

Ernst & Young LLP

**Ameritech Michigan
Michigan 271 Performance
Measurement Examination**

Supplemental Report

**Operational Support Systems (OSS)
Performance Measurement Examination
For the months of March, April, and May 2002**

September 23, 2002

Michigan 271 Performance Measurement Examination

Background

SBC Ameritech (“AIT”) requested an independent assessment of AIT’s performance measurement policies, practices, and processes used in the reported performance results based on the approved Performance Metrics and Standards in accordance with the Michigan Public Service Commission’s Orders in Case Nos. U-11830 and U-12320, and referred to as Version 1.8_09_2001 (“Business Rules”). The purpose was to evaluate whether AIT’s performance results were calculated and reported accurately and in compliance with the Business Rules. This independent assessment was performed in accordance with the Michigan Public Service Commission’s (“MPSC”) Master Test Plan, Version 3.0, dated April 2, 2002. To accomplish this objective, Ernst & Young (“E&Y”) performed the following attestation examination engagements in accordance with the attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants:

1. Attestation Examination of the Accuracy and Completeness of SBC Ameritech’s Performance Measurements for the Months of March, April, and May 2002 in accordance with the Business Rules
2. Attestation Examination of the Effectiveness of Controls over SBC Ameritech’s Process to Calculate Performance Measurements for the Months of March, April, and May 2002
 - a. Reports listed in 1 and 2 cover the following Master Test Plan Sections: certain aspects of PMR 1 (data collection only), and all of PMR 4 and PMR 5.
 - b. Reports covered the 149 Performance Measurements (“PMs”), as contained in the Business Rules.
 - c. Testing Approach.
 - i. Documentation of the Process and Controls to Capture, Calculate, and Report Each Performance Measurement.
 - ii. Site Visits and Testing of Processes to Capture PM Data.
 - iii. Program Code Review – Review of Code to determine Business Rules were appropriately applied.
 - iv. Transaction Testing – Statistical sampling of transactions for each performance measurement category to verify that raw data from the source systems was appropriately processed (i.e., Business Rules coding was appropriately applied and data was accurate) and captured in the PM reporting files (i.e., appropriately included/excluded in PM).
 - v. Recalculations – Utilizing Detailed Processed Data Files (i.e., after application of Business Rules), E&Y recalculated the numerator,

denominator, and result for each level of disaggregation for each PM reported upon. Additionally, E&Y selected a sample of PMs to recalculate the z-scores.

- vi. Analytical Review – Fluctuations in each PM disaggregation were analyzed to determine the reasonableness of reported results.

Scope and Approach Summary

E&Y performed procedures necessary to evaluate and validate the data collection processes used by AIT in reporting on its performance measures for Michigan for the months of March, April, and May. Our testing did not evaluate or determine whether AIT has “passed” specific performance measures. Rather, we focused on whether the underlying process AIT used to collect and process data used in measuring its performance was accurate in all material respects in accordance with the Business Rules.

For PMs based on mechanized systems, our approach included a review of the underlying programming code, as well as transaction testing of the underlying data. As a result of this type of approach, error conditions not otherwise uncovered through transaction testing samples are subjected to the testing processes involved in programming code verification.

Scope and Approach

Our examination tested the Operational Support Systems (“OSS”) utilized by AIT and competing local exchange carriers (“CLECs”) for processing transactions, systems used for collection of performance measure data, and the performance measure reporting systems. In addition, our examination included a review of the manual processes utilized by AIT in generating performance measures.

Our examination covered the 149 performance measurements as identified in the Business Rules (see Appendix A for a listing of PMs included in the scope of the engagement). The procedures performed were in accordance with the MPSC’s Master Test Plan as outlined below.

Process Flows and Activity Dictionaries

For the PMs identified in Appendix A, E&Y validated the integrity of data used throughout the PM generation process by reviewing each of the significant applications where data originates, was stored, or was reported on PMs. For each application, E&Y identified the various transaction types and systems utilized that directly impact the reported PMs. Upon identification of transaction types, E&Y then determined how each transaction type was initiated, captured by AIT’s OSS, and processed through AIT’s OSS and PM reporting systems. This process also identified where and how AIT applies the Business Rules to each transaction and which intermediate applications house specific PM information.

Once the above information was obtained for each PM under review, E&Y created process flowcharts and activity dictionaries. The purpose of the process flows was to document E&Y's understanding of the data flow for each PM and each transaction type. The purpose of the activity dictionaries was to provide supplemental information regarding the process flows identifying critical controls and data inputs and outputs to each system utilized throughout the process. The procedures performed in developing the Process Flows and Activity Dictionaries covered Master Test Plan Sections: PMR 1 (data collection only), PMR 4, and PMR 5.

Site Visits

For the PMs identified in Appendix A, E&Y identified all manual processes utilized by AIT in generating performance measures. This portion of the review included site evaluations at AIT's Local Operations Center, Local Service Centers, Maintenance Centers, and retail call centers and field visits with AIT technicians within Michigan (see Appendix C). During these visits, we observed various transactions including the process by which customers switch local telephone service providers, the service order entry process, issuance of trouble tickets to the field forces, and the manner in which AIT's technicians actually complete their assigned work and code transactions within the system, including jeopardy codes. Additionally, during these visits we interviewed location managers and obtained all relevant operational documentation including education and training policies and procedures, quality assurance policies and procedures, and employee hiring and review processes and procedures.

The purpose of the site visit was to document E&Y's understanding of the manual processes and procedures and to document controls over these manual processes of data input. Additionally, the transaction observation data collected by E&Y during the site visit was used to validate the transaction information in the front-end systems. Errors noted in this testing are described in Attachment A to E&Y's Attestation Report. The procedures performed in developing the site visit and the transaction tests performed covered Master Test Plan Sections: PMR 1 (data collection only) and PMR 4.

Performance Measure Code Review

For the applicable PMs in Appendix A, E&Y reviewed the respective programming code that contained the Business Rules (exclusions, inclusions, calculation of the numerator and denominator, and disaggregation rules) within the front-end, intermediate, or reporting systems. E&Y tested the corresponding manual processes. E&Y compared the code and manual processes to the Business Rules for each PM to determine whether AIT's processes were designed to apply the Business Rules properly. In addition, all changes made to programming code were reviewed for propriety and to ensure processes and controls were modified to support the code changes. The procedures performed in the PM code review cover Master Test Plan Sections: PMR 2, 3, 4, and 5. Errors noted in this testing are described in Attachment A to E&Y's Attestation Report.

To validate the results of the code review, E&Y performed significant transaction testing and analytical review procedures as described below to determine that the program code was functioning as designed.

Transaction Testing

For each of the applications identified through the creation of the process flows, E&Y identified systems that receive underlying transaction data before the Business Rules (exclusion, inclusion, calculation of numerator and denominator, and disaggregation rules) were applied (i.e., raw data). For each system and transaction type, E&Y either selected a statistical sample of transactions (described below) from the period under examination (i.e., March through May 2002) or, where volumes were low, performed a 100 percent validation of the PM results for the period under examination.

For each sample transaction chosen, E&Y determined if the Business Rules were applied properly to either include or exclude the transaction from the PM results. For each sample transaction, E&Y manually applied the Business Rules and determined if the transaction should be included or excluded. For the sample transactions that were determined to be included in the PM result, E&Y then determined the appropriate PM level of disaggregation and reviewed the calculation of the numerator and denominator. E&Y then determined if the included sample transaction was included in the correct month and disaggregation of the posted PM results. Additionally, E&Y agreed PM-related data elements from the sampled transaction to the data included in the PM results. For those transactions that were determined to be excluded, E&Y documented why the transaction was excluded according to the Business Rules. E&Y then determined that the sampled transaction was not included in the PM results. See Appendix B for transaction testing results.

Additional testing was performed to determine that all data files were appropriately transferred between systems and that no data was lost during the process of generating and reporting PMs.

The procedures performed for the transaction testing covered Master Test Plan Sections: PMR 4 and 5.

The extent of testing and results thereof are included in Appendix B and the nature of the errors is discussed in Attachment A to E&Y's Attestation Report.

Transaction Testing – Sampling Approach

E&Y's sampling techniques are further described below:

Based on the understanding of each PM's process flow, including systems utilized and types of transactions processed, E&Y obtained the underlying PM data for the months of March, April, and May 2002 from the relevant OSS before Business Rules were applied. Once this data was obtained, the data was then separated into wholesale and retail data for each PM (only wholesale data was obtained for PMs that were benchmark measures) in order to determine the total population size for each PM/transaction type.

If the population size is greater than 5,000 transactions, a random sample of 260 transactions was chosen in order to make the following statistical observations: If we found 0 errors in a sample of 260, there is a 93% probability that the error rate in the population is less than 1%. If we found 1 error in a sample of 260, we can say with 96.7% probability that the error rate in the population is less than 2%. Finally, if the error rate in the sample is 1% but we could tolerate 4%, a sample of 260 would give us 95% reliability or confidence.

If the population size is less than or equal to 5,000, a random sample of 40 was chosen in lieu of judgmental sample selection in order to make the following statistical observations: If we reviewed a sample of 40 and found 0 errors, we can say with 92% probability that the error rate in the population is less than 6%. If we found 1 error in a sample of 40, we can say with 92% probability that the error rate in the population is less than 10%, and less than 12% with 96% probability.

If error rates greater than the anticipated error rates were found during testing, E&Y considered expanding testing to determine the nature of the error and assessed the results of that testing in our planned procedures.

Performance Measure Recalculations

For the PMs identified in Appendix A, E&Y obtained the data from the AIT intermediate systems for March, April, and May 2002 that contained the underlying data after the Business Rules were applied. E&Y then recalculated the PM results for each PM reviewed for March, April, and May 2002. Additionally E&Y recalculated the corresponding z-scores. Results were then compared with the results originally posted on the CLEC website for each month.

The recalculation of the PM results included summarizing numerator and denominator information by disaggregation and then recalculating (dividing numerator by denominator) the results. For each PM, the recalculation for each disaggregation was validated to the PM Business Rule documentation for completeness of reporting all disaggregations for a PM. The procedures performed for PM recalculation testing covered Master Test Plan Sections: PMR 4 and 5.

Errors noted in this testing are described in Attachment A to E&Y's Attestation Report.

Performance Measure Analytical Review

For each PM reviewed, as identified in Appendix A, E&Y conducted an analytical review to evaluate the reasonableness of reported results. This review analyzed transaction volumes, fluctuations in results, and reasons for parity or out-of-parity results for the period under examination. The procedures performed for PM recalculation testing covered Master Test Plan Sections: PMR 4 and 5.

Errors noted in this testing are described in Attachment A to E&Y's Attestation Report.

Restatement Testing

E&Y reviewed AIT's processes and procedures for making restatements and communicating results to external parties. For each PM, E&Y validated the reason each restatement was made and determined that all restatements to PM results were communicated via the CLEC website. E&Y reviewed the explanation of the change in the PM result, determined the impact of the restatement on our testing approach, and reported restatements as exceptions to compliance with the Business Rules in our Attestation Report. The procedures performed for the restatement testing covered Master Test Plan Sections: PMR 4 and 5 and certain aspects of PMR 3.

Errors noted in this testing are described in Attachment A to E&Y's Attestation Report. To the extent errors identified in our testing were included in restatements made after our testing and before the issuance of our report, we tested to determine the transaction processes were corrected through programming code review and selected manual processing testing.

Reporting

The results of our procedures and testing are noted within our attestation examination reports. Any material¹ exceptions to compliance with the PM Business Rules are detailed in our report. Corrective action taken by the Company (i.e., accuracy of restated results or new controls) is also reported. Separate reports will be issued as noted below:

1. Attestation Examination of the Accuracy and Completeness of SBC Ameritech's Performance Measurements for the Months of March, April, and May 2002
2. Attestation Examination of the Effectiveness of Controls over SBC Ameritech's Process to Calculate Performance Measurements for the Months of March, April, and May 2002

¹ Exceptions are considered to be material if the exception has greater than a plus or minus five percent impact on the reported performance measure or if parity/benchmark result is impacted.

Appendix A – Testing Universe of PMs

Measure #	Measure Name
Pre-Ordering/Ordering	
1.1	Average Response Time for Manual Loop Make-Up Information
1.2	Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders
2	Percent Responses Received Within "X" Seconds - OSS Interfaces
4	OSS Interface Availability
5	Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned Within "X" Hours
5.2	Percentage of Unsolicited FOCs by Reason Code
6	Average Time To Return FOC
7	Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System
7.1	Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day Of Work Completion
8	Average Time to Return Mechanized Completions
9	Percent Rejects
10	Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 hour of receipt of reject in Mor
10.1	Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of receipt of Order
10.2	Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
10.3	Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
10.4	Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices (prev. MI 1)
11	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects
11.1	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface
11.2	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process
12	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy
13	Order Process Percent Flow Through
13.1	Total Order Process Percent Flow Through
Billing	
14	Billing Accuracy
15	Percent of Accurate and Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills Via EDI or BDT
16	Percent of Usage Records Transmitted Correctly
17	Billing Completeness
18	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)
19	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness
20	Unbillable Usage
Miscellaneous Administrative	
21.1	Average Time Placed on Hold at LSC
22	Local Service Center (LSC) Grade Of Service (GOS)
24.1	Average Time Placed on Hold at LOC
25	Local Operations Center (LOC) Grade Of Service (GOS)
Provisioning - Resale POTS	
27	Mean Installation Interval

Appendix A – Testing Universe of PMs

Measure #	Measure Name
28	Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date
29	Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
30	Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates Due To Lack Of Facilities
31	Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates Due To Lack Of Facilities
32	Average Delay Days For Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
33	Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 days
35	Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (1-30) of Installation
Maintenance - Resale POTS	
37	Trouble Report Rate
37.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
38	Percent Missed Repair Commitments
39	Receipt To Clear Duration
40	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours
41	Percent Repeat Reports
42	Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access)
Provisioning - Resale Specials & UNE Loop And Port Combinations	
43	Average Installation Interval
44	Percent Specials Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date
45	Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
46	Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation
47	Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates Due To Lack Of Facilities
48	Average Delay Days for Missed Due Dates Due to Lack Of Facilities
49	Average Delay Days For Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
50	Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 days
Maintenance - Resale Specials & UNE Loop And Port Combinations	
52	Mean Time To Restore
53	Percent Repeat Reports
54	Failure Frequency
54.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
Provisioning - Unbundled Network Elements	
55	Average Installation Interval
55.1	Average Installation Interval - DSL
55.2	Average Installation Interval - LNP with a Loop
55.3	Percent xDSL-Capable Loop Orders Requiring the Removal Load Coils and or Repeaters
56	Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date
56.1	Percent Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date
58	Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
59	Percent Trouble Reports within 30 Days of Installation
60	Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates Due To Lack Of Facilities
61	Average Delay Days for Missed Due Dates Due To Lack Of Facilities

Appendix A – Testing Universe of PMs

Measure #	Measure Name
62	Average Delay Days For Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates
63	Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 days
Maintenance - Unbundled Network Elements	
65	Trouble Report Rate
65.1	Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
66	Percent of Missed Appointments
67	Mean Time to Restore
68	Percent Out of Service <24 Hours
69	Percentage of Reports Percent Repeat Reports
Interconnection Trunks	
70	Percentage of Trunk Blockage (Call Blockage)
70.1	Trunk Blocking Exclusions
70.2	Percentage of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)
71	Common Transport Trunk Group Blockage
73	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks
74	Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks
75	Percentage Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 Days - Interconnection Trunks
76	Average Trunk Restoration Interval - Interconnection Trunks
77	Average Trunk Restoration Interval for Service Affecting Trunk Groups
78	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval
Directory Assistance & Operator Services	
79	Directory Assistance Grade Of Service
80	Directory Assistance Average Speed Of Answer
81	Operator Services Grade Of Service
82	Operator Services Speed Of Answer
83	Percentage of Calls Abandoned
Local Number Portability	
91	Percent of LNP Due Dates within Industry Guidelines
92	Percentage of Time the Old Service Provider Releases the Subscription Prior to the Expiration of the Second 9 Hour (T2) Timer
93	Percentage of Customer Accounts Restructured by the LNP Due Date
95	Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes
96	Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders
97	Percentage of Time Ameritech Applies the 10-digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date
98	Percentage Trouble LNP (I-Reports) in 30 Days
99	Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates (For Stand-Alone LNP Orders)
100	Average Time of Out of Service for LNP Conversions
101	Percent Out of Service < 60 minutes

Appendix A – Testing Universe of PMs

Measure #	Measure Name
911	
102	Average Time To Clear Errors (Reported in IL, IN, OH, WI)
MI 6	Erred Customer Record Update Files Not Returned by Next Business Day (Reported in MI)
103	Percent Accuracy for 911 Database Updates (Facility-Based Providers) (Reported in IL, IN, OH, WI;)
MI 7	Errors in Customer Record Update Files (Reported in MI)
104	Average Time Required to Update 911 Database (Facility Based Providers) (Reported in IL, IN, OH, WI)
MI 8	Customer Record Update Files Not Updated by the Next Business Day (Reported in MI)
104.1	The average time it takes to unlock the 911 record
Poles, Conduit & Right of Way	
105	Percentage of Requests Processed Within 35 Days
106	Average Days Required to Process a Request
Collocation	
107	Percent Missed Collocation Due Dates
108	Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates
109	Percent of Requests Processed Within the Established Timelines
Directory Assistance Database	
110	Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs
111	Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs
112	Percentage DA Database Accuracy For Manual Updates
113	Percentage of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process Without Manual Intervention
Coordinated Conversions	
114	Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1	CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval
115	Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers
115.1	Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports
115.2	Mean Time to Restore - Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)
NXX	
117	Percent NXXs loaded and tested prior to the LERG effective date
118	Average Delay Days for NXX Loading and Testing
119	Mean Time to Repair
Bona Fide Request Process (BFRs)	
120	Percentage of Requests Processed Within 30 Business Days
121	Percentage of Quotes Provided for Authorized BFRs Within 45 Business Days
Additional Measures	
MI 2	Percentage of Orders given Jeopardy Notices within 24 hours of the Due Date
MI 3	Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval
MI 4	Average Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement

Appendix A – Testing Universe of PMs

Measure #	Measure Name
MI 5	Structure Requests Completed Outside of Interval
MI 9	Percentage Missing FOCs
MI 10	Percent Time-Out Transactions
MI 11	Average Interface Outage Notification
MI 12	Average Time to Clear Service Order Errors
MI 13	Percent Loss Notification w/in 1 Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 14	Percent Completion Notifications Returned w/in "x" hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket
MI 15	Change Management
MI 16	Percentage Rejected Query Notices
WI 1	Percent No-Access for UNE Loops - Provisioning
WI 2	Percent No-Access for UNE Loops - Maintenance
WI 9	Percent Facility Modification Orders
CLEC WI 1	Average Delay in original FOC due Date
CLEC WI 4	Accuracy of Processing CLEC Corrections based on review of Directory Information
CLEC WI 5	Percentage of Protectors not moved after Technician Visit
CLEC WI 6	FMOD Process: Percent of Form A received w/in the interval
CLEC WI 7	FMOD Process: Percent of Form B, C, D, and E received w/in 72 hours of Form A
CLEC WI 8	FMOD Process: Percent of Form B returned FOC within 24 hours
CLEC WI 9	FMOD Process: Percent of Form C return quote w/in the interval
CLEC WI 11	FMOD Process: Percent Due Date Met
IN 1	Percent Loop Acceptance Test Completed on or Prior to the Completion Date

Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results

Pre-Ordering

E&Y selected the following random samples from the systems/interfaces listed below to test the accuracy and completeness of the Pre-order PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Loop Qual. System – 40 wholesale and 40 retail transactions
- Ordering and Billing Forum (“OBF”) Adapter Local Service Order Guide 5 (“LSOG”) – 260 wholesale transactions
- Ameritech Enterprise Messaging Service (“AEMS”) LSOG 1 – 260 wholesale transactions
- EDI/CORBA Transaction Tables LSOG 4 – 260 wholesale transactions
- Web Verigate LSOG 4 – 260 wholesale transactions
- TCNet LSOG 1 – 40 wholesale transactions
- Exchange Access Control & Tracking System (“EXACT”) – 60 wholesale transactions

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included¹	Properly Excluded²	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
1.1	80	77	3	0	1
1.2	Note 1				
2	1,080	477	526	77	41
IN 1	60	40	20	0	1
MI 10	1,080	504	496	80	17
MI 16	1,080	504	496	80	7

Note 1 – Transaction testing was not performed for this PM due to issues identified in the other testing procedures that indicated this PM was not calculated correctly. Alternative procedures were employed to allow for exception reporting.

¹ As utilized throughout this document, the term “properly included” refers to the fact that the detailed transaction record selected from the source system prior to the application of any Business Rules was tested and determined to be appropriately included in the file utilized to prepare the monthly PM results based on the application of the Business Rules. Additionally, the transaction data (i.e., start times, end times, etc.) was accurately captured and transferred to the reporting systems, and interval calculations related to the transaction, if applicable, were accurately performed.

² As utilized throughout this document, the term “properly excluded” refers to the fact that the detailed transaction record selected from the source system prior to the application of any Business Rules was tested and determined to be appropriately excluded from the file utilized to prepare the monthly PM results based on the application of the Business Rules.

Exceptions: Our transaction testing revealed 80 exceptions to compliance with the Business Rules, 77 of which impacted PMs 2, MI 10, and MI 16. The remaining 3 exceptions impacted only PMs MI 10 and MI 16. Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company’s compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
2, MI 10, MI 16	For EDI LSOG 1 transactions the Company excluded certain address verification transactions during the Evaluation Period that were not able to be matched to living units or street addresses.	23
2, MI 10, MI 16	After the implementation of the LSOG 5 version of EDI (“LSOG 5”) in April 2002, the Company improperly reported LSOG 5 transactions in which a request for a customer service record and directory listing is made as one combined request in the Verigate CSR submeasure. However this combined level of submeasure is not listed in the Business Rules.	41
2, MI 10, MI 16	After the implementation of LSOG 5, the Company improperly counted certain LSOG 4 pre-order queries in the CSR and TN submeasure results.	11
2, MI 10, MI 16	The Company excluded certain valid transactions during the Evaluation Period.	2
	Subtotal	77
MI 10, MI 16	Certain valid EDI LSOG 1 transactions were improperly excluded from the reported results of MI 10 and MI 16.	3
	Total Exceptions	80

Ordering

In order to get maximum coverage of Ordering PMs, E&Y selected random samples by PM transaction type (i.e., Firm Order Confirmation (“FOC”) transactions, Service Order Completion (“SOC”) transactions, etc). E&Y selected random samples from the following ordering transaction types and systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the Ordering PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- FOC transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from Mechanized Order Receipt Application (“MOR”) and Local Access Service Request System (“LASR”) combined
- SOC transactions – 265 wholesale transactions from MOR; the five additional transactions were randomly selected from certain submeasures in order to ensure adequate coverage of the submeasure
- SOC transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from LASR

- Reject transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from MOR and LASR combined
- Jeopardy transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from MOR and LASR combined
- Jeopardy transactions – 260 retail transactions from Work Force/Administration/Dispatch Out (“WFA/DO”)
- Flow through transactions – 540 retail transactions from Ameritech Service Order Negotiation (“ASON”)
- Flow through transactions – 265 wholesale transactions from MOR
- Flow through transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from LASR
- Local Number Portability (“LNP”) transactions – From our randomly selected FOC sample from MOR, 235 transactions plus an additional 152 judgmentally selected LNP transactions to ensure adequate coverage
- LNP transactions – From our randomly selected Reject sample from MOR, 200 transactions plus an additional 50 judgmentally selected LNP transactions to ensure adequate coverage
- Service order sales transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from the SOSALES file
- Service order sales transactions – 260 retail transactions from the SOSALES file
- Line Loss transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from MOR and LASR combined

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
5	285	190	95	0	12
5.2	260	9	251	0	4
6	285	190	95	0	11
7	525	260	260	5	3
7.1	525	265	260	0	4
8	525	260	260	5	3
9	260	225	30	5	1
10	260	198	62	0	1
10.1	260	179	76	0	1
10.2	260	47	213	0	1
10.3	260	2	258	0	1
10.4	520	261	228	31	22
11	260	165	95	0	1
11.1	260	47	213	0	1
11.2	260	137	123	0	1
12	538	509	29	0	1
13	1,065	860	205	0	6

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
13.1	525	400	125	0	5
91	387	42	340	5	2
93	387	12	358	17	1
95	250	36	214	0	2
MI 2	520	240	268	12	6
MI 9	260	178	82	0	3
MI 12	520	460	0	60	2
MI 13	260	171	85	4	4
CLEC WI 1	Note 2				

Note 2 – Transaction testing was not performed for this PM due to issues identified in the other testing procedures that indicated this PM was not calculated correctly. Alternative procedures were employed to allow for exception reporting.

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company's compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
7,8	The Company excluded certain service order confirmations from reported results.	3 ³
7,8	Certain orders that did not contain service order completion dates or start dates with a null value were reported as meeting the one-hour completion timeline when no data was available to make that determination.	2
	Subtotal 7,8	5
9	The Company excluded certain transactions that should be included in reported results	5 ³
10.4	The Company did not apply an exclusion for CLEC-initiated end user jeopardy codes as stated in the Business Rules.	19
10.4 and MI 2	The Company excluded certain transactions from the results that should be included.	12 ³
	Subtotal 10.4	31

³ As of the date of this report the Company is researching this exception. However, this exception has been included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company's compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002.

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
91	The Company improperly included certain LNP transactions in reported results during the Evaluation Period.	5
93	The Company excluded certain LNP transactions from reported results in error.	17 ³
MI 12	The Company excluded wholesale orders from reported results when a field identifying the CLEC was blank.	58
MI 12	The Company excluded retail transactions from reported results where the field cycle date was null. This issue was isolated to the month of May 2002.	2
	Subtotal MI 12	60
MI 13	Line loss notifications are not being reported when the winning CLEC originates the order through one ordering system and the Company sends the loss notification to the losing CLEC through a different ordering system. The Company was not capturing the final electronic processing time required to send the line loss notifications from the ordering system to the CLEC.	4
	Total Exceptions	127

Provisioning

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems for the Provisioning PMs to test the accuracy and completeness of the Provisioning PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Facilities Modifications (“FMOD”) Database – 260 wholesale transactions
- LASR – 273 wholesale transactions. E&Y randomly selected 260 Local Service Requests (“LSRs”) from LASR of which this sample of LSRs had a total of 273 service orders that were tested.
- MOR – 266 wholesale transactions. E&Y randomly selected 260 completed orders from MOR; the six additional transactions were judgmentally selected in order to ensure adequate coverage of submeasures
- ASON – 260 retail business and 260 retail residential and 20 retail business specials
- EXACT – 40 retail transactions and 40 wholesale transactions

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
27	1079	466	613	0	10
28	1079	667	412	0	10
29	1079	737	342	0	8
30	1079	90	989	0	12
31	1079	0	1079	0	0
32	1079	10	1069	0	4
33	1079	737	342	0	8
35	1079	737	342	0	8
43	286	17	269	0	3
44	286	14	272	0	2
45	286	19	267	0	2
46	286	19	267	0	2
47	286	22	264	0	6
48	286	1	285	0	1
49	286	1	285	0	1
50	286	22	264	0	2
55	1079	34	1044	1	4
55.1	1079	39	1039	1	3
55.2	539	4	534	1	1
55.3	1079	39	1039	1	1
56	1079	67	1011	1	6
56.1	539	17	522	0	2
58	1079	128	951	0	7
59	1079	122	957	0	7
60	1079	44	10354	0	18
61	1079	3	1076	0	3
62	1079	8	1071	0	4
63	1079	148	931	0	6
73	40	13	27	0	2
74	80	1	56	23	1
75	40	20	12	8	2
78	40	4	28	8	2
92	539	28	510	0	1
96	539	10	529	0	2
97	539	24	515	0	2
98	1079	137	942	0	1
99	1079	0	1079	0	0
100	539	32	507	0	1
101	539	33	506	0	1
WI 1	1079	180	899	0	1

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
WI 9	799	158	641	0	9
CLEC WI 11	799	259	540	0	27

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company's compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
55, 55.1, 55.2, 55.3, 56	Resale products classified as "unknown products" were not included in the results.	1
74, 75, and 78	23 transactions in PM 74 and 8 transactions in PMs 75 and 78 – The Company excluded certain transactions with a missed appointment code associated with a project from reported results. In May 2002, the Company excluded all projects from the reported results. The Business Rules do not allow projects to be excluded from results.	23
	Total Exceptions	24

Maintenance

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the Maintenance PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Work Force/Administration ("WFA") – 260 wholesale transactions
- WFA – 260 retail transactions
- Loop Maintenance Operations System ("LMOS") – 260 wholesale transactions
- LMOS – 260 retail transactions

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
37	520	220	300	0	4
37.1	520	249	271	0	4
38	520	219	301	0	8

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
39	520	218	302	0	16
40	520	223	297	0	4
41	520	218	302	0	4
42	520	218	302	0	4
52	520	185	335	0	6
53	520	179	341	0	6
54	520	180	340	0	6
54.1	520	164	356	0	5
65	520	295	225	0	9
65.1	520	230	290	0	8
66	520	78	442	0	2
67	520	154	366	0	10
68	520	76	444	0	1
69	520	176	344	0	6
76	80	80	0	0	4
MI 14	320	44	476	0	3
CLEC WI 5	Note 3				
WI 2	320	167	153	0	1

Note 3: Transaction testing was not performed for this PM due to issues identified in the other testing procedures that indicated this PM was not reported in accordance with the Business Rules. Alternative procedures were employed to allow for exception reporting.

Interconnection Trunks

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the Interconnection Trunk PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Weekly traffic reports – 40 wholesale transactions,
- CLEC 271 PM 70-02 (20-day study period monthly report) – 40 wholesale transactions
- Common Transport Monthly Report – 40 wholesale transactions

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
70	40	2	38	0	1
70.1	40	38	2	0	1
70.2	40	40	0	0	1
71	40	40	0	0	1
77	Note 4				

Note 4: No data was reported for this measure for the Evaluation Period.

Directory Assistance and Operator Services

For this group of PMs, E&Y tested 100% of the population.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
79	100% Tested			0	7
80	100% Tested			0	1
81	100% Tested			0	7
82	100% Tested			0	1
83	100% Tested			0	2

911

E&Y selected random samples from the following sources to test the accuracy and completeness of the 911 PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Intrado (third-party vendor) 911 unlock report – 260 wholesale transactions
- Intrado (third-party vendor) Monthly Reseller Report – 40 wholesale transactions

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
102	100% Tested			0	1
103	100% Tested			0	1
104	100% Tested			0	1
104.1	260 (Note 5)	130	130	0	1

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
MI 6	40	40	0	0	1
MI 7	100% Tested			0	1
MI 8	100% Tested			0	1

Note 5: March, April, and May data was originally reported incorrectly. Ameritech restated May data going forward to correct the reported issue. Therefore, E&Y performed transaction testing for the month of May only.

Poles, Conduit, and Right of Way

E&Y selected a random sample of 40 wholesale transactions from the structure database.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
105	57	34	11	12	1
106	57	34	11	12	1
MI 5	57	34	11	12	2

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company's compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
105, 106, MI 5	Testing of supporting documentation for the transactions that comprise these PMs revealed that start and stop times were not accurately calculated and that supporting documentation for transactions was not appropriately maintained. Additionally, certain transactions were reported in the wrong month.	12

Directory Assistance Database

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the Directory Assistance Database PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Master Data Sheet⁴ – 260 wholesale transactions. An additional 40 transactions were judgmentally selected in order to ensure adequate coverage of PM 112

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
110	260 (Note 7)	260	0	0	2
111	260 (Note 7)	260	0	0	2
112	300	260	40	0	1
113	Note 6			0	1

Note 6: Selected 5 days of transactions for the month of May (approximately 15,000 transactions) and validated that the proper records were being included and excluded according to the Business Rules.

Note 7: For the electronic submeasures for PM 110 and 111 we tested 100% of the transactions. For the manual submeasures for PM 110 and 111 we randomly selected 260 wholesale transactions.

Bona Fide Request Process (“BFRs”)

E&Y tested 100% of the transaction population for the BFR PMs.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
120	100% Tested			0	1
121	Note 8				1

Note 8: No data was reported for this performance measure for the Evaluation Period.

Local Service Center (“LSC”)/Local Operations Center (“LOC”) Automatic Call Distributor (“ACD”)

For this group of PMs, E&Y tested 100% of the population. E&Y obtained populations from Local Service Center ACD reports, Local Operations Center ACD reports, Retail Consumer Center ACD reports, Retail Business Center ACD reports, and the Customer Service Bureau ACD reports.

⁴ The Master Data Sheet is a detail of all faxed orders received.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
21.1	100% Tested			0	3
22	100% Tested			1	3
24.1	100% Tested			0	3
25	100% Tested			1	2

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company's compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
22	March 2002 results were restated in June 2002 to include all required service centers in the retail results. Although all 3 submeasures were impacted, only 1 error occurred as the same retail result is utilized for all 3 parity comparisons.	1
25	Due to a manual calculation error, April 2002 retail data was improperly reported.	1

NXX

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the NXX PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Code Activation Notification database – 50 wholesale transactions. 40 wholesale transactions were randomly selected with an additional 10 wholesale transactions that were judgmentally sampled to obtain necessary testing coverage for PM 117
- Work Force/Administration/Dispatch In (“WFA/DI”) NXX trouble tickets – 100% of population tested

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
117	50	7	41	1	1
118	Note 9				
119	100% Tested			0	1

Note 9: No data was reported for this performance measure for the Evaluation Period.

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company’s compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
117	The Company considers an NXX code request to be on time as long as it completes testing by the end of the week containing the due date, instead of by the actual due date as required by the Business Rules.	1

Coordinated Hot-Cuts (“CHC”)/Frame Due Time (“FDT”)

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the CHC/FDT PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- LOC Scheduler – 260 wholesale transactions

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
114 ⁵	260	242	18	0	2
114.1	260	242	18	0	3
115 ⁵	260	242	18	0	8
115.1	260 (Note 10)	242	18	0	2
115.2	100% Tested			0	2
MI 3	260	162	98	0	1

Note 10: The Numerator for PM 115.1 is the same data population 100% tested in PM 115.2.

OSS Interface

E&Y selected random samples from the following sources to test the accuracy and completeness of the OSS Interface PMs during the Evaluation Period:

⁵ As determined in other testing procedures, PMs 114 and 115 were not correctly reported for the Evaluation Period. See Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company’s compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002 for the exceptions noted for PMs 114 and 115. The transaction testing performed for PMs 114 and 115 was performed in accordance with the Company’s procedures, which were not in compliance with the Business Rules.

- Broadcast fax log – 40 notifications

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
4	100% Tested			0	13
MI 11	40	27	3	19	1

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company's compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
MI 11	This PM was incorrectly calculated during the Evaluation Period as the Company counted all notifications instead of just the initial notifications in the results. Additionally, manual errors were noted in the recording of start and end times associated with this PM.	19

Change Management

For this PM, E&Y tested 100% of the population.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
MI 15	100% Tested			2	2

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company's compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
MI 15	The Company did not appropriately capture the denominator for this PM during the Evaluation Period. Instead of using all changes implemented during the month as the denominator as stated in the Business Rules, the Company captures the number of notification letters sent during the month as the denominator to calculate the number of notifications issued on time.	2

Billing

Due to the nature of the Billing PMs, E&Y performed transaction as follows:

- PM 14 – Monthly bill sample listing – Randomly chose 40 wholesale bills and 40 retail bills and compared USOC rates to the billing tables and reviewed proper handling of the bill audit results according to the Business Rules
- PM 15 – Monthly sampling log – Randomly selected 6 audited wholesale bills and audited the bills in accordance with the Business Rules and proper handling of the bill audit results according to the Business Rules
- PM 16 – Monthly Resale Unbundled Report/Monthly Transmittal Report – Randomly chose 40 Michigan transmittals to verify that each transmittal was appropriately classified as to an Ameritech- or CLEC-caused error and the transmittal was appropriately included or excluded according to the Business Rules
- PM 18 – RBS cycle reports – Randomly selected 40 wholesale bills
- PM 19 – Monthly Resale Unbundled Report – Tested the entire population of Michigan, for period under review (233 transmittals), was accurate as to the number of daily usage files sent on-time and sent late from the Mainframe to PRS

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
14	80	80	0	0	2
15	6	6	0	0	1
16	40	40	0	0	1
17	Note 11			0	1
18	40	40	0	0	2
19	100% Tested			0	1
20	Note 11			0	1

Note 11: Due to the nature of these PMs, alternative testing procedures including a detail code review were performed for these PMs. See exceptions in our report regarding the Company’s process to capture billing information in the PMs.

Collocation

E&Y selected random samples from the following sources to test the accuracy and completeness of the Collocation PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Collocation Database – 40 wholesale completed projects
- Collocation Database – 40 wholesale project requests

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
107	40	40	0	0	5
108	40	40	0	0	4
109	40	40	0	0	4
MI 4	40	9	31	0	1

FMOD

E&Y selected random samples from the following sources to test the accuracy and completeness of the FMOD PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- FMOD Database – Randomly selected 260 wholesale transactions and judgmentally selected 5 additional transactions to obtain coverage for CLEC WI 9

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
CLEC WI 6	265	190	70	5	3
CLEC WI 7	265	190	19	5	8
CLEC WI 8	265	29	233	3	3
CLEC WI 9	265	1	260	4	1

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below and included in Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company's compliance with the Business Rules dated September 23, 2002:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
CLEC WI 6, 7, 8	5 transactions in CLEC WI 6 and CLEC WI 7 and 3 transactions in CLEC WI 8 – Due to errors in data collection by the reporting systems, the Company improperly excluded certain transactions from reported results.	8
CLEC WI 9	The Company excluded orders that were cancelled after Form C was sent although the Business Rules state that orders in which a Form C was sent should be included in the result.	4

Additional Measures

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
CLEC WI 4	Note 12				

Note 12: No data was reported for this PM for the Evaluation Period.

Appendix C – Listing of Site Evaluation Locations

Location	Description	PMs Impacted	Activities
Hoffman Estates, IL	Performance Measurement Reporting Group	All	
Southfield, MI	Retail Residence - Consumer Call Center	Ordering & Provisioning	Retail residence orders
Pewaukee, WI	Retail Small Business Center (Non-complex products) - Consumer Service Bureau	Ordering & Provisioning	Retail business non-complex orders
Detroit, MI	Retail Mid to Large Business Center (Complex products)	Ordering & Provisioning	Retail business complex orders
Southfield, MI	Retail and Wholesale Maintenance & Installation Center	Provisioning	Dispatch and monitor wholesale and retail orders and trouble tickets
Farmington, MI	Retail and Wholesale - Central Office	Provisioning & CHC/FDT	Close out all DI orders and tickets; close out FDT orders
Saginaw, MI	Retail and Wholesale Billing Operations Center	Billing	
Milwaukee, WI	Wholesale - Local Service Center (LSC) - UNE-P	Ordering & FMOD	UNE-P ordering; FMOD entries for conditioning
Grand Rapids, MI	Wholesale - LSC - Resale & Centrex	Ordering	Resale & Centrex ordering
Milwaukee, WI	Wholesale - Local Operations Center	Maintenance & CHC/FDT	Receipt of trouble tickets; coordination of CHC with CLEC & CO
Brecksville, OH	Wholesale - Trunk Provisioning Center	Provisioning	Close trunk service orders
Brecksville, OH	Wholesale - Centralized Translations Group	Maintenance & NXX	Close trunk trouble tickets
Brecksville, OH	Wholesale - Code Assurance Group	NXX	Load and test NPA and NXX codes
Marquette, MI	Wholesale Coordination Center	Provisioning & Maintenance	Close wholesale UNE orders and trouble tickets; jep all wholesale orders

Appendix C – Listing of Site Evaluation Locations

Location	Description	PMs Impacted	Activities
Toledo, OH	Wholesale Administration Center	Provisioning & Maintenance	Close wholesale POTS and UNE-P orders and trouble tickets; manually close out orders in ASON
Richardson, TX	Wholesale Collocation Service Center	Collocation	Receive and process collocation applications
Chicago, IL	Listing Services Department	DA Database	Receive and process manual update orders for the Directory Assistance Database
Milwaukee, WI	Resale Billing System	Billing	
Milwaukee, WI	LSC - Billing	Billing	
Southfield, MI	Technician Ride Alongs	Provisioning & Maintenance	Close retail orders and trouble tickets; wholesale orders and trouble tickets are called in to WCC or Admin Center by technicians
Southfield, MI	Wholesale LSC - UNE-P	Ordering	UNE-P ordering
St. Louis, MO	Performance Measure Reporting group - DSS	Order, Pre-order, Provisioning	Calculate performance measures and apply business rules in DSS
Indianapolis, IN	RRS database administrators	Provisioning & Maintenance	Receive and load source system files containing PM data