Oh, major
13 problem, go back and address it." And as a diagnostic,
14 our expectation is -- it would be that this is not a
15 problem, but it is a flag to say where you might be
16 experiencing a problem, and we can use it ongoing in that
17 manner.

18 Either we could use it as an ongoing
19 diagnostic measure or I could just implement it back into
20 the IT monitoring of their code. But, you know, I would
21 agree at least for an interim time to say that should be a
22 diagnostic measure and we just publish it that way.

23 MS. CEGELSKI: Sal, I want to understand
24 what you were saying about the system checking to make
25 sure FOC goes out and the time the completion is done.

1 If there was no FOC, it will send a FOC and
2 a completion in the same batch process, or how --

3 MR. FIORETTI: You know, in terms of -- I'm
4 sure they would go out effectively at very close to the
5 same time, O.K., but really, what Karen -- I think Karen
6 Kinard had asked for this based on Bell Atlantic,

7 effectively what that does is kind of give us embedded in
8 the measure that we have the measure of FOCs going out and
9 being counted as completion notices. So therefore, if the
10 code is still alive and working as it's supposed to, and
11 that's really what I'm checking out, it effectively gives

12 Karen what she wanted, but I'm not reporting that
13 separately. I'm just monitoring whether it's working,
14 O.K. Because to your point, they're going out.

15 MS. CEGELSKI: So we would have the time
16 captured on that?

17 MR. FIORETTI: Right. So you would get a
18 FOC but it would be just as if I was using just a
19 completion notice, because the times are going to be very
20 much the same, if not identical.

21 MS. CEGELSKI: Now, are you going to use
22 the time that we discussed in Ohio, not the time that
23 MORTEL is stamped but the time that batch is sent?

24 MR. FIORETTI: That's the other part of the
25 whole FOC issue. There's three other items with FOC that

1 we need to address, that we, Ameritech, need to address.

2 The first part of FOC -- forgive me, but I
3 was going to draw a little picture and hand it out and fax
4 it out to share with everyone, but not only the travel
5 from last night but the travel this morning kept me from
6 doing that. I can probably draw it on a board here but
7 that's not going to do anything for the folks on the
8 phone.

9 So what do you guys think, draw it on the
10 board and then copy it and we'll send it out? Is that
11 O.K.?

12 So those of you who were part of this
13 discussion before will immediately be able to draw the
14 picture yourself. My picture is not going to be that good
15 anyway, so you're not missing anything.

16 MS. CEGELSKI: Which picture are we
17 drawing?

18 MR. FIORETTI: I'm going to draw a real
19 high-level picture of -- make sure that I'm doing it
20 right --

21 MS. CEGELSKI: Are we just going to draw
22 the picture that the SME came in and talked about the
23 systems and the flow and where it's stamped?

24 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

25 MS. CEGELSKI: So it will be the Rick

1 Dishman picture?

2 MR. FIORETTI: Right. The FOC, the way EDI
3 works, O.K., is that there is a VAN, a value-added
4 network, provider. There is a time when -- and I'm going
5 to say GEIS to Ameritech, there is a time when we receive
6 an order, when we receive it via EDI, via VAN, GE
7 Information Systems, GEIS.

8 We receive an envelope, if you will, that
9 contains multiple PONs by trading partner or CLEC. There
10 will be, however many come in. O.K.

11 This would be trading partner 1, trading
12 partner 2. We receive this. This is a little higher-
13 level picture.

14 Ameritech picks up mail. There is a
15 process by which we go and -- this works both ways, by the
16 way, on the inbound and the outbound transactions.

17 There is a time when we pick up mail and
18 where we put mail back in the mailbox for GEIS to send it
19 out to, back to the CLEC. O.K. So there is a time when
20 we pick up the mail.

21 This time isn't in our normal, in our
22 current FOC measurement. There is another time.

23 What we do with this mail, we take all
24 these envelopes -- and I'm trying to make it descriptive
25 enough so the folks on the phone can understand what I'm

1 saying. We take all these, let's say we've got three
2 envelopes, O.K., from three different CLECs, three
3 different trading partners. The first one has got six
4 PONs in it. The second one has got four. The third one
5 has got two. All right.

6 We take those, and then we take those
7 envelopes, we pick up the mail, and then we do an FTP
8 through our translator. We take that, we take all of
9 those 12 PONs from all of the different trading partners,
10 and we create one file with it, with 12 PONs in it. We
11 send it through a translator to get it in the format that
12 we need to get it to, to insert it in our database. We
13 take it from EDI-speak to, you know, service-order-MORTEL-
14 editability kind of speak.

15 So then we take it through the translator
16 and it comes out on this end in a format that allows it to
17 be input into our database where it gets a time stamp.
18 O.K. The current measure is -- and this is what was
19 uncovered in our discussions in Ohio -- is that we use
20 this as receipt time. And then there's a process beyond
21 that. I'm not going to go any further on this part of it.
22 There's a process beyond there where all the edits then
23 start taking place and the order is input into the service
24 order system, or, you know, fields an edit or several
25 edits could be rejected or hit something that is designed

1 to drop out for manual assistance, whatever. All those
2 things happen beyond here.

3 This is just taking the order from our VAN
4 and putting it into Ameritech's hands to process.

5 Now, forever I was understanding that this
6 time is the time I got it. A couple weeks ago in Ohio we
7 went through this at a very detailed level and I
8 understood there is two parts of this process that are not
9 being measured today. O.K.

10 That's the time when it's first available
11 to us to the time when we pick it up, O.K. This is an EDI
12 function, and today we pick it up on a 30-minute -- by the
13 way, again I'm talking about the pickup side. This works
14 on the outbound side as well. So I don't know that we
15 need to do this whole discussion over just for what goes
16 out, but it happens on both inbound and outbound.

17 Every 30 minutes on the half hour we go
18 out.

19 MS. CEGELSKI: Is it on the half hour?

20 MR. FIORETTI: That's what I understand.
21 That's what I've been told.

22 MS. CEGELSKI: So that's coming back to the
23 30 minutes, coming back to the CLECs on the half hour?

24 MR. FIORETTI: It's 30 minutes on the half
25 hour that we go out and pick up the mail, O.K. And that's

1 the design of the system.

2 Now I'm working, because some of these
3 times I don't have. I'm going back to my vendor here, GE
4 Information Systems, to get the times. I'm working to
5 develop a proposal based on what's happening currently as
6 to what a measurement here would be as average time to
7 pick up. I'm just going to say "pickup."

8 PHONE VOICE: I couldn't hear you.

9 MR. FIORETTI: To pick up the mail.

10 MS. CEGELSKI: So it would be from GEIS to
11 the translator.

12 MR. FIORETTI: From GEIS to the time I pick
13 it up. So it's just measuring that 30-minute pool time.
14 I expect -- I don't know this for sure -- but I'm going to
15 let it be the data. I would expect I'm going to get
16 probably some feedback that says we'll do a study that
17 says, "Well, this is going to be probably 14 to 16 minutes
18 on average," because it seems to me when you've got a 30-
19 minute interval that you receive things in a normal kind
20 of basis, you're going to end up probably right about 15
21 minutes on average. Should be your average time, about,
22 to pick it up. I'm going to get some data to support
23 whatever it should be, all right.

24 The first part of the FOC measurement that
25 we're not measuring today, that we would suggest that we

1 need to measure, and again going back to find where all
2 these times are, because this time is not a time that I
3 have, this is GEIS putting it in my mailbox. The average
4 time to pick it up, I'm expecting it's going to be around
5 15 minutes.

6 So we need to create a measure to say:

7 "Average time to pick up the mail," O.K. Because that's
8 not in the measure today.

9 There is a second measure here that says:

10 "All right; how fast am I doing this whole translation
11 bit?"

12 Now, that question, as I have talked to the
13 IT folks, is a little more, a little bit more involved to
14 answer. That you just can't say -- you can say if you're
15 just talking about one of these. By the way, this is the
16 measure on the envelope level, O.K., this first one. It's
17 based on these envelopes, average time.

18 But you could have multiple PONs in each
19 one of these envelopes. So it's purely based on the
20 envelope measure.

21 This one then takes it. It's creating its
22 file and it's taking it on a PON level. Now I can have
23 12, like I've shown here, or I can have 10,000, depending
24 on how many envelopes the CLEC sent at that particular
25 time. O.K. And obviously it's going to take a lot more

1 time for the 10,000th order to get processed from when I
2 put it here than when I put the 12th one here. I mean it
3 would seem obvious to me that it's going to take a lot
4 longer time.

5 So what my T folks have told me is that
6 we're really testing here -- what we really should be
7 testing here is: Are we processing orders through this
8 translator at the rate that we say we should be processing
9 them? In other words, if we say --

10 MS. KINARD: I'm sorry, what was the last
11 thing you said? We didn't hear you.

12 MR. FIORETTI: We had a clap of thunder
13 here. What I said was, what they have told me is the
14 appropriate measure to have here is: Are we living up to
15 the rate at which we have established that we are going to
16 process orders through this translator? And then the
17 measurement that we always did from here, then that makes
18 sense taken by itself. This one makes sense taken by
19 itself. But this one becomes a rate, a processing rate.
20 And that says: If I said I could process a thousand,
21 2000, 3000 orders per hour, whatever it is -- I don't know
22 what that is yet -- they're coming back -- in fact, that's
23 being developed in association with the whole third-party
24 test pieces, what are the processing rates, and it's a
25 part of the way you would assess capacity and so forth.

1 If we advertise that -- let's just take a
2 thousand because it's easy. Let's assume that we can
3 process a thousand orders per hour, O.K.? I would measure
4 this rate. Am I processing a thousand orders per hour as
5 advertised, or am I only processing 500?

6 If I'm only processing 500, then I am not
7 meeting this objective.

8 O.K.

9 So this measurement here would be based on
10 am I processing the amount of orders that I said I could
11 process, and that would accommodate the fact that if I get
12 10,000 orders in here -- again a thousand works because
13 it's easy to divide -- if I got 10,000 orders here dumped
14 into this file and I say I can only do a thousand an hour,
15 that would mean that this last one, this 10,000th one down
16 here, really takes 10 hours to get through here, but I am
17 processing at the appropriate rate.

18 So I'm not being penalized for the fact
19 that whether it's coincidence or, you know, I'm holding
20 orders or whatever, that I got 10,000 orders all at the
21 same time, O.K., in terms of this average-response-time
22 kind of measure.

23 I'm going to do this one because it makes
24 sense to say am I picking it up like I'm supposed to pick
25 them up, regardless of how many are there? I pick up the

1 envelopes and I create this file. O.K., that's a
2 reasonable measure to do average time to pick up or
3 average time to send out.

4 But this one, the average time isn't a
5 reflective measure of the way the system, this system, is
6 architected, or any other system for that matter, because
7 this is based on some expectation of processing rate.

8 O.K., how fast can you process them?
9 Again, I don't know what the number is. I'm using a
10 thousand because it's easy to divide, but that would tell
11 you that, here, if I have only got 12, sure I'm going to
12 go through this in, I don't know what a thousand divided
13 by an hour is, but I'm going to say, just for ease, I'm
14 going to say I'll go through them in probably less than 10
15 minutes or two minutes or whatever it is, whatever the
16 time frame is. That's when the last one would be here.

17 If I had 10,000 that came in at that point,
18 well, this one is not going to get through there for 10
19 hours. And that should be an expectation here, not a
20 penalty, because it did.

21 So that's the one end of this measurement
22 and what we would process to measure on these two segments
23 that we established in Ohio that we are not measuring
24 today.

25 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, in Ohio we had also

1 talked about there is a portion that is parity out from
2 when it goes into ASIS.

3 MR. FIORETTI: I'm going to get to that.

4 MS. CEGELSKI: We had asked for having this
5 portion as a benchmark, having that send function as a
6 benchmark but having parity where parity is, for the FOC.

7 I think we need the time frame. This wasn't captured
8 before, and the CLECs, we didn't realize that because the
9 rule for the business, for the FOC, states from the time
10 you receive it, which is when you pull it from GEIS, you
11 have it, you own it, to the time that you send it again,
12 which is again when that whole return is done, and you
13 ship it out through the GEIS again.

14 We are sitting here trying to establish
15 time frames because it's so critical for us to know when
16 these orders are coming through so we know what to do with
17 these things and can make the commitments to our
18 customers. And now there's additional time that, you
19 know, we want to take out of this? I am concerned.

20 MR. FIORETTI: Well, all I'm suggesting
21 here is that as we talked about establishing other
22 measures to account for this time, that we would. And we
23 have the benchmark discussion. Again we could then talk
24 about this piece, talk about this piece, talk about that
25 piece separately, but I'm talking about the measurements

1 themselves.

2 MS. CEGELSKI: And all of those components,
3 in my mind's eye, give us our FOC time, so it's not just
4 this little bit here, what you're averaging for 14 or 16
5 minutes, and it's not just the translation processing time
6 here, it's of the FOC. I have an order I'm sending to
7 you. What are you telling me then, that it's ready? Or
8 would it be a combination of both?

9 MR. FIORETTI: All I'm saying there is that
10 if it made sense, if it truly made sense to measure this
11 one that way, I would say, you know, then we could talk
12 about adding these things up.

13 The best advice that I have that says how
14 to do this says that this is the way you measure this
15 particular piece, which doesn't --

16 MR. COX: Hey, Sal?

17 MR. FIORETTI: Yeah.

18 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA. I've
19 got a question.

20 MR. FIORETTI: O.K.

21 MR. COX: In the translator bucket, once it
22 leaves the pickup or the mailbox and goes into that
23 translator, is it partitioned out by CLEC or does it go
24 into one big file?

25 MR. FIORETTI: It goes into one big file.

1 MR. COX: Well, how would you know
2 individual CLEC measures for that processing time or that
3 processing rate? It sounds like we're getting all put
4 into one rate bucket.

5 MR. FIORETTI: We know, as I understand it,
6 we know the time it takes the first order to get through
7 that translator and the time it takes, you know, each PON
8 to actually be translated. But it goes in there as one
9 file. You know, it gets submitted to the translator, the
10 whole translation process is taking the PON information
11 individually and translating it to something that can be
12 used on the other end.

13 MR. COX: But how does it sequence what it
14 takes out of the mailbox? If, for example, three CLECs
15 enter a hundred orders at the same time into the mailbox,
16 how does it select --

17 MR. FIORETTI: Which one first?

18 MR. COX: Yeah.

19 MS. CEGELSKI: That's a good question.

20 MR. FIORETTI: That's a good question and I
21 can't answer that, Rod. I'm going to -- I shouldn't even
22 guess. But I think, you know, it's going to have to do
23 with exactly how these things got received by GEIS on this
24 end and they're just --

25 MS. CEGELSKI: Is it first in, first out?

1 MR. COX: First in, first out.

2 MR. FIORETTI: First in, first out.

3 MR. ANDERSON: LIFO or FIFO.

4 MR. FIORETTI: Yeah.

5 MR. COX: It may not be an issue if the
6 processing rate is extremely fast for 10,000 orders, but,
7 you know, it becomes an issue if it is like you suggested
8 a while ago, that that last one gets 10 hours and the
9 first one gets two minutes, that's an issue.

10 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, and considering the 10
11 hours, if they're pulling every 30 minutes, there's going
12 to be more dumped into that bucket. So we're always going
13 to be behind if it's taking that type of a time frame.

14 MS. FENNELL: Those were just
15 hypotheticals.

16 MR. FIORETTI: Again, those are just
17 hypotheticals. I mean, I'm just trying to deal with
18 numbers that I could --

19 MS. FENNELL: Divide by.

20 MR. FIORETTI: -- I could divide by.

21 MR. COX: I was just going to say it may
22 not be an issue unless it really truly is that length of
23 delay you're talking about.

24 MR. FIORETTI: Well, and again, what I'm
25 suggesting here is the measure itself in terms of what

1 would be measured and essentially how it would be measured
2 and how these two things are truly different type of
3 measures that you'd have in terms of what basically the
4 calculation of the measure, what it would be. And again,
5 I went back to the SMEs to say what's the right thing to
6 do here.

7 MR. KERN: I'm looking back at my notes
8 from our last session, and help me. My understanding is
9 this exercise is an attempt to determine what was to be
10 measured at parity and what cannot be measured at parity.
11 Is that correct?

12 MR. FIORETTI: Right. And we would agree
13 that these two pieces --

14 MS. CEGELSKI: And we want that measured.

15 MR. FIORETTI: -- would be measured. This
16 is what we were going to suggest.

17 MR. KERN: So the mailbox function and the
18 processing function --

19 MR. FIORETTI: These are benchmark
20 measures.

21 MR. KERN: Ameritech would suggest are
22 benchmark measures.

23 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

24 MR. KERN: Do the CLECs agree those are
25 benchmark measures?

1 MS. CEGELSKI: Yes, we agree.

2 MR. FIORETTI: I think they agree.

3 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, I'd like to see the
4 whole process time framed for one order because you have
5 it in the envelope. Is the envelope information
6 transferred over to a PON level?

7 MR. FIORETTI: But I don't have it in the
8 envelope with a time stamp here. Again, this is my vendor
9 received from your vendor. They got this envelope.

10 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, I'm going to back it
11 up, though. When you get it over here in your flat file,
12 do you know which envelope it comes into?

13 MR. FIORETTI: I don't believe I do.
14 That's part of the --

15 MS. CEGELSKI: Is that being investigated?

16 MR. FIORETTI: It's being investigated.

17 MS. CEGELSKI: O.K.

18 MR. FIORETTI: The best information I have
19 today is it does not. And then I've asked them to verify
20 that because again, this is something that the vendor puts
21 on, is going to have to tell me what time they made it
22 available to me. Because, you know, it's like you're in
23 your house, all right, and what time did the actual mail
24 truck come and put the thing in your box? You don't know
25 but you went over there at quarter after 2:00 and picked

1 them up, O.K., and they got there sometime before.

2 MS. CEGELSKI: But we know you're pulling
3 every 30 minutes, and what we're asking for and from the
4 business rules that define it is when you receive the
5 order. So we know you're pulling it every 30 minutes.

6 MR. FIORETTI: Right. But I know I'm
7 pulling envelope 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 -- I don't know how they're
8 identified -- some number.

9 MS. CEGELSKI: But from what we discussed
10 before, I believe that everything that was at GEIS at the
11 time that you would do this pull was taken.

12 MR. FIORETTI: Everything was taken. The
13 question is, can I identify back here which envelope it
14 was in and what the time is associated with it.

15 MS. CEGELSKI: Right.

16 MR. FIORETTI: And I don't believe today
17 that I can, because I'm getting this number at an envelope
18 level without knowing anything about what was in it. I
19 know I got here from -- and I can know -- they tell me I
20 can know who it came from but I don't know what -- because
21 they're not looking inside of it, all right? All I know
22 is I got envelope 1, 2, 3 from trading partner 1 at that
23 point.

24 So I can measure for CoreComm or AT&T how
25 quickly did I pick up your envelopes because I can

1 identify, you and I can identify that I got an envelope at
2 this time. I don't know what was in it at that point,
3 O.K.?

4 So we're still investigating that but I'm
5 giving you what I know today, and based on again the
6 reasonably short turnaround that we've had between all
7 these things, I'm giving you what I know today and what
8 I'm suggesting as a measure. And yes, John, we do agree,
9 I think, that these should be measured as benchmark
10 measures, O.K.?

11 I can move on to the other part of that but
12 I wanted to make sure we got this because I drew it so big
13 on that that it's very pretty.

14 MR. GOULD: Rick Gould, Horizon.

15 A quick question: As far as you're to
16 provide the FOC within so many days of receipt, we have to
17 have the order in by -- and I'm not sure if it's three or
18 12 or whatever the time frame is now -- how does that play
19 into this picture? Is it at the time of the GEIS? If we
20 get it to you at 2:30 into the GEIS, are we within that
21 day, or is it over here at this receipt time that it's
22 recorded, which could be 15, 20, 40 hours later?

23 MR. FIORETTI: The way that the business
24 rule is set up today -- and I say that because I haven't
25 considered what we need to potentially do there -- the way

1 the business rule is set up today and really the time that
2 I'd have it truly available to me in a format I can use it
3 is the time I got it here. So that's the way it's set up
4 today.

5 MR. GOULD: O.K. So if I send it to you
6 today, Thursday, at 11:10 or 10:50, you may not have it
7 till Monday as far as you --

8 MR. FIORETTI: It might be 11:10 until I
9 get it here.

10 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, depending on your
11 batching time frame.

12 MR. GOULD: And this.

13 MR. FIORETTI: I mean it could be I got it
14 in here on the ninth minute, so there's one minute here
15 and it's one of very few --

16 MS. CEGELSKI: On the flip side, it could
17 still be on the first minute, too.

18 MR. FIORETTI: -- and I've got close to a
19 minute here and it could be, you know, 10:52.

20 MR. GOULD: Right. But it could also just
21 mean your 10 hours --

22 MR. FIORETTI: It could just be 10,000, No.
23 10,000.

24 MR. GOULD: Right. O.K.

25 MR. FIORETTI: So again, that's why this --

1 we believe that this is the appropriate measure here, and
2 it doesn't translate well into the overall (a) because of
3 what you know about what's in all of those, and (b) how
4 this is architected and what to do with it.

5 But agreeing on a sense of what these
6 should be individually, we think then we can agree on what
7 this ought to be and should be able to set some
8 expectations on your part, reasonable expectations, as to
9 when to expect things back, again under --

10 MS. CEGELSKI: Personally, Sal, I think the
11 expectation would be the same thing that we've suggested.

12 Now we're uncovering a whole group of time that we did not
13 know was involved because, you know, the measurement that
14 we were reading in our time frames, we had thought it had
15 this whole thing from when you picked it up all the way
16 through.

17 MR. FIORETTI: I had that same impression.

18 MS. CEGELSKI: So I don't think that
19 there's going to be any discussion -- and I can't speak
20 for the other CLECs -- but I don't want to give on any
21 other time from what we've already recommended because now
22 we've uncovered something that wasn't measured, because
23 the times that we have I don't think are acceptable to
24 start with. That's why we made the recommendations for
25 the change.

1 MR. FIORETTI: Well, and all I'm suggesting
2 here is again that we have a measure here and we establish
3 a time frame, and we have a measure here based on
4 published or found or third-party tested capacity or
5 throughput or whatever it is, and that's how we measure,
6 O.K.? That's really all I'm suggesting here, because I
7 don't know what the numbers need to be at this particular
8 date and time. I'm suggesting the measurements.

9 MS. MOORE: When I call in Ohio where Rick
10 Dishman was showing the portion that is directly
11 comparable to retail, has Sal drawn that there?

12 MS. CEGELSKI: Yes, he has. He's done
13 pretty good.

14 MR. FIORETTI: No.

15 MS. CEGELSKI: Oh, the side to retail?

16 MR. FIORETTI: No.

17 MS. CEGELSKI: No, we haven't gotten to
18 that point, but he's got all the way up to when it's
19 stamped into MORTEL.

20 MR. COX: Oh. O.K. MORTEL.

21 MS. CEGELSKI: So we've got to MORTEL.

22 MR. FIORETTI: And I'm trying to just
23 address these, Karen, as the beginning and end part,
24 depending on if you're going inbound or outbound, and then
25 we'll talk about the middle part.

1 MS. CEGELSKI: We are only up to that point
2 at this time.

3 MR. FIORETTI: Because we had suggested,
4 you know, a time and a time for these, and on
5 investigation we found out, yes, a time is appropriate for
6 this and here's how we develop it and present it as a
7 proposal, and this one, however, should really be
8 presented in a different fashion, and that's really all
9 I'm suggesting here, and that yes, we agree that it be
10 benchmark/benchmark.

11 MS. MOORE: So we're talking about doing a
12 benchmark from GEIS to MORTEL?

13 MS. CEGELSKI: No. He's talking about
14 separating it --

15 MR. FIORETTI: Into two parts.

16 MS. CEGELSKI: -- into two separate
17 measures.

18 MS. MOORE: O.K. So instead of the one
19 measure from Ohio, we're talking two measures.

20 MS. CEGELSKI: Yes.

21 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

22 MS. MOORE: And we're going to measure
23 those two measures twice, incoming and outgoing; is that
24 right?

25 MS. CEGELSKI: We should be. We haven't

1 gotten to the outgoing yet because it goes backwards with
2 the same processes.

3 MR. FIORETTI: Yes, it goes back the same
4 processes. I think that would be something that we have
5 to determine if it makes sense. You know --

6 MS. CEGELSKI: But, Sal, we need to have
7 that, because if the measurement for FOC says from the
8 time that you receive to the time that you notify us --

9 MR. FIORETTI: I wasn't going to disagree,
10 Mary.

11 MS. CEGELSKI: O.K.

12 MR. FIORETTI: I mean I'm just saying that,
13 you know -- O.K., well, I'd leave that particular one open
14 but I think I agree with you that it would have to be
15 inbound and outbound, O.K., separated.

16 MS. MOORE: So from a practical standpoint,
17 Sal, would you make that two measures with disaggregation
18 for inbound and outbound?

19 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

20 MS. MOORE: Or would you make it four
21 measures?

22 MR. FIORETTI: No, it would be inbound and
23 outbound disaggregated.

24 MS. CEGELSKI: But you're talking about
25 making this inbound two separate measures.

1 MR. FIORETTI: Right. It would be two
2 measures.

3 MS. CEGELSKI: So the outbound would have
4 to go through the same process.

5 MR. FIORETTI: This would be No. 1 and it
6 would be in and out, and this would be No. 2 and it would
7 be inbound and outbound.

8 But this is the part that's not being
9 measured today, O.K.? I just wanted to be clear about
10 that. This is the part that's not included at all in what
11 we're measuring today.

12 MS. MOORE: Mary, to this point does it
13 look reasonable to you?

14 MS. CEGELSKI: Frankly, no. I'm having a
15 problem. I don't understand why you would not, when you
16 first get it into your translator, know which envelope
17 those things came from, or having the capability to be
18 able to stamp it to which envelope that that comes from,
19 because I see that it looks like what we had and what our
20 measurement for FOC was in the business rules would
21 contain this whole thing, and now we're chopping it up
22 into five different components.

23 And I also --

24 MR. FIORETTI: Well, so far all I've
25 suggested is two new components.

1 MS. CEGELSKI: And I know, but the starting
2 point for the parity would be after it gets to MORTEL. So
3 there would be a portion of the current measure that would
4 fall within this benchmark period, from my understanding,
5 because it would go through your receiver, it would go
6 through the processor, it would get stamped into MORTEL,
7 MORTEL would then go back up to the processor over to
8 ASIS. When it gets into ASIS and then goes into your
9 Legacy systems, that has the parity process.

10 Right now your measurement starts when it
11 gets to MORTEL. So it still is not -- I'm still unclear.

12 MR. FIORETTI: Well, the current
13 measurement is like this, it's this whole process in and
14 out. It's from here to here.

15 MS. CEGELSKI: Right.

16 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. So this is the only
17 part today that is not being measured.

18 MS. CEGELSKI: Yes, but the parity process
19 is over part of that time frame.

20 MR. FIORETTI: I know, and I want to go
21 into that. I'm trying to just talk about them one at a
22 time because otherwise the board's not big enough.

23 So yeah, there's three components in total
24 here, and yeah, there's this piece in here somewhere
25 downstream.

1 MS. CEGELSKI: And I think that -- and I'm
2 not an expert with the systems or with IT -- but to me it
3 seems logical that if you have an envelope, you have
4 components that you're opening up from that envelope,
5 somewhere they would stamp it so that they know this came
6 from that envelope. That seems logical to me.

7 MR. FIORETTI: And all I'm saying is today,
8 you know, based on the best I could get right now, is I'm
9 told I do not have that information. I told them to go
10 back because it would make sense. However, what they've
11 also said to me is that measuring this purely on the basis
12 of an expectation of an average time is not an appropriate
13 measure for this function in the way the systems work.

14 I mean if I need to do --

15 MS. CEGELSKI: But I think it's a realistic
16 request from the CLEC to find out what our average time is
17 that it takes for you to process an order to give me an
18 FOC. It should not -- and maybe I'll need you to explain
19 why you feel that it needs to be broken down in these
20 components.

21 MS. FENNELL: Well, I think part of it,
22 what happens, from my understanding of listening to Sal
23 here, is in that translator the response time is
24 completely dependent upon how many orders we're getting
25 from all the CLECs --

1 MR. FIORETTI: From all the CLECs.

2 MS. FENNELL: -- not our systems

3 performance necessarily, but how many orders we're
4 getting. If we're getting average number of orders -- and
5 our systems should be designed to handle, you know, the
6 average number of orders and be scaled for some peaks, but
7 suddenly the volumes jump right up, or in different times
8 of the month or special promotions the orders are jumping
9 up above the normal allowed for peaks that we've planned
10 for, we shouldn't get penalized because we got loaded down
11 with orders, and this would capture that. It would
12 capture both processing you in a timely manner and having
13 the appropriate capacity to process your orders, but also
14 capture those instances and still measure on those
15 instances where we get the unexpected peaks.

16 MR. FIORETTI: Right, and not penalizing us
17 for the peaks. Or, you know, maybe your system, for
18 example, maybe yours runs in a batch mode and you take
19 orders throughout the day and in the evening send them all
20 over. Well, if you send them all over and you send 10,000
21 and somebody else sends 10,000, I mean then again what
22 we're saying is you're penalizing us for the way you're
23 doing your business, which is totally up to you, we don't

24 --

25 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, I think that most of

1 the CLECs were very surprised that you were pulling on a
2 30-minute time frame and discussion in Ohio was "Let us
3 know what that time is so I'm going to send my orders to
4 you at 25 after so you pick it up in a very short time
5 frame."

6 MR. FIORETTI: Then you're assuming there
7 that there's a whole process on this end that is however
8 you get to there, how your VAN would talk to ours and all
9 the rest, so again there's --

10 MS. CEGELSKI: But we can control that by
11 watching the statistics from the time our system sent it
12 out to the time that we would hopefully get an FOC so it
13 doesn't sit at GEIS for a long time period, because we
14 want to be able to give our customers the response of when
15 this activity is going to happen somewhere close to where
16 your retail customers who are still on the phone, and
17 before that end user hangs up, that end user knows when
18 that Ameritech technician is coming out. That's what
19 we're trying to get.

20 And I understand that because of the
21 relationship on the wholesale side of this and the EDI
22 process, there's time involved to make that -- that won't
23 give us that particular parity, but we want to keep this
24 at a minimum so we have the quickest possible response for
25 our customers.

1 MR. FIORETTI: I understand, and I don't
2 disagree. The intent is to architect the systems and to
3 give you the quickest possible response. It's also to --
4 you know, maybe we need to reevaluate this in terms of the
5 times. I don't know that today, standing here, but I
6 would tell you that these are the two measurements that we
7 would suggest are most appropriate for these functions,
8 for the very reason that they are different and they're
9 more of a function of -- and certainly this one is -- of
10 the infrastructure of how you get orders versus when do I
11 actually have them in my hand to work with them, O.K.?

12 So I think that makes this one still a
13 valid piece part of the measure.

14 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, no, because then that
15 particular measure, if you're leaving it as it is today,
16 is not going to -- it contains a component that's parity
17 and a component that's not, and what we would like from
18 CoreComm is from the time that it's stamped into the ASIS
19 or ASON system all the way up from the time that you
20 receive it as one measurement. Or at least we want to
21 know what that time takes and we want to know what the
22 parity time takes.

23 And then on the flip side is once that
24 MORTEL system again is notified from ASON back out all the
25 way through to when you send that envelope back from GEIS,

1 on how long that takes. I think slicing it this way still
2 gives me a -- I'm uncomfortable with it because I feel
3 that there's portions that are going to be missed.

4 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA.

5 I think the only way you're going to get
6 true parity here is if the Ameritech retail side would go
7 through the GEIS.

8 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, no, there is parity
9 with portions of the process. After it hits MORTEL,
10 MORTEL updates ASON, ASON goes into their Legacy systems.
11 That ASON into the Legacy systems is a parity process that
12 hits all their retail side. So that I believe we should
13 be measuring on parity.

14 The other, the transmission side, their
15 processing side, isn't parity. I agree with that, it
16 should be a benchmark. But I need to capture the whole
17 time as not just sections of it or components of it,
18 because from what I see here there's going to be
19 additional time not captured from when you get my order
20 until I receive my FOC. And I just want to be assured --
21 and I don't have a comfort level at this moment -- that
22 all that time has been captured.

23 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I think -- and again,
24 based on the conversations that I have -- I'm now
25 confident that, based on the way we would do this, we

1 would capture all of the components of time and be
2 measuring them and be measuring them at the appropriate
3 kind of measurement.

4 You know, I do have that comfort level. I
5 don't know what some of the answers are with respect to
6 how long it takes. If it would be prudent to do so, you
7 know, I can take this back, which was, you know, not my
8 intention in terms of how to explain this, and bring the
9 SMEs here to talk more -- here or elsewhere -- to talk
10 more about this proposed measurement and how to do it.

11 This is where we would stand in terms of
12 our proposal as a measurement of these functions today,
13 and again, obviously it's minus what should be the time
14 and what should be the rate.

15 MS. CEGELSKI: Then are you suggesting
16 this --

17 MR. FIORETTI: And I'll go on now beyond
18 there as soon as I can kind of wipe this one clean and go
19 to the next one. But, you know, I don't want to wipe it
20 clean or stop talking about it until --

21 MR. GOULD: I've got one other question.

22 MS. MOORE: Karen Moore from AT&T. I just
23 want to be sure that I have a clearer picture in my head
24 of what you're saying.

25 You've got the envelope pickup time as 1:00

1 P.M.

2 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

3 MS. MOORE: And you've got the envelope
4 unfolding time or opening time as another piece.

5 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

6 MS. MOORE: And we know that the envelope
7 time roughly is on the half hour.

8 MS. CEGELSKI: Right.

9 MS. MOORE: But we don't know what the
10 envelope opening part time frame is, first of all because
11 it's dependent upon how many orders are in the envelope,
12 and on top of that, Sal hasn't had a chance yet to get
13 sort of the average time frame.

14 Does that capture pretty much what you
15 said, Sal?

16 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I haven't gotten the
17 results of any study that says what's the average time to
18 pick up the envelopes from GEIS at this point.

19 MS. MOORE: O.K. So we're still waiting
20 for time frames for your proposed benchmarks, as it were,
21 for those two pieces?

22 MR. FIORETTI: Right. Because the
23 processing rate, I think, is going to be an output in some
24 fashion of the third-party test as to what truly are we
25 processing at, is that processing rate appropriate. I

1 mean I'm not sure what the answers or what even the
2 questions are necessarily, but I know I'll end up with
3 here's the published processing rate tested by KPMG,
4 here's what we're going to verify that your processing
5 rate is.

6 MS. MOORE: O.K. So I'm just trying to
7 seek to understand here. You're suggesting that during
8 the third-party test, before we ever set a benchmark you'd
9 have KPMG look at those two processes to see what the
10 benchmark should be?

11 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I'm saying that I
12 might go into this measurement with what we say -- you
13 know, they're developing the specific number I need right
14 now, but that will be validated and/or I'm not sure what
15 the process and testing will be, but that process rate
16 will be validated or modified by virtue of what KPMG
17 actually does, you know, through their validation of our
18 processing to make sure that we've got the right thing
19 here. And then, you know, an understanding what that is,
20 if that's two orders an hour, I think that's probably
21 going to be considered not acceptable and we have to make
22 some changes to make it better. If it's X number of
23 orders an hour which, you know, ranks up with what all
24 everybody else kind of does in this kind of world, then I
25 think that's acceptable, and the idea is, hey, we're in an

1 acceptable range in terms of processing capability and so
2 we're processing things at an appropriate rate. We've got
3 enough capacity and it's scalable such that we can modify
4 that as is necessary to make sure that we can continue
5 that.

6 So that becomes independent, saying, all
7 right, I got the rate and I'll monitor that rate, and
8 whether it's how do you keep that up, again, I'm not sure
9 how that's going to happen. But I would suggest that I
10 would initially propose what this is and measure to what I
11 think it should be or is, and then through the third-party
12 test that number will be validated, modified, whatever, by
13 virtue of that test process.

14 But I do think I can plug something in here
15 in a very short period of time. It won't be what's a
16 validated number but it's going to be something that I
17 would say here's my published processing rate, here's what
18 I'm telling you it could be.

19 MS. CEGELSKI: Can you also check to see if
20 Ameritech has the ability to include the envelope that
21 that particular FOC PON came into when it hit the flat
22 file?

23 MR. FIORETTI: Yeah, that's a question I've
24 already asked them to go back and verify. What they've
25 told me today is no, but --

1 MS. CEGELSKI: But did they tell you that
2 they don't do it today or did they tell you they can't do
3 it? Those are two different things.

4 MR. FIORETTI: They told me they can't do
5 it today.

6 MS. CEGELSKI: They can't do it.

7 MR. FIORETTI: Right. And again, because
8 this is information that my vendor is providing me, as I
9 understand it, what happens is, you know, let's say
10 another VAN gives them the envelope. They get envelopes
11 -- you know, this is a GEIS, this is an EDI provider that
12 does EDI for any number of different customers for any
13 number of different applications. They do some processing
14 on their own that says, O.K., this is an envelope, this is
15 Ameritech's envelope; I'd better go put it in Ameritech's
16 box and puts it there. Again, so I don't know --

17 MS. CEGELSKI: The simplistic view that I'm
18 looking at is, you know, when I go to my mailbox and I
19 open up an envelope, I know what's in there.

20 MR. FIORETTI: So you know when the mailman
21 got there.

22 MS. CEGELSKI: No, I'm not saying that.
23 What I'm saying is that when I open an envelope, I know
24 what the components of that envelope are. So if I've got
25 three pieces of paper or if I've got four, I know when I

1 open that envelope.

2 MR. FIORETTI: And I've already got that
3 question pending. So can I move on to the other end of
4 this?

5 MR. GOULD: Quick question.

6 MR. FIORETTI: Oh, I forgot.

7 MR. GOULD: Thank you. This is the EDI.
8 What happens in a manual situation? Does that come in at
9 the MORTEL or is that still --

10 MR. FIORETTI: In a manual situation it
11 comes in here on a fax, and I understand the process is to
12 say when we take it off -- we've got a clerical function
13 here that sits by the fax machines. They pull these off
14 the fax machine, take the fax time and then put it into
15 MORTEL at that time.

16 So it's not the same. It's handled very
17 much differently. It's a manual process, and it's a
18 manual process to do this, but I'm confident that the time
19 that's in here is the time.

20 MS. CEGELSKI: And they use the fax
21 received time?

22 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

23 MS. CEGELSKI: O.K.

24 MR. FIORETTI: So it is different but it's
25 the same. And that's why I say this is an appropriate

1 measure when you start looking at the different flavors,
2 Mary, you know, in and of itself, but you've got to
3 capture some of those other times, then you've got to
4 capture are you doing it like you said you were going to
5 do it in an appropriate fashion. So regardless of volume
6 --

7 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, I'm just going back
8 just to the business rules for FOC, you know, from the
9 time you receive to the time that you send back your FOC.
10 So when it sits in GEIS, I don't care, that's a problem
11 with GEIS. It could be our VAN or whatever else up front.
12 But when you pull that, however every 30 minutes that you
13 pull it, we should know that you did this at 10:30 A.M.,
14 you pulled this envelope, this envelope had this many PONs
15 in it. I should know from the time that you do that pull,
16 and that's not a GEIS thing, I don't think, it's an
17 Ameritech pulling this envelope. You know when you pull
18 it.

19 So from the time you pull it through the
20 time it takes this whole process here through the time and
21 that portion of what we currently have as an FOC measure
22 is what I consider the benchmark, and that's the time it
23 takes for you to receive it. Even when we're talking in a
24 manual mode you're capturing the time that that fax was
25 received. That's the appropriate time. That's when you

1 got my order. And then whatever time it takes clerically
2 to get into the system is the processing time similar to
3 -- in a very high-level view -- to what it takes from when
4 our GEIS envelope is pulled by you till it gets entered
5 into MORTEL.

6 MR. FIORETTI: Again, I'd fall back into
7 what -- on what we think the more appropriate measure is.

8 MS. CEGELSKI: Yeah, I would love to be
9 able to -- if you could bring a SME in, I'll bring my SME,
10 too.

11 MR. FIORETTI: Have we got this on paper
12 enough so that we can --

13 MS. CEGELSKI: Yes.

14 MR. FIORETTI: I think I can re-create it,
15 anyway.

16 MS. CEGELSKI: In your sleep probably, Sal.

17 MR. FIORETTI: So we can send it to the
18 folks.

19 But I want to talk about that back end.

20 MS. CEGELSKI: I'd like to talk about the
21 middle portion, too.

22 MR. FIORETTI: Well, just I'm talking about
23 here this return trip.

24 MS. CEGELSKI: O.K. That sounds good.

25 MR. ANDERSON: We're erasing the board.

1 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. So now we're going to
2 start in the MOR database, and --

3 MS. MOORE: Sal, this is Karen Moore.
4 Could you say that sentence again, please?

5 MR. FIORETTI: Now we're going to start
6 with the MORTEL database and look at the round trip, if
7 you will, from the MOR database out to create the order,
8 at that point determining reject or -- because the other
9 thing is, this all happens for several different measures,
10 O.K.? And so when you're talking about this round trip,
11 what you're saying is you need to understand what PON this
12 is if it eventually got rejected and measuring it
13 individually. So it's a little more complex than just
14 saying, you know, what's in the envelope.

15 So now we've got the MOR database, and I
16 know Rick went through like about three different series
17 of edits when he did his analysis, but I'm going to try to
18 keep it simple and say there's this bucket of edits and --

19 MS. MOORE: You're going to keep it simple
20 and what?

21 MR. FIORETTI: There's edits that once it
22 gets into the MORTEL database, there's edits that occur.

23 MS. MOORE: O.K.

24 MR. FIORETTI: Some of the edits are just
25 form and some of the edits are form and structure and can

1 I reject the order and are there basic valid things about
2 the order and the components of the order. There are
3 others that are a little more in-depth in terms of the
4 quality of the information and going out to check
5 preorder-type systems and validate telephone numbers and
6 so forth and so on. There are several different kinds of
7 edits. I'm going to put them all in one bucket, O.K.,
8 here, because in my view, again I got the EDI process
9 here, O.K., and at the back end of this I got the -- at
10 the very left-hand side of this picture I got the CLEC
11 representative who took the order, and in my view, the
12 parity comparison -- the basic parity comparison is
13 there.

14 The idea is that the CLEC rep ought to be
15 able to do the functions that the retail rep can do to
16 generate the information that's required to populate an
17 order back at this end, and they go through talking to the
18 customer, they have their own edits that go back and forth
19 based on the CLEC system that sits in between here.
20 There's all kinds of things that happen at that level, and
21 this is the true one-for-one parity comparison.

22 There is a function at the back end of
23 these edits. Let's assume that some of these generically
24 fall out to be rejected, O.K.? They fail edits and they
25 are rejected, automatically rejected. These then start

1 the return path through this EDI function and the same
2 things take place on the translator level, and so forth.

3 So this trip, this round trip transaction,
4 is measured on a reject to, back to that same point, a
5 time stamp in a MOR database. That's why I stopped it
6 here.

7 MS. CEGELSKI: O.K. Because it stopped
8 right there. It doesn't include rebatching and re-
9 enveloping or dropping it into the mailbox.

10 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. So that the two
11 measures with two disaggregations on this end is the
12 inbound and outbound processing on this side, O.K.? This
13 isn't the parity comparison, this is a reject. This is a
14 validation of the work that's been done on this end, O.K.?

15 MR. KERN: Sal, you mentioned the round-
16 trip reject. Does the round trip start and stop at the
17 MORTEL line or is it all the way through?

18 MR. FIORETTI: No, it's right here at the
19 MORTEL database time stamp.

20 MS. MOORE: Patty, is that you?

21 MS. COUGHLIN: Yes.

22 MR. FIORETTI: So this is the time stamp
23 for the MORTEL database, that round trip.

24 There is also the function where we go off
25 to ASON to generate an order, and that's really what Mary

1 is saying, and when that happens that says I've passed all
2 my edits -- O.K., here -- passed all my edits, I got this
3 sliver of time where I'm going to input that data -- in
4 fact, inputting that data isn't even, in and of itself, a
5 parity comparison because when a retail rep who has direct
6 access to these things inputs the data, they'll input all
7 the data, hit the button, and they'll get a red, I think,
8 or something that says this piece is wrong, they'll fix
9 that.

10 MS. CEGELSKI: They have on-line edits
11 directly into ASON.

12 MR. FIORETTI: They'll do it again and
13 they'll fix it and they'll fix it and they'll fix it, and
14 then at some point where they're ready, they've got
15 everything fixed -- in this case which it comes out of the
16 edits -- they'll hit the button one last time, and that
17 might be, depending on the rep and the order, the first
18 time, it might be the 10th time, you know, depending on
19 how good they are in doing that, that they would hit the
20 button, O.K., they'd push this button and say it's ready.
21 ASON takes it, sends it downstream as a service order, and
22 sends them back a transaction that says -- Jeff, what does
23 it actually say?

24 MR. BERTON: It goes into 1:00 P.M.

25 MR. FIORETTI: Well, yeah, but this says

1 transaction successful or something like that.

2 MR. BERTON: Yes.

3 MS. CEGELSKI: So then the service rep does
4 know that that order has been successfully sent?

5 MR. FIORETTI: Right. And this is like,
6 you know, I'm saying immediate, but I'll just for
7 practical say it's a one- to two-second thing, O.K.?

8 MS. MOORE: Sal, this is Karen Moore from
9 AT&T.

10 Patty Coughlin just joined us. Can you
11 give me 10 seconds to tell her where we're at?

12 Patty, Sal is presenting the information
13 he's gathered on the FOC process.

14 MS. COUGHLIN: O.K.

15 MS. MOORE: Where he's at so far is in the
16 front and in the back there are two pieces. The first
17 piece is how often does Ameritech pick up the envelopes
18 from GEIS and does that process work the way they expect
19 it to, which is every half hour.

20 The second piece is taking those envelopes
21 and opening them up and doing the processing that's
22 involved in that. Ameritech's position is that's not part
23 of the parity comparison because the process time is
24 dependent on how many orders are in the envelope, and now
25 Sal is talking about the middle piece where they're

1 actually processing the opened-up orders.

2 MS. COUGHLIN: O.K., thanks.

3 MS. MOORE: Thank you.

4 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. So we've done the
5 edits, we've gotten rid of the rejects that we've got
6 through whatever process there. Now we're talking about
7 the function that we would agree at some point in this
8 whole process the objective is to create a service order.
9 So at some point in that process there is some function
10 that we would agree is the same function being done on the
11 resale side as in the wholesale side. We don't disagree
12 with that in terms of a parity comparison.

13 The function, however, is this sliver of
14 time back here when we know we've got all the right
15 information and we hit the button and the order gets
16 accepted and we get a response back saying "order
17 accepted." And I think that's where we all agreed the
18 function that says, all right, this function right here,
19 yeah, if you were to say this is really the parity
20 comparison -- all right? -- this little one- or two-
21 second function in here this person is doing, this person
22 is not. So it's the piece of that that's not in this one.

23 The rest of this is carrier to carrier, how
24 this whole thing works in terms of how I need to recheck
25 all the orders, check the databases, check the telephone

1 numbers, check the CSRs, all this stuff that is also done
2 back here in both of these functions, but the real
3 comparison where the customer is on the phone is back
4 here. We should be able to do all those functions to
5 check all those things and reserve all that stuff.

6 Then we've got this piece in between. This
7 is because we're doing this as a wholesale environment and
8 third-party kind of thing and we don't have direct access
9 to this because, if you took this and said, "Do you have
10 direct access to this?" you'd be pushing a button right
11 there, right?

12 Mary, I'm thinking about you because I know
13 you understand this process.

14 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, it also goes into the
15 ASON system, goes off into your Legacy systems for Wafa,
16 for your telephone assignments.

17 MR. FIORETTI: But that's all done from
18 here in terms of edits, in these edits to make sure that
19 what I've got is accurate and valid. At such time that I
20 know I got accurate and valid information, I push the
21 button, it goes to ASON. Those are functions that exist
22 within ASIS. Those preorder functions are the same
23 preorder functions that you're accessing from back here,
24 and those happen --

25 MS. CEGELSKI: I have conflicting

1 information, because from what we were told by Rick, it
2 goes from ASON to your Legacy systems.

3 Karen and Patty, do you remember that
4 conversation?

5 MR. FIORETTI: Yes, it does. That's how
6 they get in to do a telephone number check.

7 MS. CEGELSKI: So it's not part of the --

8 MR. FIORETTI: It's all happening in the
9 filling out of the form that I have to do to fill out the
10 order, O.K.? And/or when I get that form of the order,
11 that's all being do I have this field No. 1, is this a
12 valid field, is it the right number, does it fit. Those
13 are all part of the edits. Yeah, you're right.

14 But then at some point where I enter the
15 order, at some point I know I got all the right
16 information and I say, all right, going to generate the
17 order.

18 Now, all of this checking likely happened
19 back here, too, hopefully happened back here, too.

20 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, it did. We go through
21 our preorder system and we'll check even on tech
22 availability or whatever we can do, but because of the
23 inherent time frame -- and this is one of the concerns
24 that we have -- inherent time frame for this, we don't get
25 anything confirmed until it hits ASON.

1 long is it going to take for that process time? We
2 haven't even -- you're saying four hours from the time we
3 pull it until the time it gets stamped into MORTEL.

4 MR. FIORETTI: That's all I'm saying. This
5 time we just talked about that I said would be maybe 15
6 minutes and the X --

7 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, it is the X that's
8 bothering me, Sal, frankly.

9 MR. FIORETTI: As long as this is within
10 four hours, I'll override and give you that information,
11 O.K.? I'll give you that data.

12 And I think that may be something we need
13 to look at in terms of the time frame. But all I'm saying
14 is that again I'm talking process here. So we've got
15 controls in place that says, hey, we think we've got a
16 sufficient X here. It says four hours. We should be able
17 to get that darn thing.

18 From the time we get it here -- actually
19 from the time you reserved it to the time that we get it
20 here, but of course the longer you sit on it in that time
21 frame, it eats up some of that time.

22 MS. CEGELSKI: I understand that. But our
23 goal is not to -- it's to get the minimum amount of up
24 front on our end.

25 MR. FIORETTI: Obviously we need an X there

1 just to say yeah, you can't send us an order just because
2 we reserved the due date on Tuesday, you can't send us an
3 order on Wednesday and expect to give it the same due
4 date. So I mean this is kind of a requirement of doing
5 business.

6 MS. CEGELSKI: I think that's a reasonable
7 expectation, yes.

8 MR. FIORETTI: So now if we want to
9 validate that X in terms of this process, I think we need
10 to know more about it in terms of the picture I just took
11 off the board.

12 But it's a reasonable expectation to say
13 "Hey, we're going to give you the due date as long as you
14 get it to us within X." What we're saying --

15 MS. CEGELSKI: I want to read -- and
16 please, Patty and Karen, keep me honest here because these
17 are my notes from when Rick was there. I have the
18 envelope from GEIS goes into the translator, where it is
19 parsed into a flat file. The flat file is sent to the
20 receive system. The EDI format edit is done there. The
21 receive system transmits the 997 transaction. With a
22 positive 997, the order is sent to MORTEL. It is date and
23 time stamped.

24 Once it is in MORTEL, the service rep can
25 see the order. MORTEL sends the file to the processor.

1 In the processor the basic edits are done. There are
2 about 90 basic edits. These are at a high level and do
3 not edit the specific line items. Our order can be
4 rejected at this point. Orders can also drop to manual
5 here.

6 When the basic edits are successfully
7 completed, a service order is generated in ASIS. The next
8 set of edits performed at the cross field are the cross
9 field edits. Here a CSR is pulled and the order is
10 compared to the CSR. Due dates and general facility is
11 checked at this point. Orders can drop to manual at this
12 point also.

13 MR. FIORETTI: I think what they're saying
14 there is, they filled out an ASIS screen and pushed the
15 button.

16 MS. CEGELSKI: No, this is our orders.
17 This isn't a retail.

18 MR. FIORETTI: I'm just saying at that
19 point, and this was my -- I just wanted to stop you
20 because at that point they have been able to take all that
21 information and say that basically we got good information
22 here.

23 Now let's start populating these fields.

24 Then let's go through and do the other checks that say --

25 MS. CEGELSKI: That's done in ASIS, though.

1 MR. FIORETTI: That's the way. I mean
2 that's the way you do those preorder functions of
3 checking.

4 MS. CEGELSKI: But my understanding, in
5 order to get that done a service order is created in ASIS,
6 because they've already got the high level okey-dokey that
7 what we're sending is good.

8 MR. FIORETTI: They didn't create a service
9 order yet. They populated the screen. And now --

10 MS. CEGELSKI: Karen and Patty, do you
11 remember that discussion when that service order was
12 created?

13 MS. COUGHLIN: I agree with what you said,
14 Mary. I thought the service order was created when our
15 order gets to MORTEL.

16 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Excuse me a minute,
17 Patty. When you speak on the record, can you identify
18 yourself, please.

19 MS. COUGHLIN: Patty Coughlin, AT&T.

20 MR. FIORETTI: Again as I went over this
21 again with Rick, as I understand it, what we're doing
22 there is filling out the screen or screen image, and then
23 going off and doing the edits ourselves.

24 MS. CEGELSKI: It went further on and said
25 once it's in and the service order is created, it can drop

1 to manual at that point, too. ASIS looks into the Legacy
2 system for information. These Legacy systems include
3 SAMs, Wafa --

4 MR. FIORETTI: ASIS doesn't do that. We
5 kick that off from MORTEL through ASIS. That's the
6 access, O.K.? We kick that off. We still have control of
7 that whole thing. We kick that off. That's the way you
8 get -- I mean those things are accessed through an ASIS
9 function.

10 MS. CEGELSKI: Then it goes on and says
11 that once the edits are successfully completed, ASIS
12 notifies MORTEL of a positive 855, and that end stamps the
13 FOC.

14 MR. FIORETTI: Right. That's this piece.
15 O.K. Once I have validated all of that stuff, I push the
16 button and ASIS notified me that the order accepted.
17 Because before that all I'm doing is just typing it on the
18 screen and I'm going off and doing manual checks, O.K., of
19 that data.

20 So I don't know that what we're describing
21 is that different. I think there's probably a level of
22 detail that certainly Rick said in our discussion -- and
23 how he said it or whatever he said, you know, is being
24 interpreted differently by us. And I did review it again
25 with him just yesterday to make sure that, again, I was on

1 board with what's happening here.

2 I mean he agrees. I think we agreed
3 previously that here is when we're pushing the button,
4 we're getting the response. And if that were over here,
5 O.K., then we'd have a direct apples-to-apples comparison
6 over here, O.K.? Because all of the edits that you'd be
7 doing you're replicating to some degree, and all we're
8 doing is checking them to make sure.

9 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, no, because the
10 service rep does her edits up through the system here.
11 Our service rep, when they have our customer on our phone,
12 does edits through a different process.

13 So when we're talking about the edits that
14 the Retail Division goes through versus the edits that our
15 order goes through, it's the retail reps edits happen
16 here, at a different time than the edits from a CLEC rep
17 who is on the phone with our customer at that point.

18 So the comparison, you need to move the
19 retail rep up to the edit section here.

20 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I think there's more
21 to that conversation. I would suggest it's back here, I
22 think. I think they're doing the same edits.

23 TELEPHONE VOICE: You're breaking up.

24 MR. FIORETTI: I think they're doing the
25 same edits, they're doing them in potentially different

1 ways, potentially different order, but accessing the same.

2 MS. CEGELSKI: But, Sal, if we're doing the
3 same edits, then why do we have to re-edit?

4 MR. FIORETTI: Because I --

5 MS. CEGELSKI: So there is a difference in
6 the edits there.

7 MR. FIORETTI: Because I have to make sure
8 we're doing them and make sure I can put them into the
9 system, because if I get a field that's not right, I can't
10 take it.

11 MS. CEGELSKI: I understand that.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Mary, excuse me. For the
13 reporter's sake try to speak one at a time.

14 MR. FIORETTI: So our perspective is, yes,
15 there is this slice in time where there is a parity

16 function being performed. What we suggest is two things:

17 No. 1, that this whole parity function is
18 included in this round trip measurement.

19 MS. CEGELSKI: Can you repeat that?

20 MR. FIORETTI: The measurement of that
21 function, O.K., let's just humor me for a minute.

22 MS. CEGELSKI: O.K.

23 MR. FIORETTI: This one to two seconds

24 that's out there -- might be subseconds, I don't know
25 exactly what it is -- this time is included in this.

1 If this is a five-hour round trip that I'm
2 trying to make here, part of that five hours is one to
3 two seconds. The round trip is from the time stamp in at
4 the database, and the time stamp when it's going outbound,
5 O.K.?

6 If that is the comparison I'm making, that
7 two-second slice or one-second slice or whatever we
8 determine it is, is actually included in that round-trip
9 measurement from time stamp in MORTEL inbound to time
10 stamp outbound. It's in there. It's a very small part of
11 that, but it's in that measure in total.

12 MS. CEGELSKI: Well, I agree that it's in
13 there. I don't know how much of a slice it is.

14 MR. FIORETTI: I'm getting to that. I just
15 wanted to make sure I'm progressing down in steps that,
16 you know, I don't know about AT&T for example. The two
17 seconds is in there. I mean I think it's relatively
18 obvious, but I just want to make sure that we're all on
19 the same page with what I'm explaining.

20 Patty or Karen, or Karen from MCI, do you
21 guys agree? Maybe I wasn't loud enough.

22 Karen or Karen or Patty from MCI and AT&T,
23 I mean -- are you guys agreeing that that parity function,
24 that one- or two-second function, is in the five-hour or
25 X-hour round trip from time stamp into MORTEL to time

1 stamp out of MORTEL?

2 MS. COUGHLIN: I'm sorry, Sal. This is
3 Patty. It's very difficult to hear you guys. You're
4 breaking up.

5 But if I understood your question, you
6 know, I guess we're still, based on the conversation that
7 we had in Ohio, all of this, the data points that you're
8 measuring, the FOC measurements are still coming out.
9 With each meeting we have I think we're learning a little
10 bit more. So I don't know if you already addressed this,
11 Sal, but the proposal that we made in Ohio was to have
12 three separate measures.

13 MR. FIORETTI: And really, I'm getting to
14 that, but I'm trying to lay the groundwork for what our
15 position is here, that we would suggest that, yes, there
16 is a measure that we should make from the mailbox pickup
17 measure.

18 Then there's another measure that has to do
19 with processing rates, that is, processing through the
20 translator rate.

21 Then there is a third measure that we would
22 suggest is time stamp to MORTEL through the process and
23 back out, time stamp in MORTEL on the outbound. And all
24 we're saying right now is there is a sliver of time in
25 there that is a parity function that, yes, it includes.

1 And what I'm going to suggest is that here
2 we have got a one- or two-second time in this whole round
3 trip here that we have established.

4 MS. CEGELSKI: We're assuming or you're
5 assuming it's a one or two.

6 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. That's why I said
7 humor me for a minute. It's a one- or two-second time
8 that's within that measure. And all I asked you was: Do
9 you agree that it's in there?

10 I think it's in the time frame.

11 What I'm suggesting is that this measuring
12 of this piece is something that is, you know, we went back
13 to our -- I mean this happens at an ASIS-ASON level. O.K.

14 In our production system when we first went
15 back to request "Can you put in some code to measure
16 this," they said yes, "It'll take me till December." We
17 think that's not good enough and we're going to go back
18 and do it.

19 What we could suggest, maybe we could do a
20 study at whatever fashion -- we'll bring in a third party
21 if that's appropriate, or whatever -- we'll establish a
22 study and say, "Let's measure."

23 I think we can do this on the wholesale
24 side relatively easy because we've got the interface where
25 we can put a timer in to say "When did we push the button

1 and when did we take it out?" They've got to go back into
2 the Legacy system and put some code in there to do that,
3 and they tell us that that code isn't in there today.
4 O.K.

5 But we'll find a way to measure this. All
6 right, we'll find a way to prove that this (a) is a very
7 short period of time, and (b) does discriminate against
8 the CLEC in that it is a parity process. But from a
9 measurement perspective, we would suggest that we don't
10 need another measurement. We'll do a study that says,
11 hey, we'll do this with KPMG, we'll do it however, we'll
12 prove to you, you know, we believe this is, yes, it is a
13 parity function. Yes, when we send this screen and when
14 the service rep hits the button, we suggest that the time
15 should be very close. And they're going to be in the
16 range of zero to two seconds, depending on obviously
17 system constraints. There are some times when it might be
18 longer, sometimes when it might be shorter, but regardless
19 of that, the CLEC request, when we push the button and the
20 wholesale request isn't going to be different at this
21 point, done at the same time in the day, on the same day,
22 and that it's already included in this measurement. So,
23 you know, this measurement ought to be, this round-trip
24 measurement ought to be the measure by which we live to.
25 We do recognize that you have a need to know whether or

1 not this is a discriminatory process on the parity side,
2 and we expect that we'll be able to do a study to prove
3 that.

4 But to implement something ongoing that
5 collects every time a retail rep hits the button and every
6 time that we hit the button and measures that every month
7 for a one- or a zero- to two-second kind of thing, that's
8 already included in a much larger measurement and, you
9 know. So let's assume for a minute that retail was one
10 second and wholesale was one hour from when we pushed the
11 button. We're going to be losing this. That's included
12 in this measurement. I'm telling you it's not, it's
13 essentially the same. It's the same process, an
14 application in one case, hitting the button and processing
15 the data. A human is hitting the button directly into the
16 system in one case and processing the data. So, yes, it's
17 a parity function here. Yes, it's all the same exact
18 function and the results will be similar if not identical
19 here.

20 But in terms of a measurement, it's already
21 captured in this measure. And it's such a small part of
22 this measurement that when it comes to saying should we go
23 out and measure it every month and do that to measure this
24 sub of this big measurement, we think a study on a
25 verification, it's the same and it's already included.

1 And, you know, as we adjust this, that says we need to
2 maintain this.

3 MS. CEGELSKI: The CLECs have talked about
4 having this measure, as you're seeing it, which is the
5 current measure today, and not having five hours but
6 having in some cases even a 15- or 20-minute turnaround.

7 Now we're saying we understand that there is process times
8 inherent with the relationship, you know, the relationship
9 that we have with you. But we're looking at it from the
10 time it goes into your system to the point where there is
11 parity, and then outside that point where it's parity back
12 to getting us that notification.

13 So I'm seeing three separate measures. And
14 the stopping point where you were talking before about
15 this process time should really go all the way through up
16 to where ASON is noticed. And then, so we have a true
17 accounting for how long it takes you, including the
18 processing time, including the edits time, including
19 everything, and we know your up-front process takes X
20 amount of time, the parity, even if it's a sliver of time.

21 I think that the CLECs would be willing, so
22 if we are at two-second interval then we can go from the
23 true receive to the true end. But we don't even know this
24 part and we were uncovered -- a week or so ago about
25 another whole group of time that's not even mentioned and

1 what we believed to have been.

2 MR. FIORETTI: And that's why I started at
3 that end. Here's what I would propose to do on that end,
4 here's what I would propose to do on this end, I maintain
5 the one measure but go back and do a study on this side
6 and, you know, however I could do it, whether it's sitting
7 there and timing, you know, quickly, and doing a study
8 like that in the presence of a third party, whether it's
9 putting in some function on the ASIS side and expediting
10 that to something much quicker than what they initially
11 told us on our first request to do this. It could be
12 that. It could be putting something on the wholesale side
13 to do that same function, to do a study to say that we can
14 verify to you that this very important but insignificant
15 part in terms of the total time that's here doesn't
16 necessarily demand a separate measure in and of itself.
17 It's included in this round trip, if you will, through
18 MORTEL.

19 Then the question again of how you
20 disaggregate this and what the numbers ought to be. You
21 could say, if you agree on that framework, that this is
22 kind of a separate discussion that we can have and focus
23 on what should be the most appropriate times for the
24 different disaggregations.

25 MS. CEGELSKI: For measurement that we

1 have, for FOC that we have, we believed that it was
2 inclusive of your envelope, opening that envelope and the
3 processing time and the time to run that envelope. And
4 we were requesting, I believe, 15 minutes for POTS.

5 So I don't want to see where now we have
6 this particular measurement -- and this only is 15 minutes
7 -- and now we'll have to add opening-the-envelope time as
8 another increment of time and the processing time as a
9 separate increment, too. The whole thing should be a 15-
10 minute interval.

11 MR. FIORETTI: See, that's why I was trying
12 to break it out. Because as you lump it all together, I
13 think you miss the -- you jump right to setting the
14 interval versus measuring the process that's in place.

15 I think the process has to be given
16 consideration as to which process it is and the given
17 levels of disaggregation, and looking at it that way. I
18 think this is giving a realistic view of our turnaround
19 time.

20 The rest is I'm going to say systematically
21 controlled in some fashion, and we could, you know, based
22 on what turns out to be an appropriate time in terms of
23 third-party test -- and forgive me for making this analogy
24 -- but you can tune your radio to a clearer picture and so
25 you can tune those things. And let's understand this

1 process that I have in my service center and in the back
2 end of this system to generate the orders, and let's tune
3 these, understanding the process, and then tune them at
4 the different disaggregations that need to be in it.

5 MR. KERN: Is this a good place to break
6 for lunch?

7 MR. GOULD: Can I ask one quick question?

8 MR. KERN: Sure.

9 MR. GOULD: Rick Gould. With this
10 processing status from the, what you called it at the very
11 beginning, through the translator, with that, with all the
12 orders in the CLECs being bundled together to go through
13 that, why is there a breakdown then between what -- I'm
14 not sure exactly the numbers, but it's something like if
15 it's one to five orders, your line would be provisioned in
16 this amount of time; five to 10 orders would be this
17 amount of time. If it's over 10 or over 20 orders, it's
18 negotiated in such an amount of time. Why is that an
19 issue here, then, I guess?

20 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I think some of that
21 is with respect to back here in terms of how many.

22 MR. GOULD: I think it's number of orders.

23 MR. FIORETTI: It's number of lines, number
24 of lines or loops on the same order. It has to do with
25 creating an order and what it takes to create an order and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Lansing, Michigan

Thursday, April 20, 2000

1:15 P.M.

- - -

(The proceedings were resumed pursuant to the recess.)

MR. KERN: O.K., let's get back together.

A lot of people have been talking about what happened this morning over lunch, and I'm going to throw out a suggestion and get people's feedback and comment quickly.

This morning's conversation regarding the FOC issue, people seemed to think that there was some good information, it was a good discussion. People also feel that more information and more discussion would be a good thing, and to encourage that type of discussion we would recommend that those who are interested on that issue take it off line, work it the best way that you can, and either come to consensus or develop the position in such a way that we could take it to the Commission.

I think it's the consensus of a lot of people, at least here in Lansing, that as the issue is framed right now, we don't want to take it to the Commission. It would be impossible for them to make a meaningful decision based on how the issue is framed right

1 now.

2 And so I guess that's a suggestion I'd like
3 to offer to the group, which is, you know, the companies
4 that are most interested in working this FOC issue take it
5 off line, work it as best you can.

6 I would also suggest that we pick at least
7 a tentative date out into the future by which discussions
8 would have been completed or the issue has been resolved,
9 just because I don't want to see it go on forever.
10 Understand that that end date can be a tentative date, but
11 I open that up for comment or discussion.

12 MR. ANDERSON: John, I'll just comment on
13 behalf of Ameritech. We wholeheartedly support that
14 approach. I think there is clearly additional benefit
15 that can be gained. I absolutely agree with you that in
16 fairness, this was not an issue or as it's framed right
17 now would be difficult, based on the ongoing fact-
18 gathering and discussions, for the Commission to try to
19 decide and would put the Commission in a difficult
20 position.

21 I will be absolutely candid with the group.
22 One of our biggest concerns in this is proceeding, though,
23 in a manner that allows us to get to a point where we can
24 keep proceeding in some of the other activities that are
25 going on, and most particularly in the OSS testing arena,

1 and to work toward a baseline to do that.

2 And we will commit to follow up on all the
3 information, continue discussions, make ourselves
4 available, find time to do that within a reasonable amount
5 of time and try to distill the remaining issues.

6 And I absolutely agree, I think we're
7 making progress, albeit slowly and perhaps painfully. But
8 that we get it to a point within a reasonable amount of
9 time that if we recognize in good faith that we can't get
10 an agreement, we at least try to distill it in a way
11 hopefully that the Commission can decide, and to that end
12 I think we've had some conversation internally about some
13 alternatives we would ask the group to perhaps consider
14 that may give us something that we can proceed in the
15 other aspects of this proceeding, and particularly OSS, to
16 try to move forward while we continue to work this issue.
17 Because an issue like this, frankly, I think I realized as
18 I listened to the discussion this morning, has to be
19 addressed with the subject matter experts, and we have to
20 find resolution and at least by those subject matter
21 experts distilled so it's in a form that we can have some
22 kind of resolution.

23 So I appreciate your offer and we're in
24 wholehearted support.

25 MS. NG: This is Louise from CoreComm.

1 hearing -- and maybe I don't have the whole story -- but
2 where we're at right now, I think we need to engage them,
3 because I think there's a matter of opinion on what can be
4 done by Ameritech and what can't be done. And like I
5 said, unfortunately I have the technical background that
6 can tell you what I think is feasible and you can tell me
7 why you think it's not feasible and we can negotiate from
8 there.

9 MR. FIORETTI: Well, and I guess that
10 assumes that, you know, we would jump in right there.

11 You know, I would suggest also that after
12 hearing the discussion this morning, we might want to
13 bring to that group --

14 (There was a static interruption.)

15 MR. COX: What was that?

16 MR. KERN: We have no idea.

17 MR. CHORZEMPA: That's my AT&T phone. This
18 is Dave Chorzempa. Actually it's a Lucent phone.

19 MR. KERN: You don't own them anymore.

20 MR. CHORZEMPA: I'm warning you, it does
21 this periodically.

22 MR. FIORETTI: I guess bottom line, Louise,
23 is yes, we'd agree to bring whatever SMEs were necessary
24 to that table.

25 MS. NG: Well, I guess in the matter of

1 moving this along quickly, I'm just suggesting that we do
2 that at the first go-around here if we're going to break
3 out into a task force, that the EDI MORTEL SMEs are
4 available, those people that work for Catherine Long, John
5 Ellis' group, they would need to be parties to this
6 discussion.

7 MR. FIORETTI: Well, and again I would
8 suggest that maybe after hearing the discussion today, we
9 could come back with a proposal that would be acceptable
10 that we might say, yeah, we may or may not need to do
11 that, and I'd prefer to maybe start there if we think we
12 can start there, but if we can't, draw in the necessary
13 SMEs, and that would have to occur in some discussion
14 maybe earlier and prior to a meeting.

15 MS. NG: Sal, can you do me a favor -- and
16 I really hate to do this to the team; if you don't want
17 to, that's fine, but I could probably get the information
18 off line -- could you just recap real quickly the two new
19 measurements that you were proposing this morning?

20 MS. MOORE: You know what, Louise -- this
21 is Karen from AT&T -- I completely agree. I'd just like
22 to be sure that I have it nailed down in my mind. I think
23 that would be useful.

24 MR. FIORETTI: So the request is just to go
25 through the three new measurements --

1 MS. NG: The proposal that was put on the
2 table this morning so we can all understand it clearly.

3 MR. FIORETTI: There wasn't a proposal that
4 I put down on the table.

5 MS. NG: There was none?

6 MR. FIORETTI: No.

7 MS. NG: Here is the -- sorry, my ears are
8 a little fried.

9 MR. FIORETTI: The inbound and the outbound
10 transactions from EDI that we propose that we would
11 measure the average time to pick up the envelopes, that is
12 the first component, from the time first available to
13 Ameritech to the time we pick it up.

14 Do I need to go further with that
15 definition?

16 MS. NG: Well, I'll ask for clarity. I
17 would say you're talking about the minute it hits the GEIS
18 cloud to the minute you pick it up?

19 MR. FIORETTI: No, the minute GEIS
20 processes it, identifies it's ours, and puts it in our
21 mailbox, to the time when we arrive there to pick it up.

22 MS. NG: O.K. Let's start over. The
23 measurement that you're saying is average time to pick up
24 the envelope -- is that the definition of the measurement?

25 MR. FIORETTI: Right. And it's based on

1 when it's put in our mailbox to when we pick it up.

2 MS. NG: When GEIS receives it and when you
3 pick it up. So that implies to me --

4 MR. FIORETTI: No, I'm sorry, not when GEIS
5 receives it. When they put it in our mailbox.

6 MS. NG: O.K. When GEIS puts it in your
7 mailbox.

8 MR. FIORETTI: Sure, because that's the
9 first it's actually available to me.

10 MS. NG: O.K. I understand. So when it
11 goes to the Ameritech mailbox to the time you actually
12 pick it up?

13 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

14 MS. NG: O.K. Now I need clarity there.

15 To the time you pick it up or the time you
16 put it in MORTEL?

17 MR. FIORETTI: Initially to the time we
18 pick it up.

19 MS. NG: To the time, O.K. So that means
20 -- and I'm going to go another step further with you, the
21 time you pick it up, is it the time that the translator
receives it but it hasn't translated yet?

22 MR. FIORETTI: Has not been translated yet.

23 MS. NG: O.K.

24 MR. FIORETTI: The second piece that we
25 proposed this morning was the time to translate. Not the

1 time to translate, but picking up where we left off, doing
2 a rate, a processing rate, are we processing those orders
3 through the translator at the rate that's been identified
4 as our max capacity or our capacity of the translator?
5 O.K. So if that's identified in third-party testing as
6 reasonable to be a thousand an hour, that we're processing
7 at a thousand an hour and not at 500.

8 MS. NG: O.K. So let me get clarity on
9 this, Sal. You're asking for a measurement to calculate
10 the processing rate of the translation of the orders? Is
11 that correct?

12 MR. FIORETTI: Correct.

13 MS. NG: And so that means that from the
14 point, now you're taking it from the point it hits the
15 translator to the point it goes to the MORTEL database?

16 MR. FIORETTI: Yes. That's right.

17 MS. NG: O.K. Now I'm at process or
18 receive process or process received on your flow chart?

19 MR. FIORETTI: Right. The third measure
20 was the measure from process received in MORTEL, you know,
21 somewhere from when MORTEL time stamps it.

22 MS. NG: So the third measure is the
23 process received to where?

24 MR. FIORETTI: All the way around the
25 process and back again to the time stamped in MORTEL, and

1 then back out the other way, the same way it came in.

2 MS. NG: O.K. So the third measure would
3 take it from the MORTEL database, logging it in, through
4 the process request edits, through ASIS to provision, and
5 a FOC back?

6 MR. FIORETTI: Right, back to the time
7 stamp.

8 MS. NG: Back through process request, back
9 through process received, translator to the envelope?

10 MR. FIORETTI: No. We would measure on the
11 front end both the inbound and outbound sides the same
12 way.

13 MS. NG: O.K.

14 MS. CEGELSKI: Sal, your suggestion for
15 three is the current FOC measured that we have now.

16 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

17 MS. NG: O.K. Now the piece that we're
18 asking for parity on is your third measurement?

19 MR. FIORETTI: No.

20 MS. NG: O.K. Explain to me why not.

21 MR. FIORETTI: What I suggested there is
22 that since that is a small sliver of time in an interval
23 that we're already measuring, we would agree to test that
24 both on a retail and wholesale side and report back
25 through, through a study, through an independent third

1 party to say, "Yes, that's a parity measure," you know,
2 that function is in parity. And yes, it's at X seconds or
3 sub-seconds or whatever it is on both sides, and it's
4 reasonably the same. And it is a part of this overall
5 time that's from receipt time, receipt time stamp in
6 MORTEL, in the MORTEL database, to the outbound time
7 stamp.

8 And therefore maybe it's a second or two
9 seconds; it's already included in that five hours or
10 whatever it is there, and so therefore we'll study it and
11 we'll show you that it's a parity function, but we won't
12 measure it every month.

13 MS. NG: O.K. So I see the difference in
14 what we proposed actually.

15 The third measure, it includes from the
16 MORTEL database all the way through. We were looking for
17 from process request guide, right? The piece where we
18 press go and it edits and prints a FOC out?

19 MS. CEGELSKI: Right.

20 MS. NG: So that's the difference.

21 MS. CEGELSKI: Right.

22 MS. NG: Sal, you're suggesting that
23 Ameritech would provide a study to show what those times
24 are?

25 MR. FIORETTI: Right, through KPMG to say

1 here's what it is.

2 MS. NG: Well, the only question I have at
3 this point would be if you can do this third measure, why
4 couldn't you do the measure that we requested, because
5 it's a piece of this measure. That would be the only
6 question.

7 I don't see -- I see a start and end point
8 for your system programmers to be able to develop that
9 measure that we requested, that's why I'm having a hard
10 time understanding why it can't be done.

11 Because I heard through the grape vine in
12 the discussion this morning, there was some verbiage that
13 came out that said it can't be done technically, or you
14 were told it couldn't be done.

15 MR. FIORETTI: Well, the point that we were
16 making this morning was, based on information that I got
17 from those SMEs that you identified yesterday or earlier
18 today, like I don't remember the guy's name, PON is one of
19 them on the EDI side --

20 MS. NG: Yes.

21 MR. FIORETTI: Based on information that
22 Rick and I got yesterday from those folks, they did not
23 believe that they had the data at the PON level to
24 segregate these things down to the PON level. They came
25 in by envelope.

1 Now, what we may be able to propose, and
2 what I'd like to take back to this sub-team or this task
3 force that we put together, is maybe we can come up with
4 something that addresses your need for that end-to-end
5 measure, and we'd be looking for some agreement on that.
6 I don't know -- I'm still working through it.

7 I had some discussion with some of those
8 folks at lunchtime. I think we can potentially put
9 something together there. I'd like to work out the
10 details and send them off to you.

11 Maybe we can agree that we can measure,
12 take in an average on one part, maybe, and adding it to
13 the rest of the round trip and coming up with a
14 measurement that satisfies your need. And maybe in that
15 we don't have to engage the system level SMEs to talk
16 through the granular details of this. And if we decide we
17 can't, we'll go to the folks and do that.

18 MR. ANDERSON: I would also add to that,
19 maybe we can get agreement on that. If everybody were
20 satisfied as a measure that that's something you're all
21 comfortable with, but even if not, seek agreement perhaps
22 on that as an interim benchmark at a minimum, addressing
23 your needs on an interim basis, continue the discussions
24 -- meanwhile this process and SME talks to go off line --
25 but meanwhile allow us and the other collaboratives to try

1 to proceed.

2 MR. KERN: Let me ask this question: Let's
3 get some names of people who want to work on this.

4 MS. MOORE: John, before you do that, this
5 is Karen Moore with AT&T. I have a point I would like to
6 make for clarification.

7 Sal, the measures or the orders we're
8 talking about here are orders that should be flowing
9 through, right?

10 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I think this -- the
11 theory of this measurement -- it's easiest to believe or
12 easiest to discuss this in terms of flowthrough orders
13 because there's no drop-to manual, there's nothing else.

14 But in fact the process is the process
15 regardless of whether the order flows through or not. So
16 it's got to be accommodated on all of those different
17 disaggregations, differently maybe on the manually
18 received side.

19 MS. MOORE: Well, I'm not talking about
20 manually received. I'm talking about electronic orders.

21 MR. FIORETTI: Right. So I think it
22 applies to all of them.

23 MS. MOORE: O.K. Well, Sal, before AT&T
24 can even consider a change to the measure, or Ameritech
25 proposal and a benchmark, I need to get a lot more

1 comfortable with the flowthrough measure and the data
2 integrity that goes along with that.

3 The last time we talked, I believe in Ohio,
4 I mentioned to you that your flowthrough rate, self-
5 reported, is 2 percent. And your response back was -- I'm
6 really concerned about that because I think we're

7 collecting it incorrectly. So until I feel like I know
8 what the percentage of our orders are flowing through and
9 that you can collect the data properly, I don't think I
10 can make a decision.

11 Do you understand what I'm saying?

12 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I understand what
13 you're saying, but I guess this -- I would just have this
14 question: If I'm going to agree to measure both the
15 flowthrough orders and the drop-to manual orders in the

16 same fashion is acceptable to you, isn't the whole
17 flowthrough issue in terms of what that is an entirely
18 different issue?

19 MS. MOORE: Oh, I understand what you're
20 saying. But ultimately the purpose here is not to come up
21 with groovy performance measures, it's to serve our
22 customers. And right now the benchmark for your FOC is
23 five hours, and you're at like 19 hours. So I think part

24 of the problem is that none of our -- only a small portion
25 of our orders are actually going through. So while it's a

1 separate issue, it still ties in to what happens with the
2 FOCs.

3 MR. KERN: Would this be an issue for a
4 sub-team as well?

5 MS. MOORE: I don't think so.

6 MR. KERN: O.K.

7 MR. FIORETTI: Remember what we're talking
8 about is a performance issue, not a measurement issue.

9 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard from MCI.

10 From what I'm hearing today, the 19 hours
11 is just measuring from when you get the order into MORTEL?

12 MS. CEGELSKI: So that it's not even --

13 MS. KINARD: So that the unpacking and the
14 pickup of the batched orders could add many more hours. I
15 know I was saying -- when we were trying for an

16 acknowledgment interval they were saying sometimes it
17 takes 12 hours to unpack. So that's 12 hours plus the
18 half hour probably on top of the 19 hours.

19 MR. FIORETTI: Karen, where did you get
20 that number?

21 MS. KINARD: What number?

22 MR. FIORETTI: No, Karen Moore.

23 MS. MOORE: From your self-reported

24 performance data.

25 MR. FIORETTI: In Michigan?

1 MS. MOORE: I want to say that might be an
2 Ohio number, but it's an all-CLEC number.

3 AT&T's personal number, which of course I'm
4 sure I shouldn't say, is about 2 percent.

5 MR. FIORETTI: Well, that's the flowthrough
6 number.

7 MS. MOORE: Correct.

8 MR. FIORETTI: So that's not the FOC
9 number.

10 MS. MOORE: That's correct.

11 MR. FIORETTI: I was asking about the 19-
12 hour FOC number.

13 MS. MOORE: That's again an all-CLEC
14 number, probably from Ohio. Unfortunately, my computer is
15 in the hospital or I'd pull it up and tell you the exact
16 numbers. But I'm sure, Sal, you have access to that.

17 MR. FIORETTI: Well, yes, I do. I'm
18 looking at --

19 MS. MOORE: I remember this coming up in
20 Ohio.

21 MR. KERN: I think we have identified the
22 issue, Sal. Maybe you can do research off line to maybe
23 find out if the numbers reflect what they say they
24 reflect.

25 MS. MOORE: Well, Sal has already committed

1 to get some understanding around that 2-percent
2 flowthrough issue. I haven't heard back yet, but I'm
3 expecting to.

4 MS. KINARD: And, Karen, that's designed to
5 flow through, right? That's not even total, right?

6 MS. MOORE: So that's still the question.

7 MR. KERN: I want to get back to this sub-
8 team just for a minute to find out who's interested in
9 participating.

10 MS. MOORE: AT&T definitely would.

11 MS. CEGELSKI: CoreComm would.

12 MS. KINARD: MCI would.

13 MR. ANDERSON: Ameritech would.

14 May I suggest, in all due deference to
15 myself and some of my colleagues in the room, that this
16 sounds like we're getting into an area where I would think
17 you don't need us lawyers. I mean could we have the SMEs
18 work this? I mean it is a sub-team that comes back to
19 this team, I think. I mean it might help scheduling, it
20 might help free up resources.

21 MR. KERN: I think Mary and Louise from
22 CoreComm, Karen Moore from AT&T, with maybe help from
23 Patty, Karen Kinard from MCI, and Sal and whoever you need
24 from your team, Cox from McLeod -- that's the group that I
25 hear that's interested in working on this.

1 you all decide to have a conference call, if you could let
2 staff know, you know, the call-in information so they have
3 the opportunity to participate or not, that would be
4 helpful.

5 At about 2:30 I kind of want to break the
6 conversation wherever we're at to talk about what our next
7 steps are in this collaborative. I think it's pretty
8 clear we haven't covered all the issues today and we're
9 not going to cover all the issues today.

10 So having said that, you know, we'll spend
11 the remaining 40-some minutes or so to go over a few more
12 issues. But at 2:30 I'd like to stop and see where we
13 want to go from here -- future dates for meetings, if
14 those would be beneficial or not.

15 So, Sal, do you want to proceed on to your
16 next issue?

17 MR. FIORETTI: Yes. O.K. We were on No. 2
18 and we're moving to No. 3.

19 MS. NG: Louise from CoreComm. I hate to
20 do this, Sal. Do you have the proposal written up and
21 available?

22 MR. FIORETTI: Louise, what we're talking
23 from is the MCI redline comments of the document entitled
24 "Joint Status Report."

25 MS. NG: I'm talking just about the FOC

1 conversation we just had. Is that in there?

2 MR. FIORETTI: Is that written up? No.

3 MS. NG: O.K. It would be helpful if it's
4 written up so we had a baseline, and maybe we could get
5 the flow charts that we put together based on the Ohio
6 conversation out in the community so that we're not
7 talking -- I really apologize to the community for
8 speaking about things people aren't understanding. I'm
9 sorry about that.

10 MR. KERN: O.K. That's O.K., Louise. This
11 morning Sal had committed to putting all this down in
12 writing.

13 MS. NG: Thank you.

14 MR. FIORETTI: We're working from the MCI
15 redline version. Issue No. 3 is average interval for help
16 orders. The issue here is that Ameritech, through the
17 Texas measures, has several different measures of average
18 delay days, past the due date for completed orders, and
19 has a measure for the count of canceled orders, to address
20 those that are canceled.

21 What the Michigan measures call for is a
22 snapshot in time of pending orders at the end of a month
23 that are past the due date at various levels of
24 disaggregation.

25 Ameritech's position is that the Texas

1 measures in fact give you a more accurate picture of all
2 of the orders that were delayed, because an order that
3 might have been delayed in the middle of the month for
4 five or six days after the due date is not going to be in
5 your snapshot at the end of the month. And therefore,
6 Ameritech would say that in fact the picture is more
7 accurate if you would use the Texas measures.

8 There was concern about canceled orders.
9 There is a measure for canceled orders, and therefore we
10 propose to move to the Texas measure there.

11 The reason that I would propose to go to a
12 more accurate measure versus one that probably benefits us
13 more is that my systems today are not configured to be
14 able to report on pending work. And so I would have to
15 implement, on certain systems, many large changes to
16 generate that.

17 I could report partially on some systems
18 that I could get pending work out of at the end of the
19 month. But I have great difficulty on other
20 disaggregations here.

21 Again I think the bottom line is that the
22 measure identified in Texas for delay days past the due
23 date, after the order completes, is all the more
24 encompassing.

25 MS. MOORE: Sal, this is Karen Moore, AT&T.

1 Is it possible -- I think what we're looking for is to be
2 sure that every single order, whether completed or
3 pending, is accounted for in the measure. So tell me
4 where my pending orders that haven't completed, that are
5 past due, are counted?

6 MR. FIORETTI: They would be counted in the
7 month that they are completed.

8 MS. MOORE: What about the ones that never
9 complete?

10 MR. FIORETTI: They would be counted in the
11 canceled order measure.

12 MS. KINARD: If they're just hanging there
13 pending, they don't get into canceled either.

14 MR. FIORETTI: Again I think, from both an
15 Ameritech perspective and a CLEC perspective, it's
16 incumbent upon us to make sure that for whatever reasons
17 we have orders dangling out there that aren't completed or
18 aren't canceled, we need to act on those. I would not
19 expect orders to sit out there forever and not be
20 completed or not be canceled.

21 Again I'm talking about completed in our
22 system, in our provisioning systems, or canceled in our
23 provisioning systems. So the issue is, yes, but I didn't
24 get completion notice or one of those notices. I'm
25 talking about all orders.

1 MS. CEGELSKI: Sal, so if I understand you
2 correctly, what you're saying then is that we will either
3 have a completion or a cancellation on everything?

4 MR. FIORETTI: I'm not sure. I believe,
5 yes, those are the only two options once I've got a live
6 order. It's either going to complete or it's going to
7 cancel.

8 MR. COX: Sal, this is Rod Cox from
9 McLeodUSA. Do we have disaggregation defined?

10 MR. FIORETTI: As far as the cancels, Rod?

11 MR. COX: No, of pending.

12 MR. FIORETTI: I think that's identified in
13 the Texas measures. For example, there's one for PONs,
14 one for specials, one for UNEs in the disaggregations
15 under those.

16 MR. COX: Resale would fall out where?

17 MR. FIORETTI: Those would be the POTS and
18 the specials in resale.

19 MS. MOORE: There is still no measure of
20 pending orders. You don't know what's pending because it
21 doesn't get counted anywhere until it completes.

22 Then what Sal is saying, you'll find out in
23 the average delay days but it has to complete first.

24 That's where our concern was.

25 MR. FIORETTI: You know, the business

1 process is the same that we're measuring. And in fact
2 we're picking up many more orders.

3 If you have an order that's due on the 2nd,
4 gets completed on the 25th, it is not going to show up in
5 the pending orders at the end of the month, even though it
6 had 23 delay days. It will show up in the delay day
7 measure.

8 And if it completes the next month, it'll
9 show up the next month with 29 or 31 or however many delay
10 days it had.

11 MS. MOORE: Sal, that's exactly why AT&T's
12 position to date has been all three of those measures give
13 you a much more complete picture of where all of your
14 orders are.

15 MR. FIORETTI: Again I think it's
16 unnecessary to measure the pending orders, and especially
17 in light of what it will take for me to measure the
18 pending orders when they will be measured in the other
19 measure.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Let me suggest -- this is
21 Craig Anderson -- that the Commission in its order
22 recognized that in developing the measure there was a
23 balancing process of the requirements that would be needed
24 to put a measure in place where something wasn't there to
25 exist. And I think Sal has outlined some of the problems

1 with implementing this kind of measure, balanced against
2 is there really a problem here?

3 And we have heard the difficulties being in
4 place. Sal has indicated his is not -- we require major
5 system modification to do this, but I've not heard any
6 indication except just the possibility that there are any
7 significant number, anybody's notice that there are orders
8 that hang out there in limbo for any length of time.

9 MS. MOORE: Craig, I hate to disagree with
10 you. This is Karen Moore from AT&T.

11 I can tell you for sure that AT&T has -- I
12 probably shouldn't disclose how many, but there are a
13 significant number. So it's not a theoretical concern,
14 it's a very practical concern.

15 MS. KINARD: So even if we conceded that
16 canceled orders would pick this up, I think your canceled
17 measurement -- I can't say I remember all your
18 measurements exactly, just 2 percent canceled after the
19 due date -- we don't get a delay day for canceled orders,
20 do we?

21 MR. FIORETTI: You're right, Karen.
22 Actually it's a count of canceled orders after the due
23 date.

24 What I might propose is also to indicate
25 delay days there.

1 MS. KINARD: But is it in the remedy plan?

2 MR. FIORETTI: Pardon me?

3 MS. KINARD: Is it in the remedy plan?

4 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I'm just making that
5 proposal today, so it's not one of the measures today.
6 But I would suggest that I do have the data to give you
7 the delay days on the canceled orders as well.

8 However, the only thing I am recording on
9 canceled orders is the canceled due to Ameritech reasons.

10 MS. MOORE: Well, you haven't implemented
11 that measure yet, have you, Sal?

12 MR. FIORETTI: No, I haven't. Again we're
13 still working through that one. Again, canceled orders,
14 although also very, very difficult to do, isn't
15 necessarily as difficult to do as pending orders.

16 But we have implemented a system and
17 process changes to begin to count canceled orders and
18 score canceled orders so that it has to be scored so that
19 we know when it's canceled, that it's canceled because of
20 something that we have -- for example, a facility problem
21 was the last recent code on that, on that order. And so
22 that has to carry through and show up on the cancel. So
23 we've had to make system changes to do that kind of work.

24 Those aren't near what it would take to do
25 the pending orders. And in doing that, I can also capture

1 the delay days.

2 MS. MOORE: Can you elaborate on the delay
3 day calculation as far as Ameritech; what are you
4 considering the delay?

5 MR. FIORETTI: A delay day is any -- the
6 number of days after the due date that it was actually
7 completed, if the order was missed due to an Ameritech
8 reason.

9 MS. MOORE: But it doesn't consider -- so
10 it's after the delivery date has been established? It
11 sounds like a missed due date more than a delay date.

12 MR. FIORETTI: That's exactly what it is.
13 This is -- you had an expectation of a particular due
14 date. On that particular due date we did not complete the
15 order because of something that we did, and so therefore
16 the order is still pending until we could complete it, at
17 which time it gets completed and we give you the delay
18 days, the number of days between the due date and the
19 ultimate complete date, which is the same business process
20 that you're --

21 MS. NG: I guess from the CLEC side what
22 you're not capturing is the pending orders tell us how
23 many orders are out there before the due date being --
24 it's not driven by delivery. We may not know up until the
25 delivery date that you missed the date, and it's the

1 pending scenario that we're trying to understand, why
2 these orders are hanging out there if the standard
3 interval is X.

4 MR. FIORETTI: Two things, Louise. You
5 should know how many pending orders you have as well as I
6 do. The second thing is --

7 MS. NG: But the statuses don't always
8 gibe.

9 MR. FIORETTI: But the second thing is, the
10 Michigan commission order was pending orders after the due
11 date. So we're getting to the same business process in
12 these two measures. O.K.

13 The only thing that the Michigan order
14 required was orders that are still pending after the due
15 date -- so I'm saying I'll give the delay days after the
16 order completes, but I'll span months and I'll count
17 things that were delayed in the middle of the month but
18 cleared prior to the end of the month, whereas that
19 snapshot picture on the last day of the month or the first
20 day of the following month -- I think it's on the last day
21 of the month -- would not include something that was due
22 on the 2nd and completed on the 22nd. Because it's not
23 complete, it's not pending anymore.

24 I mean if I could do that one, boy, I would
25 be jumping at it because although I don't think that gives

1 an accurate picture of the real world, it doesn't account
2 for all of your orders that were delayed. I just can't.

3 I'm having a hard time getting that one done.

4 I don't think you're getting as accurate of
5 a measure in doing it that way as doing delay days.

6 MS. CEGELSKI: Sal, would it be difficult
7 to do some kind of a study to see what orders you may have
8 in your system that are not completed and that are past
9 the due date, they're still pending, that are there right
10 now without completion?

11 You know, maybe -- I know Karen has said
12 she's experienced a lot at AT&T. I believe CoreComm has
13 experienced some, too. I think Louise would be able to
14 address the volume much better than I can at this moment.

15 MS. NG: I think I'm ready to understand
16 where we would capture the information I need, and I don't
17 -- the delay days aren't going to come up until after it's
18 complete. So I think I need to know before that, then.

19 MS. CEGELSKI: So just an idea of what
20 we've got here, our concern, Sal, is month-to-month-to-
21 month there might be times that an order is just hanging
22 somewhere and there is no completion and there's no
23 cancellation, but where is it? Where is it captured?

24 MR. FIORETTI: I guess my first question
25 would be, because my background is in the service end,

1 what I would expect of any CLEC is the moment that I think
2 I have three, 10, 30, however many, whatever your
3 threshold is of those orders, I'd be talking to my service
4 manager and saying, "I need to know where these orders
5 are. Find out where they are and let's get them
6 resolved," and therefore they get completed right away.

7 MS. NG: Sal, we do that, but that's not --
8 the last statement you made doesn't always happen. I mean
9 yes, we do call the center, and we don't always get
10 compliance to complete the order. It may have to do with
11 force of mode and where the engineers are and who's not
12 available.

13 MR. FIORETTI: I hate to say this --

14 MS. NG: No, we're not going to do a task
15 force on this.

16 MR. FIORETTI: I mean by what you just said
17 you're leading me down the path that this may be something
18 that I sent to you in unsolicited FOC and that you dropped
19 on the floor and therefore know nothing about that order
20 in terms of flowthrough date or --

21 MS. CEGELSKI: No. I wouldn't go that far
22 because there's times we don't get -- CoreComm is checking
23 every unsolicited 865.

24 MR. FIORETTI: I think they would be
25 sending you that or jeopardy on all of these.

1 Maybe what we could do is we can pick out
2 -- if I did something, I'd have to do it very manually.

3 So maybe I can get a volunteer among the CLECs to focus in
4 on their orders and do a study and work through that to
5 understand what the process difficulties are in that
6 sense.

7 Again, this is a parity measure and here's
8 again part of my problem. Whenever we talk about parity
9 measures, what that means to me is not only do I have to
10 measure it for each of you and possibly do a study or do
11 something special like that. What I have to do is I have
12 to go out and measure for all of my retail unit. And so
13 if I don't have a very mechanized way to do that, I can't
14 make that comparison.

15 I do have a very mechanized way to do delay
16 days on certain services. After the due date, count the
17 days, I can do that, and I can make that comparison and I
18 think it addresses all the issues.

19 If you wanted to do a study -- maybe, Mary,
20 I can make the offer to you to say -- or to AT&T or both
21 -- I would engage your service managers and we would walk
22 through the process and understand what's outstanding and
23 why and maybe come back to the team and talk through what
24 process enhancements or whatever we could do to move
25 through that whole process issue to get us over reporting

1 on pendings versus completions, and if there are truly
2 process issues that leave things hanging out for some
3 period of time, that we address those and move on with
4 those, and that maybe we have a model for any other CLECs
5 that might want to go through that to say here's how we
6 resolved those issues.

7 MR. COX: Sal, this is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA.

8 Do you have an aging report on the retail
9 side that ages your pending orders over 10, 20, 30 days
10 like you just described a while ago? When you were in the
11 service center didn't you have a tool to manage your aging
12 service orders?

13 MR. FIORETTI: Rod, when I was in the
14 service center we didn't have many tools.

15 MR. COX: O.K. But do you have today or --

16 MR. FIORETTI: You know, from a service
17 center perspective and a tool to do that, I think there
18 are ways to do that today in the service center. The
19 difficulty again that I'm having is reporting that on a
20 regional, state, retail, wholesale, by CLEC level that
21 those tools don't provide that my reporting tools, my
22 back-end reporting tools that I use for data collection
23 and results do, and they all key off of completed service
24 orders or now canceled service orders but orders that have
25 an end to them.

1 So yeah, I think those tools, Rod, are in
2 place. Again, making those production available and
3 ability to split those by CLEC -- and again, back in my
4 service center arena I'd want to treat everyone the same.
5 So I'm not marking things by CLEC so that I can give one
6 preferential treatment or retail preferential. There are
7 orders out there.

8 So there are things I can't do with all
9 those that I could do on my back end where I've
10 architected the systems to do this kind of reporting. But
11 I can do some studies, I'm sure.

12 MS. CEGELSKI: I'm still not sure of the
13 answer to the gentleman's question. Do you have an aging
14 report?

15 MR. FIORETTI: There are tools that we can
16 look at aged orders that are pending. They are not the
17 same kind of tools that would be required to do this kind
18 of reporting at the levels that we're looking to do them
19 at.

20 MR. COX: It won't do it by CLEC?

21 MR. FIORETTI: They're not intended to do
22 that. They're not intended to provide CLEC-specific views
23 in those central levels because we don't want them given
24 different levels of service. We treat them as a bulk.
25 These are orders. They're a retail order, they're a CLEC

1 order, they're not an AT&T order or a CoreComm or a McLeod
2 order. And so --

3 MS. CEGELSKI: Couldn't you use that aging
4 report and then filter through that on who the CLEC was or
5 if it's retail or --

6 MR. FIORETTI: They don't provide that kind
7 of information in those.

8 MS. CEGELSKI: Is it just like a PON number
9 or the service order number?

10 MR. FIORETTI: Service order number.

11 MS. CEGELSKI: And then that's just a
12 listing of service order numbers that are aged?

13 MR. FIORETTI: Right. And we're -- you
14 know, I mean, believe me, we're actively working through
15 the issues of how do we get this. But in my view, and
16 it's Ameritech's position, the Texas measurements gives
17 you better reporting, gives reporting in a fashion that we
18 can execute it much quicker, much better, and for me to do
19 what has to be done to report pendings doesn't have the
20 same buyback in the end on a result. Of course, you want
21 me to also report all of them, which, you know, I think is
22 also double reporting.

23 MS. CEGELSKI: Sal, what would be the
24 possibility of taking an aging report? How often do those
25 reports come out, do you have any idea?

1 MR. FIORETTI: I don't know off the top of
2 my head.

3 MS. CEGELSKI: Say they came out weekly,
4 just for this example. If you take maybe the next two
5 weeks' aging reports, and because they're service order
6 numbers, then in the systems you know service order number
7 can be related back to the CLEC, or if it's the retail
8 division or whatever, and to see if there really is an
9 issue or how big of an issue it is.

10 MR. FIORETTI: Again, a very manual process
11 to go through that, and that's why I'd say, you know, it
12 may be easier for me to work with you and do a study based
13 on your orders or Rod's orders or Karen's orders to do
14 that work versus to go through and look up every service
15 order, understand if it's retail or wholesale in a
16 particular area -- these are very geographic -- you know,
17 I mean you use those kinds of tools on a center-by-center
18 basis and not a service center-by-service center basis,
19 but a dispatch center-by-dispatch center, state-by-state-
20 by-state basis. So therefore, you know, I'd have to go
21 and say in the Lansing, Michigan area here's a list of all
22 the pending orders at the end of the month, look up every
23 single one of those, map it to a CLEC or a retail, and
24 that for me is a very manual process to do that kind of
25 work.

1 MS. KINARD: Sal, this is sort of reminding
2 me of working with KPMG in Pennsylvania. We had one, the
3 measurement the way the CLECs wanted in Pennsylvania but
4 it wasn't implemented yet. Bell Atlantic said they would
5 implement it in January, so we were debating whether for
6 the interim test we'd use -- for at least a couple of
7 months use the canceled plus the completed and canceled
8 together, and then they would go to that in January for
9 the test. And I think Bell Atlantic got it even
10 implemented earlier than January.

11 So maybe, I don't know, either from KPMG or
12 you talking to Bell Atlantic we can figure out an easier
13 way to measure those, because I don't think Bell Atlantic
14 in Pennsylvania is doing it manually.

15 MR. FIORETTI: Well, and you know, Karen,
16 the bottom line, our position is hold me to either/or, but
17 not both, and if it's the "or," if it's the pending, it's
18 going to take me some time to get there. And I think it's
19 going to give you a much less accurate measure. What
20 you're asking me to do is incur the cost, do the pendings,
21 the less accurate measure, and do the testing, the Texas
22 ones, if I understand you correctly.

23 MR. COX: Sal, this is Rod again.

24 There's really two reasons for the two
25 different approaches here. One is from an overall

1 performance standpoint and the other is to be more
2 proactive in getting our customers served more quickly.

3 If we wait for a completion date, there's not a whole lot
4 we can do after that fact.

5 MR. FIORETTI: So how proactive is getting
6 a report of pending orders at the end of the month 20 days
7 later for in the previous month?

8 See, I think there are better ways to
9 address this in a proactive manner, and it's an
10 operational process on the front end versus a measurement
11 process on the back end.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Let me throw out, in the
13 sort of spirit of horse trading we seem to have going more
14 last time we were together than this one, if we could
15 propose to you a specific commitment on the delay days
16 measurement that Sal has talked about when we would have
17 that implemented and commit to do these carrier-specific
18 studies at the same time or while we're going through this
19 process on the manual basis, would that be something that
20 the group might be willing to accept as a compromise?

21 MR. COX: What would be the results? If we
22 do the study, what happens if the results come back that
23 there are in fact a large amount of pending orders 10, 20,
24 30 days out past the due date?

25 MR. FIORETTI: Well, I guess the intent of

1 the study would be to understand the why and the what can
2 be done to limit those, rather than to say there is X
3 number and it's bad. I mean from my personal experience
4 of working with carriers, there were many times when I
5 suggested to the carrier that "You've got a problem here
6 with this bunch of orders," in some cases a hundred, 150
7 orders. "I will do you a favor. I will make them due X,
8 O.K.? You will send me a sup when you're ready to do
9 them," and I never got a sup.

10 Now, those are orders that would be hanging
11 out there. In the interest of customer service, in the
12 interest of not getting, for example, an LNP order that
13 was due today to cut today inadvertently because the
14 carrier said please wait, I said, "I will make it due X;
15 you will send me a sup," and I never get a sup.

16 Those are the kinds of things that I'm
17 thinking of that says some of this is not my problem. And
18 by trying to work with the CLECs to resolve some of those
19 problems, in fact we've made the picture look worse
20 because we've got pending orders past their due date with
21 no reason, of course, because we didn't put a reason, we
22 just made them due X.

23 But if they're due today and I let them sit
24 out there and the carrier said wait and nobody ever got
25 back to me, someone is going to come along and say, "Hey,

1 there's a past-due order." I've got to act on that. I'm
2 going to complete that order.

3 They complete the order, the customer goes
4 out of service, and the CLEC says, "Oh, what are you
5 doing? You completed my order and I didn't send you
6 anything." So I say I've got to do something with it, I
7 made an accommodation, I'm going to make it due X, which
8 in our systems will keep people from executing it -- all
9 right -- and then I never get an order back.

10 So that's going to show up as a pending
11 order past the due date, no reason, hanging out there
12 potentially forever if I don't get a sup from the CLEC
13 because I'm expecting a sup from you.

14 In my personal experience those are things
15 that I did with more than a couple of the carriers that
16 are on the line today.

17 MS. MOORE: Sal, this is Karen Moore at
18 AT&T.

19 Our policy at AT&T is the sup orders that
20 we make, if it's our request, to postpone an order, but if
21 it's Ameritech's request to postpone an order, we will not
22 do a sup because that screws up the data and will show
23 that -- because once you do a sup, the due date starts all
24 over again. If you've requested an extension on a due
25 date, we think you'd put us in jeopardy. We have orders

1 that are still hanging out there.

2 MR. FIORETTI: But Karen, the situation I'm
3 talking about is a situation where on the due date at the
4 cut time you asked me to hold the order and not cut it and
5 said, "I'll send you a sup," and I never got a sup.

6 MS. MOORE: Oh, all right. Well, Sal, let
7 me ask you this clarifying question: As you stated
8 before, you're not yet reporting on canceled orders. When
9 do you plan on sending us reports on canceled orders?

10 MR. FIORETTI: I don't have the schedule in
11 front of me but I know it's either 5/1 data collection or
12 6/1 data collection, but I think it's 5/1 data collection.

13 MS. MOORE: So we would see results June
14 22nd?

15 MR. FIORETTI: If it's 5/1, yes. And I
16 believe it is. I just don't have it in front of me.

17 MS. MOORE: Well, I'm going to throw
18 something out on the table. I'm not sure how I really
19 feel about it but I think it's something we should
20 consider.

21 Based on what Sal has said, would it be
22 reasonable to accept Sal's proposal for their measure and
23 at the six-month review, once we've collected some more
24 data, once the CLECs have kind of reconciled their data
25 with Ameritech, and revisit where we're at?

1 MR. FIORETTI: I think that's fine. Again,
2 I would suggest that we'd be working with the delay days
3 until then.

4 MS. CEGELSKI: I think that's acceptable.

5 MR. FIORETTI: That's fine.

6 MS. MOORE: Karen Kinard, what do you
7 think? You have the most experience with this in
8 actuality.

9 MS. KINARD: I'm sorry, I was distracted.
10 Could you repeat what you were asking, Karen?

11 MS. MOORE: I put on the table for us to
12 consider accepting Sal's proposal on an interim basis
13 until the six-month review so that would give us an
14 opportunity to actually get the results, since we haven't
15 gotten any yet because the canceled order measure has not
16 yet been implemented, accept Sal's offer to do the delay
17 days, and then as we go back as CLECs working with our
18 account team, you know, where our orders are really
19 sitting, that we come back in the six-month review and
20 rehash through this and see whether the way Ameritech has
21 measured it is acceptable or whether we need to go back to
22 the held orders again.

23 MS. KINARD: I think that's acceptable to
24 MCI. We don't have any of the data CLECs in the room, the
25 DSL providers in the room, do we, today?

1 MR. KERN: No, we don't.

2 MS. KINARD: O.K. Because they're usually
3 the ones that fight the most on this because of orders
4 held for conditioning or line and station transfers. I
5 don't know if they've been involved in Michigan or not but
6 they've been involved in other states.

7 MCI could probably go along with this
8 interim proposal but we might want to check with them if
9 they're not on this call.

10 MS. MOORE: What does staff think?

11 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: I think a six-month
12 interim measure would be fine.

13 MS. MOORE: Well, I want it to be clear,
14 though, that AT&T doesn't waive its right to go back to
15 the held order if we need to at the six-month review.

16 MS. KINARD: And that we each get our
17 studies.

18 MR. ANDERSON: We would agree all parties
19 reserve their rights.

20 MS. MOORE: O.K.

21 MR. FIORETTI: And all I would ask in terms
22 of the studies, that as you contact your service manager
23 to do that, contact me -- you know, cc me on the e-mail
24 and I will make clear to the service manager the extent of
25 the work that I expect them to do.

1 MS. MOORE: They'll love you.

2 MR. ANDERSON: If Sal's working hard, these
3 service managers are going to work just as hard.

4 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA.

5 I'm O.K. with that suggestion. I guess I'm
6 kind of hoping that we would have come up with some kind
7 of a held-for-facilities measure if that doesn't exist
8 today.

9 MR. FIORETTI: Well, there is.
10 Specifically --

11 MS. MOORE: There are delay days due to
12 facilities?

13 MR. FIORETTI: Yeah. There is specifically
14 that kind of disaggregation. It's a separate measure, I
15 believe, Rod.

16 MR. COX: Then I'm fine with that.

17 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. And again, I think the
18 Texas measures give you a wider scope of why and how, but
19 we'll work from there.

20 MS. MOORE: Yeah. And until we can see the
21 data, Sal, you can understand our hesitation, right?

22 MR. FIORETTI: Yeah.

23 MS. MOORE: And Craig, was that good enough
24 horse trading for you?

25 MR. ANDERSON: Wonderful, Karen.

1 MR. KERN: Moving to No. 4 very quickly,
2 I'm going to ask a relatively simple question, and that
3 is, is this not pretty darn close to the first issue we
4 talked about?

5 MS. MOORE: Which issue was that, John?

6 MR. KERN: I'm sorry. No. 4 is mean time
7 to repair, percentage of customer troubles not resolved
8 within an estimated time.

9 MR. FIORETTI: This is the issue of
10 completion notification.

11 MR. KERN: Versus -- yeah, completion
12 notification versus customer notification.

13 MR. FIORETTI: I believe this is the same
14 issue.

15 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And this is also one
16 where staff had asked that you make sure that this is
17 being -- or there is an interim measure to pick up that
18 second time frame.

19 MR. FIORETTI: Correct.

20 MR. KERN: And I guess my simple question
21 is, do we need to talk about this further? Mary?

22 MS. CEGELSKI: I don't believe so.

23 MR. KERN: Karen or Karen?

24 MS. MOORE: AT&T is O.K.

25 MR. KERN: Thank you.

1 MS. KINARD: This is Karen from MCI
2 WorldCom.

3 I'd still like to see KPMG consulted on
4 this, since they've had experience with looking at metrics
5 that go both ways.

6 MR. KERN: O.K.

7 MR. COX: Can you summarize that, John?
8 What are we agreeing to?

9 MR. KERN: A separate completion
10 notification from an installation notification and -- I'm
11 looking at my notes. Separate completion from
12 notification.

13 MS. KINARD: Wait a minute. What's that
14 what you were asking agreement on? I was still on held
15 orders. I'm sorry.

16 MR. KERN: Karen -- and I apologize. I
17 can't seem to find my notes from our conversation on the
18 first measure.

19 MS. KINARD: I thought we were going to
20 have a -- no.

21 MR. KERN: No, it's the second measure.

22 MR. COX: I guess I'm a little unclear as
23 to what we're --

24 MR. KERN: Yeah, so am I.

25 MS. FRENTZ: Do you want to take five

1 minutes?

2 MS. CEGELSKI: John, wasn't it physical
3 work completion and notification of physical work
4 completed and then the actual completion notice in the
5 system to the notification to the CLEC? I think those are
6 the two measurements.

7 MR. FIORETTI: Yeah, the two measurements
8 are within an hour of system update on service order
9 system side, and within -- I don't remember if it's one
10 day or 24 hours of actual work completion, are the two
11 measures, and to measure them separately.

12 MS. CEGELSKI: The two measures, my
13 understanding is the actual work completion, the physical
14 work completion, until the time that it's updated into the
15 system as it being completed.

16 And then the second measure is when the
17 system is completed to the actual notification to the
18 CLEC, right?

19 MR. FIORETTI: No. They both end with the
20 notification to the CLEC.

21 The first one is system update to
22 notification within one hour. The other one is work
23 completion, service activated to completion, notification
24 to the CLEC, one day. So it's work completed --

25 MS. CEGELSKI: Physical work completed.

1 MR. FIORETTI: Physical work completed to
2 notification of the CLEC, one day. System updated to
3 completion to the notification of the CLEC within one
4 hour.

5 MR. COX: So on the electronic transfer of
6 trouble tickets, that stamp just had the one measurement,
7 GUI, and/or through ap to ap?

8 MR. FIORETTI: Right. On the maintenance
9 side, which is where we have not finished in instituting
10 this measure, it is -- well, first of all, in Texas they
11 didn't have a measure on maintenance -- but the
12 maintenance side, it's the manual side of maintenance that
13 really causes the difficulty because on the electronic
14 side you get notification through either the GUI or the ap
15 to ap, Rod -- and you're familiar, I think, with the GUI
16 -- very proactively on completion of that order.

17 MR. COX: Right.

18 MR. FIORETTI: Or trouble ticket, I mean.
19 I'm sorry.

20 MR. COX: I guess I'm trying to figure out
21 of those that don't get in the GUI or bill manual and it's
22 a physical callback, how are you collecting that?

23 MR. FIORETTI: That's the part I'm working
24 on, to complete the maintenance measure right now.

25 MR. COX: O.K.

1 MR. FIORETTI: That's why you're not
2 getting that today, either of those maintenance ones.

3 MR. KERN: Rod, are you comfortable with
4 that?

5 MR. COX: Yeah, I think so.

6 MS. KINARD: This is Karen from MCI. I'm
7 still kind of lost on what we're agreeing to. Are we
8 agreeing to a separate notice measurement for maintenance,
9 like we have a completion notice or --

10 MR. FIORETTI: That's what we're working on
11 developing and that's really the part of the Michigan
12 piece in terms of the piece parts that has not yet been
13 implemented.

14 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: But you're proposing to
15 implement that notification time separately from the
16 completion time.

17 MR. FIORETTI: Correct. Just as we do on
18 the provisioning side.

19 MR. KERN: O.K. I want to try and knock
20 off the next couple, two or three, pretty quickly if we
21 can.

22 On No. 5, Ameritech was supposed to -- no,
23 I'm sorry -- CLECs were to review Ameritech's proposed
24 measures. Did CLECs have a chance to review what
25 Ameritech had proposed regarding collocation? Mary?

1 MS. CEGELSKI: No, I haven't. Oh, the
2 proposal that we had from the last time?

3 MR. KERN: Yes.

4 MS. CEGELSKI: Yeah, I think that's all
5 right.

6 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with MCI
7 WorldCom.

8 First on the overall intervals where you
9 took the Michigan standard for physical and virtual, I
10 don't think we have a cageless one, right? Do we in
11 Michigan?

12 But anyway, from what I understand, your
13 contract offer is 60 and 90 days, so we would rather have
14 that than the 63 and 99.

15 And for the augment intervals, they looked
16 O.K. to our SMEs except for you didn't address whether the
17 DSLAM would go in the first one with the splitter, and
18 also they said that Ameritech requires us to do our own --
19 get a contractor to do our own tiedown, so they didn't see
20 why there had to be different capacity limits -- three
21 DS3s or so many copper lines, et cetera -- if we had the
22 terminal equipment there, because you don't do the work,
23 it's the contractor we hire, just so long as the
24 terminating equipment is there.

25 So that was their reaction.

1 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA.

2 We were really interested in the cageless
3 portion being split out.

4 MR. FIORETTI: I think we've agreed for
5 where we do cageless collocation, we do in the Texas
6 measure have a cageless disaggregation.

7 MS. MOORE: You agreed to do that in
8 Indiana, right?

9 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

10 MR. COX: And was that a 45-day interval?

11 MR. FIORETTI: Rod, I don't know what the
12 interval is off the top of my head.

13 MS. CEGELSKI: And Sal, CoreComm agrees
14 under that stipulation, too, that the cageless would be
15 included if we have cageless at that point.

16 MS. MOORE: Can't hear you.

17 MS. CEGELSKI: CoreComm says that if there
18 is cageless, that we should also measure cageless on that,
19 do the agreement in the other commissions.

20 MR. FIORETTI: We have a collocation tariff
21 here in Michigan, I believe.

22 MR. ANDERSON: We do, and we also have
23 approved interconnection agreements that include cageless.

24 MR. FIORETTI: And I think the way that the
25 Texas measure is written is it's based on the intervals

1 established in the tariff.

2 MR. ANDERSON: Well, that one I'm not sure
3 about the interval in the tariff.

4 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: I'm not sure of the
5 intervals in the tariff either.

6 MS. KINARD: I think our people have told
7 me the Texas interval was 55 days for cageless.

8 MR. FIORETTI: But I think that was based
9 on the Texas tariff.

10 MS. KINARD: Yeah. So I don't know what
11 you have in Michigan.

12 MR. FIORETTI: And I think that's why we
13 left the language to what was in the tariff, to get some
14 sense of standardization of the measure in terms of how we
15 would pay remedies.

16 If contractually we have something
17 different, I would suggest that that shouldn't change
18 these standard performance measures but we somehow work
19 with you to make sure that we're meeting the contractual
20 obligation that we have. But from a measurement
21 perspective, we're looking at the standards.

22 MR. DENNISTON: Sal, it's Jim Denniston.
23 There's an open question in our mind as to whether the
24 present tariff complies with the Commission's order in
25 11831. In the event that some kind of a motion is brought

1 in 11831 to require Ameritech to change its collocation
2 tariff, would those changes be reflected and do you put
3 them in performance standards measurements?

4 MR. FIORETTI: I would suggest that, hoping
5 to be somewhat consistent with something I've said before,
6 where I can point to something and say it's the tariff,
7 that I would measure to the tariff. So if the tariff got
8 changed, I would measure to whatever that modification
9 was.

10 MR. ANDERSON: Jim, this is Craig Anderson.
11 I recognize you may have some issues with the tariff, and
12 maybe this is one where we can check, I mean on that
13 somewhat narrow issue right now. What is the interval for
14 cageless? I'm pretty sure cageless is in there.

15 There are some questions I have about the
16 tariff, too. And maybe in the process we can talk about
17 tariffs and maybe take an issue off the table for 11831,
18 in the spirit of collaboration.

19 MR. DENNISTON: O.K. Very good.

20 MR. KERN: AT&T, do you have any comments
21 about the collocation issues?

22 MS. MOORE: No. We agree with MCI, and I
23 also agree with Sal where we can point to something
24 outside the measure itself, where we can all agree, that
25 would be great. Of course we want what is shortest.

1 MR. FIORETTI: So do you want to move on to
2 No. 6?

3 No. 6 I think was from the MCI redline.
4 That was one of the new items that, unfortunately, I am
5 not prepared to discuss today. I just did not have enough
6 time to go back and do this one. I would hope that we can
7 hold this one till the next time.

8 MS. MOORE: What's the item?

9 MR. ANDERSON: Hot cuts.

10 MR. FIORETTI: This is the hot cuts frame
11 due time issue.

12 MS. MOORE: I understand you haven't had
13 time to look into this. If I could respectfully suggest
14 that you talk to Mr. Dysart in Texas. I was in Texas on
15 Monday, and the whole hot cut frame due time measures were
16 up for review, and there have been some CLEC proposals,
17 your parent company has agreed to them.

18 MR. FIORETTI: To be honest, Karen, I was
19 trying to wait until some of that got done so I could cut
20 to the chase, but I didn't then get to Randy in time.

21 MS. MOORE: You know what, Sal, that's O.K.
22 From AT&T's perspective anyway, I think it's a real good
23 idea that you get together with your Texas folks,
24 understand what they're doing and bring it on over,
25 assuming that all the other CLECs agree.

1 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. I will get to Randy
2 first opportunity next week.

3 MS. MOORE: Do you know, Sal, is the
4 opportunity for us to request frame due times on the table
5 for Ameritech?

6 MR. FIORETTI: Karen, I can't say for sure.
7 I don't know. I know that that issue is being worked, but
8 I don't know exactly what the current status is.

9 MS. MOORE: O.K. Let me --

10 MR. CHORZEMPA: -- change in their
11 position, Karen, so far in the arbitration.

12 MS. MOORE: Say it again.

13 MR. CHORZEMPA: They haven't changed their
14 position on that in arbitration.

15 MS. MOORE: So, Sal, then I would
16 respectfully suggest that you confirm what Dave just said.
17 The CLECs really, really want frame due time. And as part
18 of that, the hot cut measures 114 and 115 and 114.1 which
19 we've never talked about here have been changed and agreed
20 to. So I'd like to see you bring that to the table.

21 MR. FIORETTI: O.K.

22 MS. MOORE: Maybe you could do that by, if
23 I could also suggest, at least having some more feedback
24 for us at our Illinois meeting the 4th and 5th of May.

25 MR. FIORETTI: I will certainly try to do

1 that.

2 MR. ANDERSON: And, Dave, is that an issue,
3 then, if we could possibly resolve that through this? Sal
4 has got to check, obviously, that maybe it could come off
5 the issue in the arbitration.

6 MR. CHORZEMPA: Yes, it could. I mean
7 right now we're asking them for Ameritech to provide frame
8 due hot cuts, and I have seen a mockup of our document
9 which was deleted, but Ameritech deleted a hundred percent
10 of our language so that -- that was outside, and the
11 negotiations are scheduled for next week on that, or even
12 the week after.

13 MR. FIORETTI: Might I suggest the one
14 issue that, you know, I just think that it's worth noting
15 that the policy position will really establish what the
16 measurement position might be on this. And that is, you
17 know, I can't have a measurement that measures something
18 that we don't have.

19 So one is going to follow the other, and
20 I'll follow up on both of those. But just --

21 MS. MOORE: Sal, I have to respectfully
22 disagree with you. Frame due time is only a portion of
23 measure. There are other issues around the whole measures
24 that we need to address, too. And if you look at measure
25 114.1, forgetting about the frame due time piece,

1 coordinate just from the hot cut perspective, I would like
2 to see measure 114.1, with of course a different
3 benchmark, brought into the Ameritech region.

4 MR. FIORETTI: I guess the only question I
5 would ask you, Karen, is that in our first go-round over
6 the issues, the CLEC position that was stated said "Keep
7 the Michigan measure for coordinating conversions."

8 MS. MOORE: That's right, because you don't
9 have 114.1. So I guess I expected you to come back with,
10 you know, your intent to resolve that.

11 MR. FIORETTI: Well, you know, I'd be happy
12 to go back and talk to Randy. And if I can do 114.1 along
13 with the Texas measures and not be driving the policy with
14 the performance measure, I'd be happy to do that.

15 MS. MOORE: Sal, let me say this: If you
16 could come back and bring to the table 114.1, AT&T would
17 be willing to take off the table the Michigan measure,
18 because they're very similar.

19 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. I understand.

20 MR. ANDERSON: But to be clear, that's
21 going to be driven by the policy decision.

22 MS. MOORE: Well, Craig, I'm not sure if
23 that's the case because it includes other things besides
24 frame due time. Frame due time is just a disaggregation
25 level.

1 MR. ANDERSON: I'm suggesting, to put it
2 another way, we'll have to check with San Antonio.

3 MS. MOORE: Thank you.

4 MS. KINARD: This is Karen with MCI
5 WorldCom.

6 For the frame due time, and maybe Karen
7 Moore can fill me in, you're just talking about the
8 translation timing, if I may?

9 MR. FIORETTI: Frame due time has to do
10 with jumpers, not translations.

11 MR. CHORZEMPA: It's a coordinated cut
12 versus frame due time cut where you only actually have
13 coordination between the companies when you're actually
14 doing the cut.

15 MR. FIORETTI: Yes. Frame due time says,
16 as I understand the general definition, at time certain,
17 at 2:00 o'clock or 2:30 on Thursday afternoon you're going
18 to cut this order; don't call me, just cut it.

19 MR. CHORZEMPA: I think the point is, once
20 the hot cut process becomes more reliable, companies would
21 like the ability to have frame due time cut instead of a
22 coordinated cut. Obviously, if the process isn't reliable
23 -- I don't think it's there yet in Ameritechland -- frame
24 due time is the best way to do it. But if you have a
25 reliable process and you could use frame due time, you

1 obviously increase the volumes of cuts that take place.

2 MS. KINARD: And for coordinating cut right
3 now, you don't have a cutover window, right?

4 MR. CHORZEMPA: You don't have a set time
5 where you cut over; you actually have -- well, you do have
6 a time. You also have actual manual interaction between
7 us and Ameritech as it relates to the cut.

8 MS. MOORE: Perhaps to more precisely
9 answer your question, what we're missing from the Texas
10 measure the way Sal implemented them when he put that
11 stake in the ground and stated this is what we're going to
12 do, there is no measure outside of Michigan that says:
13 Here's the amount of time you have to do these coordinated
14 cuts, you've got to do it in this time frame.

15 In Texas, 114.1 is exactly that, although
16 in the CLECs' opinion in Texas that benchmark is far too
17 long. It's like two hours or so.

18 MS. KINARD: I have seen that later for an
19 interval proposal in Texas. It is a long time.

20 MS. MOORE: Right. And so now during the
21 Texas six-month review there are some CLECs proposing to
22 change the coordinating conversion measures that FCC has
23 accepted, which, of course, was what I wanted to send out
24 to the CLECs until my computer died and went to the
25 hospital. So I'm waiting for it to be revived, and when I

1 do that I'll be happy to send it out.

2 I know Sal is going to go back and talk to
3 Mr. Dysart.

4 MS. KINARD: For the noncoordinated hot
5 cuts or cuts, is there a discussion of rather than frame
6 due time, Ameritech waiting for the attack broadcast?

7 MS. MOORE: I don't know.

8 MR. FIORETTI: I don't know either, Karen.

9 MS. KINARD: I think that's our preferred
10 method. That gives us more control over making sure
11 that's not a problem with you taking out the translation.

12 MS. MOORE: Karen, are you talking about
13 the waiting for the activation method?

14 MS. KINARD: Yes.

15 MS. MOORE: Yes. O.K.

16 MR. KERN: Let's see if we can do No. 7 or
17 8 real quick.

18 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. We're getting pretty
19 close to having a business rule.

20 MS. MOORE: What's No. 7, please?

21 MR. FIORETTI: 7 on the MCI document is:
22 Ameritech will develop and implement a new measure for
23 resale billing completion based on the rate of clearing
24 error notices. And I think subsequently Mary changed a
25 couple of words in there.

1 MS. CEGELSKI: Yes, I did change a couple.

2 MR. FIORETTI: I think that was something
3 that we did commit to do. So that was just left off.
4 Actually, one of the areas of agreement -- not
5 disagreement -- right? We just have not delivered to you;
6 there's a business rule.

7 So it's open from that perspective, but I
8 think it is an area of agreement that we've agreed to do.

9 MS. KINARD: This doesn't foreclose when we
10 do have an EDI billing completion notice up and running,
11 getting a measure on the completion notice -- or that
12 might have been what Mary added and I have the wrong copy
13 in front of me.

14 MR. FIORETTI: No, that's not what Mary
15 added, but it doesn't foreclose it, nor does it guarantee
16 it, either one. It's something that we'll talk about when
17 we get something like that.

18 MS. MOORE: Sal, to go along with that
19 question in a more general sense, when do you think you
20 will have this new or latest version of the business rule?

21 MR. FIORETTI: Karen, I had anticipated
22 you'd have them before now. In fact, I had them before
23 now but I wanted to take a look at them, so I'm the
24 roadblock. I just haven't reviewed them just to say O.K.,
25 I'll send them out to you. So I apologize to you for

1 that. I hope to get them out to you next week.

2 MS. MOORE: Could I ask, then, in addition
3 to that, Sal, that you send out whatever changes you made
4 to the implementation schedule, too?

5 MR. FIORETTI: Yes, again the same. I'm
6 sticking to my story there.

7 MS. MOORE: O.K. Thank you.

8 MR. KERN: The last one I want to try to
9 touch on today was Ameritech will further define the
10 business rule for defining when it changed to an order for
11 their interconnection trunk will be deemed a supplemental
12 order.

13 MR. FIORETTI: Well, this goes back to a
14 longer discussion than I think you probably want to have,
15 John, but let me frame the issue for you.

16 This goes back to a conversation that I
17 had. I think this was an exchange that I had with Karen
18 Kinard, talking about FOC, FOC time for interconnection
19 trunks. All right.

20 I said, based on the way that our folks had
21 read the Michigan order, that our FOC time for
22 interconnection trunks was 24 hours, and that where we
23 don't reject orders from CLECs on interconnection trunks,
24 we call you and attempt to resolve discrepancies and have
25 a process in place by which we stop the clock or whatever,

1 and then potentially ask you to sub the order for more
2 information, if that's required, in order to FOC the order
3 back.

4 I was very wrong on that process, and I was
5 very wrong on the FOC time for interconnection trunks. I
6 think we need to probably talk about that again.

7 First of all, the process I was referring
8 to is a process that we use on the ordering -- what I'll
9 call special access type trunks, special access type DS1s
10 where we do manual processing. It's not going to have to
11 do anything specific with interconnection trunks. We
12 don't stop the clock at all on those. We report what time
13 it takes.

14 And in fact the Michigan commission order
15 does not -- the Michigan order specifies only that we are
16 to implement a disaggregation for interconnection trunks,
17 but the actual definition that it gives for objective time
18 frames leaves one to wonder which of the time frames the
19 Commission would have expected for interconnection trunks.
20 And the 24 hours is way too short of a time to actually do
21 that.

22 I'm working with my folks to understand
23 what the right times are. I don't expect that you'll be
24 able to react to anything I say until I tell you what I
25 think it ought to be. And that's why I say this

1 discussion is a little bit longer.

2 But suffice it to say, from the perspective
3 of the process to request the stuff and stop the clock and
4 all that, that's not one that we do, and I was wrong
5 there. So that's not the issue.

6 The issue is interconnection trunk clock
7 time.

8 MR. KERN: Suffice it to say, it's an issue
9 that we need to follow up next time.

10 MR. FIORETTI: Yes, we do.

11 MR. KERN: I guess that's the question I
12 have for the group: When is the next time going to be?

13 MS. MOORE: John, before we go, can I ask
14 Sal one more question?

15 MR. KERN: Sure.

16 MS. MOORE: Sal, my understanding from
17 being in Texas earlier this week, that SBC is in swing
18 stage, it's going to be changing the way they produce
19 performance data; they're working on a process to use
20 Microsoft access databases, which, as you know, AT&T would
21 dearly love. So if you could -- it's not for Illinois --
22 at May 4th and 5th, next time we're in Ohio, the 8th or
23 9th, or here in Michigan sometime after that, if you could
24 give us some feedback as to whether or not you think you
25 can trust us your data the way your parent company is

1 going to do it.

2 MR. FIORETTI: Karen, I did get your
3 message the other day about this and did have some -- I
4 did not have conversation with Randy Dysart as I said, but
5 did have some conversation with the IT folks that are
6 doing the work that's being done, that I think you're
7 referencing here. And that's why I need to touch base
8 with Randy.

9 And as I'm sure you'll recall, both in the
10 Telcordia analysis of the Texas performance measures, and
11 I think there's some comment by the DOJ and/or FCC, they
12 said that their processes were much too manual-intensive,
13 and they were based on spreadsheets and weren't
14 mechanized. I believe that from the information I found,
15 this is the back end of the process, the data warehousing
16 type end that they're talking about. But to be sure, I
17 need to talk to Randy.

18 It doesn't have anything to do with how
19 they post it and how they post it to the Internet.

20 MS. MOORE: Sal, I appreciate your
21 commitment to talking to Randy. I can tell you that it
22 will in fact include the issue of how the CLECs were
23 getting the data, because I know as part of our filing in
24 Texas, in anticipation of the six-month review, we asked
25 those specific questions. So I'm sure that Randy and his

1 team are working on that issue.

2 MR. FIORETTI: O.K. Well, as I said, I
3 didn't talk to Randy. I talked to the IT folks. When I
4 gave them the explanation that I knew, they said, well,
5 this is what we're doing at their end. And so if it's
6 something that Randy is working on independently, I need
7 to talk to him. So I'll do that.

8 MS. MOORE: O.K. I look forward to your
9 updates, Sal. Thank you.

10 MS. KINARD: Sal, this is Karen Kinard from
11 MCI WorldCom. When you're checking into the trunk
12 interval -- and it sounds like you made my heart leap for
13 joy for nothing --

14 MR. FIORETTI: Karen, you know you were the
15 one that convinced me that I must be crazy.

16 MS. KINARD: -- that you -- in two states.
17 Could you make sure you get the line
18 numbers they apply to, if there are cutoffs when things go
19 to project, like Bell Atlantic intervals up to 192 trunks
20 --

21 MR. FIORETTI: Yes, I will, Karen.

22 MS. KINARD: -- they're one thing, and then
23 over that amount they are another thing.

24 MR. FIORETTI: Yes, I will, Karen. And
25 thank you. I mean it was that conversation that made me

1 think I had no idea what I was talking about.

2 MS. MOORE: It takes a brave man to admit
3 that, Sal.

4 MR. KERN: So when do we want to try and
5 reconvene this group, this collaborative group? I think
6 we're making some progress. I saw a couple more issues
7 get knocked off the to-do list onto the agree list.

8 Do we not -- do people not want to have
9 another meeting?

10 MR. ANDERSON: We absolutely do, but I want
11 Sal to breathe. He's got some real assignments here, so
12 I'm going to Sal first for time.

13 MR. KERN: Let's take a couple minutes.

14 (There was a discussion off the record.)

15 MR. KERN: This is where we're at, people,
16 correct me if I'm wrong.

17 We have taken one of the issues off line to
18 a sub-team, that is this average FOC notice interval.
19 That sub-team is going to have two conference calls, first
20 one on Thursday, May 4 at 9:00 o'clock Central, second one
21 on May 12, 9:00 o'clock Central.

22 This collaborative will meet again on
23 Friday, May 19, by conference call, and the call will be
24 from 9:00 to 12:00 Eastern time, 8:00 to 11:00 Central
25 time.

1 And does anybody else have anything they
2 wish to add?

3 MR. ANDERSON: We'll set up the bridge for
4 the calls.

5 MR. KERN: Ameritech will take care of the
6 conference bridges.

7 And, Jim, thank you very much for your
8 willingness to do the bridges today.

9 (At 3:05 P.M., the proceedings were
10 adjourned to May 5, 2000, at 10:00 A.M.)

11 - - -

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

C E R T I F I C A T E

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that we reported stenographically the foregoing proceedings had in the within-entitled matter, being Case No. U-12320, before John Kern, Facilitator, at the offices of Ameritech Michigan, 3893 Okemos Road, Suite A1, Okemos, Michigan, and the Mercantile Building, Lansing, Michigan, on April 20, 2000, and that the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true and correct transcript of our said stenographic notes.

Dated: April 20, 2000

