

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 of the Federal Communications Act of 1996.

Case No. **U-12320**

**JOINT MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF PROCEDURES
FOR REVIEWING 271 COMPLIANCE MATERIALS**

On February 9, 2000, the Commission issued an order in this case establishing a tentative timetable for determining Ameritech Michigan's compliance with the requirements of Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 271. On May 15, 2001 the Commission modified these timetables, in part, to permit comments to be filed in response to information filed by Ameritech Michigan on May 15, 2001 related to its compliance with the Section 271 checklist requirements. In its May 15th Order the Commission also found "that Ameritech Michigan, the Staff, and all interested parties should endeavor to resolve all disputes regarding the schedule, scope, and format for review of KPMG's third-party OSS test and performance measure reporting required by the February 9 order."¹ The Commission requested that any disputes regarding this schedule be submitted to the Commission for resolution by July 30, 2001.

In compliance with the Commission's Order, Ameritech, Staff and interested parties² have participated in good faith negotiation in order to reach agreement on a proposed schedule

¹ Page 4 of the May 15, 2001 Order.

² These parties include the Michigan Attorney General (AG), AT&T Communications, Inc., MCI WorldCom, XO Michigan, Inc., the CLEC Association of Michigan, LDMI, and McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc.

for reviewing performance measures reporting and the results of KPMG's third party OSS testing. This proposal is specified in Attachment A.

WHEREFORE, the parties respectfully request that the Commission adopt the proposed procedures delineated in Attachment A.

Respectfully submitted,

**MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
STAFF**



Steven D. Hughey (P32203)
Assistant Attorney General
Public Service Division
6545 Mercantile Way, Suite 15
Lansing, MI 48911
Telephone: (517) 241-6680

Concurred in by:

Attorney General
Ameritech Michigan
AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. and TCG
Detroit
MCIMetro Access Transmission Services, LLC, MCI
WorldCom Communications, Inc. (f/k/a MFS
Intelenet of Michigan, Inc.), and Brooks Fiber
Communications of Michigan, Inc., (collectively,
"WorldCom")
XO Michigan Inc.
CLEC Association of Michigan
LDMI
McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc.

DATED: July 30, 2001
12320/Joint Mot

I. Proposed Process and Timeline for Review of KPMG's Third Party OSS Test Results

1. KPMG issues draft final report, consistent with the then current Michigan Master Test Plan.
2. As soon as possible after draft report issuance, parties identify for KPMG in writing questions which they request KPMG address or for which they seek additional information at the collaborative discussion (see item #3).¹
3. Fourteen days after issuance of KPMG's draft final report: collaborative session convened for presentation and discussion of report by KPMG and interested parties. A transcribed record will be kept of this session. A request will be made for John Kern to preside over the session. Those in attendance should include the appropriate KPMG, HP and Ameritech subject matter experts. The format of the discussion will be similar to the format of the collaborative sessions that have been utilized during the last year in this proceeding. The purpose of this session is informational and parties may ask questions of KPMG or others in attendance. Such questions should be related to the testing covered by KPMG's implementation of the Master Test Plan. Mr. Kern or the Staff may resolve any disputes regarding the scope of questioning. The session initially will be convened as a four-day session. At the direction of Staff or Mr. Kern, the session may be ended earlier, extended for more than four days or reconvened at a later time for further discussion.
4. As soon as practical after the collaborative: KPMG issues final report or resumes testing if it determines this is required.
5. Two weeks later: Written comments filed in response to KPMG's report.
6. One week later: Oral presentations before Commission for a minimum one-day session. A transcribed record will be taken of the proceeding. Times will be allotted to parties who wish to make presentations. The Commission may question presenters. Parties may address the results of the third party test as well as other 271-related issues if desired. Parties, however, are reminded of the Commission's caution (as specified in its February 9, 2000 order in this proceeding) that issues raised late in this process "may limit the ability of the Commission to give full, or any, consideration to the information..."
7. If required, interim order issued on OSS test specifying deficiencies and any required retesting.
8. Continue iterative process until OSS Test Report is found acceptable to the Commission.

¹ As soon as is practicable, KPMG will meet with interested parties including Staff to discuss the manner in which those parties will be provided access to pertinent information.

II. Performance Metrics Report

1. Ameritech submits proof of three consecutive months of performance metrics compliance.
2. Fifteen days later: written comments filed in response to Ameritech's declaration.
3. Fifteen days later: responsive comments filed regarding Ameritech's declaration.
4. If required, interim order issued on performance metrics reporting specifying deficiencies and required actions.
5. Continue iterative process until performance metrics results are acceptable to the Commission.