

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, SEPTEMBER 15, 2000

VOLUME 31

- - -

BEFORE: JOHN KERN, Facilitator, via telephone

PARTICIPANTS

MPSC

ANN SCHNEIDEWIND, MPSC Communications Staff

AMERITECH MICHIGAN

SUSAN FRENTZ, via telephone  
DONALD CALAMIA, via telephone  
JACK DEMPSEY, via telephone  
SAL FIORETTI, via telephone  
JEFF BARTON, via telephone  
JAMES METROPOULOS, via telephone

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS

KAREN MOORE, via telephone  
MIKE KALB, via telephone  
DOUG TRABARIS, via telephone

CORECOMM

TOM O'BRIEN, via telephone

WORLDCOM

JANEEN SANDERS, via telephone  
JAMES DENNISTON, via telephone

NEXTLINK

THERESA POWELL, via telephone

Z-TEL

CLAUDIA EARLS, via telephone

BIRCH TELECOMMUNICATIONS

TIM MOORE, via telephone

KPMG METRICS



7 MR. KERN: O.K. Why don't we go ahead and  
8 get started. Are you ready there, Ann?

9 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Yes, thank you, John.

10 MR. KERN: O.K. This will be a conference  
11 call of the Michigan performance measures collaborative.

12 For the next couple hours we have about five issues to  
13 discuss. This is being transcribed, so before you make a  
14 comment, please identify yourself each time.

15 And Ann, do we want to run down the list of  
16 participants for the record or is that already identified?

17 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: We're all set. Thank  
18 you, John.

19 MR. KERN: O.K.

20 This is Kern again. Let's go to item No.  
21 1.

22 CLECs provided a response to Ameritech's  
23 change management proposal. And I guess the question for  
24 Ameritech is, do you have any reaction to it?

25 MR. FIORETTI: John, this is Sal Fioretti

4160

1 from Ameritech.

2 I got the CLECs' response and my sense is

3 that there are -- probably a couple of the points made

4           there, you know, I wouldn't mind adding some language in  
5           my description of the change management program.  However,  
6           the change management plan that we have -- some of the  
  
7           things that the CLECs listed as things that they want to  
8           change, like, in their proposal they say when changes are  
9           made to OSS systems, the SBC Ameritech PM staff will  
10          review the changes to verify one of the following.  And  
11          then they list three things and expect to get notice when  
  
12          those three things happen.

13                                 And really, all -- two of those three  
14          things where they talk about "data points for existing  
15          measures will not change and the accuracy (unintelligible)  
  
16          stays intact, is business as usual.  Why would I notice  
17          that?

18                                 Data points need to be changed to  
19          accurately depict the existing business rule.  Well, the  
  
20          business rule is not changing.  The measurement is not  
21          going to change.  Something in the background changed and  
22          I expect that's business as usual as well.  I've got to  
23          make sure that that happens.  So I look at that as  
  
24          business as usual as well, and no need for notification.

25                                 Data points have been eliminated.  Well,

4161

1           as far as I'm concerned, that can wait for the six-month

2 review. We can make sure that we don't have any volume on  
3 anything. And in fact the product is gone -- for example  
4 INP -- and therefore I probably don't need to notice them  
5 either. We could take care of that on the six-month  
6 review.

7 I do plan to add some language about the  
8 six-month review and how we expect to handle new products  
9 or services that are introduced. There were some points  
10 in there that I'm going to make some changes to the plan  
11 that to some degree go along with what the CLECs talk  
12 about in the rest of their plan, but not exactly. And I  
13 will provide that before the end of next week back to the  
14 CLECs.

15 We were meeting in Illinois on the 20th  
16 and maybe we could talk about that a little bit then as  
17 well and hope to close on that item. But for the most  
18 part, I'm not certain that there's more notice that needs  
19 to be given. But I will be doing another draft of this  
20 plan.

21 MR. KERN: This is Kern.

22 Any CLECs have a response or a comment to  
23 what Sal indicated?

24 O.K. Well, how soon do you think you  
25 would have a revised version?

1 MR. FIORETTI: I'm hoping that by the  
2 second day of the Illinois collaborative, which is the  
3 20th, I would have that done.

4 I think you just asked me a few hours ago  
5 to provide that on the 21st anyway. So I'll have it by  
6 Wednesday.

7 MR. KERN: O.K. This is Kern again.  
8 That's good.

9 MS. EARLS: This is Claudia Earls with  
10 Z-Tel.

11 We aren't participating in that Illinois  
12 ring of the five-ring circus. Are you going to send out  
13 the changes to the Michigan list?

14 MR. FIORETTI: I'll send it out to that  
15 list as well, Claudia.

16 MS. EARLS: Thank you.

17 MR. KERN: This is Kern again.  
18 Let me just throw out something here real  
19 quick.

20 Ann, are we going to make a filing in  
21 Michigan on the 30th dealing with remedies?

22 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: That's right.

23 MR. KERN: These things we're talking  
24 about now, like change of management, if parties are

25           unable to agree on a change-of-management proposal, we

4163

1           would like to tee that up to the Commission, obviously.

2                         Would you agree with me that the data for

3           that is not the 30th?

4                         MS. SCHNEIDEWIND:  No.  I don't think  
5           that -- this is Anne Schneidewind -- I don't think that  
6           there was anything in the Commission's order that

7           addressed that.  It was the remedy plan that the  
8           Commission, I think, expects to see by September 30th.

9                         MR. KERN:  O.K.  This is Kern again.  So we  
10          do have some time for carriers to continue to work on this  
11          proposal.

12                        MS. SCHNEIDEWIND:  I would say as long as  
13          it does not affect KPMG's testing, because they're going  
14          forward.

15                        MR. FIORETTI:  This is Sal Fioretti.  I  
16          would only suggest that we do, you know, have a document  
17          by which we are expecting to run our change-management  
18          process, and just like anything else, if it changes during  
19          the course, we would probably move ahead.  If it changes,  
20          if we haven't tested it yet, we would test it under the  
21          changed environment.

22                        MR. KERN:  This is Kern.  If Ameritech gets

23 a new draft out the 20th, how long do CLECs need to review  
24 the next version?

25 Hello? How about September 27th?

4164

1 MS. POWELL: I think that works. This is  
2 Nextlink. Theresa.

3 MS. SANDERS: This is WorldCom. I believe  
4 that's fine.

5 MS. EARLS: O.K. with Z-Tel.

6 MR. O'BRIEN: O.K. with CoreComm.

7 MR. KERN: I think -- this is Kern again --  
8 after the 27th we'll see how far apart the parties are,  
9 and I guess at that time we would decide if this issue  
10 needs to be teed up to the Commission.

11 O.K., let's go to the next agenda item,

12 which was Ameritech responding to CLEC deal breakers for  
13 performance measures, and I guess now the question is for  
14 the CLECs. Do you have any response to Ameritech's  
15 reaction to your deal breakers?

16 MR. DENNISTON: John Kern, this is Jim  
17 Denniston. I would like Marsha Emch to address that when  
18 she joins the call.

19 MR. KERN: O.K. This is Kern again.

20 CoreComm, Nextlink, Z-Tel, do you all have

21 any comments?

22 MR. O'BRIEN: John, this is O'Brien. I'm  
23 sorry, this has just been a bad week and we're just not  
24 prepared.

25 MR. KERN: This is Kern again.

4165

1 That's fine. The real reason for doing the  
2 list of deal breakers was to identify where the really big  
3 differences of opinion are.

4 What we need to do is file a remedy plan.  
5 Hey, I'm looking at the Commission's order that was dated  
6 July 17th, and I quote: "The motion reflects a commitment  
7 to present the Commission with the results of the  
8 collaborative workshop on proposed remedies for  
9 performance failures no later than September 30th."

10 So let me just go to the last agenda item,  
11 then, which is preparing for this filing. Do parties --  
12 is the expectation that we would have simultaneous filings  
13 of all remedy plans, or is there another process that  
14 parties would like to use?

15 MR. DENNISTON: John, this is Jim  
16 Denniston. Maybe we'd have a more open discussion if  
17 we're not on the record. Can we go off the record for a  
18 couple moments on this one issue?

19 MR. KERN: Does anybody oppose -- this is

20 Kern -- does anybody oppose going off the record to  
21 discuss this briefly?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. KERN: O.K. Ann, why don't we go off  
24 the record.

25 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: O.K.

4166

1 MR. KERN: We're off.

2 (There was a discussion off the record.)

3 MR. KERN: O.K. This is the schedule  
4 that has been agreed to regarding resolution of the remedy  
5 plan.

6 Staff will file with the Commission on  
7 September 30th informing the Commission that the following  
8 schedule will be used for resolving the issues associated  
9 with the remedy plan.

10 Simultaneous filings on October 16th by  
11 any party wishing to present a remedy plan. And at this  
12 time it's our understanding there are three plans,  
13 Ameritech, the joint CLEC filing, or excuse me, the joint  
14 CLEC plan and a Sprint plan.

15 Thirty days after that parties would file

16 comments on the respective plans. And I believe the date  
17 is November 15th.

18 Thirty days after that the parties would  
19 file reply comments and the date would be December 15th.

20 And then the Commission would decide the issues.

21 Is that accurate?

22 MR. DENNISTON: John Kern, this is Jim  
23 Denniston.

24 Yes. With the one clarification that  
25 there might be a plan that's been offered by Z-Tel that

4167

1 might also be thrown into the mix there.

2 MR. KERN: Fair enough. O.K. This is  
3 Kern again.

4 Let's move on to the next agenda item,  
5 which is Ameritech's response to Worldcom's matrix  
6 regarding quality-of-service rules and performance  
7 measures.

8 Ameritech did respond to the matrix that  
9 WorldCom put together. Does WorldCom or any other CLEC  
10 have a response to Ameritech's comments?

11 MR. DENNISTON: John, this is Jim

12 Denniston again. We are still waiting for Marsha Emch on  
13 that.

14 MS. SANDERS: This is Janeen with  
15 WorldCom, Jim. I'll try and give her another call.

16 MR. KERN: O.K. This is Kern again.  
17 While we're waiting for Marsha to join,  
18 let me move down to the fourth item, which is an update of  
19 the performance measures matrix.

20 Sal, can you give us an update on how  
21 those new measures are going in terms of Illinois and  
22 Ohio.

23 MR. FIORETTI: We had an Illinois call  
24 today and I believe there were four or five items that are  
25 only left as items that the CLECs would want to take

4168

1 forward.

2 There are some issues relative to the  
3 Wisconsin A-to-AA list that we need to resolve, and I  
4 would expect that we'll have final positions on those by  
5 next Thursday.

6 We're meeting in Illinois -- and well, we  
7 talked this morning on the Illinois piece. We are meeting  
8 on Tuesday and Wednesday in Illinois and Thursday in  
9 Wisconsin. The following Tuesday and Wednesday are  
10 currently on the schedule in Ohio.

11 I would expect that by the end of next

12 week at best case and by the end of the following week at  
13 worst case we would have identified any issues that are  
14 outstanding and have yet to be negotiated to a conclusion.

15 MR. KERN: This is Kern.

16 So we could have all issues closed by  
17 September 28th?

18 MR. FIORETTI: That's a possibility.

19 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And John, this is Anne  
20 Schneidewind.

21 We owe the Commission something on that  
22 too, and not by a specific date. But we had proposed to  
23 them that by September 15th we would have resolved issues  
24 regarding performance standards for the new products that  
25 weren't included in our original baseline list. And there

4169

1 certainly is an urgency to change anything on the baseline  
2 list because KPMG is moving forward with it. So I think  
3 this is going to require another filing if we do resolve  
4 this all by September 28th, sort of like the one we filed  
5 in July.

6 MR. KERN: This is Kern.

7 Ann, I think you are absolutely right.  
8 I'm just thinking how best we do that.

9 Do you want to go off the record again

10 and talk scheduling?

11 MR. DENNISTON: Sure.

12 MR. KERN: Anybody opposed? Let's go off  
13 the record.

14 (There was a discussion off the record.)

15 MR. KERN: O.K., let's go back on the  
16 record.

17 Ameritech will be preparing a draft  
18 petition to present to the Commission on new performance  
19 measures that we need Commission action on. The draft  
20 petition and all attachments will be circulated by the  
21 close of business October 4th.

22 We will have another conference call on  
23 October 9th, beginning 1:00 o'clock Eastern, 12:00 o'clock  
24 Central, lasting for two hours, to go over the petition,  
25 and at that time we'll decide when we could file the

4170

1 petition.

2 MR. ISIOGU: Did you say October 4th?

3 MR. KERN: I'm sorry. 12:00 to 2:00  
4 Central, 1:00 to 3:00 Eastern.

5 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: But that's October 9th,  
6 right, John? This is Ann Schneidewind.

7 MR. KERN: This is Kern. Yeah, October  
8 9th.

9 MR. ISIOGU: Thank you.

10 MR. KERN: This is Kern again.  
11 Jim, is Marsha on the call?

12 MR. DENNISTON: I don't believe so.

13 MS. SANDERS: This is Janeen Sanders with  
14 WorldCom. I wasn't able to reach Marsha. Perhaps we can  
15 prepare a response in writing and provide it to the distri  
16 by close of business Monday?

17 MR. FIORETTI: This is Sal Fioretti. I  
18 guess the question is, what are we going to do with the  
19 responses? It's just another item to bring to the  
20 Commission?

21 MS. SANDERS: Have you already sent an  
22 e-mail with your response to the service quality matrix  
23 that we put together?

24 MS. FRENTZ: That was sent out on the 31st  
25 of August.

4171

1 MR. KERN: This is Kern.

2 Sal does raise a good point. Assuming that  
3 there's not a lot of agreement on this, how do we get it  
4 to the Commission for resolution? And do we really want a

5 third filing? Or do we include this in a joint petition  
6 with this one issue being in dispute?

7 MR. DENNISTON: I think the latter, John,  
8 might make sense.

9 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
10 Schneidewind. I agree.

11 MR. DENNISTON: And perhaps in that  
12 petition we could set forth our respective positions, or  
13 at most under separate cover have our respective positions  
14 on that to be filed on the same day whenever the joint  
15 petition is filed.

16 MR. KERN: This is Kern. Then why don't we  
17 do this: If WorldCom could provide a written response to  
18 Ameritech's response, I guess -- that way everybody  
19 understands what the issues are -- I would ask if --

20 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: I'm sorry, John, to  
21 interrupt you, but I thought this is an issue that we want  
22 the Commission to resolve, right?

23 MR. KERN: Yes.

24 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Then I'm not sure, are  
25 we going to allow parties to comment on it? I mean does

4172

1 it belong in a joint petition where we're asking the  
2 Commission to adopt our recommendations on the new

3 performance measures?

4 MR. KERN: Well, this is Kern.

5 This is what I was thinking, and I  
6 apologize and confess I really haven't thought this all  
7 the way through: that we'd make this joint filing in  
8 which we're asking the Commission to adopt new performance  
9 measures that were the subject of further collaboration,  
10 and we would also ask the Commission to resolve this one  
11 issue that's in dispute, which is the WorldCom matrix that  
12 Ameritech disagrees with.

13 And we would ask those parties in support  
14 of the matrix to prepare a section of the joint petition  
15 and Ameritech to prepare a section of the joint petition.

16 So in essence we're asking the Commission to approve  
17 everything that we're asking them to approve, and we'd  
18 also be asking the Commission to resolve the one issue in  
19 dispute.

20 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And this is Ann. Could  
21 you go over for me -- I'm sorry, I'm missing all these  
22 different points here -- what this one issue is that's in  
23 dispute?

24 MR. KERN: This is Kern.

25 WorldCom had presented a matrix at the last

1 collaborative showing or arguing that Ameritech's  
2 performance in terms of provisioning some of these  
3 services needs to be at such a level that the CLEC is  
4 found not to be in compliance with the state quality-of-  
5 service standard.

6 Did I say that right, Jim?

7 MS. SANDERS: That's correct, John. This  
8 is Janeen with WorldCom.

9 We were basically using the matrix to point  
10 out the discrepancy between the Michigan state regulations  
11 and the existing Ameritech performance measures.

12 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann. How can we  
13 -- if the Commission, let's say, adopts WorldCom's  
14 position on this, all we have presented to them is the  
15 complete set of performance measures, along with the  
16 business rules and everything else, that do not include  
17 these provisions at all. It's not like we're developing  
18 two complete sets of business rules here.

19 MR. DENNISTON: Ann, this is Jim Denniston.  
20 What would you suggest? Would you suggest that maybe on  
21 that day we support -- we file comments in support and  
22 then 10 days later file response comments under a  
23 specifically-agreed-upon schedule?

24 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Well, I guess what I'm  
25 trying to deal with is the fact that we're jointly

1 proposing that the Commission adopt something that we're  
2 not jointly proposing that they adopt.

3 Do you see what I'm saying? In other  
4 words, if the Commission were to adopt WorldCom's  
5 proposal, then the measures and the business rules that  
6 will be delineated in this filing are not what WorldCom  
7 wants the Commission to adopt, right?

8 MR. DENNISTON: Yeah.

9 MR. KERN: This is Kern.

10 Jim, why don't you and Janeen and Marsha  
11 caucus off line to see how you want to handle this issue.

12 MR. DENNISTON: Well, I mean, we are  
13 going to need a Commission order to resolve it one way or  
14 the other. The question is, how do we get the Commission  
15 order? And I would think one possibility would be to  
16 submit comments in this case, maybe file an initial round  
17 of comments the same day we file the joint motion, and  
18 maybe by agreement 10 days later, or something like that,  
19 file response comments and then let the Commission resolve  
20 it.

21 It might be that by the time the  
22 Commission issues its order with respect to the joint  
23 filing it might also in the same order reach resolution

24 as to the service quality issues.

25 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Jim, this is Ann.

4175

1 What I'm saying is that the two motions  
2 or the two parts of this motion conflict with each other.

3 You're saying, Commission, adopt this standard which,  
4 let's say, has some kind of a benchmark in it. But then  
5 the other Part 2 of this filing says, but the benchmark  
6 should be different because you should have 50 days with a  
7 minimum of 40 days because of the quality-of-service  
8 standard.

9 So I mean how can they act on the one  
10 motion without first resolving this other issue?

11 MR. DENNISTON: Or maybe the joint motion  
12 would be to choose one or the other based on the comments  
13 to be filed.

14 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: But I don't think  
15 we're presenting them with a complete alternative here.  
16 We're not putting forth business rules that would allow  
17 them to adopt one set or the other. So it almost seems to  
18 me that we have to take this up prior to the submission of  
19 the measures themselves.

20 MR. DENNISTON: O.K.

21 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Am I missing

22 something?

23 MR. DENNISTON: No. I think you're

24 right. So maybe we have the cart before the horse.

25 MR. KERN: This is Kern again.

4176

1 Jim, how do you suggest we resolve it?

2 Do you want to tee this issue up first?

3 MR. DENNISTON: Well, from what Ann is

4 saying, from necessity we have to tee it up first.

5 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And again, is there

6 anybody that sees it differently?

7 Sal Fioretti, doesn't one conflict with

8 the other?

9 MR. FIORETTI: Well, they do in that you

10 would have to modify the business rules should you --

11 should there be specific measures that need to have some

12 minimum performance standards. Because everything that

13 was on WorldCom's matrix was a parity comparison. So

14 basically in the standard today it says parity comparison

15 with whatever their associated retail product or service

16 is.

17 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: So if the Commission

18 adopted the motion that maintained this parity comparison,

19 but then they said but now go back and modify this to

20 reflect the adoption of MCI's proposal, then we're going  
21 to have yet another order before we have measures that we  
22 can really turn over to KPMG.

23 MR. KERN: Where is that background  
24 coming from?

25 MR. ISIOGU: It's not me.

4177

1 MR. KERN: This is Kern.

2 It sounds like maybe we should shift  
3 focus here. And the joint petition would be teeing this  
4 issue up for dispute resolution and we would be holding  
5 off asking the Commission to adopt new measures, is that  
6 correct?

7 MR. DENNISTON: That's what appears to be  
8 the most logical way of dealing with it.

9 MR. KERN: O.K. Given the fact that we  
10 know the parties' positions, how long do you think it's  
11 going to take to produce this joint petition asking the  
12 Commission to resolve the issues? And this is Kern  
13 again. I guess I'm asking WorldCom and Ameritech how  
14 long will it take you to draft your respective positions?

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

17 Well, first I think we would expect to  
18 get some response from WorldCom. I think that's what we  
19 talked about, right?

20 MS. SANDERS: This is Janeen with  
21 WorldCom.

22 Yes. We can provide a response by close  
23 of business on Monday.

24 MS. FRENTZ: This is Susan Frentz. I  
25 don't know if I'm on the record or not, and not that it

4178

1 matters.

2 But this proposal from MCI that at this  
3 point in the game says that they would like to modify  
4 things that are at parity --

5 MR. TRABARIS: Hi, everyone. This is  
6 Doug Trabaris and Karen Moore. We are beyond late.

7 MS. FRENTZ: Anyhow, as I was saying --  
8 this is Susan Frentz -- this proposal that MCI has  
9 proposed somewhat late in the game, as far as changing  
10 rules that relate to parity, actually it also impacts  
11 Phase 1 which has been approved by the Commission. It's  
12 not just Phase 2, performance measurements.

13 MR. FIORETTI: It actually is only Phase  
14 1, as I recall.

15 MS. FRENTZ: So continuing with that, I  
16 don't know that Phase 2 measurement needs to be delayed,  
17 or the cart before the horse or whatever.

18 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Jim Denniston, this is  
19 Ann Schneidewind.

20 Is it your feeling that this has to be  
21 addressed before we can go ahead? As Susan suggests, we  
22 have already adopted these baseline measures. Given the  
23 number of proceedings that the Commission has going on  
24 right now in regard to quality of service, is this  
25 something that you feel has to be addressed before we can

4179

1 adopt the measures for the new services that we hadn't  
2 addressed in July?

3 MR. DENNISTON: I don't have a definitive  
4 answer. But if it is the case, then Susan has a good  
5 point.

6 MS. FRENTZ: This could be teed up at any  
7 point.

8 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And in fact, Jim, one  
9 of the proceedings that the Commission has just initiated  
10 is to address an entire redo of Ameritech's quality-of-  
11 service measures. And perhaps this is an issue that needs  
12 to be addressed in that kind of a forum.

13 MS. FRENTZ: This is Susan Frentz.  
14 Or at least until those are resolved or  
15 completed.

16 MR. DENNISTON: Yeah. This is something  
17 that I have to discuss with Marsha.

18 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Well, Jim, this is  
19 Ann.

20 Can we go back to the proposal that we  
21 had for filing the joint motion?

22 MR. DENNISTON: Sure.

23 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: And then if there's a  
24 position that you take that this has to be addressed  
25 before we can go forward on anything else, then you could

4180

1 advise us quickly. But otherwise we could stick with this  
2 October 4th and October 9th date.

3 MR. DENNISTON: Yeah. Why don't we stick  
4 with those dates unless you hear from us otherwise.

5 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: Thank you.

6 MR. KERN: O.K. This is Kern.

7 That pretty much covers everything on the  
8 agenda.

9 And Doug and Karen from AT&T, we  
10 appreciate your contribution.

11 MS. MOORE: I apologize. I can't

12 apologize enough.

13 MR. TRABARIS: Sal should be happy we  
14 didn't say anything.

15 MR. KERN: Anything else?

16 MR. MOORE: John, this is Tim Moore from  
17 Birch.

18 The question that I have, and I don't know  
19 if it's pertinent to this discussion or not, but a lot of  
20 our concerns with the performance measures is related to  
21 the 271 amendment and will UNE combinations actually be  
22 tariffed or will they be secured through the amendment to  
23 the interconnection agreement?

24 And my understanding is that if it's not  
25 tariffed, that the performance measures that we're

4181

1 discussing and talking about here would not be applicable  
2 to those UNE combinations. And that was a concern for us.

3 I just wanted to pop that on the table  
4 here. Are we correct in understanding that? And if  
5 whatever performance measures we agree to during the  
6 collaborative and if the ruling comes out where indeed UNE  
7 combinations should be tariffed, would these performance

8 measures then be carried forward to apply to those  
9 combinations as well?

10 MS. SCHNEIDEWIND: This is Ann  
11 Schneidewind.

12 I think in the past where performance  
13 standards and an interconnection agreement have differed  
14 from what the Commission has adopted, Ameritech has still  
15 been bound by the performance standards that have been  
16 adopted by the Commission. And additionally, if they  
17 wanted to do what's in an interconnection agreement, they  
18 can do so.

19 I mean these were negotiated agreements  
20 that I'm talking about. But the Commission has adopted  
21 these standards in the past as standards that Ameritech  
22 must comply with, period.

23 MR. MOORE: O.K. That's helpful, thank  
24 you.

25 MR. KERN: Anything else?

4182

1 O.K. Thank you everybody. Doug and  
2 Karen, give me a call and I'll fill you in.

3 MR. TRABARIS: Thank you, John.

4 (At 3:05 P.M., the hearing was adjourned  
5 to 1:00 P.M., Monday, October 9, 2000.)

6

- - -

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4183

C E R T I F I C A T E

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that we reported stenographically the foregoing proceedings had in the within-entitled matter, being Case No. U-12320 before John Kern, Facilitator, at the Mercantile Building, Lansing, Michigan, on September 15, 2000, and that the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true and correct transcript of our said stenographic notes.

---

---

Dated: September 15, 2000