

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Further Investigation)
Into Ameritech Ohio's Entry Into In-Region)
InterLATA Service Under Section 271 of the) Case No. 00-942-TP- COI
Telecommunications Act of 1996)

AMERITECH OHIO'S PHASE TWO CHECKLIST INFORMATIONAL FILING

Ameritech Ohio submits this Checklist Information Filing pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. § 271.¹ In an Entry dated June 1, 2000, the Commission established a phased approach to evaluating Ameritech Ohio's compliance with Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This filing represents Phase Two in the process adopted by the Commission.²

I. INTRODUCTION

This Phase Two filing represents one of the final steps in the process towards Ameritech Ohio's filing to offer in-region interLATA long distance services pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecom Act. Subject to completion of the third party OSS test and three months of performance data, it is Ameritech Ohio's plan to file its application with the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") early in the year 2002.

¹ Coincident with this filing Ameritech Ohio is docketing a Notice in this case and Case No. 98-1082-TP-AMT in compliance with the requirements of the SBC/Ameritech merger Stipulation and Recommendation, Section XI.C.

² Phase One involved the commencement of a third party test of Ameritech Ohio's operational support systems and performance measurements. On December 7, 2000, by Entry, the Commission adopted the Ohio Master Test Plan proposed by the parties. December 7, 2000 Entry, p 13. KPMG Consulting began Ohio OSS testing in February, 2001. Phase Two is a review of Ameritech's checklist compliance, subject to conclusion of OSS testing and a review of performance results. Pursuant to the Commission's June 1, 2000 Entry, Ameritech can commence Phase Two at anytime fourteen days after the third party test begins. Phase Three involves a review of the third party OSS test results and performance data. June 1, 2000 Entry, pp. 7-8.

As contemplated by the Commission's June 1, 2000 Entry in this proceeding, there have been numerous Section 271 related activities during the year 2000 involving the Commission Staff, interested parties and Ameritech Ohio. A key component has been the numerous collaborative sessions which have been held related to Ameritech Ohio's Section 271 compliance. These proceedings concerning Ameritech Ohio's Section 271(c) compliance have been comprehensive and open to participation by all interested parties. Through the collaboratives, the Commission's dispute resolution procedures, and various FCC and Commission orders in this and other proceedings, most of the open issues regarding Ameritech Ohio's checklist compliance have been resolved. Several issues have been the subject of extensive Commission proceedings and are awaiting a decision.

Numerous OSS enhancements, process improvements and product introductions resulted from the industry-wide collaboratives held in Ohio and other states. A comprehensive set of performance measurements, based on the Texas approved measurements, were adopted by the Commission and implemented by Ameritech Ohio. In addition, a remedy plan, based on the Texas remedy plan, has also been implemented by Ameritech Ohio pursuant to the Commission's order in the SBC/Ameritech merger case, Case No. 98-1082-TP-AMT.

A protocol for independent third-party testing of Ameritech Ohio's OSS has been developed through collaborative sessions. KPMG has been selected to conduct the test, and testing designed to ensure that Ameritech Ohio's OSS is capable of performing at commercial volumes is now underway. All that remains is completion of the third party OSS testing and the provisioning of three months of data demonstrating Ameritech Ohio's compliance with Commission approved performance measurements. Accordingly, the time is ripe to begin Phase

Two and the final steps that will allow the Commission to evaluate Ameritech Ohio's compliance with the Section 271 checklist.

II. CHECKLIST INFORMATIONAL FILING

Ameritech Ohio is filing with this pleading information on product, price and process demonstrating that it is in full compliance with each of the fourteen competitive checklist items in Section 271(c)(2)(B), subject to satisfactory completion of third party OSS testing and performance results. Ameritech Ohio is filing with the Commission a draft of its proposed Section 271 application and supporting affidavits. They are in substantially the form that Ameritech Ohio intends to subsequently file at the FCC. These materials demonstrate that Ameritech Ohio satisfies Section 271(c)(1)(A) ("Track A") and is in compliance with all competitive checklist requirements for in-region interLATA relief. In addition to the supporting affidavits, Ameritech Ohio is also filing a Section 271 amendment (referred to as "Oh2A") which extends Ameritech Ohio's commitments beyond those required by the Section 271 checklist.

While the Commission's final evaluation regarding Ameritech Ohio's compliance with the checklist, and ultimately its recommendations to the FCC, will necessarily be subject to completion of OSS testing and provision of acceptable performance data in Phase Three of this proceeding, this checklist information filing will provide the Commission and interested parties with information otherwise demonstrating full compliance.

This filing is consistent with the Commission's adoption of a phased approach to address the complex issues within the short time frames set forth in Section 271. Accordingly, this checklist informational filing is designed to provide the Commission with all the information it needs to assess and evaluate Ameritech Ohio's compliance with the Section 271 checklist,

subject to satisfactory completion of third party OSS testing and performance results, sufficiently in advance of the filing of a Section 271 application to allow an opportunity for meaningful review and analysis by the Commission, Staff and interested parties.

III. COMMISSION APPROVED PROCEDURE FOR COMMENTS

In its June 1, 2000 Entry adopting a phased approach to evaluating Ameritech Ohio's Section 271 readiness, the Commission established a specific procedure to be followed for Phases Two and Three.³ Specifically, the Commission established a requirement that parties file comments 31 days after Ameritech Ohio's Phase Two checklist information is filed. Reply comments are due 30 days after the comment cycle deadline. All comments and replies must be served on all parties.⁴ Based on this Commission approved schedule, comments will be due on September 13, 2001, and reply comments will be due on October 16, 2001.⁵

Electronic Service of Documents and Confidentiality

The affidavits and other documentation supporting Ameritech Ohio's checklist informational filing are lengthy. In order to facilitate effective participation as well as meaningful review, Ameritech Ohio will serve Staff and interested parties with a CD-ROM containing the redacted filing in a ".pdf" format. This will allow the parties to perform electronic text searches, rather than solely relying on review of the hard copy.⁶ Ameritech Ohio also proposes that all pleadings be served in electronic ".pdf" format. Electronic formatting is quicker and more efficient than paper, which is all the more important given the 'fast track' nature of § 271 proceedings.

³ June 1, 2000 Entry, p. 8.

⁴ Id.

⁵ The filing dates calculated include three additional days for service under the Commission's Rules.

⁶ If service of the filing by way of CD-ROM would impose a hardship on a party, Ameritech Ohio is willing to work with that party to craft alternative arrangements.

Ameritech Ohio's checklist informational filing contains confidential information regarding CLECs, which should be protected from disclosure.⁷ Ameritech Ohio is filing a Motion For Protective Order with this filing.

IV. FURTHER PROCEEDINGS

After reply comments are filed, the Commission has indicated that it will issue an entry identifying the checklist items, if any, that require further analysis.⁸ Consistent with the phased approach adopted by the Commission for this proceeding, Ameritech Ohio requests that, after completion of the comment and reply cycle, the Commission issue, as part of its entry, a written evaluation assessing Ameritech Ohio's compliance with each checklist requirement. Ameritech Ohio further requests that the Commission find that the terms and conditions of the Oh2A, when implemented, meet the product offering requirements of Section 271(c)(2)(B)(ii) for purposes of providing combinations of network elements (subject to changes in the law).

Ameritech Ohio understands that any Commission evaluation of its checklist compliance would be subject to the completion of Phase Three of this proceeding, including the satisfactory conclusion of OSS testing and the provision of three months of performance data. A written evaluation on each checklist requirement, subject to conclusion of OSS testing and provision of performance results, will allow the parties to focus their attention on any items for which additional information may be required to demonstrate full compliance to the Commission's satisfaction.

⁷ Ameritech Ohio will enter into a standard Nondisclosure Agreement with parties who desire to review the confidential portions of Ameritech Ohio's checklist filing. Ameritech Ohio will serve all parties with a public version of the filing and, upon request, will serve confidential portions upon those parties who have executed a Nondisclosure Agreement.

⁸ June 1, 2000 Entry, p.8.

Ameritech Ohio expects that OSS testing will be completed within a number of months. Shortly thereafter the results of the test will be filed along with the three months of performance data. When combined with the information submitted with this checklist informational filing, and any further information required by the Commission in response to the checklist informational filing, the Commission, when Ameritech Ohio makes its Section 271 filing, will be fully prepared to fulfill its obligations to consult with the FCC regarding its evaluation of Ameritech Ohio's compliance with the competitive checklist.

V. CONCLUSION

The course of this and related proceedings concerning Ameritech Ohio's efforts to fully meet the Section 271 checklist requirements has been long, with sometimes unexpected turns, but the finish line is now in sight. This progress can be traced, in significant part, to the cooperation of the parties and the efforts of the Commission Staff, which has helped facilitate numerous collaboratives to address checklist compliance and related issues.

In assessing Ameritech Ohio's efforts to irrevocably open its local markets to competition, the Commission has the benefit of specific guidance from the FCC through its orders approving the long distance applications of Ameritech Ohio's affiliates in Texas,⁹ Oklahoma and Kansas,¹⁰ as well as Verizon's successful applications in New York,¹¹ Massachusetts,¹² and Connecticut.¹³

⁹ *In re: Southwestern Bell Application for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Texas*, FCC 00-238 (Rel'd, June 30, 2000).

¹⁰ *In re: Southwestern Bell Application for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Kansas and Oklahoma*, FCC 01-29 (Rel'd, January 22, 2001).

¹¹ *In re: Bell Atlantic New York Application to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York*, FCC 99-404 (Rel'd, December 22, 1999).

¹² *In re: Verizon New England's Application to Provide In-Region InterLATA Services in Massachusetts*, FCC 01-130 (Rel'd, April 16, 2001).

¹³ *In re: Verizon New York's Application to Provide In-Region InterLATA Services in Connecticut*, FCC 01-208 (Rel'd, July 20, 2001).

By adhering to the FCC's blueprint, or "roadmap," Ameritech Ohio is confident that its Section 271 application will be supported by the Commission and approved by the FCC. Ohio telecommunications customers will then continue to realize the benefits intended by the Telecommunications Act of even more robust competition for both local and interLATA long distance services.

Respectfully Submitted,

AMERITECH OHIO

Kevin M. Sullivan

Kevin M. Sullivan
Michael T. Mulcahy
James F. Lang
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP
1400 McDonald Investment Center
800 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2688
(216) 622-8200
(216) 241-0816 (fax)

Mary Ryan Fenlon
Ameritech
150 E. Gay St., Rm. 4-C
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 223-3302

Its Attorneys

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of Ameritech Ohio's Phase Two Checklist Informational Filing, Supporting Affidavits and Brief was served via regular U.S. mail, postage pre-paid, this 9th day of August, 2001, upon the following:

Sally W. Bloomfield
Julia L. Dorrian
Bricker & Eckler, LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291

Terry L. Etter
Rochelle L. Cavicchia
Ohio Consumers' Counsel
Suite 1800
10 West Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-3485

Pamela H. Sherwood
Time Warner Telecom of Ohio
4625 W. 86th Street, Suite 500
Indianapolis, IN 46268

Joseph P. Serio
David C. Bergmann
Yolanda Vorys
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793

Thomas W. Hill
Robert G. Cohen
Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter
65 East State Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215

William S. Newcomb, Jr.
Stephen M. Howard
Joseph C. Blasko
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease
52 East Gay Street
P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, OH 43216-1008

Henry T. Kelly
Michael W. Ward
O'Keefe, Ashenden, Lyons and Ward
30 N. LaSalle St., Suite 4100
Chicago, IL 60602

Benita A. Kahn
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 East Gay Street
PO Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

David J. Chorzempa
AT&T Corp.
222 West Adams, Suite 1500
Chicago, IL 60606

VP Regulatory Midwest
Time Warner Telecom
250 W. Old Wilson Bridge Rd., Suite 130
Worthington, OH 43085

Jeffrey L. Small
Chester Willcox & Saxbe
17 South High St., Suite 900
Columbus, OH 43215

Steve Nourse
Jodi Bair
Chief, Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad St., 7th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215

Roger P. Sugarman
Leigh A. Reardon
Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter
65 East State Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215

Joseph R. Stewart
50 W. Broad St., Suite 3600
Columbus, OH 43215

Lee T. Lauridsen
Sprint Communications Co., L.P.
8140 Ward Parkway
Kansas City, MO 64114

Ruth Holder
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
1200 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Joseph P. Meissner
Cleveland Legal Aid Society
1223 West Sixth Street
Cleveland, OH 44113

Ellis Jacobs
Legal Aid Society of Dayton
333 West First Street, Suite 500
Dayton, OH 45402

Boyd B. Ferris
Carlile Patchen & Murphy LLP
366 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Judith Sanders
Bell, Royer & Sanders Co., LPA
33 South Grant Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Douglas Kinkoph
XO Ohio, Inc.
Two Easton Oval, Suite 300
Columbus, OH 43219

Evan Siegel
MCI WorldCom
205 N. Michigan Ave., 11th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Christopher J. Wilson
Frost & Jacobs
201 E. 4th Street, Room 102-620
Cincinnati, OH 45201

Thomas L. Jacobs
United Telephone Co. of Ohio
900 Springmill Street
Mansfield, OH 44906

Nancy Neylon
Executive Director
Ohio Domestic Violence Network
4041 N. High St., Suite 400
Columbus, OH 43214

Tim Strach
Dept. of Information and Technology
Services
130 W. Second St., Suite 320
Dayton, OH 45402

William Haas
Daniel Lipschultz
McLeodUSA Telecommunications
Services, Inc.
400 S. Highway 169, Suite 750
Minneapolis, MN 55426

Andrew D. Lipman
Mary C. Albert
Eric J. Branfman
Tamar E. Finn
Swidler, Berlin, Shereff, Friedman LLP
3000 K St. NW
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Robert J. Aamoth
Andrew M. Klein
Kelley, Drye & Warren L.L.P.
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036

Linda L. Oliver
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.
555 Thirteenth St. NW
Washington, DC 20004

Barth E. Royer
Bell, Royer & Sanders Co., LPA
33 South Grant Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Michael R. Smalz
Ohio State Legal Services Association
861 N. High St.
Columbus, OH 43215

Christopher Holt
CoreComm Limited
110 E. 59 St.
New York, NY 10022

Mary W. Christensen
Christensen, Shoemaker, Winkler,
Howarth & Taylor
77 East Nationwide Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43215-2539

Howard Siegel
Vice President-Regulatory Policy
IP Communications Corp.
502 West 14th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

John W. Bentine
Todd M. Rodgers
Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP
17 S. High Street, Suite 900
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Sheldon A. Taft
Stephen M. Howard
Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease
52 E. Gay St., P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, OH 43216-1008

Regulatory Manager
Scherers Communications Group
670 Lakeview Plaza Blvd., Ste. A
Worthington, OH 43085-4783

Thomas J. O'Brien
Bricker & Eckler, LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291

Glenn Harris
Itzel D. Berrio
NorthPoint Communications, Inc.
303 Second Street, South Tower
San Francisco, CA 94107

Carol Ann Bischoff
COMPTTEL
1900 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Kevin M. Sullivan

One of the Attorneys for Ameritech Ohio