

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

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

**AFFIDAVIT OF YOUNG NOBLE
REGARDING
CERTAIN DSL ISSUES**

1 I, Young Noble, being first duly sworn under oath, do state that if called upon to
2 be a witness in this matter that I would be competent to testify to the following:

3 I am a Manager, Level II, of Local Network Planning and Services Delivery at
4 WorldCom. I have held this position for a year, and have been with the company (and its
5 predecessors) for 6 years. My present responsibilities include managing project managers
6 for daily activities & tasks, develop project implementation strategy and analyze project
7 readiness, and to oversee tasks relate to numerous projects, including HDSL
8 Process/System Requirements Development & Pre-production testing and DSL LEC
9 LSR requirements.

10 The purpose of this affidavit is to show some of the difficulties WorldCom is
11 having with Ameritech which are preventing WorldCom from provisioning digital
12 subscriber loop (“DSL”) services to its own customers. This affidavit is not intended to
13 describe all of the problems WorldCom is experiencing. Instead, it highlights some recent
14 problems which are indicative of the obstacles and challenges we are facing in attempting
15 to begin ordering DSL-capable loops in the Ameritech region.

16 One of the initial steps in determining how WorldCom can provision DSL
17 services to its customers in Michigan is to obtain documentation from Ameritech
18 showing the ordering requirements which WorldCom is to follow when ordering DSL-
19 compatible loops. To meet this objective, people in my group including Sigrid Heuser
20 and Richard Weedon have conducted conference calls with Ameritech and have
21 submitted sample LSR order forms for Ameritech’s critique and corrections. WorldCom
22 refers to this as 'Clean Order Testing'. This Clean Order Testing effort is to be performed
23 in advance of submitting orders, so as to minimize Ameritech order rejects and to

1 maximize on-time service delivery to WorldCom customers. The Clean Order Testing
2 took place in October 2000 and resulted in a “Job Aid” document which WorldCom
3 prepared based on the experience in the Clean Order Testing which Ameritech reviewed
4 and approved. The Clean Order Testing allowed WorldCom to successfully send a test
5 order.

6 In June 2001, Ameritech unilaterally and without notice to its business contacts at
7 WorldCom changed its business practices. This change in business practices rendered
8 the Job Aid developed in October 2000 inaccurate. The misleading information provided
9 in June 2000 and relied upon by WorldCom has now delayed WorldCom’s ability to
10 begin submitting “live customer” orders. This means that the “clean” test order which
11 was sent in October 2000 would now be rejected by Ameritech.

12 For example, during the Clean Order Testing conducted in October 2000,
13 Ameritech stated that WorldCom would not be expected to specify the specification
14 (SPEC) code on the loop orders for the loops which we wanted conditioned and therefor
15 would not have to access Ameritech’s loop make-up database to obtain the SPEC code.
16 During June 2001, while attempting to order a 4-wire HDSL-compatible loop, Ameritech
17 indicated that WorldCom is expected to select one of SPEC codes and include the
18 specific SPEC code on the local service request (“LSR”) order form, in order to ensure
19 the loop is DSL-compatible upon loop delivery. Each SPEC code specifies whether and
20 what type of loop conditioning (i.e., removal of load coils, repeaters, and/or bridge taps)
21 is requested based upon Verigate loop make-up information.

22 Ameritech, as is true for many incumbent local exchange companies (“ILECs”),
23 offers a web-based “CLEC Handbook.” Ameritech's CLEC Handbook can be found by

1 accessing <http://clec.sbc.com/>, clicking on "CLEC Handbook", and selecting the
2 appropriate state (from SBC's list of 13 states). Ameritech's CLEC Handbook contains
3 inaccurate, conflicting and missing information. Examples of inaccurate and missing
4 information were provided to Ameritech during a June 14, 2001 conference call. In
5 response to WorldCom's request that Ameritech correct the inaccuracies in its CLEC
6 Handbook, Ameritech provided an on June 21, 2001 which stated: "We will take that into
7 consideration." A subsequent attempt by WorldCom to obtain an Ameritech commitment
8 to correct its web information has been met with no response.

9 An example of the misinformation contained in the CLEC Handbook is that
10 CLECs are frequently prompted to use an Access Service Request ("ASR") order form.
11 However, during the June 14, 2001 conference call with WorldCom, Ameritech
12 representative Milly Plavsic (Ameritech's Local Service Center Support for Methods &
13 Procedures) stated that WorldCom should only submit DSL and PSD (Power Spectral
14 Density) orders via a LSR (Local Service Request), and not an ASR. As many in the
15 industry are aware, LSRs and ASRs are vastly different ordering forms which are based
16 on entirely on different systems.

17 An example of missing information from the CLEC handbook is that the PSD
18 includes a category "3b" PSD, but the definition of 3b does not describe how Ameritech
19 would support this type of PSD category. Ameritech has informed us that we need to use
20 category 3b to 4-wire HDSL capable loops. Yet, there is not documentation showing that
21 we should use this category, nor any description of how Ameritech would support this.
22 This missing information is preventing us from ordering 4-wire HDSL capable loops.

1 Ameritech stated during the June 14, 2001 conference call that WorldCom is
2 permitted to order xDSL loops and PSD (Power Spectral Density) mask types, and took
3 the action item to define the differences between DSL and PSD, from technical,
4 operational and process standpoints. Kevin Sievert of WorldCom offered Peggy Herzog
5 of Ameritech the name of the SBC SME who has represented SBC at DSL
6 forums/meetings: Gene Edmunds. On June 21, 2001, Peggy Herzog/SBC Account
7 Manager e-mailed a status update on Ameritech's action items, but did not provide any
8 clarity, stating: "There isn't a difference between DSL & PSD's...." On June 25th
9 WorldCom requested that Ameritech provide the ANSI (American National Standards
10 Institute, an organization which sets national standards) document references for each of
11 the following Ameritech NC/NCI (Network Channel/ Network Channel Interface) codes
12 which Ameritech provides for their DSL and PSD-compatible loop ordering:

- 13 LX-- 04QB5.003
- 14 LX-- 02QB9.005
- 15 LX-- 02QB5.001
- 16 LX-- 04QB5.00H
- 17 LX-- 02QB9.00A

18 We are still awaiting a response. It is critical that Ameritech correlate their NC/NCI
19 codes to the industry standards as set by ANSI so that we can order the proper type of
20 loop for the customer specific applications.

21 Kevin Sievert indicated that ANSI document T1417-2001 includes PSD
22 categories such as 1, 2, 3, etc. and not 1a, 1b, 3a, and 3b which Ameritech employs.
23 Ameritech has not provided any comment to this discrepancy to the industry standard,

1 neither during the conference call nor subsequently. Ameritech's failure to do so means
2 that we do not know how Ameritech provisioning differs from industry standards and as a
3 consequence the Ameritech product is not properly defined. This leaves us in the dark on
4 what to order from Ameritech to serve our customers.

5 WorldCom's DSL initiatives include providing Integrated DSL service or IDSL
6 service for customers who are served by loops up to 50kft. WorldCom was told by
7 Ameritech that (in an e-mail from Peggy Herzong) that: "Customer can order as long of a
8 loop or short of a loop as they desire. However, conditioning charges will change
9 depending on loop length." Ameritech stated on a June 14, 2001 conference call with
10 WorldCom that SPEC codes to remove lad coils, repeaters and bridge taps (UALRLT,
11 UALRLX, UALRRX, UALRTR, and UALRTX) are to be used for loops over 12kft to
12 17.5kft. There are currently no SPEC codes for loops over 17.5kft. Ameritech has
13 indicated to WorldCom only that IDSL will have its own SPEC codes in the future.
14 However, when asked for a timeframe, or whether WorldCom would receive an
15 "accessible letter" of notification of the additional SPEC codes, Ameritech participants
16 said they were unaware of when this information would be made available. Thus, as it
17 currently stands, WorldCom's IDSL initiatives are being blocked because of Ameritech's
18 failure to implement a system for ordering loops that are longer than 17.5kft and require
19 conditioning.

20 In an effort to gather information to assist in the development of its DSL
21 initiatives, WorldCom on June 14, 2001 requested the following information from
22 Ameritech: What general design rules does Ameritech use for copper networks with
23 loops: a) 12kft and less; and b) 18kft and less, including the wire guage corresponding to

1 what kilofeet parameters? Peggy Herzog/SBC Account Manager responded via a June
2 21, 2001 email: "SBC does not give out information on the design of their network. We
3 design our network to support voice traffic according to the ANSI Standards." No
4 specific reference was provided. This is an example of Ameritech just not providing
5 basic information.

6 As a result of the above, WorldCom's ability to enter the DSL market in
7 Michigan in a competitive way is being severely hampered by Ameritech's inconsistent,
8 changing and undocumented business rules and explanations, and by Ameritech's
9 unwillingness to disclose information essential for competitive entry.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT

Young Noble

Young Noble

Subscribed to and sworn to before me this

28 day of June, 2001

Tricia Lynn Morrison

Notary Public

my commission expires 12-31-05.