

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 Michigan Public Service Commission, 6545  
Mercantile Way, Lansing, Michigan.

SESSION OF FRIDAY, MAY 19, 2000

VOLUME 13

- - -

BEFORE: THOMAS LONERGAN, Director  
MPSC Communications Staff

JOHN KERN, Facilitator, via telephone

PARTICIPANTS

MPSC

ANN SCHNEIDEWIND, MPSC Communications Staff

AMERITECH MICHIGAN

JOHN M. DEMPSEY, Legal  
KELLY FENNELL, Director  
ROBIN GLEASON, V.P., Regulatory, via telephone  
DONALD CALAMIA, Manager, Regulatory  
SAL FIORETTI, Ameritech SBC, via telephone  
JIM METROPOULIS, Legal, via telephone

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS

FRANCES BROWN, via telephone  
KAREN MOORE, via telephone

CORECOMM

TOM O'BRIEN, via telephone

HORIZON TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

RICK GOULD, Regulatory, via telephone

MCI WORLDCOM

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

RHYTHMS NETCONNECTIONS  
CLEC ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN  
McLEODUSA

LELAND ROSIER, Legal, via telephone  
ROD COX, McLeodUSA, via telephone

TODD McNALLY, McLeodUSA, via telephone

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY

JIM KITE, via telephone

ATTORNEY GENERAL

ORJIAKOR ISIOGU, Assistant Attorney General, via telephone

- - -

Lansing, Michigan

Friday, May 19, 2000

9:15 A.M.

- - -

(The proceedings were resumed pursuant to the adjournment.)

MR. KERN: Let's get started. This is John Kern.

We are going to be transcribing the conference call today, and as some of you may have already heard, you have to identify -- at least give your name, not necessarily your affiliation, but give your name before you make a statement. Because there are so many people on the call, if you do not indicate your name, the record will indicate the person speaking is unannounced or unknown.

So having said that, for the next couple hours we want to kind of talk about the performance measures collaborative or some of the issues that are still remaining.

No. 1, we want to have an update on what I think are the two big open issues, FOC and the notice interval or the commitment interval.

Second, we need to talk about how this collaborative is going to be making a filing to the

1 Commission asking the Commission to modify its original  
2 performance measures that came out in 11830.

3 And finally, we need to talk about what the  
4 future or what the status of this particular performance  
5 measures collaborative will be on a going-forward basis,  
6 and if we need to have a meeting, to at least get a date  
7 in the calendar so that people can start planning towards  
8 that date.

9 Does anybody else have anything else they'd  
10 like to talk about this morning?

11 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with MCI  
12 WorldCom.

13 Jim had talked to AT&T, who was in Indiana,  
14 and CoreComm. We didn't mention that we were going to say  
15 anything here to Ameritech yet, but, Sal, I want to bring  
16 up our proposal about the regional collaborative and maybe  
17 at some point on the agenda discuss that, if you don't  
18 mind.

19 MR. FIORETTI: Karen -- and maybe that  
20 really goes to John's last point as to the future of this  
21 collaborative.

22 MS. KINARD: O.K. Great.

23 MR. KERN: I don't know what the best way  
24 is to approach these two open issues. I guess I would  
25 simply ask maybe Sal or Karen Moore or Karen Kinard to

1 kind of bring us up to speed at least on -- I mean the  
2 sub-team was developed to look at the FOC issue. Maybe  
3 that's the one we should discuss first.

4 MR. FIORETTI: John, this is Sal  
5 Fioretti.

6 I sent out this morning a summary. And  
7 the summary -- I mean the sub-team hasn't seen. So they  
8 can certainly feel free to correct me if I'm in error  
9 somewhere. But I sent out a summary in e-mail and I'd be  
10 happy to just walk through it even if folks don't have it  
11 in front of them to just hit the highlights of what we did  
12 and what, at least what I believe, we agreed upon and what  
13 might be the next steps.

14 MR. ROSIER: Sal, this is Leland Rosier.  
15 Is this the spreadsheet form that says  
16 U-11830 Collaborative Resolution and Status?

17 MR. FIORETTI: No. That's one of the  
18 other documents, Leland. That's the matrix that we had  
19 already started working on. It was a second e-mail that I  
20 sent this morning.

21 MR. McNALLY: Sal, this is Todd McNally  
22 with McLeod.

23 I received an e-mail from you that  
24 was titled "New Copy of Illinois Business Rule Documents  
25 Schedule."

1                   Did you use the same dis trail for that  
2 e-mail as well?

3                   MR. FIORETTI: No.

4                   MR. McNALLY: I received the New Copy of  
5 Business Rules, but not the summary that you're talking  
6 about.

7                   MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

8                   This was entitled, I believe, FOC Sub-Team  
9 Status, or Status of FOC Sub-Team.

10                  MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

11                  Sal, it sounds like some people may not  
12 have it. And it might be best if you kind of walk us  
13 through it quickly.

14                  Hello. Did someone just join the call?

15                  MR. METROPOULOS: This is Jim Metropoulos.

16                  MR. KERN: Jim from Ameritech, right?

17                  MR. METROPOULOS: Yes.

18                  MR. KERN: All right.

19                  MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

20                  All right, John, I'll walk through this.

21 And again, if any of the team members that participated  
22 differ from the status that I give, please feel free to  
23 stop me and we'll work through it from there.

24                  We held two conference calls, one on May  
25 4th and an abbreviated one on May 12th. And basically

1 what I'm going to summarize are those calls.

2 In the first call we discussed several  
3 things, but the primary issue was the fact that Ameritech  
4 did identify a method to measure the entire process. It's  
5 different from our previous position. In the interim time  
6 period we had identified a way to include the EDI handoff  
7 and the translation times that were not previously being  
8 counted in the measurements. Really, I think, just as the  
9 CLECs had requested. This work is going to be based on  
10 control numbers of the EDI VAN.

11 Subsequent to that discussion or  
12 coincident with that discussion, we initiated with our  
13 corporate IT folks an order-of-magnitude and a high-level-  
14 requirements process to establish exactly how this would  
15 be done, develop the high level requirements for the work  
16 associated with it and an estimate of the time that might  
17 be required.

18 We talked about the particular pieces of  
19 this and how it would be done. We would be collecting the  
20 start time for when the EDI message is first available to  
21 Ameritech. We would be collecting the end time as to when  
22 we did the handoff to our EDI VAN.

23 We proposed, I think, that the Texas  
24 measures that we listed -- and I'll give you a short list  
25 of them -- would continue to be intact with modifications

1 to the business-rule language, so that we could  
2 specifically identify in their language the new start time  
3 and end times so there would be no confusion as to where  
4 we were applying these times.

5 We did talk about the fact that there was  
6 a small number of customers who interfaced directly other  
7 than using the EDI VAN and that we should also  
8 appropriately identify the intervals, although they might  
9 be a little bit different in that scenario, and apply  
10 those for correct start and end times. And we did not see  
11 the need for an additional technical subject matter  
12 expert-type call at this time, although I think we talked  
13 about potentially holding that call later if it was  
14 required.

15 There were eight measurements that we  
16 identified of the Texas measures, Nos. 5, 6, 94, 10, 10.1,  
17 10.2, 11 and 11.1, that we identified that would be  
18 affected by this new data collection method.

19 Just for that piece with regard to the  
20 measurements, Karen, Karen -- I wondered who else was on  
21 those calls -- is that pretty accurate?

22 MS. MOORE: Yes.

23 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Identify yourself,  
24 please.

25 MS. MOORE: Oh, I'm sorry. This is Karen

1 Moore from AT&T. Yes, Sal's description was accurate.

2 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with MCI  
3 WorldCom.

4 Your description was accurate, and if we  
5 can mention, I think we're still waiting for when you can  
6 use this new process.

7 MR. FIORETTI: Right. This is Sal Fioretti  
8 again.

9 The order of magnitude came back. The  
10 expectation is that it's going to take sometime between  
11 one and three months to do this work. We are working to  
12 expedite the scheduling and the work to try to bring that  
13 down. But, you know, we're in the process of scheduling.  
14 So it's my sense it's going to take certainly less than  
15 three months. I don't have any specific dates at this  
16 point.

17 The other issues that we talked about in  
18 these calls were we talked about the parity function and  
19 we talked about we would conduct a study under the  
20 guidance of KPMG that would establish whether or not that  
21 particular function, which I call pushing the button but  
22 it's really the time that it takes for us to actually  
23 submit the order into our Legacy ordering system, we would  
24 do that under the guidance of KPMG. Ameritech proposed  
25 that if the study reveals a parity process, that we

1 wouldn't necessarily have to measure it every month, since  
2 the response time is included in each of the measures.

3 But we did, I believe, agree to do that third-party test.

4           We talked a little bit about -- we went  
5 back and talked a little bit about the impacts of this  
6 batch processing environment. Ameritech noted that the  
7 CLECs are really looking for us to process very  
8 dynamically and very efficiently, and, you know, we wanted  
9 to make sure that we pointed out that CLECs have the  
10 ability to influence our ability to process dynamically  
11 and efficiently if they hold orders and drop large volumes  
12 of orders in that batch mode, and, you know, we really  
13 came to necessarily no agreements there. We just had the  
14 discussion that there was some potential if folks were  
15 dropping large batches of orders on us.

16           We talked about the business-rule language  
17 modifications quite briefly because we had conference  
18 bridge problems. I sent out some proposed language  
19 changes. I also included those in the document that I  
20 sent out this morning just for good measure. I never  
21 received any comments about that. I know I was having  
22 e-mail difficulties, so I'm not particularly sure that  
23 everyone got those, so I included them this morning again.

24 I think we need to close on that as one of the next steps,  
25 so that's still kind of a to-do item.

1                   We talked also briefly about the  
2 benchmarks. You know, Ameritech suggested that the  
3 current benchmarks for Texas measures be utilized but  
4 potentially be reevaluated. If there was agreement to  
5 change the measures, the disaggregations, for example, to  
6 utilize the flow-through measure, that might in and of  
7 itself cause us to change the benchmark.

8                   And we also talked about there needs to be  
9 some potential consistency between the FOC benchmarks and  
10 the reject and also potentially having to apply the  
11 benchmarks for completion notices differently now once  
12 this rearchitecture of the measurement is done to  
13 accommodate the fact that on manual orders we send out EDI  
14 to fax, a fax server notification, versus the outbound EDI  
15 transaction. So they might need to be altered as well.

16                   I would propose that this sub-team probably  
17 needs at least one more conference call to close on the  
18 business rules and to talk about the benchmarks, and if  
19 they would like Ameritech to present the proposal on  
20 benchmarks, we can and would relative to, you know,  
21 changes in the disaggregations to include flowthrough. I  
22 know that's one of the items that we talked about on our  
23 matrix. I believe it's still an open item and that  
24 probably still needs to be closed on.

25                   Again, Karen and Karen, do you think that's

1 relatively accurate of the additional discussions that we  
2 had?

3 MS. KINARD: Yes. This is Karen Kinard  
4 with MCI WorldCom.

5 The only thing to add is we also talked  
6 about having KPMG look at the new process in two regards:  
7 first, the length of that interval that wasn't captured  
8 before and looking at if it turns out to be a pretty long  
9 interval, what's going on there, the things Ameritech can  
10 do better, and KPMG can also bring up if there's a  
11 problem, like Sal mentioned, of how CLECs do things and  
12 hold orders that caused this delay, and we would like to  
13 see that and maybe approve some language on what KPMG  
14 would look at in the third-party test.

15 And the other thing was not all orders will  
16 be batched on both ends. There are some interfaces that  
17 will be transactional on both ends and then there are some  
18 that will be batched on the return end, and we want to  
19 make sure those are covered with the new way of measuring  
20 as well.

21 MR. FIORETTI: Yes -- this is Sal Fioretti.

22 Karen, I did cover that one, I think, with  
23 respect to the fact that there are some CLECs who  
24 interface directly rather than use the (unintelligible).

25 MS. KINARD: O.K.

1 MR. FIORETTI: And we do need to address  
2 those. But I did miss in my review the looking at this  
3 process, and I can add that to the document I sent out.

4 MS. KINARD: All right.

5 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from AT&T.  
6 I have two additional things.

7 One pertains to Sal's discussion of  
8 changing benchmarks. One of the things the CLECs  
9 requested was a matrix that gave full description of what  
10 orders are intended to flow through.

11 The second is regarding the parity audit by  
12 KPMG. The CLECs asked that we determine what would be an  
13 acceptable result to say that our process is at parity  
14 with Ameritech's process.

15 For example, if Ameritech's process for, as  
16 Sal puts it, pushing the button, takes half a second and  
17 the CLEC process takes 10 seconds, that's not parity, and  
18 I think we need to have an expectation of what would be a  
19 minimal comparison.

20 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

21 Karen, you're right. I did include that.  
22 I just missed it in doing the review.

23 MS. MOORE: O.K.

24 MR. FIORETTI: In the note that I wrote  
25 this morning I didn't address the full description of

1 orders to flow through. We could. There is work in  
2 progress there. As you know, we did pass out in Ohio an  
3 initial draft of that document and there's continuing work  
4 on it, but we can include that as well.

5 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from AT&T.

6 Yes, Sal, thank you very much for that  
7 matrix, and we're looking forward to the updated, more  
8 detailed copy of it.

9 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

10 Am I correct in assuming that if the  
11 sub-team has at least one more call to close up these few  
12 loose ends and Sal modifies his summary to include what  
13 Karen Kinard and Karen Moore have indicated should be  
14 included, do I understand that we would have consensus at  
15 least among the collaborative that this issue is closed?

16 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from AT&T,  
17 John.

18 I think we have some more things to  
19 discuss, especially around benchmarks. And I appreciate  
20 Sal's offer to have a proposal as to what those benchmark  
21 changes should be, but I think that's going to be a very  
22 detailed, complex discussion. But if we come to agreement  
23 on all those things, yes, it will be closed.

24 MR. KERN: Then let me ask the follow-up  
25 question. I'm sorry, this is John Kern.

1                   Let me ask the follow-up question, and I'll  
2 ask it to those who've been working on the FOC sub-team:

3 How much more time do you feel is required to close this  
4 issue out?

5                   MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with MCI  
6 WorldCom.

7                   Well, I think we can get to an interim  
8 solution quicker than a final solution. I think the final  
9 signoff comes after we hear what KPMG finds, and the  
10 interim solution will have to wait until we get some  
11 information from Sal on the flow-through issue and what we  
12 can come up with for the benchmarks during the interim  
13 until we find out more from KPMG.

14                  MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

15                  I guess two questions that I have. One is  
16 I am not clear -- let me put it this way: I think I've  
17 gotten mixed signals from the CLECs as to whether they  
18 wanted me to develop a new proposal on benchmarks with  
19 regard to integration of that flow-through measure. So if  
20 that's what you want me to do, I'd be happy to do that.

21                  The second question is can we --  
22 considering Karen Kinard's comment about the longer-term  
23 evaluation of KPMG, could we progress otherwise with the  
24 current benchmark (unintelligible) disaggregation if  
25 that's not a proposal you want me to make?

1 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with  
2 MCI WorldCom.

3 I think from the flow-through conflict  
4 the issue is basically normally in another jurisdiction we  
5 have flowthrough broken out and have a very short  
6 interval for flow-through orders for FOC and rejections.

7 But we have a lot of issues on what  
8 exactly flows through in Ameritech region. And we don't  
9 want to lock into this short interval and hardly anything  
10 be in it and feel happy.

11 So it's sort of tied to the whole  
12 flow-through measurement issue which I think we have  
13 discussed in other proceedings but we haven't really gone  
14 over the flow-through situation here.

15 MR. FIORETTI: Again, this is Sal  
16 Fioretti.

17 But, Karen, that would say that it might  
18 not be necessarily something that is an interim. We could  
19 agree on the benchmarks as they are today in Texas. Also  
20 for gross down the flow-through process and evaluation, as  
21 well as the evaluation by KPMG as secondary steps.

22 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard from  
23 WorldCom again.

24 I think this is something we'll have to  
25 talk about on that subsequent call with the other CLECs on

1 maybe defining, if we do do something like that in the  
2 interim, how long is this interim period.

3 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

4 Sal and Karen Kinard and Karen Moore,  
5 have you guys an idea when you would be having this  
6 follow-up conference call to further discuss some of these  
7 items?

8 MR. FIORETTI: Nothing has really been  
9 scheduled as of yet. We really are just now proposing  
10 that the sub-team continue.

11 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from  
12 AT&T.

13 We're making excellent and significant  
14 progress as we're discussing this FOC issue. So I would  
15 really appreciate the Commission's latitude in letting us  
16 spend a little bit more time on it so that everybody will  
17 be happy and we won't have to complain or litigate the  
18 issue.

19 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

20 I think you're absolutely right, Karen.

21 I think when I first started the  
22 collaborative this FOC issue seemed to be damn near  
23 impossible. And I think you all have made really good  
24 progress and you have some good concepts in terms of  
25 interim situations pending analysis or review by KPMG on

1 the final solutions. And I think it's great for the team  
2 to continue to work.

3 I'm just trying to get a feel for how  
4 much time you think is necessary to finish this piece of  
5 it. But maybe we can get back to that issue when we talk  
6 about the future of the collaborative and the time lines  
7 that we have to deal with.

8 Is there anything else on the FOC issue?

9 MR. COX: John, this is Rod Cox from  
10 McLeodUSA. I joined a little late.

11 MR. KERN: Thank you, Rod.

12 MR. COX: I would echo what Karen just  
13 said. I think there's been a lot of good progress made  
14 and I'm all for continuing to work through the issue.

15 MR. KERN: Fair enough.

16 The other big open issue, I think, is the  
17 average completion issue. My notes are really kind of  
18 confusing on this.

19 All I know is that, Sal, you were going  
20 to go back to Ameritech and check on something.

21 MR. FIORETTI: Yes. This is Sal  
22 Fioretti. Let me at least give you a status there.

23 Ameritech is in the process of  
24 establishing -- we are already reporting on the  
25 provisioning completion intervals. The missing data that

1 we have is on maintenance. And I won't necessarily go  
2 into the process description here, but suffice it to say  
3 that we can measure and should have shortly our ability to  
4 measure the electronic interfaces that we have with CLECs  
5 as far as maintenance completions.

6           Again, we have not, because this was  
7 never a part of the Texas business rule -- we have not  
8 really gotten -- nor was it separately a part of the  
9 Michigan requirement as a separate entity -- developed any  
10 sense of a business rule and benchmarks for that.

11           So again, what I would propose is that we  
12 would come to the table and propose a business rule to a  
13 team for completion notifications.

14           Electronically, we would suggest that that  
15 would be a rather short time, as would be expected.

16           For those maintenance requests that are  
17 handled manually, that presents us with some major  
18 difficulties with respect to collecting the data and  
19 calculating the time and the timing of the actual notice.

20           It would be our proposal that a  
21 maintenance trouble that was done manually would have a  
22 fairly significantly longer notification time, being like  
23 the next business day, than an electronic notification.

24           But we would propose that we address  
25 those. And again a sub-team or the same sub-team meeting

1 where we would propose business rules around that and talk  
2 with the CLECs if we got agreement that it could be  
3 measured separately.

4 We are developing the processes. We have  
5 now identified a process by which we can fax back  
6 maintenance completion notifications and would put that --  
7 are going to put that entire process into place. But the  
8 measurement piece would follow the process piece as we  
9 start doing the work.

10 The only issue would be we would need  
11 to get each CLEC to provide us with a fax number to get  
12 notice completion notifications back.

13 So there's some work we have to do there.  
14 But we haven't closed generically, I don't think, on the  
15 issue of reporting it separately.

16 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with  
17 MCI WorldCom.

18 Just for clarification, Sal, when you  
19 were talking about the maintenance notification, that was  
20 for the meantime to restore type of intervals and prepare  
21 commitments met where we want notice to the CLECs rather  
22 than the average interval, right?

23 MR. FIORETTI: Right. And we would  
24 propose that we would do it similarly to the way we would  
25 do provisioning where those traditional network measures

1 would remain intact, and a comparison just like they are  
2 today. And we would take the additional slice of time to  
3 notify CLECs and measure it separately and develop a  
4 business rule and some benchmarks with respect to that,  
5 that function, as we don't do that on the retail side.

6 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with  
7 MCI WorldCom again.

8 On the need for the other additional  
9 meeting or so, we're in agreement. We can't sign off on  
10 the two-step process until we hear more on the ability to  
11 log, to enter troubles before we get the completion  
12 notice, and also the issue of what if we don't get  
13 completion notices, is there a way that Ameritech has for  
14 checking missing notifications if we don't make the end  
15 time for intervals, that notification.

16 So I think we're going to have to discuss  
17 both of those things more. I know Sal was talking to his  
18 counterparts in Texas because they are talking about a new  
19 informational trouble ticket. I think he talked about  
20 before the completion of the order and waiting for some  
21 language from them and what they're going to do.

22 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti  
23 again.

24 We also have a sub-team that some of you  
25 might be participating in relative to the work going on in

1 Wisconsin that is discussing that same issue and is  
2 working directly with the Texas folks to understand their  
3 process and on integrating it into ours.

4 So really what I've done is leave that  
5 particular process to that team who is focusing on  
6 coordinating conversions in particular, and take the  
7 output of that and apply it into the performance measures.

8 MS. MOORE: Karen Moore from AT&T.

9 Sal, just for my own understanding, what  
10 you're saying is the issue of informational trouble  
11 tickets that the folks in Texas are doing is being  
12 addressed by the Wisconsin sub-team, and the output of  
13 that sub-team will be incorporated into the performance  
14 measures from Texas. So basically Ameritech is agreeing  
15 to do that measure, assuming they can come to agreement  
16 on the process?

17 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti  
18 again.

19 I think what I'm saying is that that  
20 sub-team, that team in Wisconsin, is working through the  
21 process. And that is one component of the process. And  
22 whatever agreements are made there we would fold back  
23 into the performance measurements.

24 As we had discussed in Illinois, we were  
25 going to review the coordinated cut-over measurements in

1 Illinois, and because this team was in the process of  
2 reviewing, evaluating and possibly updating the process, I  
3 would ask that we hold that review until that team was  
4 done so that we could make sure that our measures map  
5 directly to whatever new parts of the process came in.

6 And I would expect that this piece, this  
7 entering trouble on the data, the due date, is part of  
8 that process change that they are instituting.

9 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with  
10 MCI WorldCom.

11 I personally have not been involved in  
12 the Wisconsin meetings. They have often conflicted with  
13 other metric collaboratives. But we do have someone  
14 there.

15 Probably Karen Moore is in the same  
16 situation. So we would like to make sure we hear the  
17 final report from there, not only on these issues about  
18 completion and the ability to log troubles, but also  
19 on hot cuts. And that will have to be wrapping up  
20 those issues on metrics. So Michigan will be contingent  
21 on hearing what comes out of that operational  
22 discussion.

23 And while we're on that, from what I hear  
24 Wisconsin is also talking about different FOC intervals to  
25 allow the checking of facilities on a larger number of

1 loop orders. And I think we have to hear that too before  
2 we close out the FOC issue as well.

3 MR. KERN: O.K. This issue is still  
4 open, but progress is being made.

5 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

6 I would certainly characterize it as

7 that. We need just to finish some of those other  
8 discussions and work through it.

9 We'll circulate some business rules and  
10 completion notification in advance of those things so we  
11 can work on kind of a parallel track.

12 MR. KERN: This is John Kern again.

13 O.K. And I guess the reason why I have  
14 been asking people to see how much more time they need, at  
15 some point we need to make a filing to the Commission  
16 formally asking them to adopt the agreed-upon performance  
17 measures and business rules that this collaborative has  
18 agreed are appropriate in lieu of the performance measures  
19 that have been adopted in 11830.

20 So I just want people to be thinking  
21 about at some point in the near future we have to make  
22 that type of filing.

23 And, Ann, I don't know what your sense  
24 is, but I think it would be great if we could, when we  
25 make that filing, indicate that there's really no open

1 issues per se. There may be interim solutions that would  
2 be finalized after KPMG did an analysis or maybe Wisconsin  
3 has completed their analysis.

4 But the bottom line is we would be able  
5 to present to the Commission as a collaborative the list  
6 of performance measures and business rules that we would  
7 use, at least for testing purposes.

8 And so, again, just keep that in the back  
9 of your mind. We have to make this type of filing to the  
10 Commission.

11 Something else that I'd like to have a  
12 little bit of discussion about is -- and maybe, Sal, this  
13 is a question for you or maybe it's a question for  
14 everybody -- but what is the status of the performance  
15 measures related to line-sharing and related services  
16 that result in the UNE remand proceeding? Are those being  
17 done? Are they being worked on? If they are, where, and  
18 what's the status of those?

19 MR. FIORETTI: John, this is Sal  
20 Fioretti.

21 I think from our perspective, although  
22 there are discussions in different venues about those  
23 measures, you know, what we were intending to do was to  
24 get our baseline measures documented. There are  
25 discussions in Texas going on on some of those issues.

1 And so as those products evolve and as those, as they  
2 become closer to being, we can evaluate the systems and  
3 processes that support them and come up with the  
4 appropriate measures.

5 I do believe that they have talked about  
6 line-sharing metrics in Texas. We have not evaluated them  
7 here as yet. But we would try to as much as -- and we had  
8 this discussion in Indiana just this week -- what we would  
9 try to do is inasmuch as our systems would support them,  
10 adopt what came out of Texas on those particular issues.  
11 Since they are evolving products for everyone, we would  
12 expect to be able to possibly adopt some of those coming  
13 out of Texas since we are evaluating them on a 13-state  
14 basis in most cases.

15 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

16 Sal, let me ask this question. What is  
17 your expectation in terms of testing of line-sharing  
18 services if performance measures are still in a state of  
19 flux, I guess? Or would you simply propose that the line  
20 sharing, that that portion of the OSS testing  
21 regarding line sharing cannot be held until the  
22 performance measures have been completed?

23 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

24 I would suggest that those issues I  
25 expect to be resolved in the relatively near future. And

1 so therefore we would go into testing and understand that  
2 there are some products that we might have to in the  
3 interim develop performance measures and that would have  
4 to happen late in the process.

5 But the fact is a lot of those products  
6 and services are evolving as we are talking about them.

7 We are never going to catch up with everything that's  
8 right now being discussed. So we have to draw a line  
9 somewhere.

10 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Sal, this is Ann  
11 Schneidewind.

12 The thing that concerns me is that by the  
13 time you're ready to go forward, certainly I believe there  
14 will be a requirement that not only you will be offering  
15 these UNE remand and line-sharing products, but I read the  
16 FCC orders to say that would include the establishment of  
17 performance measures for those products.

18 And so, if they are not to go forward for  
19 adoption with the rest of this package that we're sending  
20 up to amend the existing measures that the Commission has  
21 adopted, I think there better be a very ready resolution  
22 to it which may be different than the process that we may  
23 discuss later for adoption of new measures for new  
24 products.

25 I see this as almost an existing product.

1 Your UNE remand tariff has already been filed now and your  
2 line-sharing tariff will be filed, I assume, in the next  
3 week or so.

4 I think that at a minimum, when this other  
5 package goes forward to the Commission, that we're going  
6 to have to be able to prescribe a specific time frame for  
7 performance measures on these offerings, which may be  
8 different than, as I say, performance measures for new  
9 services which we don't anticipate at this time.

10 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

11 Ann, I don't disagree with you at all.

12 I think what we just need to close on is what are the list  
13 of the products that we would be talking about as needing  
14 to have performance measures, and then close on the  
15 baseline for these, the existing set of products, and  
16 quickly move forward to be able to have something prior to  
17 the end of OSS testing where we could test the other  
18 products.

19 There is no question in my mind, however,  
20 those things have not been delineated today.

21 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard from  
22 MCI WorldCom.

23 You mentioned the work being done in  
24 Texas. And we're starting to bring in the DSL discussion  
25 from Texas in one of the states. At least Ohio has

1 brought in -- the Data CLEC Coalition, a representative  
2 has brought in exactly the same wording from Texas,  
3 because we don't even have all the DSL metrics, let alone  
4 the line sharing and the further unbundled element metrics  
5 here at Ameritech.

6 We plan to discuss them. There has been  
7 an order in California, another part of the SBC region, an  
8 interim order on line sharing measurements. It's mostly a  
9 disaggregation order that we'll look at, a trial that's  
10 going on out there, and then discuss some additional  
11 measurements based on that trial that we want to  
12 discuss. When we bring up the regional metric  
13 collaborative later in this call, we want to discuss in  
14 that forum at the same time California and Texas are  
15 discussing those kinds of measurements.

16 I have also just received on e-mail from  
17 California, the CLEC proposal for measuring the new types  
18 of UNEs in combinations like EELS.

19 MS. MOORE: Karen Moore from AT&T.

20 AT&T is very interested in further  
21 disaggregating those new UNE combinations.

22 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

23 Again, I'm not saying that we wouldn't.

24 All I'm saying is that we need to put that off in some  
25 sense to further down, later into the project, because some

1 of those products we don't -- even if we're now very  
2 recently ready to offer them, that's very recent and I  
3 have not gotten -- I don't have much sense as to exactly  
4 how the systems, the processes work, to be able to  
5 establish performance measures today or in the relatively  
6 near future.

7 But I would agree with Karen, in the  
8 regional collaborative we should and sure will be driven  
9 to make that a very high priority in what's addressed  
10 next.

11 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from AT&T.

12 Sal, as I recall, in the discussions we've  
13 been having over the last year around new products  
14 Ameritech has made a commitment to offer performance  
15 measure results within, I want to say four to eight weeks  
16 of offering the actual product. So my expectation is once  
17 you file a tariff for any new product, including EELs or  
18 new UNE combinations, that within a month or so you'll be  
19 sending us data. So we need to work through what those  
20 performance measures are going to be in order for you to  
21 accomplish that.

22 MS. KINARD: And this is Karen Kinard with  
23 MCI WorldCom.

24 I don't know if you're aware, Sal, but your  
25 FCC merger condition requires that a line-sharing metric

1 be filed. I'm not sure when the reporting on it is  
2 supposed to occur, but that has been proposed by SBC  
3 already and CLECs are commenting to the FCC on it. So  
4 that one may be coming sooner than it will come up in our  
5 collaborative.

6 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti, and I  
7 agree. Again, we just don't have any closure on those  
8 issues, and so I would suggest we don't hold up these  
9 baselines for that but still address them in as quick a  
10 method as we could once we have established that we could.

11 MS. MOORE: Sal, would you be willing to  
12 reiterate your commitment of reporting on performance  
13 measure data for new products within four to eight weeks  
14 of offering it?

15 MR. FIORETTI: Karen, our intent -- and  
16 this is Sal Fioretti -- our intent in that commitment, if  
17 you look at it, is that generally speaking we will do that  
18 and we expect to try to live up to that. We obviously  
19 will need the concurrence of CLECs and we'll need  
20 definition of product and process in order to do that, and  
21 so my expectation is that some things we will not be able  
22 to live up to that but that is certainly our intent.

23 MR. KERN: Sal, this is John Kern. My only  
24 comment is we are going to be meeting -- the OSS  
25 collaborative is going to be meeting June 6th and 7th, and

1 the objective of that meeting was to have a draft, a final  
2 draft MTP that would incorporate all the results of the  
3 performance measures collaborative as well as the tariff  
4 collaborative, which would include line sharing, EELs, and  
5 a few of these other issues.

6 All I'm suggesting to you and to your team  
7 is if we hope to have a final MTP by June 7th, we really  
8 need to work, I think, on getting closure on some of these  
9 performance measures -- performance measures issues  
10 related to some of these new products and services if the  
11 expectation is they will be part of the test, which I  
12 think it is.

13 And I'm not suggesting we delay anything.  
14 It's just a time line that we've kind of put ourselves  
15 under, as June 7th is the date where a lot of this stuff  
16 would get wrapped up, at least initially, understanding  
17 that there will always be new measures and there will  
18 always be new services, and we need to talk about how we  
19 bring those to the Commission at a later date. But in  
20 terms of the baseline for testing, I think it was the  
21 expectation of a lot of parties that at least the line-  
22 sharing and UNE remand portions would be pretty well  
23 finalized by June 7th.

24 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti. I  
25 mean you have our commitment that we'll be working on

1 those with those same goals in mind.

2 MR. KERN: Thank you, and that -- this is  
3 John Kern again -- and my assumption also is, Sal, as soon  
4 as you have proposals or have what you think is the best  
5 way to resolve the issue, that you would be sending out  
6 e-mails to all members of this collaborative so they can  
7 kind of get a feel for what you're proposing.

8 MR. FIORETTI: Fine. Yes, John, I would.

9 MR. KERN: And one other question I have.

10 MR. COX: John?

11 MR. KERN: I'm sorry?

12 MR. COX: John, this is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA.

13 MR. KERN: Yes.

14 MR. COX: Help me understand the June 7th  
15 master test plan. You're saying that will be completed by  
16 June 7th? Is that the expectation?

17 MR. KERN: It was the expectation that the  
18 master test plan that is completed by June 7th would be,  
19 you know, the final master test plan that would

20 incorporate the results of the performance measures  
21 collaborative and the tariff collaborative. By the way,  
22 that assumes that we have all the issues closed and  
23 resolved. Obviously if there's major open issues, then  
24 maybe the June 7th date may be in danger, but that's the  
25 expectation, Rod, is to have a final MTP by June 7th.

1                   MR. COX: O.K. It seems a little  
2 aggressive, but I wasn't aware of that drop-dead date.

3                   MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with MCI  
4 WorldCom.

5                   Not only looking at our issues here but  
6 just watching the e-mails on the UNE-P tariff, I'd be very  
7 surprised if that was settled by that date. I think there  
8 are some measurements where we definitely have to have a  
9 commitment in the MTP that they will be in place and  
10 reported on in a period of time to evaluate Ameritech's  
11 performance. You know, while we might be able to wait  
12 some on sub-loop unbundling, we definitely need the EELs  
13 and other types -- you know, the line-sharing that we  
14 mentioned part of that plan and really see data on it.

15                  MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from AT&T.

16                  I would like to reiterate what Karen Kinard  
17 said and add that Ameritech is not planning to complete  
18 its data collection on some measures until June, and there  
19 are significant measures that AT&T has concerns about, the  
20 results of which have just started to be reported.

21                  So we need to be very sure that we have  
22 enough time to collect data before the completion of the  
23 MTP and the test itself.

24                  MR. KERN: And this is John Kern.

25                  To Karen Kinard's comment, we do have a

1 conference call and another meeting of the tariff  
2 collaborative, and I do know that there are open issues  
3 with the tariff collaborative and they will be working on  
4 those issues in those forums, and we will be able to  
5 better judge the progress after we meet on June 5th, which  
6 is the tariff collaborative.

7 And something that Karen Moore just  
8 mentioned, which is the integrity of the data or an  
9 analysis of the data. One of the things that we need to  
10 talk about -- and help me if I mischaracterize -- but one  
11 of the requirements in 11830 is an annual audit of  
12 Ameritech's performance measures. Is that correct, Ann?

13 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: That's correct. Ann  
14 Schneidewind.

15 MR. KERN: And at some point, you know, we  
16 as a collaborative need to figure out, you know, what the  
17 scope of that audit is going to be and how it's going to  
18 be conducted, I guess.

19 MS. FENNELL: This is Kelly Fennell. And  
20 Ann, pardon me if I'm wrong, but I thought in the last OSS  
21 collaborative it was agreed that the audit scope contained  
22 within the OSS test plan was going to ensure that we  
23 incorporated the 11830 requirements for the annual audit.

24 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
25 Schneidewind.

1                   Yes, absolutely; that this first KPMG test  
2 would include the first audit. But I think John is  
3 speaking to the scope of ongoing audits, which, before we  
4 established these collaboratives, the Commission required  
5 that a group of interested parties define the scope of.

6                   So I think John is talking more about  
7 audits from this point on.

8                   MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from AT&T.

9                   John, your point, of course, was excellent.  
10 However, what I was really getting at is the fact that  
11 Ameritech has not completed reporting on the measures it's  
12 committed to to date. We still haven't gotten data on all  
13 the measures yet. Some of the most important measures  
14 have just begun being reported. So we don't have data to  
15 analyze all the measures yet.

16                  MR. KERN: Uh-huh.

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

18                  And in regards to the audit and the process  
19 in the master test plan of the audit, I mean that is still  
20 an open issue as far as I'm concerned. There's a lot of  
21 discussion that's still pending on the audit process and  
22 how that's going to work with KPMG.

23                  MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann Schneidewind  
24 again. I guess my point was only that clearly we will  
25 have to resolve that in some way so that the first annual

1       audit is addressed now in some way in this immediate next  
2       few months, in testing or however we decide to approach  
3       it. I'm just trying to distinguish that from the ongoing  
4       audit, which may indeed not involve or may or may not  
5       involve testing on an ongoing basis.

6                       MR. COX: I guess it's safe to assume that  
7       the whole notion of audit and those issues associated with  
8       it are still something that's open for discussion.

9                       MR. LONERGAN: John, this is Tom Lonergan.  
10       I've been sitting here a while.

11                      I submitted some proposed language to KPMG  
12       to put in the second draft of their test plan that I  
13       believe was based upon the discussions that we had at the  
14       last OSS collaborative and hopefully will in some fashion  
15       address the timing and the scope of the initial audit. I  
16       don't think that second draft is out yet -- I haven't seen  
17       it -- but I would ask the parties to take a look at that.  
18       I believe it reflects the agreement we reached at the last  
19       meeting.

20                      I think we all have to keep in mind on  
21       this, though, that the test plan will be something of a  
22       living document and that we cannot indefinitely postpone  
23       finishing the master test plan because there are still  
24       issues outstanding. In the other states, you know, those  
25       things, there has to be a method to deal with them, but at

1       some point we have to give KPMG the O.K. to proceed with a  
2       master test plan that is subject to some change,  
3       additional measures, additional tests, whatever, and  
4       that's what I think we're shooting for for June 7th, is to  
5       reach that point where we can give KPMG the green light  
6       with some sort of master test plan.

7                       Now, there may be provisions that  
8       additional metrics will be added, that additional even  
9       testing items will be added, that we'll be looking for the  
10      audit sooner rather than later, but it was my  
11      understanding at least or thought that we were trying to  
12      bring a lot of these things to some form of closure the  
13      first week in June.

14                      Everyone is speechless.

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

16                      You know, as far as it being a living  
17      document, I would totally agree with that, and there will  
18      be -- obviously there will have to be some process or  
19      mechanism in place to allow to insert changes into the  
20      master test plan as we go forward.

21                      MR. LONERGAN: Absolutely.

22                      MR. KERN: Let me then just ask one more  
23      question, and this is for Sal, I guess, or your team. In  
24      this performance measures collaborative, you know, we've  
25      been focusing primarily on looking at Texas 122

1 performance measures and business rules, modifying them,  
2 and mapping them to the Michigan performance measures that  
3 came out of 11830.

4 There's other aspects in 11830 which we  
5 haven't talked about. Am I correct to assume that you are  
6 in agreement that all other aspects of the original  
7 Commission's order should remain as they have been  
8 ordered?

9 MR. FIORETTI: John, this is Sal Fioretti.  
10 I guess I'd like you to clarify that. Are you thinking  
11 about things like the audit requirement?

12 MR. KERN: No. I was thinking more like --  
13 and Ann, again help me if I mischaracterize -- but there  
14 were certain geographic areas where measurement was to  
15 occur in geographic areas or geographic locations.

16 MR. FIORETTI: John, Sal Fioretti again.  
17 Yes, we are assuming that that stays intact  
18 and that we will continue as we already are. As we  
19 migrate to the Texas measures, we will continue  
20 disaggregating geographically.

21 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
22 Schneidewind. And also issues like the statistical  
23 methodology to the extent it was discussed in our  
24 Commission's orders, I guess I would only say if there's  
25 anything different from that than is being utilized in

1 Texas, perhaps it needs to be addressed in this filing we  
2 ultimately make to the Commission also.

3 I just think we need to go through that  
4 order and make sure that if there's anything else besides  
5 the measures themselves that we want the Commission to  
6 address, that we address it, because that order is  
7 standing out there at this point.

8 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti again.

9 Ann, I would agree with you. We need to go  
10 through that order and make sure we've got agreement on  
11 those specific items that may or may not be different.

12 And the only issue Ameritech would have on any of those  
13 others that I can think of is trying to apply them  
14 consistently. But, you know, similar to many of the  
15 issues we've already talked about, I think we're already  
16 doing those things and would be agreeable to continue  
17 doing them, but I think we need to check them off and make  
18 sure that we've addressed them all.

19 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann Schneidewind  
20 again.

21 Yes, I think that there may be agreement on  
22 those kinds of matters. But again, if the Commission  
23 hasn't adopted it, we need to address it now.

24 MR. KERN: This is John Kern again.

25 One of the last things I think we need to

1 talk about, I know we've never discussed remedies in  
2 Michigan. I do know that remedies, I think, have been  
3 raised in Indiana. Is that correct?

4 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore. In Ohio.

5 MR. KERN: In Ohio. This is John Kern  
6 again.

7 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox. Openly  
8 discussed in Indiana.

9 MR. KERN: So it's safe to assume that  
10 remedies are being discussed in other venues, and at some  
11 point I think the Michigan folks would like to have a  
12 brief summary, if you will, on what the status of the  
13 various remedy proposals are, and it's my understanding  
14 that this would likely be an issue that would need  
15 Commission resolution on.

16 MS. KINARD: Yes. This is Karen from MCI  
17 WorldCom.

18 MS. FENNELL: This is Kelly Fennell. What  
19 we've called a performance assurance plan is directly  
20 listed as something we need to propose and to have a  
21 collaborative on in the Commission's 12320 order.

22 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore. Is that a  
23 271 order?

24 MS. FENNELL: Yes.

25 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann Schneidewind

1       again.

2                       It occurs to me when I hear some of the  
3       discussions regarding what still has to be resolved by the  
4       sub-groups on performance measures that things like  
5       outstanding benchmark issues may relate to resolution of  
6       the -- what do we call these?

7                       MS. FENNEL: This is Kelly. Performance  
8       assurance plan.

9                       MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And so perhaps when we  
10      talk about when and what document goes forward to the  
11      Commission now in 11830 that would give enough direction  
12      to KPMG so that testing can begin, perhaps the remedies  
13      issue and maybe even some of the benchmark issues can be  
14      -- we can specify in that filing that those would be  
15      resolved at a later date. But KPMG would at least have  
16      enough to get going and begin testing.

17                      MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from AT&T.  
18                      I'd just like to reiterate AT&T's position  
19      that a remedy plan has to be part of a performance measure  
20      plan separate and distinct from a 271 filing. There's no  
21      point in having performance measures without penalties.

22                      MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Karen, could you state  
23      your last statement again? There's no point in having ...

24                      MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from AT&T.  
25                      There is no point in having a penalty plan

1 without remedies associated with them. AT&T believes that  
2 remedies have to be associated with penalty plans  
3 independent of the 271 decision. It's a business issue.  
4 We're trying to get into business, and I realize  
5 Ameritech's position is otherwise, but what they do for  
6 271 is up to them.

7 MS. KINARD: And this is Karen Kinard with  
8 MCI WorldCom.

9 We agree with AT&T that the remedy plan,  
10 the performance assurance plan, needs to be in place not  
11 necessarily contingent on 271 approval. Other states have  
12 implemented remedy plans, self-executing remedy plans, in  
13 fact before 271 approval, including Pennsylvania, Texas  
14 and Massachusetts, to name some. So just because it's  
15 taken up in the 271 docket doesn't mean you have to wait  
16 for 271 approval. You could probably start the test  
17 before you have the remedy plan in place, but we would  
18 like to get the enforcement mechanism for the measurement  
19 started as soon as possible.

20 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti. I  
21 don't think that we're saying that we would expect to  
22 begin to implement a remedy plan after 271. I think what  
23 we're saying is it's part of that other docket in terms of  
24 how we'd address it.

25 Is that right, Kelly?

1 MS. FENNELL: I'm sorry, Sal. I was  
2 reading while you were talking.

3 MR. FIORETTI: I don't think we're saying  
4 that we would wait for 271 approval in order to implement  
5 the remedy plan or the performance assurance plan; that  
6 it's actually part of the other docket; that we're  
7 addressing it there versus necessarily here.

8 MS. FENNELL: That would be right.

9 MR. ISIOGU: What do you mean by the other  
10 docket?

11 MS. FENNELL: This is Kelly.

12 Orji, he's referring to the checklist  
13 docket 12320. And we're not saying we're waiting until  
14 after we have 271 approval to approach a remedy plan. The  
15 Commission has ordered and the Commission called it a  
16 performance enforcement plan, and I'm looking at paragraph  
17 12 of the February 9th order of U-12320, and it said to  
18 use the collaborative process to develop specific  
19 performance assurance measures, including a self-  
20 effectuating system to prevent backsliding, and that we  
21 shall include the key elements discussed in the December  
22 22nd, '99 order for the Bell Atlantic 271 approval.

23 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
24 Schneidewind.

25 But separately in the original May order,

1 May 1999 order, where the Commission adopted initially  
2 these performance standards, although they did not adopt  
3 remedies initially, I think that they clearly said that  
4 these issues could come before them in arbitration and  
5 that the issue of damages under Michigan law could come  
6 into play.

7 So I don't think that they necessarily  
8 separated the issue of remedies from performance standards  
9 at all.

10 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

11 So I think what we're saying is we need to  
12 establish a schedule, although not contingent on starting  
13 the third-party testing, to discuss the performance  
14 assurance plan.

15 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
16 Schneidewind.

17 I would certainly agree with that.

18 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

19 Yeah, I think we have three broad  
20 categories of activities. First of all, I think we need  
21 to finish what we're calling this baseline performance  
22 measures, which would include, you know, closure of the  
23 FOC issue and closure of the completion interval issue, or  
24 at least to the best we can.

25 The second main work effort, then, would be

1 to take that information and make a formal filing to the  
2 Commission, asking them to adopt our recommendations, and  
3 it would be that baseline that would be given to KPMG and  
4 would be incorporated into the initial master test plan.

5 And then the third key area would be future  
6 activities, which would be, you know, development and  
7 implementation of performance measures for new services.  
8 It may include remedies, it may include these audits that  
9 we've been talking about, the ongoing audits that were  
10 outlined in 11830.

11 And I guess to Point No. 1 and No. 2, I  
12 know I've asked this question a couple times and I'm going  
13 to ask it again: What is a reasonable time line, Sal, for  
14 the sub-team to try and get some closure on the two  
15 outstanding issues so that we could prepare a filing for  
16 the Commission on the baseline performance measures?

17 MS. KINARD: Before Sal talks -- this is  
18 Karen Kinard for MCI WorldCom -- I'd like to say there is  
19 like two other big issues, flowthrough and hot cuts, that  
20 we need to have closure on besides all the other new  
21 services that need to go into the test. And I don't mean  
22 that's all the UNE remand services, but the ones like EELs  
23 and UNE-P. UNE-P is probably covered by disaggregation,  
24 but some of the other ones need special measures like DSL  
25 and line-sharing that should be in place for the test.

1 Maybe it can start and they come on later, but you still  
2 need enough data for them to really analyze.

3 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

4 Karen, there are some DSL measures already as well.

5 And again, John, I would suggest that --

6 MR. KERN: Let me restate my -- this is

7 John Kern again, Sal. Let me restate my question.

8 I mean let's assume that you and your team  
9 get back together for another conference call. Would it  
10 be appropriate for this collaborative to have a face-to-  
11 face meeting after that call and see where the status of  
12 these open issues are and work from there?

13 MR. FIORETTI: I think so.

14 MR. KERN: Does anybody else -- this is  
15 John Kern -- does anybody else have a comment on that? Is  
16 that a reasonable approach?

17 Hearing none, I'm going to assume that it  
18 is.

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

20 John, I can't stress the importance of  
21 performance measurements and all the work that's gone into  
22 this process so far, and I know there's a date out there  
23 to finalize the master test plan, but I just want to make  
24 a point that in my opinion, we will not have performance  
25 measurements in their completeness and they will have to

1 be inserted into the master test plan.

2 MR. LONERGAN: Rod, this is Tom Lonergan.

3 I agree with that. That's not a problem, in my view. You  
4 know, even if we're only 80 or 90 percent there, my goal  
5 is to be able to give whatever we have agreed to to KPMG  
6 and let them begin at least their preliminary work.

7 You know, it would be great if we're at a  
8 hundred percent, and I don't want to discourage the  
9 parties from trying to reach that goal, but I don't think  
10 it is an absolute necessity before we approve at least the  
11 first version of a master test plan.

12 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox again. It's my  
13 understanding that Sal is putting together a matrix that  
14 will have those measures defined that we do have agreement  
15 on and those that we don't, and those that are still  
16 pending process review and that kind of matrix. Is that  
17 correct, Sal?

18 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

19 For Michigan there is already a matrix that  
20 we've shared, Rod, that went out this morning that talks  
21 about the areas of agreement for this particular  
22 collaborative. You may be talking about with respect to  
23 the other states and just developing a common matrix of  
24 all the changes that have been requested.

25 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox again.

1 I have not seen the one that went out this  
2 morning, but I think I was speaking more of the overall  
3 matrix that you were going to work on.

4 MR. McNALLY: Sal, this is Todd McNally  
5 with McLeodUSA.

6 Could you actually maybe have somebody  
7 cross check that distri so everybody that is on the distri  
8 that you sent the other e-mail out could get that summary?

9 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

10 Yeah, we'll make sure, Todd, that you're on  
11 there as well.

12 MR. McNALLY: Great. Thanks.

13 MS. BROWN: This is Francie Brown, and  
14 this is a question, I think, more to Tom Lonergan.

15 Tom, there's going to be a workshop  
16 scheduled in Chicago on the, what, 13th and 14th to review  
17 Ameritech's processes?

18 MR. LONERGAN: I believe, yeah, at least  
19 tentatively scheduled.

20 MS. BROWN: And how do we envision these  
21 open issues working into that workshop process? Would  
22 KPMG -- and this is a workshop for KPMG -- would they ask  
23 Ameritech about the processes that would support these  
24 open issues so that they at least would have the  
25 background, at which point in time they would have

1 information so that when these benchmarks were added into  
2 the MTP, they would already have background? Or how do  
3 you envision that working?

4 MR. LONERGAN: Well, I'll be honest with  
5 you, I don't know what the workshop's actually going to  
6 look like. It's my belief that it would be information  
7 presented to KPMG that is generally available to any CLEC.  
8 It's to give them what they need to know to create the  
9 pseudo-CLEC and begin testing.

10 Obviously, if things are still up in the  
11 air for any CLEC, they should be up in the air for KPMG,  
12 which doesn't preclude a future workshop or some other  
13 method of sharing information once we have closure on some  
14 of those issues.

15 I can't answer it any more specifically  
16 than that. Obviously KPMG can ask any and all questions.  
17 Whether they'll get answers or not, your guess is as good  
18 as mine.

19 MS. BROWN: O.K.

20 MR. KERN: This is John Kern again.

21 Is it reasonable to try and have a meeting  
22 of this collaborative, I'm going to suggest two weeks from  
23 today? That would be Friday, June 2nd. That would give  
24 those companies working on the sub-team an opportunity to  
25 continue to work those issues.

1 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard from  
2 MCI WorldCom.

3 Well, first of all, I'm going to be in a  
4 Bell South collaborative on the 2nd of June. So that  
5 wouldn't work for me.

6 But the main point I want to bring up, in  
7 Indiana we just sort of-- the CLECs that were there, that  
8 included MCI, AT&T, McLeod, Sprint, Warner and Ameritech,  
9 talked about having a regional collaborative. Because  
10 what we're finding now is every week we have a  
11 collaborative to go to. We spend one whole day catching  
12 up the next state on what we did in the three other states  
13 because we're all trying to work on the same thing.

14 We lose time in doing that. We also, in  
15 traveling between all these states, we lose time on  
16 working off line. Particularly, Ameritech has to go back  
17 and check and get its answers. And if Sal is running from  
18 state to state he can't do that for us. And then we have  
19 to take their alternative proposals back and get  
20 resolution. And we just don't have the time with this  
21 running from state to state.

22 So we talked about a way we could  
23 preserve the states' rights and their different  
24 proceedings on dealing with all of this and get this done  
25 as quick as possible and save the wear and tear on the

1 resources in this region, since unlike a lot of the other  
2 regions I have been involved with, all your states are hot  
3 at the same time with collaboratives. And it's just hard  
4 to really make progress.

5 So we talked about meeting in one place  
6 or maybe rotating it to different states occasionally with  
7 all the states' staff that are interested in listening in  
8 while we talk, and then reporting our resolution on not  
9 only the metric issues but ancillary issues and remedies  
10 back to each state and giving each state the open issues  
11 that need to be resolved.

12 Now, there's a push to get the  
13 third-party testing underway. So maybe in these  
14 proceedings we would highlight the issues that we  
15 definitely need to have done, compromises resolved by the  
16 states before that starts.

17 But with that said, I think there are  
18 other issues regarding getting the products and tariffs  
19 and ways to order these new services in place for the test  
20 that I think will be done with the metrics part by a mile  
21 before those things come up for the test actually to  
22 start.

23 So we had talked about starting this with  
24 our week of meetings in, or when we have two days in  
25 Illinois -- I think it's the 6th and 7th -- and maybe

1 expanding on that -- CLECs getting together next week on a  
2 conference call, getting the word out to all the states to  
3 mark up the whole measurements and start talking about  
4 them in Illinois and then just moving on from there.

5 This is the first state other than  
6 Indiana where we have broached this issue. We need to  
7 talk to the other states. But as soon as we can just get  
8 some relief from hopping from here to there and sitting in  
9 one place, we think we can make incredible progress.

10 So if any of the other CLECs that were  
11 there want to add anything or clarify what I have said,  
12 feel free to do so.

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

14 And Karen, I think you did a good job of  
15 summarizing what we discussed in Indiana.

16 MS. KINARD: Thank you.

17 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from  
18 AT&T.

19 AT&T vigorously supports the idea of a  
20 multi-state collaborative. And I think Karen described it  
21 really well. I would just add to the resource issue.

22 There are for many CLECs the same folks  
23 trying to do performance measures and OSS collaboratives  
24 and change management collaboratives and DSL  
25 collaboratives, not just in the Ameritech region but in

1 Dallas with SBC as well. So trying to do things state by  
2 state by state is pretty much killing us.

3 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

4 I guess I would suggest -- I also  
5 obviously support the regional view.

6 I think we can still clean up the issues  
7 that we have here, get them going, and then integrate any  
8 agreements that we have made here as appropriate back to  
9 those at the regional collaborative.

10 But it seems to me we are so close to a  
11 baseline that we can address the Michigan issues somewhat  
12 independently and then move to some of these other issues  
13 into that regional forum and take advantage and go forward  
14 with that.

15 Please don't make any assumption that I'm  
16 not for that regional approach. I am very much for  
17 that. I just think we are very, very close here to having  
18 the baseline that we intended when we started out. And we  
19 probably could close a couple of those issues, in  
20 particular the FOC and completion and the review of the  
21 Michigan order, and move forward here.

22 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

23 Tom or Ann, I don't know what your  
24 thoughts are.

25 I mean on the one hand having a regional

1 process to resolve some of these future performance  
2 measures seems to make a lot of sense.

3 MR. LONERGAN: We were just kind of chit-  
4 chatting off line.

5 I guess I come back to my original  
6 statement. I would like to see closure on the items which  
7 we have agreed on and be able to incorporate those into  
8 our test plan and close that out. Or not close it -- I  
9 guess that's a wrong word -- but proceed with the test  
10 plan.

11 As far as performance metrics or any  
12 other issues that are regional in nature, we tried to get  
13 a regional approach to this in the beginning but found  
14 that it's like herding cats to get these five state  
15 commissions to work together on stuff.

16 But we certainly would support -- if we  
17 can resolve the performance measures for the additional  
18 services and so forth on a five-state basis, wonderful.  
19 We would support that.

20 But I know how much work is going to go  
21 into trying to make that work. You've got five states  
22 with five different processes and different priorities.  
23 But it's certainly worth a try. And we would cooperate.

24 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And this is Ann  
25 Schneidewind.

1                   I would just add that Michigan is in sort  
2 of a peculiar position right now because we actually have  
3 a set of performance measures here that have been adopted  
4 and that I think everybody agrees we don't want KPMG to go  
5 test.

6                   And so to the extent that there is, at  
7 least as Tom suggested earlier, agreement that 80 percent  
8 of those should change in some fashion, I think we need to  
9 go back to our Commission now and get them to adopt that.  
10 And then if there's some regional approach to resolving  
11 the remaining 20 percent, or new measures for new services  
12 or issues like that, clearly I think we talked about  
13 earlier how the Wisconsin process on these so-called A-to-  
14 Y issues, to the extent that there's resolution of many of  
15 those, then just bring back the remaining unresolved  
16 issues for our Commission to rule on.

17                   I think that would be something that  
18 would be very efficient to rule on and staff would be  
19 happy with.

20                   MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

21                   All that considered, I think maybe we  
22 could establish a sub-team call coincident or following or  
23 in addition to a call that we have identified in Illinois  
24 for the 30th, and maybe extend that to talk about these  
25 other issues.

1 I would get proposals out to you before  
2 then on both FOC and completion so you could review it.

3 And we could at least begin sub-team meetings, pick up  
4 another sub-team meeting following our call on the 30th  
5 that we have already scheduled for Illinois.

6 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard with  
7 MCI WorldCom.

8 Will we have the information from the  
9 loop collaborative for the completion one in time for that  
10 meeting? I'm not involved in Wisconsin so I don't know.

11 MR. FIORETTI: I'm not sure. This is Sal  
12 Fioretti again. I'm not sure, but I would take whatever  
13 learnings we had from there and incorporate them. And I  
14 do expect that to be resolved relatively quickly.

15 I thought they met again Wednesday. I'm  
16 not sure what the outcome of that was.

17 MR. KERN: This is John Kern. It's still  
18 open.

19 MR. FIORETTI: Is it? There's a pretty  
20 short fuse on it, though, right.

21 MR. KERN: This is John Kern again.

22 Yes. Wisconsin's effort is to try to  
23 wrap up all those issues. But they have to be -- the work  
24 effort stops on May 31st. And those issues that have  
25 resolution go to the commission as such. Those issues

1 that are still unresolved go to the commission with a  
2 recommendation that they go to hearing on July 18th.

3 But May 31st is the drop-dead date, at  
4 least at this point, for all those issues.

5 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti  
6 again.

7 So, Karen, I would expect that by then we  
8 would have at least a good portion of that if not all of  
9 that done. And we would certainly try to incorporate it.  
10 But it would be a next step anyway and move us toward  
11 this baseline and getting the Michigan-specific issues  
12 addressed.

13 And then we could work to close the rest  
14 of those things up shortly thereafter and move to a  
15 regional approach beyond that.

16 MR. KERN: This is John Kern again.

17 The other thing that I think this  
18 collaborative has to do on its own, at least probably one  
19 of the last work products they have to do on their own  
20 again, is to prepare that filing for the Commission that  
21 Ann has referred to a couple of times to formally ask the  
22 Commission to substitute the measure they have already  
23 adopted in 11830 for the measures that we are proposing  
24 here.

25 And we really need to be thinking about

1       how that filing is going to be made and how soon it can be  
2       made.  And again, I guess I'm looking for an open date for  
3       a conference call or meeting to start working on that  
4       filing, recognizing that we need to incorporate whatever,  
5       any closure of any open issues that we have.

6                       MS. KINARD:  This is Karen Kinard from  
7       MCI WorldCom.

8                       Sal, if you started writing up where we  
9       had agreement now with the matrices attached and also  
10      include any other agreements from working the front and  
11      the back of the metrics in the other states, and then we  
12      could add resolution of these outstanding issues, we have  
13      to have a document to work from before we have another  
14      meeting or call.

15                      And if maybe you could set a time for  
16      when you could get that out and then maybe have the call  
17      or the meeting a week after that.

18                      MR. FIORETTI:  This is Sal Fioretti.

19                      I'm attempting to try to have that put  
20      together prior to the, and it might be minutes prior to  
21      the meeting of the 24th in Wisconsin.  So that I think  
22      that's the list you are looking for, the regional list.

23                      Incorporating that with our list here in  
24      Michigan, because it's a little different, I think I can  
25      try to get what you're looking for out by the 24th, which

1 is next Wednesday.

2 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard from  
3 WorldCom again.

4 I thought we weren't doing measurements  
5 in Wisconsin. That they had so many OSS issues, we were  
6 sort of at the end of the week and might not even be  
7 called on.

8 MR. KERN: Karen, this is John Kern.

9 We are going to have -- we are devoting a  
10 half a day on Wednesday to summarize for Wisconsin  
11 carriers and the Wisconsin staff kind of the status of the  
12 agreed-upon performance measures that all the carriers in  
13 this region have tried to implement. And we're also going  
14 to have a brief discussion on remedies.

15 But we have heard the commission's order  
16 that we have to have some discussion on performance  
17 measures, that that has to be included in the ALJ's draft  
18 report that goes to the commission on May 31st.

19 And I think what Sal is referring to in  
20 term of his matrix and his writeup would be a summary for  
21 the Wisconsin carriers that are not involved in this  
22 process and the Wisconsin staff, so that they have a feel  
23 for the type of conversation and discussion, the issues  
24 that are closed and the issues that are open, so that they  
25 have an understanding of what's going on.

1 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard from  
2 MCI WorldCom.

3 I was just asking for the bridge and the  
4 time of that call. And also I wanted to say that that's  
5 fine for a starting point for the matrices.

6 I don't know, do we need to -- we  
7 probably need to put it in words rather than just filing  
8 matrices in this docket, right?

9 So you're still going to need time to  
10 work on the filing to get it out to us for us to review.

11 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
12 Schneidewind.

13 Is the joint progress or status report  
14 that we have been receiving updates of in some way an  
15 attempt to put words on the matrix?

16 Ameritech.

17 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

18 I would think that it is. Certainly it  
19 contains the summary of where we are.

20 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
21 Schneidewind.

22 Eventually couldn't that just be turned  
23 into "and there is agreement amongst the parties on this  
24 particular measure" and very quickly just say, "therefore,  
25 we jointly ask the Commission to adopt these, and we adopt

1 the following other schedule or propose the following  
2 other schedule for resolution of unresolved issues."

3 MR. DEMPSEY: This is Jack Dempsey.

4 I think that is exactly what would be the  
5 appropriate approach to take based on what you have said.

6 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard again.

7 I hadn't looked at the new version sent  
8 out, but I remembered marking up ones from the first time.  
9 So yeah, we could keep working that one.

10 MS. FENNELL: This is Kelly Fennell.

11 And so you know how we sent this one  
12 back out, as we have gotten markups from MCI and then  
13 CoreComm added to MCI -- and just to talk, real quick  
14 process, I adopted all of those changes in and then did  
15 the markup of Ameritech over that. So hopefully it will  
16 be clear.

17 And where MCI had added something or  
18 CoreComm had added something for a particular -- I put  
19 their name in front of their comments so we would know  
20 where it genesisised from.

21 MR. DENNISTON: This is Jim Denniston.  
22 Why has the caption been changed from 11830 to 12320 on  
23 the draft joint status report?

24 MR. DEMPSEY: Jim, this is Jack Dempsey.

25 That was my suggestion so that no one

1 would have the feeling that we were prepared to make a  
2 filing in the performance measure docket prematurely,  
3 that these discussions in this docket and all of this has  
4 made a lot of progress. It sounds like there's a lot of  
5 closure.

6 So without really having closure on the  
7 actual process for making this filing with the Commission,  
8 it was my suggestion that we send this back out captioned  
9 in this docket just so we can continue to focus positively  
10 and cooperatively on these issues.

11 Now, when we actually get to making the  
12 filing, I think what Tom and Ann have suggested is that  
13 that filing would have to be in 11830 to get the  
14 Commission to modify, adopt, replace, whatever, those  
15 existing measurements.

16 So that was all that was intended. It  
17 was not intended to be any major change, but simply to  
18 continue to move the process forward here and reflect the  
19 agreements that were made here.

20 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
21 Schneidewind.

22 I would agree that this needs to be  
23 docketed in 11830, because to me -- I thought this was a  
24 status report that reflected on the fact that Ameritech  
25 has suspended consideration of a motion that was filed to

1 have the Commission adopt the Texas measures in place of  
2 the ones it had adopted a year ago. And so I would  
3 definitely see this as a status report of the issues in  
4 11830.

5 MR. ISIOGU: This is Orji Isiogu.

6 I understand the concern. But I think it  
7 creates more confusion to switch the docket. I think we  
8 might just as well keep it consistent and keep the case  
9 where it really belongs, with 11830.

10 MR. DEMPSEY: Well, let me follow up --  
11 this is Jack Dempsey -- with what you just said, Ann.

12 Is it your direction that then this joint  
13 status report would be filed separate from some request to  
14 the Commission? Or is this going to be sort of  
15 transmogrified into a motion to the Commission?

16 You know how lawyers think. They are  
17 very --

18 MR. LONERGAN: What was that last word?

19 MR. DEMPSEY: That's from Calvin and  
20 Hobbes.

21 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
22 Schneidewind.

23 I guess I never understood what this  
24 joint status report was about. I'm not suggesting that at  
25 all it be filed frankly in any docket. I thought it was

1 maybe just for the information of the parties to keep  
2 everybody up to date on where we were in this performance  
3 measure collaborative.

4 Certainly to the extent anything is  
5 filed, I think it should be filed in 11830 because that's  
6 where we are asking the Commission to take action.

7 I'm not suggesting that the joint status  
8 report itself be filed anywhere.

9 MR. DEMPSEY: This is Jack Dempsey.  
10 And that's really why. I mean, it's  
11 interesting to talk about why the captions are different.

12 But that's exactly why we didn't want to prematurely put  
13 people on red alert that this was going to be filed  
14 immediately.

15 We still have some obvious discussions to  
16 carry forward. And maybe an appropriate thing would be to  
17 convert this into this joint motion you mentioned with  
18 some more specificity about the exact changes and then  
19 finalize that here in the near term.

20 MR. LONERGAN: That's probably a good  
21 idea.

22 MS. KINARD: This is Karen Kinard from  
23 MCI WorldCom.

24 And whatever we call it, this would be  
25 great, not only here but for what we will eventually go to

1 if we get the regional collaborative going, to just send  
2 out something like this with the updated matrices on  
3 pending issues and putting a cover document with anything  
4 agreed to in that that we can first use here for this  
5 state proceeding, and then keep it going as we continue  
6 working issues.

7 So I think we could just keep working  
8 this document and decide on the heading for whatever  
9 state, whatever.

10 And, Jim Denniston, are you still on the  
11 call?

12 MR. DENNISTON: Yes, I'm here.

13 MS. KINARD: I'm going to have to drop  
14 off, but Janeen is on. But just fill me in. Thanks.

15 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Could Janeen state her  
16 last name, please.

17 MS. SANDERS: This is Janeen Sanders, MCI  
18 WorldCom. I apologize for joining late.

19 MR. LONERGAN: This is Tom Lonergan.

20 Just to summarize, what it sounds like  
21 would make sense is that Ameritech would begin working on  
22 a joint motion -- let's call it that for the time being --  
23 which eventually would be filed in the 11830 docket to  
24 replace, I guess, the current pending motion of Ameritech  
25 to adopt the Texas measures. And this would be submitted

1 jointly on behalf of the collaborative to the Commission  
2 for adoption as soon as it's ready to go.

3 MR. DEMPSEY: Ameritech would agree with  
4 that. We'll do that.

5 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.  
6 How soon do we expect to see that  
7 document?

8 MR. DEMPSEY: This is Jack Dempsey.  
9 Maybe we could take a five-minute break  
10 and figure that out and come back, since I also need a  
11 comfort break.

12 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA.  
13 Just real quick.

14 I think what I heard earlier, Sal was  
15 suggesting that that document, or at least the matrix, be  
16 done by the 24th. And before that call and that  
17 discussion -- I don't know what Sal's schedule is like --  
18 but I think it would help a lot if we had any kind of an  
19 indication ahead of that 24th meeting. To look at that  
20 and review that prior to the meeting would be great, even  
21 if it was half a day or a day, Sal.

22 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

23 As soon as I think I've got it in  
24 reasonable shape, I'll send it out. I'm expecting to try  
25 to spend some time over the weekend doing it.

1 MR. COX: Thanks.

2 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: John, can we take five  
3 minutes?

4 MR. KERN: Take five minutes.

5 (A recess was taken.)

6 - - -

7 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

8 Jack, what have you all decided when we  
9 took a little break?

10 MR. DEMPSEY: This is Jack Dempsey.

11 I think what we're talking about is  
12 preparing a draft joint motion, as the staff has described  
13 it, and to get that out for people to comment on. The  
14 draft obviously, depending on when it would go out, would  
15 be somewhat fluid in nature because there are still issues  
16 being worked by the sub-teams which appear to be able to  
17 be resolved. At least that's the way it sounds.

18 So we're just kicking around a date to  
19 try to get a draft out. And just let me check one second,  
20 here.

21 (There was a pause in the proceedings.)

22 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore from  
23 AT&T.

24 John -- or excuse me -- what is the case  
25 number that the draft joint motion would be filed in?

1 MR. KERN: I believe it would be 11830.

2 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: That's correct. This

3 is Ann Schneidewind.

4 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore.

5 Which is the Ameritech petition?

6 MR. KERN: No. Karen, this is John Kern.

7 No. That's the original docket that the original  
8 performance measures in Michigan were formally approved by  
9 the Commission.

10 MS. MOORE: The May order?

11 MR. KERN: Well, I think there were a  
12 couple orders. But that is the docket number that they  
13 came from.

14 MS. MOORE: So the initial performance  
15 measures docket.

16 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And you're correct,  
17 Karen. The original order was in May of 1999 and then  
18 they amended a few of them in a subsequent order in  
19 September of '99.

20 MR. DEMPSEY: This is Jack Dempsey.

21 Mindful of the coming holiday weekend, I  
22 think what we would shoot for is to get the draft  
23 motion out on Thursday the 25th so people could even  
24 comment back the next day if they wanted to before they  
25 went on their extended vacation.



1 back to -- well, I would encourage everybody to send their  
2 comments to everybody else, but no later than June 1st.

3 And Jack, what was your expectation in  
4 terms of actually filing this with the Commission? When  
5 would you expect to file it? Obviously, based on the  
6 comments you get back from the parties, but when would you  
7 expect to file this with the Commission?

8 MR. DENNISTON: John -- this is Jim  
9 Denniston -- may I interrupt for a moment.

10 I think we should have a counsel  
11 conference to discuss the comments then, because it might  
12 be that there might be some disputes that could be worked  
13 out.

14 MR. KERN: Jim, this is John Kern.

15 I fully agree. I was just trying to  
16 figure out -- our time line is getting really kind of  
17 crowded here. And I was trying to figure out if they had  
18 an expectation of when they would want to file. And we  
19 would have to have at least a conference call before that  
20 to make sure everybody was in agreement with what it said  
21 and how it was said.

22 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: John, this is Ann  
23 Schneidewind.

24 I thought we were going to have one more  
25 discussion somehow or somewhere, aside from the regional

1 approach to future issues, on the sub-team's telephone  
2 call in the next week or so on the few issues that they  
3 are going to take up at that time.

4 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

5 You're absolutely right. And we had  
6 talked about that. But I don't recall anyone saying that  
7 there was a specific time frame that they wanted to do  
8 that.

9 MR. FIORETTI: John, this is Sal  
10 Fioretti.

11 I did propose the 30th. We could also  
12 try to pick a different day.

13 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

14 Well, what is the parties' pleasure?  
15 We'll have Ameritech's draft motion on the 25th. We'll  
16 have comments back by June 1st. Sal is proposing a  
17 conference call of the sub-teams on Tuesday the 30th.

18 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti  
19 again.

20 And from my schedule, John, I can do  
21 something on Friday the 26th as well.

22 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore.

23 For a call?

24 MR. FIORETTI: Yeah, for a call. I was  
25 just intending to go try to piggyback on top of the

1 Illinois call that we already have scheduled on the 30th.

2 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Sal, this is Ann

3 Schneidewind.

4 But this is a sub-team call you're  
5 proposing?

6 MR. FIORETTI: Correct.

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

8 I would prefer the 30th.

9 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore, AT&T.

10 Sal, how long do we have that Illinois  
11 call scheduled for on the 30th?

12 MS. SANDERS: This is Janeen Sanders at  
13 MCI WorldCom.

14 I thought we agreed to 9:00 to 11:00,  
15 Karen, which was the same time frame we had set up for the  
16 last call to red-line.

17 MS. MOORE: 9:00 to 11:00 central time.

18 MS. SANDERS: That's right.

19 MR. FIORETTI: Karen, this is Sal

20 Fioretti again.

21 Maybe we could just expand on it either  
22 end a little bit.

23 MS. MOORE: Well, that's kind of where I  
24 was going.

25 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.



1 How about June 1st, then? Obviously subject to check by  
2 various company SMEs.

3 MR. FIORETTI: John, this is Sal Fioretti.  
4 I could work something in on June 1st in the morning.

5 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.  
6 Karen Moore?

7 MS. MOORE: Thursday, June 1st I'm  
8 available.

9 MR. KERN: Rod Cox?

10 MR. COX: I have a conflict but I'll make  
11 it work.

12 MR. KERN: Do we have CoreComm still on the  
13 phone?

14 I can check with Tom off line.

15 Ann and Tom, does that fit O.K. with your  
16 schedules?

17 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: That's fine.

18 MR. COX: This is Rod Cox again. I guess I  
19 would ask if it could be in the afternoon, would be better  
20 for me.

21 MR. KERN: This is John Kern. Does anybody  
22 have a problem with the call in the afternoon?

23 MR. ISIOGU: This is Orji Isiogu. That's  
24 fine with me.

25 MR. DENNISTON: And John, this is Jim

1 Denniston. We'll have to check with Karen on that.

2 MS. MOORE: This is Karen Moore, AT&T. I'm  
3 available Thursday afternoon, but I'd like to check with  
4 my attorney first, because we're going to talk about the  
5 FOC sub-team and the joint motion, is that correct?

6 MR. KERN: That was my suggestion.

7 MR. FIORETTI: Sal Fioretti. I'll make  
8 Thursday afternoon work.

9 MR. KERN: Let's tentatively plan a call  
10 Thursday afternoon. I will propose 1:00 to 4:00 Central  
11 time, 2:00 to 5:00 Eastern time. I'll get an e-mail out,  
12 and, Jim, you need to check with your SME, and Karen, you  
13 need to check with your attorney, but let's plan that  
14 unless you hear otherwise, O.K.?

15 MS. MOORE: John, this is Karen Moore,  
16 AT&T. Would you please real quickly just review the dates  
17 that we've agreed to for the record? If you prefer, I can  
18 do it.

19 MR. KERN: No. I think -- correct me if  
20 I'm wrong -- this is John Kern -- the dates we've agreed  
21 to is that Ameritech would send out to all parties of the  
22 performance measures collaborative a draft motion that  
23 would attempt to summarize the results of this performance  
24 measures collaborative in terms of measures that we have  
25 agreement on and measures that are still open. That would

1 be produced by Thursday, May 25th.

2 Parties would comment on that -- ah, shoot.

3 MS. MOORE: 6/1.

4 MR. KERN: Yeah, 6/1, but we're going to  
5 have a conference call on 6/1 to talk about it.

6 MR. DENNISTON: John, this is Jim

7 Denniston. I think for those comments we'll just try to  
8 shoot for getting them also done that morning.

9 MR. KERN: Yeah.

10 MS. MOORE: Do we say like 9:00 A.M. and  
11 have a conference call, since you proposed a conference  
12 call, at 1:00 o'clock?

13 MR. KERN: I guess -- this is John Kern --  
14 are people going to have enough time to review various  
15 parties' comments that morning and be able to discuss them  
16 that afternoon?

17 MR. DENNISTON: Again this is Jim  
18 Denniston. I guess we don't know until we see them.

19 MR. COX: And this is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA.

20 I will be on another ROC U.S. West call at  
21 that time. I doubt I'll have time to review them, but  
22 don't stop that because of me.

23 MS. MOORE: Well, is it possible to shoot  
24 for -- this is Karen Moore, AT&T -- possible to shoot for  
25 close of business on --

1 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: On what did you say,  
2 Karen?

3 MS. MOORE: I'm trying to remember if there  
4 are 30 days or 31 days in May.

5 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Thirty-one.

6 MS. MOORE: Thirty-one. On the 31st.

7 MR. DENNISTON: Thirty days hath September.

8 MS. MOORE: April, June and November,  
9 right.

10 MR. DENNISTON: All the rest have 31.

11 MS. MOORE: Except February, which has 28.

12 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Our court reporter is  
13 not putting this in the record.

14 MR. DENNISTON: It's in.

15 MS. MOORE: Thank you.

16 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

17 Karen, are you suggesting that parties try  
18 to get their comments on the draft motion to other parties  
19 by the close of business on the 31st?

20 MS. MOORE: That was my suggestion, yes.  
21 That way it would give everybody a chance to have, you  
22 know, at least have a day to look at it and overnight.

23 MR. KERN: That would be a reasonable  
24 expectation.

25 MR. DENNISTON: This is Jim Denniston.

1                   We will shoot for that. I don't know if we  
2 could make that, but can Ameritech move -- you know, I  
3 know that we've mentioned May 25 as the deadline. If they  
4 can get it out early on the 25th or on the 24th, that  
5 would help.

6                   MR. DEMPSEY: This is Jack Dempsey. We  
7 will definitely shoot for that.

8                   MR. COX: This is Rod Cox, McLeodUSA. I'm  
9 O.K. with that.

10                  MR. KERN: O.K. This is John Kern.  
11 Let me try this schedule one more time.

12 Ameritech will get a draft motion out no later than  
13 Thursday, May 25th.

14                  Parties will respond to that draft motion  
15 no later than the close of business on May 31st.

16                  The sub-team we have set up already will  
17 have a conference call on May 30th to continue to work the  
18 issues that they are working on.

19                  And the next meeting of this performance  
20 measures collaborative will be by conference call on  
21 Thursday, June 1st, 1:00 o'clock Central, 2:00 o'clock  
22 Eastern, lasting until 4:00 o'clock Central, 5:00 o'clock  
23 Eastern, and the topics for conversation for that call  
24 will be a report back from the sub-team on the status of  
25 the issues that they are looking at, and we will begin

1 discussions on the draft motion that this collaborative  
2 would eventually file in Docket No. 11830.

3 Did I hit all the dates?

4 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: John, this is Ann  
5 Schneidewind. Just two questions.

6 Ameritech was going to provide an updated  
7 matrix by May 24th. At least the matrix, is that still --

8 MR. KERN: O.K.

9 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti. The  
10 matrix we were talking about was summary of all the  
11 agreements in all the other states, and again we already  
12 have a matrix of all the agreements here that we've  
13 updated prior to this call. But which matrix are we  
14 referring to for that?

15 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann. I was  
16 talking about the Michigan matrix. Were you going to be  
17 updating that to reflect this call or no?

18 MR. FIORETTI: Again, this is Sal Fioretti.  
19 Yes, we will if it needs to be updated, and, you know,  
20 based on comments from each of the participants. So  
21 please, if you have comments on the matrix we sent out  
22 this morning, get them back to me.

23 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann. The other  
24 question was -- and I know our court reporter is going to  
25 cringe here -- are we going to keep a record of the phone

1 call on June 1st?

2 MR. FIORETTI: On June 1st, that's the big  
3 team call?

4 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: That's correct.

5 MR. FIORETTI: I would suggest yes.

6 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann. I would  
7 agree.

8 MR. DEMPSEY: This is Jack Dempsey.

9 Just something that might help, although  
10 I'm not suggesting that anyone has to do this, but if the  
11 folks would take a look at the joint status report 5/18/00  
12 draft that went out this morning, if there are any  
13 comments on that, obviously to the extent those reflect an  
14 error or something, we'd be more than happy to reflect  
15 that in this draft that would go out on the 25th.

16 So if there are comments on it, feel free  
17 to get those to us so that we could reflect that input.

18 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti.

19 Karen Moore, maybe you and I can talk about

20 -- I'll send an e-mail to Illinois asking them to move  
21 their conference call back from 10:00 to 12:00 and we'll  
22 meet 8:00 to 10:00 on the 30th?

23 MS. MOORE: That sounds great. So

24 basically the call will be from 8:00 to 12:00.

25 MR. FIORETTI: Right.

1 MS. MOORE: O.K. And Sal -- this is Karen  
2 Moore from AT&T -- when you send that e-mail out, would  
3 you please indicate AT&T supported that idea?

4 MR. FIORETTI: O.K.

5 MS. MOORE: Jim Denniston from MCI, do you  
6 think MCI could also lend their support?

7 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti. Maybe  
8 that's a better question for Janeen.

9 MS. SANDERS: I'm sorry, I apologize. I  
10 was called away for a moment. Can you repeat that  
11 question?

12 MR. FIORETTI: Janeen, we've got an  
13 Illinois review call scheduled for the 30th.

14 MS. SANDERS: Yes.

15 MR. FIORETTI: What we're proposing is that  
16 we're going to take that call, move the Illinois portion  
17 back to begin at 10:00 o'clock, go from 10:00 to 12:00,  
18 and we'll tag on a call that we can address these Michigan  
19 issues from 8:00 to 10:00 either on the same bridge or  
20 otherwise. But I'll propose that modification to the  
21 Illinois staff to make sure that they're O.K. with that  
22 and we'll indicate AT&T's support. We were wondering if  
23 we would have MCI's support for that as well.

24 MS. SANDERS: Actually, I think that would  
25 be fine.

1 MS. MOORE: Rod, what about McLeod?

2 MR. COX: McLeod's O.K. with that. This is

3 Rod Cox.

4 MR. FIORETTI: I'll indicate that. Thank  
5 you.

6 MR. KERN: This is John Kern.

7 The last thing I need is a -- I need a  
8 company to volunteer to set up the bridge for our call on  
9 June 1st.

10 MS. MOORE: AT&T would be happy to do that.

11 MR. KERN: Thank you, Karen. If you'd just  
12 send me the calling information as soon as you get it,  
13 I'll get the memo out to the collaborative.

14 MS. MOORE: This is Karen. No problem.  
15 Just to reiterate, Thursday, June 1st, 1:00 to 4:00  
16 Central time.

17 MR. KERN: Right.

18 MS. MOORE: Do you have a suggestion on how  
19 many ports?

20 MR. KERN: I think we've been -- this is  
21 John Kern. I think we've been using 25.

22 MS. MOORE: O.K.

23 MR. KERN: O.K. Or actually 24, because my  
24 understanding is with conference bridges when you go to 25  
25 and higher, it gets complicated.

1 MS. MOORE: O.K.

2 MR. KERN: Does anybody else have anything  
3 else for this group?

4 Hearing none, I thank everybody for their  
5 participation and continued good work and we will talk  
6 again it looks like in about --

7 (The phone bridge beeped.)

8 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: John, you said we're  
9 going to talk again in about what?

10 MR. KERN: No, we'll talk again in a couple  
11 weeks.

12 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Thank you.

13 MR. COX: Thanks, John.

14 (At 11:25 A.M., the proceedings were  
15 adjourned to Thursday, June 1, 2000 at 2:00 P.M.)

16 - - -

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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 Thomas Lonergan at the Mercantile Building, Lansing, Michigan, on May 19, 2000, and that the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true and correct transcript of our said stenographic notes.

---

---

Dated: May 19, 2000

